INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]

NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI[®]

ANTECEDENTS AND OUTCOMES OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICER
ATTITUDES TOWARDS FEDERAL INMATES: AN EXPLORATION OF PERSON-
ORGANIZATION FIT

© Michel A.S. Larivière

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research at Carleton
University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in Psychology

Ottawa, 2001

**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-60959-6

Canada

The undersigned recommend to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
Acceptance of the thesis:

"Antecedents and Outcomes of Correctional Officer Attitudes Towards Federal Inmates:
An Exploration of Person-Organization Fit"

submitted by

Michel Larivière

in Partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'K. ...', written over a horizontal line.

Chair

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'A. ...', written over a horizontal line.

External Examiner

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'D. ...', written over a horizontal line.

Thesis Supervisor

Carleton University
May, 2001

Abstract

Correctional Officers represent a large, influential group of prison workers and have long attracted the interest of social scientists. Their attitudes towards inmates, and the prediction of these attitudes, have received particular scrutiny, especially since Zimbardo's (1973) seminal study of a mock prison. Compared to other workers, Correctional Officers are often the least empathic, the most punitive, and the least supportive of rehabilitation. This is unfortunate since Correctional Officers are ideally placed to improve the social atmosphere of institutions and to positively influence those under their supervision.

A recent line of enquiry has examined the work adjustment of Correctional Officers including job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Results obtained thus far have not been encouraging; compared to other employees Correctional Officers have usually shown the poorest outcomes.

The present study examined the attitudes and work adjustment of a large sample of correctional workers employed by the Correctional Service of Canada. Extending previous research, it also explored the link between attitudes and work adjustment. Using Person-Organization fit theory it then examined the moderating effect of an institution's environment on stress, satisfaction, and commitment.

Results showed that attitudes among Correctional Officers were predominantly negative. Education and prison size emerged as robust determinants of empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation. While notable regional and age-related differences were found, only moderate levels of variance were explained.

A strong relationship was found between correctional attitudes and work adjustment. In fact, attitudinal variables were far more important than institutional characteristics, and the interaction between the two, in explaining job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The implications of these findings were discussed in terms of staff recruitment, retention, and management. It is suggested that future research consider how staff attitudes influence actual offender behaviour and their successful reintegration into the community.

Acknowledgments

There are a number of people without whom this work would never have come to fruition. Thanks go first to my advisor, Dr. David Robinson, who graciously accepted the responsibility of guiding my doctoral studies. David introduced me to social learning theory then applied it through his consistent demonstration of intelligence, patience, accessibility, industry, and genuineness. How he managed to supervise several graduate students while meeting extensive familial and professional obligations is certainly worthy of additional research.

I am grateful to the Correctional Service of Canada, and to Dr. Larry Motiuk of the Research Branch, for the opportunity to mine such a rich repository of information. The following pages will hopefully make a useful contribution to the organization's knowledge base and corporate development. It has certainly helped me gain understanding and insight into this very large workforce. I am particularly indebted to Dr. Robert Climie who kindly granted me two years of focused effort at Carleton University. His leadership and support in this regard is deeply appreciated. A special thank you goes to the staff at the Ministry library, especially Noëlla, Heather, and Leonard. While I promise to never write another thesis, I'm still likely to request many articles and books from you.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Adelle Forth and Dr. Brian Grant for participating on my thesis committee. Their interest and helpful comments along the way certainly improved the final product. The insights articulated by Dr. Alan Leschied and Dr. Charles Gordon rendered my thesis defense a pleasant and memorable event. I would also like to extend my appreciation to Kim Cook, Lynn Giff, and Etelle Bourassa for their administrative acumen and quiet influence behind the scenes. And to those who helped make my experience at Carleton University an intellectually stimulating one: Dr. Tina Daniels, Dr. David Simourd, Dr. Robert Hoge, Dr. Richard Dillon, Dr. Peter Fried, Dr. Shelley Borys, and Fred Tobin, many thanks.

Friendships were perhaps the most important, and certainly the most pleasant, findings of my doctoral work. Much is owed to Dale McLees whose balanced lifestyle, social conscience, and correctional philosophy exerted a strong and positive influence on

me. Dale can reflect on a lifetime of helping others and I am fortunate to have been one of them. Jemeen Horton was surely the finest statistics partner I could have found. But it is not so much the vectors, polynomials, and alphas that are etched in my mind from that course, but rather her persistence, success, and camaraderie. I also had the good fortune of working with Dr. Sharon Kennedy who sparked my interest in treatment and is largely responsible for the clinical work I am currently undertaking. Many others helped make pleasant an otherwise arduous graduate program. I think especially of Manon, Marlo, Mike, cousins Heidi and Christine, Craig, Anne, Suzanne, Mary, Michel, Avery, my godson Quincy, as well as Liz, Frank, Bart, Alex, and Sarah.

I would like to express my gratitude to the Tonnos and Boudreau families for their support and prayers during this undertaking. How I have looked forward to holiday dinners with Roger, Solange, Marie-Anna, Marc, Samantha, Amy, Eric, Kate, Miranda, Pierre, Tanya, and Steffon! At the end of my exile in Ottawa, I will also look forward to many feasts with the entire Tonnos clan, hopefully several on the shores of South Bay. In the meantime, I would like to express my special appreciation to Jid, Judy, Mary-Anne, Stonewall, Rebecca, Albert, Rose, and Joshua. Their warmth and genuine interest in my work was always energizing. And to Rita, I would like to say that Dr. Kimble, the little fugitive, often thinks of you.

Closure on six years of graduate work necessarily leads to personal reflection. In my case, I have thought a great deal about my immediate family and their central role in my life. I will always be grateful to my siblings Roc, Natalie, and Brigitte for their availability and continued involvement in my plans despite the physical distance between us. It is with a great deal of pride and comfort that I think of them, of their success, and of their partners Carolyn, Marco, and Rick.

I have also been blessed with two loving parents, Marcel and Diane. As teachers and lifelong learners, it is they who nurtured my curiosity for the world around me. It has been said that a house is no home unless it contains food and fire for the mind as well as the body. And so, thanks to them, I grew up surrounded by literature- from National Geographic to Saint Thomas Aquinas, from Dr. Seuss to Dostoevsky. The kitchen table was often a gathering place for lectures, readings, and thoughtful debate attracting both the marginal and the strong, the worldly and the ascetic, on issues ranging anywhere from

farming to epistemology. Ah, what wondrous adventures for the young developing mind! I am hopeful that I will never outgrow their legacy of study and introspection. At the very least, I will hold dear their spirituality, openness, autonomy, and deep belief that anything their children undertook was possible.

My newborn son Samuel rested quietly at my side as I wrote most of this manuscript. His gentle cooing and warm, generous smiles provided most welcomed distractions from my everyday ritual at the keyboard. I, too, plan to be by his side as he undertakes life's many challenges, academic or otherwise.

Finally and most importantly, I want to thank the person who was present during every frustration, disappointment, defeat, and victory. My wife Céline is so many things to so many people that it is hard to keep track: wife, mother, daughter, sister, cousin, friend, professor, and scientist. And she remains gracious, optimistic, generous, and tireless in each of these roles. To say that she was instrumental in the successful completion of this doctorate would certainly be insufficient. She is a gift from above and for that, I will always be grateful.

Dedicated to Meg and the Buds

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
Dedication.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables.....	ix
List of Figures.....	xi
List of Appendices.....	xii
Introduction.....	1
Correctional Officers' attitudes towards offenders.....	4
The Importation-Differential Experiences Model.....	12
The Work Role-Prisonization Model.....	22
Model Selection.....	25
Correctional Officer work adjustment research.....	27
Job stress.....	27
Job satisfaction.....	30
Organizational commitment.....	34
Person-Organization Fit.....	36
Summary and problem formulation.....	39
Hypotheses.....	46
Method.....	52
Setting.....	52
Participants.....	53
Research instrument.....	54
Demographics.....	55
Correctional attitudes.....	55
Work adjustment.....	58
Procedure.....	60

Results.....	61
Demographics.....	61
Psychometrics.....	65
Correctional attitudes.....	71
Number of positive correctional attitudes and consistency of attitudes.....	74
Attitudes in treatment and women's institutions.....	77
Prediction of correctional attitudes.....	78
Work adjustment.....	85
Prediction of work adjustment.....	88
Attitude interactions.....	99
Person-institution interactions.....	101
Discussion.....	109
Attitudes towards inmates.....	109
Prediction of attitudes towards inmates.....	111
Work adjustment.....	118
Prediction of work adjustment.....	119
Attitude consistency.....	123
Person-organization fit.....	125
Study limitations and future research.....	129
References.....	131
Appendices.....	148

List of Tables

1	Outcomes of gender-based attitude research.....	14
2	Outcomes of race-based attitude research.....	16
3	Outcomes of education-based research.....	19
4	Outcomes of age-based attitude research.....	21
5	Response rate and sample size by job type.....	54
6	Empathy subscale.....	57
7	Punitiveness subscale.....	57
8	Support for rehabilitation subscale.....	58
9	Job stress subscale.....	59
10	Job satisfaction subscale.....	59
11	Organizational commitment subscale.....	60
12	Sample size by occupational group and gender.....	62
13	Sample descriptive statistics.....	63
14	Age and experience of Correctional Officers and non-Correctional Officers.....	64
15	Language, education, and race of COs and non-COs.....	65
16	Correlations among subscales and internal consistency.....	66
17	Factor loadings on attitudes towards inmates items.....	69
18	Factor loadings on work adjustment items.....	70
19	Correctional attitude scales by occupational group.....	72
20	ANOVA measuring correctional attitudes across occupational groups.....	72
21	Correctional attitudes of prison occupational groups.....	73
22	Attitude consistency for custodial and non-custodial staff.....	76
23	ANOVA summary table of work adjustment by correctional attitudes.....	76
24	Positive correctional attitudes and indicators of work adjustment.....	77
25	Attitudes of Correctional Officers in treatment centers and non-treatment centres..	78
26	Attitudes of Correctional Officers in male and female prisons.....	78
27	Prediction of empathy among prison workers.....	82

List of Tables (cont...)

28	Prediction of punitiveness among prison workers.....	83
29	Prediction of support for rehabilitation among prison workers.....	84
30	Work adjustment scales by occupational group.....	86
31	ANOVA measuring work adjustment across occupational groups.....	86
32	Work adjustment of prison occupational groups.....	87
33	Prediction of job stress among prison workers.....	91
34	Prediction of job satisfaction among prison workers.....	92
35	Prediction of organizational commitment among prison workers.....	93
36	Prediction of job stress among prison workers.....	96
37	Prediction of job satisfaction among prison workers.....	97
38	Prediction of organizational commitment among prison workers.....	98
39	3-way ANOVA measuring job stress among Correctional Officers.....	100
40	3-way ANOVA measuring job satisfaction among Correctional Officers.....	100
41	3-way ANOVA measuring commitment among Correctional Officers.....	101
42	ANOVA measuring individual and institutional empathy on work adjustment.....	103
43	ANOVA measuring individual and institutional punitiveness on work adjustment.	103
44	ANOVA measuring individual and institutional support for rehabilitation on work adjustment.....	104

List of Figures

1	Antecedents and outcomes of correctional attitudes: The influence of fit.....	51
2	Mean Correctional Officer empathy scores by age.....	105
3	Mean Correctional Officer punitiveness scores by age.....	106
4	Mean Correctional Officer support for rehabilitation scores by age.....	106
5	Mean Correctional Officer empathy scores by experience.....	107
6	Mean Correctional Officer punitiveness scores by experience.....	107
7	Mean Correctional Officer support for rehabilitation scores by experience.....	108

List of Appendices

A	The 1996 Correctional Service of Canada All-Staff Survey.....	148
B	Modifications to correctional attitude subscales.....	192
C	Correlation matrices for correctional attitude and work adjustment scales..	197
D	SPSS data output for multiple stepwise regression analyses.....	202
E	Regional variations in correctional attitudes and work adjustment.....	287
F	Analysis of Variance cell means.....	289

Antecedents and Outcomes of Correctional Officer Attitudes towards Federal Inmates: An Exploration of Person-Organization Fit

Correctional Officers are by far the largest occupational group of the prison system. Recent U.S. statistics show that there are nearly 300,000 Correctional Officers working in federal, state, and local institutions (Finn, 1998). Though smaller in number, Canadian Federal Correctional Officers are equally well represented. There are approximately 6,000 Correctional Officers among a total staff complement of 14,325 in the federal system alone (N. Cohen, personal communication, January 11, 2000). This reason in and of itself might explain why Correctional Officers have attracted such a great deal of attention from policy makers and social scientists. In fact, a search of the National Criminal Justice Reference System database (NCJRS, 2000) reveals no fewer than 2,961 entries for the keywords Correctional Officer. Yet Correctional Officers, or Prison Guards as they have sometimes been referred to, are of interest to researchers and policy makers for a number of other reasons.

At an obvious level, Correctional Officers are responsible for maintaining the security, peace, and order of a correctional institution. In doing so, they play an important role in protecting the public at large and in protecting inmates from each other. It has become increasingly clear that this custodial function is no easy task. An extensive legislative framework guides Correctional Officers' duties and their actions are carried out within a complex bureaucracy with its own set of policies, procedures, and expectations. At the same time, Correctional Officers are called to act in accordance with an organization's guiding philosophy which, in many systems, includes the notion of treatment and rehabilitation.

At a deeper level, researchers have been interested in the psychology of Correctional Officers. While several social scientists have explored the general characteristics of these workers, fewer have studied the effect of the correctional environment itself on individual attitudes. In rare instances, researchers have examined how these personal and environmental factors might interact with each other to influence attitudes and behaviours.

Historically, this occupational group has been over represented by rural Caucasian men with little formal education and frequent unemployment (Irwin, 1980). Many began their careers in their mid to late twenties after having tried a number of other jobs, including the military (Philliber, 1987). Correctional Officers frequently report that their main attraction to prison work is job security and the steady pay that it offers. Few relate to their occupation as a profession; most often, Correctional Officers view their work as “just another job” (Josi & Sechrest, 1998). However, it should be pointed out that these descriptors are based on American studies and may not accurately reflect the typical backgrounds of Canadian Federal Correctional Officers.

However, research by Rosine (1992) on 121 randomly selected Correctional Officers from the Ontario region revealed the following characteristics: 71 percent were male, 15 percent had military experience, and only 11 percent were university graduates. These subjects had on average 6.5 years work experience prior to joining the Correctional Service of Canada. Recent statistics also show that visible minorities, including members of Aboriginal groups, account for less than 7 percent of the Canadian Federal Correctional Officer population (N. Cohen, personal communication, January 11, 2000). Considering the fact that most Federal penitentiaries in Canada are situated in small

communities and remote areas, it would appear that Canadian Federal Correctional Officers are not altogether different from their American counterparts, at least from a demographic point of view.

A precursor to much of the research on Correctional Officers is a well-known study that was conducted by Zimbardo and his collaborators in 1973 (Jacobs & Kraft, 1978). Zimbardo created a mock prison at Stanford University and randomly assigned male students to “prisoner” or “guard” roles for an extended period of time. Guards were given simple rules to enforce during their 8-hour “shift” and were basically told to maintain order. The results were unexpected and dramatic. Animosity between the two groups became so intense that the experiment was terminated early. Among “prisoners”, Zimbardo described a syndrome of depression and helplessness while “guards” were characterized as authoritarian, hostile, and in some cases, sadistic.

Zimbardo’s research was often used to support the idea that Correctional Officers’ attitudes towards inmates are the result of environmental conditions (e.g., the type of prison) and the role they are assigned (e.g., custody/punishment vs. rehabilitation). These variables were presumed to act independently of an individual’s gender, education, age, race, and socio-economic status (Jacobs & Kraft, 1978). In many ways, Zimbardo’s work explored one of the most important questions in psychology, that is, the relative importance of individual versus environmental conditions as predictors of attitudes and behaviours.

While Zimbardo’s (1973) study was criticized for a variety of reasons, not the least of which was on ethical grounds, it did generate a significant amount of work in this area. Subsequent research would seek to answer the following questions: 1) Do

Correctional Officers have uniformly negative attitudes toward inmates? 2) Which variables tend to best predict these attitudes? And 3) what is the relative contribution of individual factors (e.g., gender, race, education, age) versus environmental factors (e.g., security level, amount of contact with inmates, prison size) in determining these attitudes?

Three attitudes have been of particular interest to prison researchers: empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation. Within the context of correctional work, empathy has been defined as perspective taking or the willingness to understand the circumstances and affective state of inmates. This construct usually taps into issues of trust, compassion, and advocacy for offenders. Punitiveness assesses the extent to which a Correctional Officer favours punishment, deterrence, and retribution for criminal behaviour whereas support for rehabilitation reflects an employee's endorsement of treatment, intervention and correctional programming in general.

Correctional Officers' attitudes toward offenders

Following in the steps of Zimbardo (1973), researchers began to explore the aggressive potential of actual Correctional Officers (Jenne & Kersting, 1996; Marquart, 1986). A notable field-study in a Texas prison by Marquart (1986) showed that physical violence against inmates was commonplace and seemed to be a highly structured, even ritualized, activity. With the Warden's permission, Marquart entered a large maximum-security prison for a 19-month period as a "guard". He discretely noted over 50 acts of violence, including severe beatings, committed against inmates who had violated diverse rules. More recent work by Jenne and Kersting (1996) however, indicated that such

widespread violence was rather exceptional. Though relying entirely on self-report measures, these authors concluded that Correctional Officers rarely use physical force to obtain the compliance of inmates. Their data was obtained from six different institutions, suggesting that Marquart's observations may have been limited to one problematic prison. Alternatively, it is possible that Correctional Officer attitudes have shifted in a positive direction in the 10 years that followed Marquart's work.

While the exact prevalence of Correctional Officer violent misconduct is still uncertain, the fact that it occurs at all is indicative of negative attitudes towards offenders. Chang and Zastrow (1976) investigated Prison Guards' perceptions of inmates to determine if their views were conducive to rehabilitation. Using a 20-item semantic differential scale, it was reported that guards perceived inmates as highly unpredictable, sneaky, untrustworthy, undependable, and lazy. The authors suggested that offender treatment would be practically impossible under these conditions. Moreover, they proposed that guards were "implicitly being a factor in perpetuating the criminal behaviour for which inmates have been incarcerated" (p. 96). Using Cooley's "looking-glass self" theory of self-concept, Chang and Zastrow (1976) argued that inmates would continue to engage in antisocial activity once released from prison because this was the overriding expectation of people in their immediate environment (i.e., Prison Guards).

Equally negative views of inmates were reported by a majority of guards in Jacob and Kraft's (1978) study. Over 90 percent of their sample felt that inmates "try to take advantage of you whenever they can". A similar number agreed with the statement "the courts have given inmates so many rights that it is practically impossible to maintain satisfactory discipline". Accordingly, relatively few Correctional Officers feel that

inmates have a right to legitimate avenues of protest such as talking or writing to the Warden, filing a grievance, or bringing it to the attention of the Inmate Committee (Hepburn, 1984). At the same time, Correctional Officers report that they lack power and control over inmates and that their authority continues to be eroded as correctional systems become more centralized (Hepburn, 1987).

Freeman and Johnson (1982) who conducted a survey of health-related knowledge, attitudes, and practices of Correctional Officers have reported other harmful views. They revealed that over two-thirds of Correctional Officers were “uncertain whether their colleagues would use CPR for inmates who needed it”.

There are also indications that Correctional Officer attitudes vary according to certain inmate attributes. Kropp, Cox, Roesch, and Eaves (1989) found that Correctional Officers perceived mentally disordered offenders less favourably than other offenders describing them as more dangerous and less predictable. Yet based on their review of the literature, Wormith and Borzecki (1985) have concluded that “the mentally disordered offender is very unlikely to be dangerous...similarly, the violent individual typically is not mentally disordered” (p. 77). As well, Bonta, Hanson, and Law’s (1998) meta-analysis has shown that mentally disordered offenders were actually less likely to recidivate either violently or for any new crime.

Similar biases would also seem to exist for sexual offenders. Weekes, Pelletier, and Beaudette (1995) reported that Correctional Officers perceived this type of inmate to be more dangerous, aggressive, and unchangeable than other types of inmates. Yet authors like Gordon and Porporino (1991) have stated that sexual offenders (excluding pedophiles) and non-sexual offenders tend to be similar in terms of their personality,

criminal history, and level of sexual arousal. On the other hand, there is ongoing and polarized debate in the literature regarding the effectiveness of sex offender treatment. While Marshall (1993) and Marshall and Pithers (1994) have argued that intervention reduces victimization and re-incarceration, recent work by Quinsey, Khanna, and Malcolm (1998) showed that specialized sex offender programming had little effect on recidivism. In fact, these authors suggested an emphasis on incarceration and supervision for high-risk offenders and minimal intervention for low-risk offenders. Ongoing longitudinal work by Marques (1999) may help resolve this debate. Preliminary findings suggest that treating serious sex offenders may still be worthwhile despite the fact that in the aggregate, treatment and control groups have just about the same rates for new sex offenses following release.

A number of researchers have compared the attitudes of Correctional Officers with those of other prison workers (Gerstein, Topp, & Correll, 1987; Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980; Ortet-Fabrigat, Perez, & Lewis, 1993, Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd, 1993, Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd, 1996). Each of these studies showed that Correctional Officers had significantly poorer views of inmates, and showed less support for rehabilitation than workers in other occupational groups including parole officers, health care workers, vocational counselors, teachers, labourers, and administrators.

These findings might not be unexpected given the type of work Correctional Officers perform and the conditions in which their duties are carried out. Rosine (1992) underlines that prisons are unusual social environments in that they bring employees in close contact with individuals who are not only held against their will but in many cases have a demonstrated potential for violence. In fact, the main disadvantage of guard work

reported by a large sample of American Correctional Officers was found to be “danger” (Jacobs, 1978).

Yet, there is a remarkable lack of aggression directed at Correctional Officers. In a study of New York prisons, Light (1991) found only 19 cases of violence directed at a sample of 24,000 guards. In fact, the murder rate for American Correctional Officers on the job is about 3 per 100,000 compared to a murder rate of 8 per 100,000 in the general population (Ouimet, 1999). Little data of this kind is currently available for Canadian federal penitentiaries. However, in a study of the Québec provincial prison system, Ouimet (1999) reports that no Correctional Officer has been murdered in the last 10 years while on the job. In fact, his review of 8,554 disciplinary infractions recorded in 1996 uncovered only five cases of physical aggression directed against Correctional Officers. While these incidents did warrant police notification, none led to serious physical injury. The findings suggest that Correctional Officer perceptions of danger may not accurately fit reality. Indeed, Ouimet (1999) describes how Correctional Officers have rates of victimization lower than that of bailiffs, police officers and social workers. They are also less likely to be injured on the job than miners, truck drivers, and construction workers. Ouimet (1999) has argued that this lack of aggression is due to the fact that inmates fear the swift and certain punishment that would result from attacks on Correctional Officers. Lusignan (1995) has also suggested that Correctional Officers rarely leave themselves vulnerable to attack as they tend to work in close proximity to each other and are usually able to defend themselves if necessary.

Despite the above findings, there are suggestions in the literature that Correctional Officers' attitudes are not uniformly negative. A study by Jacobs (1978) showed that 46

percent of guards thought “rehabilitation was the main purpose of imprisonment” and only 26 percent believed that “punishment was the main reason for putting the offender in prison”. Seventy-five percent agreed with the statement “only a few inmates are troublemakers; most of them are decent people”.

Burton, Ju, Dunaway, and Wolfe’s (1991) sample of Bermudan guards expressed even stronger views. Eighty-six percent would support “expanding the rehabilitation programs with criminals that are now being undertaken in our prisons”. Another eighty-six percent disagreed with the statement: “the only way to reduce crime in our society is to punish criminals, not try to rehabilitate them”. It should also be noted that these findings are consistent with those of the general public who, to a large extent, continue to support offender rehabilitation programs (Cullen, Skovron, Scott, & Burton, 1990).

Regarding their present job duties, a significant number of Correctional Officers have expressed a desire to “listen to prisoners problems” and “try to support them in much the same way a social worker would” (Shamir & Drory, 1981). Recent work by Simourd (1996) on a Canadian sample largely confirms these views and challenges the common stereotype of Correctional Officers as brutal disciplinarians. Results indicated that on average, Correctional Officers were supportive of rehabilitation and human service work and generally unsupportive of punitive approaches.

Interestingly, these findings contradict Correctional Officers’ own views of their profession and their peers. Toch and Klofas (1982) showed that Correctional Officers underestimate the professional orientation of their colleagues and overestimate their cynicism and punitiveness. This “pluralistic ignorance” to which Toch and Klofas refer causes empathic Correctional Officers to incorrectly feel that they are in the minority and

punitive Correctional Officers to feel that their views are mainstream even though they are not.

In summary, the evidence regarding Correctional Officer attitudes towards inmates is mixed. While there are documented accounts of violence committed against inmates it does not appear that such behaviour is widespread. And although a significant number of Correctional Officers express a negative view of inmates, a number of others seem to favour rehabilitation and show a strong desire to participate in such efforts.

In all cases however, researchers seem to agree that Correctional Officers are extremely important players in the criminal justice system and certainly worthy of additional research. As the correctional system's largest occupational group, Correctional Officers have the most contact with inmates. They strongly influence the human environment within prisons and to a large extent, are responsible for what prisoners experience during their incarceration (Hepburn & Knepper; 1993). Guenther and Guenther (1974) state that Correctional Officers are the most important people in an inmate's world. Several others argue that Correctional Officers have a unique opportunity to improve the institutional atmosphere, carry out correctional objectives, and reinforce treatment gains (Chang & Zastrow, 1976; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986; Smith, Milan, Wood, & McKee, 1976). At the very least, Correctional Officers seem ideally placed to engage in pro-social modeling which, as Bandura (1977) has shown, is a major influence on behaviour. As a result, some have suggested an expansion or evolution of the role of the Correctional Officer to include elements of treatment and rehabilitation (Lombardo, 1985; Toch, 1978).

To this end, the Human Services Model has been proposed (Hepburn & Knepper, 1993; Johnson & Price, 1981). In this model, Correctional Officers not only enforce prison rules but also act as lay counselors, mediators, administrative ombudspersons, and treatment aides (Larivière & Robinson, 1996). Johnson and Price (1981, as cited in Hepburn & Knepper, 1993) state:

Correctional Officers must evolve roles that blend, merge, or balance custodial and treatment functions. Human service roles offer one means to this end. Officers who play human service roles seek to advise, support, console, refer, or otherwise assist inmates with the problems and crises of adjustment produced by imprisonment. (p. 344)

It is clear from previous research that not all Correctional Officers have a Human Services orientation. Some are focused exclusively on custodial objectives (i.e., prison security) and/or hold punitive attitudes toward inmates. In contrast, those most likely to support the Human Services Model would be empathic and supportive of rehabilitation. Accordingly, researchers have exerted considerable effort to determine the predictors of correctional attitudes. In this regard, two models have been proposed (Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link, & Wolfe, 1991).

The first has been referred to as the Importation-Differential Experiences Model, which focuses on the individual and demographic predictors of attitudes. Basically, the model argues that the perceptions that people have of offenders is an outcome of what they bring or “import” to the job (e.g., gender, race, education, age, religious beliefs, degree of urbanization). The second has been called the Work Role-Prisonization model. It downplays individual differences on the basis that the prison environment overpowers

whatever Correctional Officers may bring to the job. According to this model, and consistent with Zimbardo's thoughts, variables such as the type of institution, the frequency of contact with inmates, and the length of tenure would be the most important predictors of attitudes toward inmates. The following section of this review examines commonly studied predictors within the framework of the two aforementioned models.

The Importation-Differential Experiences Model

Gender. The introduction of women as Correctional Officers is a fairly recent phenomenon and is an outcome of the employment equity policies of the 1960's and 1970's (Philliber, 1987). In addition to creating a more representative workforce, policy makers have suggested that the presence of female correctional officers might have a "normalizing" effect on an otherwise homogeneous social environment (Pogrebin & Poole, 1997).

Qualitative research suggests that women have better interpersonal relationships with inmates, contribute to a more relaxed prison environment, and increase morale within the institution (Szockyj, 1989). While these observations still require empirical verification, they do seem intuitively plausible. One thing seems certain however; men and women are attracted to the field of corrections for different reasons. Jurik and Halembe (1984) reported that compared to men, women preferred the human service aspects of their job such as treatment and counseling. However, few other gender differences have been reported. In terms of attitudes towards inmates, most studies have demonstrated similar levels of punitiveness, support for rehabilitation, and custodial orientation (Table 1). Only Crouch and Alpert (1982) and Walters (1992) have found

gender differences. In both of these studies, men were found to be more aggressive/punitive and custody oriented than women.

The findings presented on the following page must be assessed with an understanding that women are relatively new to the correctional milieu. Therefore attitudinal differences, or lack thereof, may be the result of a number of factors other than gender. Because of recent recruitment efforts, female samples tend to be younger, more educated, and more racially diverse (Jenne & Kersting, 1996; Jurik & Halemba, 1984). This in turn may have an effect on rank, shift, assigned institution, and specific job duties. At the same time, women continue to be significantly under-represented in the correctional workforce. At the Correctional Service of Canada for instance, the ratio of male to female Correctional Officers is approximately 4 to 1 (N. Cohen, personal communication, January 11, 2000). As a result, women may be socialized to adopt existing male attitudes and perceptions. Unfortunately, researchers usually fail to account for these factors in their analyses.

Table 1. Outcomes of gender-based attitude research.

Author	Outcome variable	Males	Females
Crouch & Alpert, 1982	Aggression/Punitiveness	+	-
Jurik & Halemba, 1984	Punitiveness	=	=
Zupan, 1986	Perception of inmate needs	=	=
Cullen et al., 1989	Support for rehabilitation	=	=
Van Voorhis et al., 1991	Support for rehabilitation Custody orientation	=	=
Walters, 1992	Custody orientation	+	-
Robinson et al., 1993	Support for rehabilitation	=	=
Jenne & Kersting, 1996	Aggression	=	=
Paboojian & Teske, 1997	Support for rehabilitation	=	=

Race. As has been the case with women, focused efforts have been undertaken to increase the representation of minorities in the prison system. Some have proposed that including minority groups in the correctional workplace would reduce tensions between staff and inmates on the basis that non-Caucasian Officers would more readily identify with the cultural and socio-economic backgrounds of many offenders (Jackson & Ammen, 1996). If this is the case, then one might expect more positive attitudes towards inmates among minority-status workers.

The research presented below strongly supports this expectation. As can be seen in Table 2, only one study (Jacobs & Kraft, 1978) showed a more positive attitude among

non-minority Officers. Based on the number of disciplinary reports that were filed over a period of time, Jacobs and Kraft (1978) showed that minority Officers were more active disciplinarians than non-minority Officers were. However, it should also be pointed out that the minority Officers in this study preferred and chose assignments that required frequent contact with inmates. Interestingly, non-minorities preferred working in the security towers. This reason alone might explain the more frequent disciplinary reports filed by minority workers. More importantly though, the findings suggested that these minorities were more likely to demonstrate a preference for a Human Service orientation as opposed to a custody/control orientation.

Crouch and Alpert (1982) provide the only study not to show racial differences with regard to attitudes towards inmates. However, their research may have been limited by a small sample size ($N = 84$) and reliance on a fairly obscure measure of punitiveness (Thurstone's Attitudes Toward Punishment of Criminals- 1968). Moreover, participants in the study were new recruits of the Texas Department of Corrections (TDC)- a reportedly conservative and punitive system. Accordingly, individuals with a Human Service orientation may be less inclined to seek employment from (and be selected by) this particular organization.

Table 2 shows that in every other study found for this review, minority-status employees demonstrated more empathy, a greater support for rehabilitation, and lower levels of punitiveness towards inmates than non-minority employees did.

Table 2. Outcomes of race-based attitude research.

Author	Outcome variable	Minority Status	Non-minority Status
Jacobs & Kraft, 1978	Punitiveness	+	-
Jurik, 1985	Support for rehabilitation Extension of inmate rights	+	-
Cullen, 1989	Support for rehabilitation	+	-
Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989	Punitiveness	-	+
Van Voorhis et al., 1991	Support for rehabilitation	+	-
Crouch & Alpert, 1982	Punitiveness Aggression	=	=
Jackson, & Ammen, 1996	Support for rehabilitation Punitiveness	+	-
		-	+

Education. Concurrent with efforts to recruit women and minorities, several correctional jurisdictions sought to increase the educational level of front-line staff (Jurik, 1985). This movement towards professionalization has taken place despite warnings that a highly educated line staff might be incompatible with large bureaucracies and rigid hierarchical structures (Jacobs, 1983). Nevertheless, modern prison systems have incrementally raised educational standards such that university-trained individuals are now preferred candidates for employment as Correctional Officers. Policy makers expected highly educated officers “to be more interested in new human service components of their position; to have more treatment-oriented and less punitive attitudes towards inmates and to select their job for intrinsic reasons rather than for the extrinsic

rewards it offers” (Jurik, Halembe, Musheno, & Boyle, 1987). There is at least partial support for this statement.

Research has demonstrated that university graduates tend to select correctional work because they perceive it to be a helping profession and because they enjoy the intrinsic aspects of the job (Hepburn & Knepper, 1993; Jurik, Halembe, Musheno, & Boyle, 1987; Jurik & Musheno, 1986). However, while there is a general trend towards more positive attitudes towards inmates with increasing levels of education, the relationship between these variables is often tenuous. As can be seen in Table 3, many studies show that education has little impact on attitudes. In fact, the results are remarkably similar to what has been observed in gender studies, that is, highly educated workers tend to hold a human services orientation but feel no differently about those under their supervision. A recent study by Robinson, Porporino, and Simourd (1997) demonstrated that while university trained Correctional Officers were less custody oriented and more supportive of rehabilitation in general, they did not express any greater interest in participating in treatment or in counseling inmates than those with only high school education.

Results showing no attitudinal differences between higher and lesser-educated Correctional Officers should be treated with caution. As was the case with female Officers, educated workers tend to be younger and less experienced. Accordingly, these employees might be assigned the least desirable jobs in the most difficult institutions. In fact, studies showing no attitudinal differences on the basis of educational attainment have all drawn their samples from either medium or maximum-security facilities. It is perhaps not surprising then that highly educated Correctional Officers are significantly

less satisfied with their jobs than Correctional Officers who have not received any post-secondary training (Jacobs, 1983). Educated Correctional Officers also tend to be more urban and more racially diverse than their less educated counterparts. Without adequate experimental or statistical controls in place, these variables will probably interact and affect attitudes in several unknown ways.

It is also interesting to note that with the exception of Shamir and Drory's (1981) research on Israeli Correctional Officers, studies showing no attitudinal differences were all conducted in the Southern or Southwestern United States. For example, Jurik's three articles assessed Correctional Officers from the same medium-security institution in Arizona. These findings are probably limited in their generalizability and may not adequately reflect the circumstances of other jurisdictions, especially those in Canada.

Table 3. Outcomes of education-based attitude research.

Author	Outcome variable	Lower educational level	Higher educational level
Teske & Williamson, 1979	Support for rehabilitation	-	+
Poole & Regoli, 1980	Custody orientation	+	-
Shamir & Drory, 1981	Empathy Support for rehabilitation	=	=
Crouch & Alpert, 1982	Punitiveness/aggression	=	=
Jurik, 1985	Support for rehabilitation	=	=
Jurik & Musheno, 1986	Support for rehabilitation	=	=
Jurik et al., 1987	Punitiveness	=	=
Cullen et al., 1989	Support for rehabilitation	=	=
Burton et al., 1991	Support for rehabilitation	-	+
Rogers, 1991	Custody orientation	+	-
Van Voorhis et al., 1991	Support for rehabilitation Custody orientation	=	=
Loza, 1993	Support for rehabilitation	-	+
Robinson et al., 1993	Support for rehabilitation	-	+
Paboojian & Teske, 1997	Support for rehabilitation	=	=
Robinson et al., 1997	Custody orientation	+	-
	Support for rehabilitation	-	+
	Punitiveness	+	-

Age. For the most part, studies have shown a positive relationship between chronological age and a supportive attitude towards inmates (Table 4). The reasons for this are unclear and the literature offers few explanations. Some have proposed that a maturation process occurs with time on the job, that is, workers eventually become more realistic about their career expectations and contributions (Paboojian & Teske, 1997). Others have suggested that correctional employees simply “mellow” with age (Toch & Klofas, 1982); for example, they tend to be more accepting of individual differences. Alternatively, poor attitudes towards inmates may lead to Correctional Officer burnout and attrition, especially in correctional systems that emphasize treatment and rehabilitation. In these jurisdictions, more senior age cohorts would be over-represented by empathic, non-punitive, and pro-rehabilitation workers.

On the other hand, research by Toch and Klofas (1982) and Rogers (1991) indicates that this explanation might be overly simplistic. Their work suggests that attitudes towards inmates might not follow a clear and predictable linear pattern. Instead, attitudes are more likely to follow a U-curve whereby the youngest and the oldest workers perceive those under their charge most positively. Middle-aged Correctional Officers, however, would hold the least favourable views of inmates. As can be seen, longitudinal research is clearly needed in this area. Regrettably, no such data is yet available in the literature and researchers must still draw inferences from cross-sectional work.

Table 4. Outcomes of age-based attitude research.

Author	Outcome variable	Younger COs	Older COs
Teske & Williamson, 1979	Support for rehabilitation	-	+
Crouch & Alpert, 1982	Punitiveness	=	=
Toch & Klofas, 1982	Custody orientation	+	-
Shamir & Drory, 1981	Empathy	=	=
	Support for rehabilitation	=	=
Jurik, 1985	Support for rehabilitation	-	+
	Punitiveness	+	-
Whitehead et al., 1987	Social contact with inmates	-	+
Cullen et al., 1989	Support for rehabilitation	-	+
Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989	Social contact with inmates	-	+
Van Voorhis et al., 1991	Support for rehabilitation	-	+
Paboojian & Teske, 1997	Support for rehabilitation	-	+

Urbanization/religious affiliation. Although receiving less attention, two other variables have been studied within the Importation-Differential Experiences Model: urbanization and religious affiliation. Toch and Klofas (1982) found that inmate-oriented Correctional Officers were more likely to come from rural communities. However, subsequent research by Klofas (1986) failed to replicate these findings and more recent work by Paboojian and Teske (1997) actually found that rural officers held more unfavourable attitudes toward inmates than their urban colleagues did.

In a rare study of religious beliefs and correctional orientations, Leiber and Woodrick (1997) failed to show a relationship between Christian fundamentalism, a dispositional explanation of crime, and retribution. On the other hand, “Biblical literalness” was positively related to support for the death penalty.

The Work Role-Prisonization Model

As previously discussed, the Work Role-Prisonization Model includes variables that derive from the correctional environment itself such as the type of facility (e.g., security level, treatment philosophy), the frequency of contact with inmates, and the amount of experience on the job.

Type of institution. Street (1965) proposed that a prison’s philosophy could be classified along a custody-rehabilitation continuum. At one extreme, the objective is to protect the public by containing inmates within the institution. At the other extreme, containment is no more important than changing an inmate’s values, attitudes, and behaviour.

To no great surprise, Street (1965) found that staff from treatment-focused institutions valued rehabilitation far more than custody-focused institutions. These staff members largely believed that correctional workers could have trusting, close, and understanding relations with inmates. Also to no surprise, staff from custodial organizations were more likely to emphasize order, discipline, and the use of strong negative sanctions. They also believed in the universal application of rules and avoided informal relations with inmates preferring that “inmates keep to themselves” (p. 45). Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link, and Wolfe, (1991) also underscored the importance of institutional

factors on Correctional Officer attitudes in finding that maximum-security staff and those working the night shift held more punitive views of inmates and were less supportive of rehabilitation. Jurik (1985) and Saylor and Wright (1992) have reported similar findings. Unfortunately, one cannot conclude from these studies that the correctional environments were responsible for changing staff attitudes. It may have been the case that staff self-selected to certain prisons based on their own expectations and beliefs.

However, an innovative program in Alabama provided a unique opportunity to explore this question. In an effort to reduce prison overcrowding, Alabama developed the Supervised Intensive Restitution (SIR) program, which provided the early release of several inmates. As a result, 35 Correctional Officers were chosen to supervise these offenders in the community and to act as quasi-Parole Officers. Freed of their custodial duties, Lindquist and Whitehead (1986) observed a decrease in punitive attitudes and a greater approval of rehabilitation among these correctional staff. Not only were their perceptions of inmates more positive than their institutional counterparts but they were also more favourable than those of regular Parole Officers. While results from this study appeared to support the Work-Role Prisonization Model, a number of selection biases may have affected the overall findings. For instance, Lindquist and Whitehead (1986) found that females and college-educated individuals were significantly over-represented in the experimental group.

Frequency of contact with inmates. Lindquist and Whitehead's (1986) study suggests that increasing the frequency of contact with offenders might also increase positive views toward them. However, research by Hepburn (1985) and Jurik (1985)

showed no relationship between these variables. In fact, Saylor and Wright (1992) found the opposite to be true. Staff who had the most contact with inmates actually had the most negative views. Overall, these findings suggest that the frequency of contact alone may not be sufficient in and of itself to explain attitudes. The context (community versus prison) and quality (custody versus support) of these interactions is probably also important.

Correctional experience. The relationship between experience as a Correctional Officer and attitudes is unclear. One theory suggests that newly recruited officers (with their idealism) and senior officers (having “mellowed” somewhat) will display the fewest negative attitudes towards inmates. Mid-career officers on the other hand (for whom idealism is gone and the relief of retirement is distant) would tend to hold the most negative perceptions of inmates (Philliber, 1987).

In support of this theory, Plecas and Maxim (1987) found that Canadian Federal Correctional Officers became more punishment oriented and less supportive of inmate rights early in their career. Nine months after induction training, the authors found increased agreement with statements such as “physical punishment is necessary in dealing with criminals”, “harsh punishment will deter people from committing crimes”, and “federal prisoners do not deserve any civil rights”. A second follow-up showed that attitudes had stabilized at these more negative levels. Also in support of Philliber’s (1987) model, Poole and Regoli (1980) showed a gradual decrease in the number of disciplinary reports filed against offenders over time. Similarly, Hepburn (1984) found that the most experienced officers had the greatest support for inmate rights. Using

results from the Correctional Service of Canada's first All-Staff Survey, Larivière and Robinson (1996) showed increasingly positive attitudes toward inmates with experience on the job. In fact, empathy and support for rehabilitation, was highest among those with 25 or more years of experience.

In contrast, Jurik (1985) discovered that longer tenured Correctional Officers were more likely to hold punitive attitudes and were generally unsupportive of rehabilitation efforts. Finally, Shamir and Drory (1981) were unable to find any relationship between experience and attitudes.

These contradictory findings are perplexing. Though age and tenure are not perfectly correlated (some careers start later in life), one would expect them to have a similar effect on attitudes. As with age, experience should increase one's positive views of inmates. Longitudinal work is clearly needed to disentangle the effects of age and experience. This type of research would also help determine if the relationship between these variables and positive attitudes is in fact curvilinear as Philliber (1987) has suggested.

Model selection

It is interesting to note that despite the literature's bias for the Work-Role Prisonization model, prediction research has typically focused on individual variables such as gender, race, education, age and to a lesser extent, religious beliefs and urbanization. Fewer studies have explored institutional variables such as overall correctional attitudes and only in rare cases have researchers considered both types of variables simultaneously.

Van Voorhis et al. (1991) predicted custody and rehabilitation orientations from race, gender, shift, education, work experience, and age. Only working the night shift significantly predicted custodial attitudes ($R^2 = .08$, *n.s.*). However, race (minority status), experience, and age significantly predicted support for rehabilitation ($R^2 = .14$, $p < .01$). Cullen, Lutze, Link, and Wolfe (1989) have reported similar findings. These authors found significant contributions for age, race, and shift in predicting custody orientations ($R^2 = .15$, $p < .05$) and support for rehabilitation ($R^2 = .17$, $p < .05$). Though not explaining much of the variance, these results suggest that both individual and environmental variables are important in predicting correctional attitudes.

Summary

Since Zimbardo's (1973) classic experiment, social scientists have shown a great deal of interest in assessing the attitudes of Correctional Officers. Despite the popular stereotypes portraying Correctional Officers as harsh or sadistic, research has shown that not all Correctional Officers have punitive attitudes. On the contrary, many Correctional Officers have expressed an empathic view of inmates and many others have supported rehabilitation efforts. In short, few generalizations can be made about this occupational group.

A secondary focus of the literature presented thus far has been on the prediction of Correctional Officer attitudes. The Importation-Differential Experiences and Work Role-Prisonization models provide a framework to examine two types of variables: individual versus institutional/environmental. Zimbardo's study suggested that the primary determinant of attitudes was the prison environment itself. However, subsequent

research suggests that variables from both models are related to attitudes toward inmates. Among these, race, age, length of job tenure, and shift (night vs. day) seem to be particularly important predictors. In the aggregate however, these variables account for very little of the variance in correctional attitudes. There are likely other variables, or combinations of variables, that more readily explain Correctional Officer's views of inmates. For instance, the size and security level of an institution might be expected to significantly influence correctional attitudes. Regrettably, these variables have been largely ignored in the literature.

Correctional Officer work adjustment research

Having explored the predictors of Correctional Officer attitudes and measured the relative contribution of individual versus environmental variables, researchers turned their attention to issues such as job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. While several studies have measured the prevalence of these work outcomes in correctional organizations, it will be seen that few have attempted to link these variables to attitudes toward inmates.

The following section examines job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among Correctional Officers and explores the possible relationship of these work outcomes with empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation.

Job stress. Stress relates to "excessive demands that produce disturbances of physiological, social, and psychological systems" (Lazarus, 1968; p. 338). The literature on stress in Correctional Officer populations is extensive and for good reason. First,

prisons are perceived as highly dangerous by those who work in them (Jacobs, 1978). Second, there is evidence that Correctional Officers suffer from a number of stress-related symptoms and illnesses (Cheek, 1984). Finally, elevated levels of stress among front-line workers can have a significant impact on a prison's operations and overall atmosphere (Rutter & Fielding, 1988).

In general, research indicates that stress in correctional environments is prevalent and that it manifests itself most intensely among Correctional Officers (Fry, 1990, Stohr Lovrich, & Wilson, 1994, Robinson et al., 1996). Thirty-nine percent of Correctional Officers in Lindquist and Whitehead's (1986) survey agreed that their jobs were "very stressful" or "more than moderately stressful". Similarly, a majority of participants in Freeman and Johnson's (1982) study admitted to "some signs of stress within the last week". Stohr et al. (1994) administered the Brief Symptom Inventory (1977) to a large sample of Correctional Officers in six different facilities and found symptoms that were above profile scores for all nonpatient populations. They reported that stress levels were "disturbingly high" and in many cases "approached dangerous levels". Only Saylor and Wright (1992) have presented evidence to the contrary. In their sample of 3,325 American prison workers, only 15 percent reported being troubled by job-related stress on a regular basis. However, their sample included non-security staff.

Indirect evidence for high stress levels among Correctional Officers can be found in health-outcome research. Cheek (1984) reported that the average lifespan for Correctional Officers is fifty-nine years; significantly less than the national average of seventy-five. Cheek (1984) also found higher rates of divorce, alcoholism, and suicide in

this occupational group. Slate and Vogel (1997) also noted that Correctional Officers were more prone to heart attacks, high blood pressure, and ulcers.

The determinants of stress in Correctional Officer populations are varied but have generally been categorized as follows (Finn, 1998): organizational (e.g., staffing levels, overtime, supervisor demands), work-related (e.g., threat of inmate violence, actual violence, inmate demands/manipulation, co-workers, security level), and external (e.g., public support and recognition). Of these, perceived level of dangerousness, administrative/management practices, and relationships with inmates and co-workers are particularly important (Cullen, Link, Wolfe, & Frank, 1985; Grossi & Berg, 1993; Long, Shouksmith, & Roache, 1986; Rutter & Fielding, 1988; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1986). Recent work by Millson (2000) on Canadian Federal Correctional Officers identified personal security as the best predictor of stress ($R^2 = .24$, $p < .0001$) followed by staff empowerment ($R^2 = .05$, $p < .0001$.) and the impact of shiftwork ($R^2 = .022$, $p < .0001$).

Time on the job also seems to effect the amount of stress experienced by correctional staff. In a study of Probation and Parole Officers, Patterson (1992) found those workers with the least and the most experience had the lowest mean stress scores. No such research has yet been conducted on Correctional Officers.

Contrary to what might be expected, the frequency of interaction with inmates has no appreciable effect on stress levels. Whitehead and Lindquist (1986) caution however, that the quality of these interactions does. In fact, Gerstein, Topp, and Correll (1987) argued that the most important contributor to staff burnout in correctional institutions is the nature of staffs' relationship with inmates. Their research showed that the more

ineffective or powerless staff felt with inmates, the more emotionally and physically exhausted they felt.

Surprisingly, positive relations with other Correctional Officers does not decrease job stress. In fact, Cullen et al. (1985) showed that peer support was related to increased levels of workplace stress. It would seem advisable to replicate Cullen's findings, as they appear to contradict previous work regarding the effectiveness of support systems on coping.

However, the research seems clear that a human service orientation is associated with lower stress levels. In a study by Rutter and Fielding (1988), Correctional Officers who put the greatest emphasis on the control and security aspects of their job also reported the most stress. Similarly, Poole and Regoli (1980) found that a custody orientation (measured by the number disciplinary reports filed against inmates) was also linked to higher levels of stress.

Job satisfaction. Job satisfaction has long been of interest to industrial-organizational psychologists but has only recently emerged in the correctional literature (Dantzker & Kubin, 1998). A common observation has been that job satisfaction is low among Correctional Officers compared to other occupational groups in the prison system (Grossi & Berg, 1993; Meyer & Allen, 1988; Robinson et al., 1996). Because of its association with absenteeism, job turnover, and stress, researchers have paid increasing attention to the correlates of job satisfaction. In this regard, gender, race, and education have received particular scrutiny.

Many female Correctional Officers report being discriminated against at work and relate that the prison environment is especially hostile towards them (Jurik, 1985; Owen, 1986; Zimmer, 1986). Remarkably, few gender differences have been reported on various job satisfaction measures (Cullen et al., 1985; Dantzker & Kubin 1998; Jurik & Halembe, 1984; Jurik & Winn, 1987; Van Voorhis et al., 1991;). This phenomenon, referred to as the “paradox of the contented working woman”, has been observed in a number of occupational groups (Jackson, 1989). While the reasons for this are still unclear, some have argued that women have lower expectations for work and therefore are less likely to feel disappointed about issues such as prestige, salary, and autonomy (Britton, 1997).

Minority groups in the correctional workforce have faced similar obstacles as women especially in terms of harassment and promotability. However, in this case, decreased job satisfaction has been reported as a direct outcome (Britton, 1997; Cullen et al., 1985). This might be surprising given that minority groups have typically shown more positive attitudes towards inmates and to support rehabilitation to a greater extent than non-minorities (Cullen et al., 1989; Jurik, 1985; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). On the other hand, minorities have expressed dissatisfaction with the quality of supervision they receive as well as frustration regarding their chances for advancement (Rogers, 1991).

Highly educated Correctional Officers have voiced similar complaints (Jurik & Musheno, 1986; Rogers, 1991). In this case, formal education is associated with higher work aspirations, which in turn leads to greater dissatisfaction when expectations are not met. Rogers (1991) found that high school educated Correctional Officers held the most congruent aspirations and expectations compared to those with post-secondary training.

Accordingly, non college-trained subjects reported the greatest amounts of job satisfaction. In fact, the level of pride expressed in being a Correctional Officer decreased in step with the level of formal education.

Race and education may only indirectly influence job satisfaction however. One could speculate that a Correctional Officer's work duties and the institution's philosophy (e.g., treatment vs. custody) would mediate the effect of race and education. For instance, Minority-group employees might be more satisfied working in non-custodial and non-punitive environments. It should also be expected that Correctional Officers whose education exceeds the functional requirements of the job might be disappointed about the challenges that the position offers.

The importance of the prison in and of itself on job satisfaction is highlighted in a study by Stohr et al. (1994). These authors compared two types of prisons, one which espoused a "control model" (inmate's activities and time were tightly monitored; rules were strictly enforced) and another which embraced an "employee investment model" (officers were trained to use proactive interpersonal skills in addition to supervisory rule enforcement skills). Correctional Officers from the second institution were shown to be more satisfied at work, to identify more readily with the organization, and to have significantly more motivation while on the job. These findings are consistent with Lindquist and Whitehead's (1986) aforementioned study of prison guards who were given an opportunity to work with offenders in the community. These individuals showed greater support for rehabilitation and higher overall job satisfaction than their institutional peers did.

A related line of research has considered the relationship between the extrinsic and intrinsic aspects of prison work and job satisfaction. Extrinsic factors include pay and benefits, promotions, and job security while intrinsic factors include the chance to use one's skills, the freedom to plan one's activities, and the opportunity for personal growth on the job (Larivière & Robinson, 1996). Hepburn and Knepper (1993) showed that job satisfaction among Correctional Officers was predominantly related to the intrinsic aspects of their work. Correctional Officers that had chosen a treatment career-stream (Correctional Program Officers- CPOs) as opposed to a custody career-stream (Correctional Service Officers- CSOs) demonstrated higher levels of job satisfaction, a significantly greater sense of authority over prisoners, and significantly lower levels of role strain.

The association between correctional attitudes and job satisfaction still requires investigation. Whereas Jurik and Musheno (1986) found a significant negative relationship between punitiveness and job satisfaction ($r = -.24$), Hepburn (1984) found no significant association between these variables ($r = -.09$). Other international work has shown only a marginal relationship between support for rehabilitation and job satisfaction. For example, Shamir and Drory (1981) reported a small correlation of $r = .07$ between general job satisfaction and views on the rehabilitation potential of inmates.

In contrast, work by Larivière and Robinson (1996) and Simourd (1997) on Canadian Federal samples showed a strong association between these variables. Larivière and Robinson (1996) reported that 63 percent of Correctional Officers with positive attitudes towards inmates were satisfied with their work compared to only 52.5 percent of Correctional Officers who did not share these attitudes ($p < .0001$). Simourd's

(1997) study of various correctional workers found that job satisfaction was significantly correlated with support for rehabilitation ($r = .25$), custody orientation ($r = -.16$), and punitiveness ($r = -.19$).

These studies suggest that there may be something unique about Canadian Federal correctional workers. For instance, they may work in an organization that is more strongly supportive of the Human Services Model compared to other jurisdictions. If this is the case, then the effect of empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation on job satisfaction would be accentuated. In such a situation, the compatibility between individual and organizational values would be particularly important to explore. Issues of person and organization fit will be addressed in later sections. For the moment, it is sufficient to state that additional research is needed to assert the direction and size of the relationship between correctional attitudes and a person's overall satisfaction with prison work. The empathy variable is notably absent in studies of Correctional Officer job satisfaction and therefore also requires attention.

Organizational Commitment. Researchers have been interested in organizational commitment for many of the same reasons that they have been interested in job stress and job satisfaction. Like the previously discussed variables, it has generally been assumed that organizational commitment is related to a number of desirable outcomes such as successful job performance, punctuality, low absenteeism and reduced job turnover (Randall, Fedor, & Longenecker, 1990). Others have added that organizational commitment renders employees more likely to receive the intrinsic (e.g., personal

satisfaction) and extrinsic (e.g., pay and benefits) rewards associated with employment (Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982).

While it has been defined in a variety of ways, Mowday et al. (1982; p. 27) see organizational commitment as “the relative strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization”. Organizational commitment differs from job satisfaction in that it “emphasizes attachment to the employing organization, including its goals and values, while satisfaction emphasizes the specific task environment where an employee performs his or her duties” (Mowday, Steers, & Porter, 1979; p. 226). Wittig-Berman and Lang (1990) propose two types of organizational commitment. Value commitment refers to identification with the organization, acceptance of its mission, and a willingness to give energy and loyalty whereas continuance commitment refers to wanting to stay with the organization for instrumental reasons such as individual-organizational transactions and investments over time. The latter type of commitment reflects an individual’s vested interests in the organization and the perceived costs of leaving it, whether or not any positive affect toward the organization exists.

Despite the distinction that was made between organizational commitment and job satisfaction, allegiance to an employer seems to be driven by the nature of the work itself. Specifically, Mottaz (1988) found that the intrinsic rewards of a job were the most powerful determinants of organizational commitment. Task involvement, task significance, and task autonomy predicted commitment to a far greater extent than demographic variables such as marital status, family income, gender, and job tenure.

This study was conducted on a large sample of employees working in a variety of occupations including education, health, manufacturing, and law enforcement.

Employees' expectations and experiences immediately following entry into an organization have also been shown to be instrumental in shaping their commitment to that organization. Meyer and Allen (1988) found that the pre-entry expectations of recent university graduates vis-à-vis opportunities for challenge and self-expression were important determinants of future organizational commitment.

Unfortunately, there has been little work on organizational commitment among Correctional Officers. Comparative research by Robinson et al. (1996) showed that Correctional Officers were significantly less committed to their employer than administrators, case managers, labourers, and other professionals in the prison system (e.g., nurses, psychologists). However, the determinants and consequences of commitment were not explored in this research. In the only other study of this variable, Stohr et al. (1994) were able to demonstrate that rehabilitation-focused institutions and those that invested a great deal in staff development produced significantly more committed employees. This finding suggests that pro-rehabilitation individuals might show more commitment to their organization but certainly more research is needed to establish this link.

Person-Organization fit

Person-Organization fit has been the subject of considerable study in the social sciences recently. The current appeal of this area of research has been attributed in part to the large-scale downsizing and re-organization activities of the early 1990s (Kristof,

1996). Traditionally, researchers have defined Person-Organization fit as the level of compatibility between individuals and the organizations for which they work (Kristof, 1996). However, this definition continues to be refined and clarified.

Muchinsky and Monahan (1987; p. 269) make an important distinction between supplementary fit and complimentary fit. Supplementary fit occurs when someone “possesses characteristics which are similar to other individuals” in a particular organization or group. Complimentary fit is said to occur when a person “makes whole” the environment or “adds to it what is missing” (Muchinsky & Monihan, 1987; p. 271). Thus, a more contemporary definition reads as follows: “Person-Organization fit is the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when a) at least one entity provides what the other needs, or b) they share similar fundamental characteristics, or c) both” (Kristof, 1996; p. 4). Person-Organization fit also needs to be distinguished from other forms of person-environment fit found in the literature such as person-vocation fit (compatibility of an individual’s self-concept with vocation), person-group fit (compatibility of individuals with their workgroups), and person-job fit (compatibility of individuals with their assigned tasks).

A frequently studied dimension of Person-Organization fit is the compatibility of employer-employee values. Kristof (1996) regards value congruence as an important dimension of fit arguing that values are enduring and strongly influence employees’ day-to-day behaviours and interactions. While employee values have been the subject of numerous studies, the challenge for Person-Organization fit researchers has been describing an organization’s values. Without a clear mission statement, social scientists must ask employees for their perceptions of organizational values. In other cases,

researchers have been forced to make their own inferences about an organization's value system. Ideally, organizational values are a "group product" where "a majority of members are aware of the group's support for a given value" (Chatman, 1989; p. 339).

The Person-Organization fit model has been used to explain new graduate job searches, employer recruitment and selection, workplace socialization and attrition, employee perceptions of work, work stress, citizenship behaviours, and actual job performance. The following section will briefly discuss each of these issues.

According to Person-Organization fit theory, individuals are likely to seek employment with organizations that best fit their personalities, attitudes, and values. For instance, Bretz, Ash, and Dreher (1989) found that graduates with a high need for achievement preferred organizations characterized by frequent reinforcement and rewards for competitive effort. Turban and Keon (1993) showed that self-esteem and self-efficacy was related to a search for companies with high pay levels and organizational centralization.

If potential employees tend to seek the most compatible organizations, strategic employers should be expected to actively recruit staff that best "fit" their corporate values. However, the literature suggests that this is not usually the case (Kristof, 1996). More typically, organizations are most concerned with the fit between individual attributes and the specific requirements of the job. This is unfortunate according to Bowen, Ledford, and Nathan (1991) who argued that selecting people with compatible values and personalities creates a more flexible workforce than selecting people solely on the basis of job-related criteria.

New recruits will certainly vary in their level of fit with a chosen organization. However, Schneider's (1987) Attraction-Selection-Attrition (ASA) theory proposes that over time employee-employer congruence should increase. First, employees whose values and attitudes do not match those held by their employer will tend to quit and find more compatible organizations. Second, tenure in and of itself is sufficient to increase attitudinal congruence (Hall, Schneider, & Nygren, 1975). The net effect of both these influences is such that Person-Organization fit should be highest among the most experienced workers.

As might be expected, a strong relationship has been found between Person-Organization fit and successful work outcomes (Boxx, Odom, & Dunn, 1991; Chatman, 1991). Those reporting adequate fit are more likely to be motivated on the job, to feel more successful, to exhibit more citizenship behaviours in the workplace (e.g., teamwork, ethical behaviour), and to be more committed to their employer. This in turn leads to reduced workplace stress and better performance in various job duties (Kristof, 1996).

Summary and problem formulation

Correctional Officers have dominated much of the correctional-staff literature since Zimbardo et al.'s (1973) seminal study of a mock prison. A popular line of enquiry has consisted in measuring Correctional Officer attitudes towards inmates such as their level of empathy, punitiveness, and overall support for rehabilitation. In most cases, researchers have concluded that Correctional Officers hold fairly negative views of those under their care and supervision. On the other hand, there have been some indications

that Correctional Officers may in fact support the rehabilitative potential of inmates and interact with these individuals in a non-punitive and empathic fashion.

The occasional contradictory finding is at least partially explained by methodological factors. Most studies have relied on small samples drawn from individual institutions. Staff composition, management style, security level, and overall correctional philosophy will vary from prison to prison, especially in the large decentralized systems of the United States.

In a broader sense, it could also be argued that the U.S. penal system is itself distinct from those of other Western countries. Factors such as high incarceration rates, capital punishment, prison overcrowding, harsh sentencing, and paramilitary management structures are only a few factors that might influence the orientation of American Correctional Officers. Thus, despite the fairly negative attitudes attributed to Correctional Officers, one must be cognizant of the U.S. context wherein most of the research has been conducted to this point. Cross-cultural issues may limit the generalizability of the current literature, especially as it relates to the Canadian Federal reality, which emphasizes humane conditions, rehabilitation, and the potentiality of human development.

However, if there is one consistent finding in the literature, it is that Correctional Officers are the least empathic, the most punitive, and the least supportive of rehabilitation among the various types of prison workers studied including administrators, health care workers, case managers, psychologists, and labourers. Using Cullen's (1989) rehabilitation orientation scale, Robinson et al. (1993) compared Correctional Officers to Case Management Officers and found striking differences

between these groups ($M = 18.73$ vs. 23.21 , $p < .0001$). In a subsequent study, Robinson et al. (1996) compared Correctional Officers to a number of other occupational groups. Correctional Officers obtained the lowest scores for general support for rehabilitation (2.08) compared to administrators (2.51, $p < .0001$), health professionals (2.54, $p < .0001$), correctional supervisors (2.41, $p < .0001$), case managers (2.58, $p < .0001$), and labourers/support staff (2.20, n.s.). They also recorded the highest custody scores (1.97) compared to administrators (1.46, $p < .0001$), health professionals (1.45, $p < .0001$), correctional supervisors (1.55, $p < .0001$), case managers (1.52, $p < .0001$) and labourers/support staff (1.86, n.s.). Similar work conducted by Ortet-Fabregat et al. (1993) using a modified *Attitudes Towards Prisoners Scale-ATPS* (Melvin, Gramling, & Gardner, 1985) supports these findings. Here, positive attitudes towards inmates were found to be lower among Correctional Officers (77.9) than among law enforcement officers (81.9, n.s.), university students (92.1, $p < .01$), defense attorneys (99.4, $p < .01$), and prison rehabilitation teams (103.6, $p < .01$).

Researchers and policy makers have been disappointed with these results since it is increasingly clear that Correctional Officers create and maintain the human environment within prisons. Moreover, Correctional Officers have the most day-to-day contact with inmates and are therefore ideally placed to influence behaviour in a positive way.

As social scientists began to recognize this fact, they advocated an expansion or evolution of the guard's role to include elements of assistance, treatment, and support. At the same time, efforts were made to determine the predictors of correctional attitudes. It was hoped that if scientists were able to determine the precursors of certain attitudes, then

specific hiring or training practices could be implemented in such a way as to improve the atmosphere and effectiveness of prisons.

Accordingly, a variety of individual and environmental variables were studied. It was demonstrated that race, tenure, and shift, were significant predictors of attitudes toward inmates. Specifically, members of minority groups (Cullen et al., 1989; Jackson & Ammen, 1996; Jurik, 1985; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989; Van Voorhis et al., 1989), those working the day shift (Jurik, 1985; Saylor & Wright, 1992; Van Voorhis et al., 1989), as well as those in older age groups were shown to have more positive attitudes (Hepburn, 1984; Larivière & Robinson, 1996; Plecas & Maxim, 1987; Poole & Regoli, 1980). Authors have written fairly extensively about why race and tenure might predict attitudes towards inmates. Minorities are thought to relate more effectively with the socio-cultural reality of inmates (Jackson & Ammen, 1996) while older Officers would owe their positive attitudes to maturational processes (Philliber, 1987).

Much less has been said about why specific shifts might be associated with particular views of inmates. It may be the case that reduced staffing levels during the night shift increases the level of fear experienced by Officers. This in turn could lead to more punitive attitudes and decreased levels of empathy. As well, no rehabilitation programs occur at night such that it would be difficult for these employees to observe and take part in treatment efforts. On the other hand, previous findings might simply be an artifact of certain staffing practices. In a seniority-based system for example, the longest tenured Officers would have priority with regard to the most sought after shifts (presumably the day shift). Accordingly, the night shift might be over-represented by young, inexperienced, and low-rank workers.

In any event, these correlates have explained only a small fraction of the variance in correctional attitudes. Work by Van Voorhis et al. (1991) suggests that these three variables together account for only 2 percent of the variance in custody orientation and approximately 7 percent of the variance in support for rehabilitation. It should be kept in mind that very few studies have included a broad range of predictors within the same analysis. Usually, only small clusters of relevant variables have been studied at any one time. Some variables, such as rank, prison size and security level, are rarely discussed in the literature.

Also within the context of improving the effectiveness of prisons, researchers have examined job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Perhaps to no surprise, high stress levels and poor health outcomes have been observed among Correctional Officers. This occupational group has also reported lower job satisfaction and organizational commitment relative to other prison workers. As it stands, researchers have still not fully explained these findings.

Some authors have argued that prisons are simply dangerous and unpleasant environments for Correctional Officers. On the other hand, it has also been shown that prisons are actually quite safe for front-line staff. Moreover, this type of reasoning would not explain why other front-line workers show more positive work outcomes (e.g., lower work stress, greater job satisfaction, higher organizational commitment) than Correctional Officers.

A second hypothesis has been that Correctional Officers have few opportunities to perform tasks that are associated with heightened satisfaction and commitment such as assisting in treatment and influencing institutional decision-making. However, many

correctional jurisdictions have modified the role of Correctional Officers to include elements of rehabilitation and policy input. In 1986 for instance, the Correctional Service of Canada implemented Unit Management in all of its facilities as a decentralized approach to inmate and institutional management. This system divides a prison into small clusters of inmates and assigns a multidisciplinary team to oversee day-to-day operations. In this system, “cooperation between all staff is emphasized – teamwork between program and security staff is an essential element... decision-making is delegated to the unit level as much as possible” (Correctional Service of Canada, 1988; p.2). Unit Management also emphasizes intensive interactions between staff and inmates. Notwithstanding the particular administrative structure in place, Correctional Officers in any jurisdiction are free to empathize with inmates and support the notion of treatment and rehabilitation.

A third and perhaps more interesting line of enquiry would try to relate job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment with attitudes towards inmates. In short, are empathic, non-punitive, and pro-rehabilitation Correctional Officers significantly more satisfied about their work and more committed to their employer? Do they report less stress in the workplace? Preliminary work by Larivière and Robinson (1996) and Simourd (1997) suggests that positive correctional attitudes might be associated with better work outcomes. In fact, Millson (2000) demonstrated significant correlations between work stress and support for rehabilitation ($r = -.17, p < .0001$), empathy towards offenders ($r = -.15; p < .0001$), and punitiveness ($r = .22, p < .0001$). However, there is still little known about job satisfaction and organizational commitment in this population.

Much less is known about the nature of these relationships and the moderating effect of the correctional environment itself.

Person-Organization fit theory provides a useful framework to study these and other questions. Basically, fit is said to exist when there is congruence between organization and employee personalities, values, and attitudes. According to the literature, fit should increase over time because employees are selectively attracted to compatible organizations. At the same time, attrition should occur among employees whose characteristics and views do not match those of their employer. In the end, one should expect a homogenization of values and attitudes over time. While this phenomenon has been documented among professionals of large private sector companies, it has yet to be demonstrated in correctional samples.

The Person-Organization fit model can also be used to support or refute previous research findings. In fact, the measured effects of empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation on work outcomes may be entirely dependent on the characteristics of the institution itself. For instance, it may be the case that empathy and support for rehabilitation are associated with positive work adjustment but only for those who work in institutions that are tolerant of such attitudes. In contrast, empathic and pro-rehabilitation individuals working in more custody-oriented facilities may report lower job satisfaction and higher job stress. Variations of this kind are numerous and all revolve around the concept of Person-Organization fit.

Hypotheses

Broadly speaking, the present study examines four issues. First, it measures the correctional attitudes and work adjustment of Canadian Correctional Officers. Using the same research instrument, it compares these results with those obtained from other occupational groups in the Federal prison system. Second, having identified potentially salient variables from existing studies of Correctional Officers, the current study attempts to predict attitudes and work adjustment within a single empirical analysis. Third, this study explores the extent to which attitudes towards inmates are related to work outcomes. Finally, within the context of Person-Organization fit theory, the study examines whether institutional characteristics moderate the influence of attitudes on work adjustment.

This research is thought to contribute to our current state of knowledge in several ways. It begins by exploring the degree to which attitudinal measures and subscales overlap with each other. Using a large dataset, it then clarifies the uncertainty as to whether Correctional Officers have negative or positive views of inmates. It also predicts these views using variables that have typically been studied in isolation from one another. The current effort also measures the work adjustment of these individuals while attempting to link these results with correctional attitudes. As such, it builds directly on recent efforts by Simourd (1997) and a number of smaller studies produced by the Correctional Service of Canada (Larivière & Robinson, 1996; Robinson et al., 1996, Robinson et al., 1997). For instance, Simourd (1997) used Canonical analysis to examine the relationship between attitude variables and work outcome variables. However, her research was conducted on 477 correctional staff of whom only 193 were Correctional

Officers. More importantly, Simourd (1997; p. 11) emphasized that her work “was not a test of Person-Environment Fit”. As such, the mediating effect of the correctional environment (i.e., overall institutional empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation) on work adjustment was not directly tested. Finally, the study will explore the extent to which prison workers hold consistent attitudes towards inmates and whether or not this has any effect on work adjustment.

Hypothesis 1. In line with several studies, Correctional Officers will generally express negative correctional attitudes. Compared to other workers such as administrators, support staff, front-line correctional managers, case management officers, health care workers, labourers, and those involved in programs, Correctional Officers are expected to be the least empathic, the most punitive, and the least supportive of rehabilitation.

Hypothesis 2. Consistent with prior research, gender, race, education, age, and experience are expected to correlate significantly with empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation. Variables from both the Importation-Differential Experiences Model and the Work-Role Prisonization Model will contribute to explaining the variance in correctional attitudes. The inclusion of other, less studied variables such as the size of the institution, region, language, security level, rank (Correctional Officer I level versus Correctional Officer II level), and shift (type and most recent) will explain a greater proportion of variance than what has been reported in previous studies.

Preliminary work by Larivière and Robinson (1996) showed that rank and region significantly influenced reported measures of empathy, punitiveness and support for rehabilitation. For example, Correctional Officers from the Québec region were shown to have significantly poorer views of inmates relative to their counterparts in other regions of the country suggesting, among other things, the potential influence of socio-demographic and socio-political factors. As well, Correctional Officer IIs (CO-II) were more empathic, slightly less punitive, and more supportive of rehabilitation than Correctional Officer Is (CO-I). The size and type of institution should also be expected to influence attitudes towards inmates. Street (1965) for instance, found that treatment oriented institutions tended to employ pro-rehabilitation employees. As for institutional size, it is assumed that large prisons require a greater emphasis on discipline and rule enforcement compared to small institutions. Smaller prisons should have an easier time maintaining institutional order and, as a result, allow for more meaningful interactions between staff and inmates. Although exploratory in nature, the inclusion of these variables should explain a larger proportion of the variance in attitudes towards offenders than what has been reported in previous studies.

Hypothesis 3. In accordance with Person-Organization Fit theory and previous research, it is expected that older Correctional Officers and those with longer tenure will have more positive attitudes towards inmates. Individual differences are predicted to decrease over time because the prison environment homogenizes employees by exposing them to similar experiences and socializing them into specific subcultural values. Those

who do not fit the organization will be screened out through resignation or termination and the views of those who remain should converge over time.

Hypothesis 4. As predicted by the Human Services model, positive correctional attitudes will be associated with higher job satisfaction, lower job stress, and greater organizational commitment.

Hypothesis 5. Employees holding consistent correctional attitudes should demonstrate better work adjustment. Those holding incompatible views (e.g., being both punitive and supportive of rehabilitation) will demonstrate greater job stress, and lower levels of satisfaction and commitment.

Hypothesis 6. Consistent with Person-Organization fit theory; the prison environment will moderate work outcomes such as job satisfaction, job stress, and organizational commitment. As such, empathic, pro-rehabilitation, and non-punitive Correctional Officers should demonstrate positive work adjustment but only in environments that are supportive of such attitudes. For people with positive correctional attitudes, work in non-empathic, punitive, and anti-rehabilitation institutions will be associated with higher levels of job stress, lower job satisfaction, and lower organizational commitment. By extension, those with negative views of inmates should manifest better work outcomes in institutions more conducive to such views.

Figure 1 shows the complete set of variables under consideration for this study. As can be seen, a number of traditional antecedents of correctional attitudes are listed.

Other variables such as institution size, region, official language, and rank have rarely been considered in the literature in terms of their ability to predict correctional attitudes.

Empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation should in turn have an impact on job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. However, it is expected that the relationship will be moderated by the institution's collective view of inmates.

Whether correctional attitudes serve as antecedents or consequences to work outcomes is certainly debatable. The current study will assume that there is a certain amount of reciprocity between empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation with job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. This is indicated by the bi-directional arrow in the lower right hand corner of Figure 1. It might also be argued that the organizational and institutional collective orientations would have a direct effect on attitudes and work outcomes. These possibilities are represented by the dotted arrows in the figure. It should be noted that the current study does not consider Figure 1 to be a specific model requiring testing and interpretation. It is presented here simply to list the variables of interest and to summarize the questions outlined thus far.

The present study will also examine if issues of Person-Organization fit are particularly important for Canadian Federal Correctional Officers compared to Correctional Officers in other jurisdictions. Previously cited international research (i.e., American studies) suggests that the relationship between correctional attitudes and work outcomes is tenuous. However, the Canadian Federal penal system boasts a strong mission statement which is reflective of a Human Services model (i.e., it values empathy and rehabilitation, and discourages punitiveness). The Correctional Service of Canada's

Mission and values permeate through most of its activities from policy development to staffing actions. Thus, in the Canadian Federal system, compatibility between workers and the organization may be especially relevant in determining overall levels of satisfaction, stress, and commitment. Alternatively, it may be that certain attitudes lead to better work adjustment regardless of where an individual carries out his or her duties.

Figure 1. Antecedents and outcomes of correctional attitudes: the influence of fit.

Method

Setting

The following was an archival study based on a large sample of Federal prison workers at the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC). The organization is an agency of the Ministry of the Solicitor General responsible for administering the sentence of convicted offenders sentenced to imprisonment for two years or more. This responsibility includes the management of offenders at various security level institutions and the supervision of offenders who have been conditionally released into the community. Correctional Service of Canada is a large department, which operates in every region of the country. In total, it manages 52 federal penitentiaries, 71 district parole offices, 175 community-based residential facilities, and 17 community correctional centers. It employs over 14,000 individuals, of which 6,000 are Correctional Officers, and administers a yearly budget of 1.2 billion dollars (CSC, 2000). Correctional Service of Canada is guided by a Mission Statement, which reads, “The Correctional Service of Canada, as part of the criminal justice system, and respecting the rule of law, contributes to the protection of society by actively encouraging and assisting offenders to become law-abiding citizens” (CSC, 2000).

The organization is also guided by a number of Core Values, Guiding Principles, and Strategic Objectives. Core Value 3 states “We believe that our strength and our major resource in achieving our objectives is our staff and that human relationships are the cornerstone of our endeavour” (CSC, 2000). In keeping with the spirit of this Core Value, CSC has conducted two national staff surveys, the most recent in 1996. Results

from these surveys help shape correctional policy and offer unique opportunities to study important research questions such as those outlined in the previous section. To some extent, the All-Staff Survey parallels the American Federal Bureau of Prisons' Social Climate Survey. The U.S. survey is conducted yearly to "provide Bureau executives with critical information about the care and custody of inmates, crowding, the personal well-being of staff, and the quality of work environments within its more than 60 prisons" (Saylor & Wright, 1992; p. 135).

Participants

Subjects in this study are participants in the Correctional Service of Canada's 1996 All-Staff Survey (Robinson et al., 1997). A random sample of the total staff population was selected so as to generate a 95 percent confidence level with a 5 percent margin of error for each CSC work site and each occupational group. As such, 7,157 names were selected to participate. In the end, 4,961 questionnaires were completed resulting in an overall response rate of 69 percent. A total of 1,376 Correctional Officers responded to the survey representing 28 percent of the entire sample. The sample sizes and response rates for the various occupational categories are presented in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Response rate and sample size by job type.*

Job Type	Population	Sample	# of respondents	Response rate (%)
Correctional Officers	4,544	2,815	1,376	49
Case Management Officers/Coordinators	983	666	523	79
Correctional Programs/Chaplaincy	639	481	314	65
Health Care/Psychology	646	400	253	63
Correctional Supervisors/Coordinators /Unit Managers	416	329	237	72
Trades/Labour	943	577	386	67
Administrative Support	1,339	881	651	74
Administrative Officers/Managers	1,014	668	561	84

*From Coopers and Lybrand Consulting, Final report, Volume 1, p. 2-8

Research instrument

The research instrument used for this study was designed by a steering committee consisting of subject area experts from the Correctional Service of Canada as well as representatives from the Union of Solicitor General Employees (USGE), and the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada (PIPSC). Input was also invited from the Correctional Service of Canada's 5 regions: Atlantic, Québec, Ontario, Prairies, and Pacific. The questionnaire is divided into 18 sections and can be found in Appendix A. Items relevant to the present study were drawn from the following instruments: Professional Orientation Scale (Klofas & Toch, 1982), Rehabilitation Scale (Cullen et al.,

1989), General Job Satisfaction (Hackman & Oldham, 1974), Work Stress (Cullen et al., 1989), and Organizational Commitment (Mowday et al., 1979). These instruments, and other procedures for quantifying the variables of interest in this study, are described further.

Demographics

Section 1 of the survey gathers basic demographic and work-related information such as gender, age, experience, race, education, institution (and security level), region, official language, and rank. These will serve as the main independent variables for this study.

Correctional attitudes

Professional Orientation Scale (Klofas & Toch, 1982). The Professional Orientation Scale (Klofas & Toch, 1982) is a multidimensional measure of attitudes towards offenders. It was originally developed from a study of 832 New York State Correctional Officers where it assessed a person's "interest in work beyond pure custody and preference for moderate social distance from inmates" (Klofas & Toch, 1982; p. 240). In its original form, the Professional Orientation Scale contained 25 items. However, subsequent factor analyses led to a 17-item, four-factor measure of attitudes towards inmates (Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989): counseling roles (three items that assess an individual's preference for rehabilitation roles); concern over corruption of authority (five items measuring the extent to which officers feel that inmates cannot be trusted); social distance (five items that relate to a preference for direct contact with inmates); and punitive orientation (four items that measure the extent to which Correctional Officers

prefer harsh prison conditions for inmates). Each item is scored on a 4-point Likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Items are then categorized in an agree/disagree dichotomy and summed to obtain a total score (Klofas, 1986). Higher scores indicate a stronger professional orientation.

Klofas and Toch (1982) reported reliability coefficients for the four subscales as follows: counseling roles (.76), concern with corruption of authority (.77), social distance (.75), and punitive orientation (.72). Subsequent work by Whitehead, Lindquist, and Klofas (1987) showed an identical factor structure and similar reliability coefficients (.65, .78, .59, and .64 respectively). These authors also examined the discriminant validity of the instrument by correlating its four components with measures of job stress, job satisfaction, role conflict, and participation in decision making. The low correlations that were reported (.00 to .14) suggest that professional orientations are distinct from various work outcomes (Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989).

To increase the relevance of the questions for participants, a number of adjustments were made to the Professional Orientation Scale. First, to ensure consistency in the survey, the Likert scale was expanded from four to seven levels. Second, minor wording adjustments were made to better suit the context of correctional staff. Finally, some items were added or removed entirely from certain subscales. These modifications are shown in their entirety in Appendix B.

Based on these changes and the need to fashion distinct and suitable measures of empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation, three separate composite subscales were created. These are shown below in Tables 6 to 8.

Table 6. Empathy subscale.*

Questionnaire Items (alpha = .78)
4.1 Staff should work hard to earn trust from offenders.
4.2 It's important for staff to have compassion for offenders.
4.3 The way to get respect from offenders is to take an interest in them.
4.4 Sometimes staff should advocate for an offender.
4.9 You can't ever completely trust an offender.**
4.10 A good principle is to not get "close" to offenders.**
4.11 If staff are lenient with offenders, they will take advantage of them.**

* Sum of items/7, percent favourable = > 4.

** items are reversed.

Table 7. Punitiveness subscale.*

Questionnaire Items (alpha = .71)
4.5 There would be much less crime if prisons were more uncomfortable.
4.6 Improving prisons for inmates makes them worse for staff.
4.7 A military regime is the best way of running a prison.
4.13 We should stop viewing offenders as victims of society.

* Sum of items/4, percent favourable = > 4.

Table 8. Support for rehabilitation subscale.*

Questionnaire Items (alpha = .69)
4.8 Rehabilitation programs are a waste of time and money.**
4.12 Rehabilitating an offender is just as important as making an offender pay for his or her crime.
4.14 I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs, which are presently being offered in our institutions.

* Sum of items/3, percent favourable = > 4.

** Item is reversed.

Work adjustment.

Job stress. Job stress was assessed using Cullen et al.'s (1989) six-item self-report scale with one additional question (Q. 6.36). As can be seen in Table 9, questions measure the extent to which officers feel "tense", "frustrated", "worried", or "upset" while on the job site. Again, items are scored on a 7-point rating scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The scale has been shown to be internally consistent (alpha = .74) and to correlate significantly with life stress, job dissatisfaction, role problems, and perceived dangerousness on the job (Cullen et al., 1989).

Table 9. Job Stress subscale.*

Questionnaire Items (alpha = .87)
6.30 When I'm at work I often feel tense or uptight.
6.31 A lot of times, my job makes me very frustrated or angry.
6.32 Most of the time when I am at work, I don't feel that I have much to worry about.**
6.33 I am usually calm and at ease when I am working.**
6.34 I usually feel that I am under a lot of pressure when I am at work.
6.35 There are a lot of aspects about my job that can make me pretty upset about things.
6.36 I often worry about work-related problems after work hours.

* Sum of items/7, percent experiencing stress = > 4

** Items are reversed

Job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Job satisfaction was assessed using two questionnaire items (Table 10) and organizational commitment was measured via five modified questions borrowed from the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Mowday et al., 1979). These items are listed in Table 11 below.

Table 10. Job satisfaction subscale.*

Questionnaire Items (alpha = .77)
4.8 I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in my job.
4.12 Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my job.

* Sum of items/2, percent favourable = > 4

Table 11. Organizational Commitment subscale.*

Mowday, Steers, & Porter (1979)	Questionnaire Items (alpha = .69)
1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.	12.1 I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help CSC be successful.
2. I feel very little loyalty to this organization.	12.2 I feel very little loyalty to CSC.**
3. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.	12.3 I find that my values and the values of CSC are very similar.
4. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization	12.4 I am proud to tell others that I am part of CSC.
5. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar.	12.5 No Change.**

* Sum of items/5, percent favourable = > 4

** items are reversed

Procedure

Questionnaires for this study were distributed to every Canadian Federal prison and administered by an external consulting firm (Coopers and Lybrand) to randomly selected participants. Institutional managers were instructed to give staff the necessary time required to complete the anonymous survey during their shift. In general, participants completed the research instrument in small groups, which were scheduled in advance. After completion, respondents sealed their questionnaires in envelopes provided by the consulting firm and marked confidential. Participants had the option of returning the questionnaire to their institution's site coordinator, which were mailed in batches, or mailing the questionnaire directly to Coopers and Lybrand in self-addressed stamped envelopes. The consulting firm was also responsible for data entry, preliminary analysis, and the reporting of key findings.

Results

Demographics

The sample consisted of 4,961 employees who participated in the 1996 Correctional Service of Canada All-Staff Survey. The present study retained only those individuals who were employed in federal penitentiaries. Employees working in the community (e.g., Parole Offices) or in administrative centers (e.g., National Headquarters or Regional Headquarters) were excluded from the analyses. The final sample consisted of 3,834 subjects, drawn from every geographical region of the country. Correctional Officers formed the largest group of respondents, representing 35.8 percent of the sample. The next largest groups included the Correctional Programs/Chaplaincy group (10.2 percent) and the Administrative Support group (10.0 percent).

Table 12 lists the number of participants for each occupational category according to gender. As can be seen, there is an over-representation of male subjects ($\chi^2 (11, N = 3,834) = 1035.8, p < .001$) in general, and in the Correctional Officer group in particular ($\chi^2 (1, N = 3,834) = 198.8, p < .001$). These, and all subsequent analyses, were conducted using SPSS 9.0 (SPSS Inc., 1999).

Table 12. Sample size by occupational group and gender.

Occupational Group	Male % (N)	Female % (N)
Administrative Support	5.4 (21)	94.6 (366)
Administrative Officer/Supervisor/Manager (Finance, Personnel, Administration, Information Technology)	50.9 (147)	49.1 (142)
Correctional Officer I	80.4 (434)	19.6 (106)
Correctional Officer II	78.1 (651)	21.9 (183)
Correctional Supervisor/Coordinator	90.6 (155)	9.4 (16)
Unit Manager	76.9 (60)	23.1 (18)
Case Management Officer/Coordinator	51.1 (133)	48.9 (127)
Correctional Programs/Chaplaincy (program delivery officers, shop supervisors, instructors, teachers, social development, recreation, etc.)	75.0 (297)	25.0 (99)
Technical/Institutional Services	91.3 (273)	8.7 (26)
Health Care/Psychology	34.7 (93)	65.3 (175)
Other	67.9 (212)	32.1 (100)
Total	64.6 (2,476)	35.4 (1,358)

Table 13 presents basic demographic data for participants retained in this study. Over 50 percent of the entire sample of subjects were drawn from either the Québec (30.2 percent) or Prairie regions (26.4 percent). The majority of participants were English

speaking (65.3 percent) and working in medium-security institutions (53.2 percent), as opposed to minimum (14.5 percent) or maximum-security units (32.3 percent).

Approximately two-thirds of the sample had some type of post-secondary training (64.7 percent), while only a small fraction of respondents belonged to a visible minority group (10.6 percent).

Table 13. Sample descriptive statistics.

Variable	N	%
Region*		
Atlantic	387	10.0 (73)
Québec	1,166	30.2 (75)
Ontario	688	17.8 (74)
Prairies	1,019	26.4 (53)
Pacific	604	15.6 (68)
Language		
English	2,522	65.3
French	1,309	33.9
Security Level		
Minimum	562	14.5
Medium	2,055	53.2
Maximum	1,247	32.3
Education		
Less than High School	42	1.1
Some High School	209	5.4
High School Graduate	1,062	27.5
Some College	484	12.5
College Graduate	676	17.5
Some University	421	10.9
University Graduate	724	18.7
Post Graduate Degree	198	5.1
Race		
Non minority	3,455	89.4
Minority	409	10.6
Mean age (<u>SD</u>)	42.3 (8.7)	--
Mean experience (<u>SD</u>)	12.6 (7.5)	--

*Brackets indicate regional participation rates for the survey

A more specific comparison of age and experience (Table 14) showed that Correctional Officers were somewhat younger than other survey respondents ($t_{3,768} = 11.43, p < .001$) but did not have less experience on the job ($t_{3,816} = .55, p = .580$). Moreover, as noted in Table 15, Correctional Officers received significantly less formal education ($\chi^2(7, N = 3,816) = 132.07, p < .001$) and were more likely to be part of a racial minority ($\chi^2(1, N = 3,864) = 33.08, p < .001$). No significant linguistic differences were found between these groups ($\chi^2(1, N = 3,831) = 1.99, p = .158$).

Table 14. Age and experience of Correctional Officers and non-Correctional Officers.

Variable	Correctional Officers ($N = 1,374$)	Non-Correctional Officers ($N = 2,460$)
Mean age yrs. (<u>SD</u>)	40.2 (8.9)	43.5 (8.4)
Mean experience yrs. (<u>SD</u>)	12.5 (7.5)	12.7 (8.9)

Table 15. Language, education, and race of Correctional Officers and non-Correctional Officers.

Variable	Correctional Officers % (N = 1,374)	Non Correctional Officers % (N = 2,460)
Language		
English	64.4	66.6
French	35.6	33.4
Education		
Less than High School	1.2	1.0
Some High School	4.9	5.8
High School Graduate	32.9	25.0
Some College	14.6	11.6
College Graduate	20.1	16.4
Some University	10.8	11.1
University Graduate	14.6	21.4
Post Graduate Degree	0.9	7.6
Race		
Non minority	85.6	91.5
Minority	14.4	8.5

Psychometrics

Measures of internal consistency were calculated for each of the six subscales of interest in this study (three measures of attitudes towards inmates and three measures of work adjustment). Cronbach's alpha, a computation based on the number of items in a particular scale (k) and the ratio of the average inter-item covariance to the average item variance (SPSS, 1999) are presented in Table 16. Using Nunally and Bernstein's (1994) criterion of $\alpha = .70$, the current subscales were found to have an acceptable level of internal consistency.

Table 16 also presents correlation coefficients among the various subscales. As can be seen, attitudes towards inmates were significantly related to work adjustment measures. In other words, empathic, non-punitive, and pro-rehabilitation workers showed less stress on the job, more satisfaction with their work, and more commitment to their employer. The relationship between attitudes and adjustment scores was especially strong for organizational commitment. In fact, the strongest correlation recorded in Table 16 was between support for rehabilitation and organizational commitment ($r = .40$).

Table 16. Correlations among attitude and adjustment subscales and estimates of internal consistency.

	Empathy	Punitive	Rehabilitation	Stress	Satisfaction	Commitment
Empathy	.78 (3,679)					
Punitive	-.51 (3,661)	.71 (3,765)				
Rehabilitation	.50 (3,668)	-.54 (3,748)	.69 (3,773)			
Stress	-.13 (3,624)	.19 (3,701)	-.16 (3,709)	.87 (3,756)		
Satisfaction	.26 (3,649)	-.22 (3,731)	.28 (3,738)	-.47 (3,745)	.77 (3,791)	
Commitment	.37 (3,599)	-.33 (3,676)	.40 (3,682)	-.27 (3,685)	.48 (3,714)	.69 (3,728)

Note. All inter-scale correlations are statistically significant at $p < .01$. N 's are in brackets. Estimates of internal consistency (Cronbach alphas) are shown on the diagonal in bold.

Exploratory factor analyses were conducted to measure the extent to which attitude (empathy, punitiveness, support for rehabilitation) and work outcome (job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment) items could be represented by six dimensions, or if single underlying attitude and adjustment dimensions might be present. These procedures were carried out on the entire sample and then separately on the Correctional Officer group. Maximum-Likelihood (with oblique rotation) and Principle Components (with varimax rotation) analyses were conducted after reverse coding negatively phrased items.

A three-factor model was found to be an appropriate fit for the correctional attitude items (Table 17), regardless of the technique used or the sample chosen. Eigenvalues and explained variance were also similar for different sets of analyses. In all cases, Factor 1 related to an individual's endorsement of a punitive prison environment including the availability of treatment programs for inmates. Factor 2 pertained to elements of empathy such as trust, compassion, and advocacy while Factor 3 tapped into the interpersonal relationships between staff and inmates.

While the three-factor solution explained 53.96 percent of the variance, the support for rehabilitation items did not form a distinct subset or construct. In fact, question 4.08 and 4.14 loaded most strongly within the punitiveness factor whereas question 4.12 found itself categorized among empathy scale items. Nevertheless, given its internal consistency and strong face validity, the support for rehabilitation subscale was retained for subsequent analyses.

A three-factor model was also obtained for the work adjustment items (Table 18). This solution explained 57.23 percent of the variance. As was the case with attitudinal

measures, various extraction and rotation methods produced similar findings regardless of whether the full sample or the Correctional Officer sample was used. In this case, the job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment items loaded as predicted into 3 separate factors. Appendix C shows correlation matrices for attitude and adjustment items for the entire sample of respondents and separately for the Correctional Officer sample.

Table 17. Factor loadings on Attitudes towards Inmates items.

Subscale item	1	2	3
4.08 Rehabilitation programs are a waste of time and money. (REH)	.774	-.450	.219
4.05 There would be much less crime if prisons were more uncomfortable. (PUN)	.668	-.275	.343
4.07 A military regime is the best way of running a prison. (PUN)	.668	-.367	.348
4.06 Improving prisons for inmates makes them worse for staff. (PUN)	.649	-.307	.342
4.14 I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs, which are presently being offered in our institutions. (REH)	-.637	.465	-.122
4.13 We should stop viewing offenders as victims of society. (PUN)	.306	-.165	.254
4.03 The way to get respect from offenders is to take an interest in them. (EMP)	-.360	.752	-.205
4.01 Staff should work hard to earn trust from offenders. (EMP)	-.358	.698	-.170
4.02 It's important for staff to have compassion for offenders. (EMP)	-.450	.646	-.194
4.04 Sometimes staff should advocate for an offender. (EMP)	-.336	.609	-.197
4.12 Rehabilitating an offender is just as important as making an offender pay for his or her crime. (REH)	-.358	.368	.062
4.10 A good principle is to not get "close" to offenders. (EMP)	.345	-.329	.628
4.11 If staff are lenient with offenders, they will take advantage of them. (EMP)	.417	-.336	.597
4.09 You can't ever completely trust an offender. (EMP)	.444	-.294	.583
Eigenvalue	4.80	1.51	1.26
Explained Variance (%)	34.28	10.78	8.90

Note. N = 3,648. EMP = empathy, PUN = punitiveness, REH = support for rehabilitation. Extraction method = Maximum Likelihood. Rotation method = Oblique with Kaiser Normalization.

Table 18. Factor loadings on Work Adjustment items.

Subscale item	1	2	3
6.30 When I'm at work I often feel tense or uptight. (STR)	.797	-.036	-.372
6.34 I usually feel that I am under a lot of pressure when I am at work. (STR)	.750	-.051	-.272
6.31 A lot of times, my job makes me very frustrated or angry. (STR)	.734	-.050	-.505
6.35 There are a lot of aspects about my job that can make me pretty upset about things. (STR)	.692	-.065	-.439
6.33 I am usually calm and at ease when I am working. (STR)	-.683	.001	.433
6.36 I often worry about work-related problems after work hours. (STR)	.622	-.044	-.156
6.32 Most of the time when I am at work, I don't feel that I have much to worry about. (STR)	-.571	.019	.346
12.04 I am proud to tell others that I am part of CSC. (COM)	-.049	.808	.036
12.03 I find that my values and the values of CSC are very similar. (COM)	-.045	.722	.050
12.02 I feel very little loyalty to CSC. (COM)	-.009	.577	-.001
12.01 I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help CSC be successful. (COM)	-.001	.530	.015
12.05 I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar. (COM)	-.029	.199	-.009
6.28 Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my job. (SAT)	-.466	.012	.869
6.15 I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in my job. (SAT)	-.357	.032	.722
Eigenvalue	4.44	2.35	1.23
Explained Variance (%)	31.68	16.80	8.75

Note. N = 3,604. STR = job stress, SAT = job satisfaction, COM = organizational commitment
Extraction method = Maximum Likelihood. Rotation method = Oblique with Kaiser Normalization.

Correctional attitudes

Means and percentages were used to test the hypothesis that Correctional Officers would hold the least favourable views of inmates relative to other staff (Tables 19-21). Using the subscale mean as the cutoff, it was found that significantly fewer Correctional Officers could be categorized as empathic $\chi^2 (1, N = 3,679) = 202.26, p < .001$ or supportive of rehabilitation $\chi^2 (1, N = 3,765) = 141.07, p < .001$ compared to non-Correctional Officers. At the same time, a significantly greater number were classified as punitive $\chi^2 (1, N = 3,773) = 169.90, p < .001$.

Correctional Officers were also compared separately with each of 11 occupational groups on the three attitudinal measures of interest. Table 20 shows that among the 11 types of prison workers studied, Correctional Officers held the lowest empathy ($F(11, 3,667) = 52.50, p < .001$) and support for rehabilitation scores ($F(11, 3,761) = 44.42, p < .001$). With the exception of the Technical/Institutional Services group (who scored higher than CO IIs), Correctional Officers also held the most punitive attitudes ($F(11, 3,753) = 39.74, p < .001$) towards inmates. In contrast, unit managers, chaplains, psychologists, and other allied health-care workers showed significantly more positive views.

Table 19. Correctional attitude scales by occupational group.

Attitude	COs ^a (%)	Non-COs ^a (%)
1. Empathic	26.2	54.4
2. Punitive	73.4	53.8
3. Supportive of rehabilitation	52.9	73.8

^aRespondents scoring above the subscale mean.

1. $\chi^2 (1, N = 3,679) = 202.26, p < .001$

2. $\chi^2 (1, N = 3,773) = 169.90, p < .001$

3. $\chi^2 (1, N = 3,765) = 141.07, p < .001$

Table 20. Analyses of Variance for correctional attitudes across occupational groups.

Attitude	Source	df	SS	MS	F	p <
Empathy ^a	Between	11	569.10	51.74	52.5	.001
	Within	3,667	3,613.57	.99		
	Total	3,679	4,182.67			
Punitiveness ^b	Between	11	736.77	66.98	39.74	.001
	Within	3,753	6,324.81	1.69		
	Total	3,764	84,250.75			
Support for rehabilitation ^c	Between	11	825.40	75.04	44.42	.001
	Within	3,761	6,353.54	1.69		
	Total	3,772	7,178.94			

Note. Eta squared: a = .136, b = .104, c = .115

Table 21. Correctional attitudes of prison occupational groups.

Variable	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>	Significant Differences
Empathy				
1. Administrative Support	3.63	.92	359	1 < 2, 6, 7, 10
2. Administrative Supervisor/Manager	4.12	.91	281	
3. Correctional Officer I	3.13	1.03	521	3 < 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
4. Correctional Officer II	3.48	1.09	805	4 < 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
5. Correctional Supervisor/Coordinator	3.93	.86	168	
6. Unit Manager	4.53	.86	76	
7. Case Management Officer/Coordinator	4.05	1.00	253	
8. Correctional Programs/Chaplaincy	4.27	.92	375	
9. Technical/Institutional Services	3.85	1.00	286	9 < 6, 8, 10
10. Health Care/Psychology	4.30	.79	264	
11. Other	3.94	1.16	291	11 < 6
Overall	3.78	1.07	3,679	
Punitiveness				
1. Administrative Support	4.66	1.31	376	1 > 2, 10
2. Administrative Supervisor/Manager	4.11	1.26	288	
3. Correctional Officer I	5.16	1.27	536	3 > 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11
4. Correctional Officer II	4.84	1.33	816	4 > 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11
5. Correctional Supervisor/Coordinator	4.51	1.29	169	5 > 6, 10
6. Unit Manager	3.69	1.23	75	
7. Case Management Officer/Coordinator	3.98	1.26	256	
8. Correctional Programs/Chaplaincy	4.04	1.28	385	
9. Technical/Institutional Services	4.85	1.25	296	9 > 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11
10. Health Care/Psychology	3.86	1.19	263	
11. Other	4.27	1.52	305	
<u>Overall</u>	4.53	1.37	3,765	

(table continues)

Variable	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>N</u>	Significant Differences
Support for rehabilitation				
1. Administrative Support	4.80	1.28	374	1 < 8, 10
2. Administrative Supervisor/Manager	5.01	1.17	287	
3. Correctional Officer I	3.93	1.38	537	3 < 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
4. Correctional Officer II	4.38	1.36	818	4 < 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11
5. Correctional Supervisor/Coordinator	4.70	1.27	169	5 < 8, 10
6. Unit Manager	5.36	1.13	76	
7. Case Management Officer/Coordinator	5.20	1.17	257	
8. Correctional Programs/Chaplaincy	5.37	1.25	386	
9. Technical/Institutional Services	4.49	1.30	296	9 < 2, 6, 7, 8, 10
10. Health Care/Psychology	5.30	1.26	267	
11. Other	4.93	1.42	306	
Overall	4.71	1.38	3,773	

Note. Multiple comparisons were conducted using Scheffe's post-hoc procedure with $p < .05$.

Number of positive correctional attitudes and consistency of attitudes

The current study also examined the number of positive and negative correctional attitudes held by prison employees and, in doing so, assessed the extent to which respondents were consistent in their views. Employees holding three positive or three negative correctional attitudes were said to be consistent (i.e., either uniformly positive or uniformly negative) and all others were seen as holding incompatible attitudes. For instance, some respondents might hold a punitive orientation while at the same time being empathic and supportive of rehabilitation. Similarly, other respondents might not support offender rehabilitation but may still be empathic and non-punitive in their orientation. These consistency scores were then related to measures of work adjustment with an expectation that those holding incompatible views would express higher levels of job stress, lower job satisfaction, and lower organizational commitment. It was thought

that a lack of attitudinal congruency might serve to increase an employee's dissonance, which in turn would affect work adjustment.

Table 22 shows the number of positive attitudes for custodial and non-custodial staff such that 0 represents uniformly negative attitudes towards inmates and 3 represents uniformly positive attitudes towards inmates. Those obtaining a score of 1 or 2 were considered to possess incompatible attitudes towards inmates. Correctional Officers were less likely to hold three positive attitudes and more likely to hold three negative attitudes than non-Correctional Officers ($\chi^2 (3, N = 3,652) = 320.43, p < .001$). However, they were not more prone to holding one or more incompatible attitudes. In fact, they were less likely to be inconsistent in their views compared to non-custodial staff. As can be seen, 51.9 percent of Correctional Officers obtained a score of 1 or 2 compared to 56.4 percent of non-Correctional Officers ($\chi^2 (1, N = 3,864) = 4.71, p < .05$).

Contrary to expectation, holding incongruent attitudes did not adversely affect work adjustment. Instead, Table 24 shows a clear trend towards better work adjustment with each additional positive attitude held. Correlation coefficients show that job stress decreased in step with the number of positive attitudes that were held by employees. The same effects, but in the opposite direction, was noted for job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Here, indicators of work adjustment improved with each additional positive attitude held by employees.

Table 22. Attitude consistency for custodial and non-custodial staff.

		Sum of positive attitudes				
		0	1	2	3	Total
Non-COs	Count	347.0	660.0	657.0	672.0	2,336
	Expected count	530.3	697.9	581.4	526.4	2,336
	Percent within group	14.9	28.3	28.1	28.8	100
COs	Count	482.0	431.0	252.0	151.0	1,316
	Expected count	298.7	393.1	327.6	296.6	1,316
	Percent within group	36.6	32.8	19.1	11.5	100

$\chi^2 (3, N = 3,652) = 320.43, p < .001.$

Table 23. Analyses of Variance summary table of work adjustment by number of positive correctional attitudes.

Work Adjustment	Source	<u>df</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p <</u>
Job Stress	Between	3	176.81	58.93	36.24	.001
	Within	3,594	5,844.15	1.63		
	Total	3,597	6,020.96			
Job Satisfaction	Between	3	578.59	192.86	98.82	.001
	Within	3,618	7,060.96	1.95		
	Total	3,621	7,639.54			
Organizational Commitment	Between	3	645.22	215.07	204.39	.001
	Within	3,573	3759.76	1.052		
	Total	3,576	4404.98			

Table 24. Correlation between number of positive correctional attitudes held and indicators of work adjustment.

	Stress	Satisfaction	Commitment
Number of positive correctional attitudes	-.17	.27	.38

Note. All Pearson correlation rs are statistically significant at $p < .01$

Attitudes of Correctional Officers in treatment centers and women's institutions

In addition to traditional male prisons, the Correctional Service of Canada operates a number of specialized treatment centers and women's facilities. Because of their focus on treatment and rehabilitation, it was thought that Correctional Officers from these institutions would hold more progressive views than Correctional Officers working in more typical prisons. Tables 25 and 26 show that this was in fact the case. Staff from treatment centers and women's prisons were found to be significantly more empathic and supportive of rehabilitation. They were also significantly less punitive than staff not working in such facilities. Given the significant impact these results could have on other statistical procedures, workers from treatment centers and women's prisons were excluded from subsequent analyses.

Table 25. Mean attitudes of Correctional Officers in treatment centers versus non-treatment centres.

	Treatment centers	Non-treatment centers	t
Empathy	3.87	3.33	-3.22*
Punitiveness	4.57	4.98	1.99*
Support for rehabilitation	4.60	4.19	-1.88*

* $p < .001$

Table 26. Mean attitudes of Correctional Officers in male and female prisons.

	Male prisons	Female prisons	t
Empathy	3.30	3.84	4.97
Punitiveness	5.04	4.18	-6.66
Support for rehabilitation	4.12	5.04	6.81

* $p < .001$

Prediction of correctional attitudes

The current section describes results from multiple stepwise regression analyses predicting empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation. Descriptive statistics, correlation matrices, excluded variables, as well as collinearity diagnostics (including partial and semi-partial correlations) are presented in Appendix D. It should be noted at this point that effect coding was used for non-quantitative variables such as region prior to their inclusion in the multiple regressions.

A concern of the present study related to the numerous inter-correlations between independent variables. Collinearity can lead to imprecise estimates of regression coefficients such that slight changes in the data causes significant fluctuations in these estimates (Pedhazur, 1997). To examine these potentially negative effects, every regression procedure was followed by collinearity diagnostics. For each independent variable, a tolerance level and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) was computed.

Tolerance is equal to $1 - R^2_i$ where R^2_i is the squared multiple correlation of the variable of interest with the other independent variables in the equation (Pedhazur, 1997). Values of tolerance will range from 0 to 1 where a value of 0 indicates a linear combination of the other independent variables. In this situation, the regression coefficients are said to be very unstable and computations would be highly inaccurate (SPSS Inc., 1999). In contrast, a tolerance of 1 means the variable in question is not correlated with the other independent variables, such that “all the information it provides is unique” (Pedhazur, 1997, p. 302). The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) is the reciprocal of tolerance and indicates the “inflation of the variance of b as a consequence of the correlation between the independent variables” (Pedhazur, 1997, p. 296). Therefore, if $r^2_{12} = .00$, then $VIF = 1.00$. It will be shown that the variables selected in this study stood up well as independent predictors.

While tables 27 to 29 show statistically significant equations across each dependent variable, the level of explained variance was relatively modest ranging from 6.7 percent to 15.1 percent. It can also be observed that both individual-level variables (e.g., age, education, language) and institutional-level variables (e.g., prison size, security level, rank) made important contributions to the prediction of correctional attitudes.

For the individual-level variables, education, age, rank, region, and language all played a significant role in predicting attitudes towards inmates. Among these, education was a particularly strong predictor, especially for non-Correctional Officers. In fact, education emerged as the strongest correlate of the three dependent variables of interest, explaining between 3.0 to 9.2 percent of the variance in attitudes towards inmates. While not playing as important a role for Correctional Officers, education still appeared in the three regression equations presented below. For these workers, age, language, and region also played a significant role in explaining attitudinal differences.

Among institutional-level variables, it can be seen that the size of the prison had much to do with how staff viewed inmates. Its retention in all six regression equations indicated that empathic, non-punitive, and pro-rehabilitation employees were most likely to be found in smaller facilities. For Correctional Officers, rank was also related to attitudes such that higher-ranking individuals showed more positive attitudes towards inmates. Region was another notable correlate, especially in the prediction of punitiveness. Staff in the Québec region were found to be significantly more punitive in their views than their colleagues from other regions. In contrast, workers in the Pacific region showed the most positive regard for those under their supervision and care (Appendix E).

The clearest pattern to emerge from these analyses was the recurring presence of education and prison size in the regression equations. The current data suggested that additional formalized post-secondary training and work in smaller facilities significantly explained the variations in Correctional Officer and non-Correctional Officer views of inmates.

Race was remarkably absent as a significant predictor in the tables presented below. Though slightly more positive in their views of inmates, members of racial minority groups were not significantly different from their non-minority peers. Gender was also excluded as a significant correlate in the Correctional Officer sample. However, this variable was retained in the equation predicting punitiveness and support for rehabilitation among non-Correctional Officers.

Regression diagnostics indicated that collinearity did not adversely affect these analyses. Minimum tolerance levels were met or exceeded by all variables whether they were retained or excluded from the regression equations (Appendix D). This included strongly inter-correlated variables such as language/region and security level/prison size.

Table 27. Prediction of empathy among prison workers.

Correctional Officers

Predictor Variable	Beta	Sig.	R Square Change	Cumulative R Squared
1. Age	.243	****	.051	.051
2. Prison size	-.121	**	.019	.069
3. Education	.127	**	.017	.086
4. Rank	.104	*	.011	.097

$$\text{Equation: } F(4, 515) = 13.80, p < .001$$

Excluded variables: experience, gender, race, region, language, security level, shift type, most recent shift

Non-Correctional Officers

1. Education	.211	****	.033	.033
2. Age	.169	****	.032	.065
3. Region	-.126	****	.015	.080
4. Prison size	-.079	****	.007	.086
5. Experience	.062	*	.003	.089

$$\text{Equation: } F(5, 1,933) = 37.86, p < .001$$

Excluded variables: gender, race, language, security level

Note. Beta coefficients reported are those obtained in the last step.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. **** $p < .0001$.

Table 28. Prediction of punitiveness among prison workers.

Correctional Officers

Predictor Variable	Beta	Sig.	R Square Change	Cumulative R Squared
1. Region	-.102	*	.042	.042
2. Prison size	.148	****	.024	.065
3. Language	.132	**	.012	.077
4. Age	-.153	****	.011	.088
5. Education	-.151	**	.021	.109

$$\text{Equation: } F(5, 527) = 12.87, p < .001$$

Excluded variables: experience, gender, race, security level, shift type, recent shift, rank

Non-Correctional Officers

1. Education	-.328	****	.092	.092
2. Language	.211	****	.027	.119
3. Age	-.093	****	.013	.132
4. Prison size	.116	****	.006	.138
5. Experience	-.095	****	.005	.143
6. Gender	-.072	***	.004	.147
7. Region	.062	*	.002	.149
8. Security level	.053	*	.002	.151

$$\text{Equation: } F(8, 1,981) = 44.12, p < .001$$

Excluded variables: race

Note. Beta coefficients reported are those obtained in the last step.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. **** $p < .0001$.

Table 29. Prediction of support for rehabilitation among prison workers.**Correctional Officers**

Predictor Variable	Beta	Sig.	R Square Change	Cumulative R Squared
1. Rank	.141	**	.030	.030
2. Language	-.119	**	.016	.046
3. Prison size	-.107	*	.011	.057
4. Education	.098	*	.010	.067

$$\text{Equation: } F(4, 532) = 9.52, p < .001$$

Excluded variables: age, experience, gender, race, region, security level, shift type, most recent shift

Non Correctional Officers

1. Education	.25	****	.057	.057
2. Language	-.17	****	.015	.072
3. Gender	.10	****	.008	.080
4. Prison size	-.07	***	.004	.084
5. Age	.08	***	.004	.088
6. Region	-.07	**	.004	.092
7. Race	-.05	*	.002	.094

$$\text{Equation: } F(7, 1,998) = 29.57, p < .001$$

Excluded variables: experience, security level

Note. Beta coefficients reported are those obtained in the last step.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. **** $p < .0001$.

Work adjustment

Correctional Officers were also compared with non-Correctional Officers on three measures of work adjustment (Table 30). Again using the subscale mean as the cutoff, it was found that a significantly greater proportion of Correctional Officers were dissatisfied with their work $\chi^2 (1, N = 3,791) = 169.97, p < .001$ and less committed to the organization $\chi^2 (1, N = 3,728) = 242.08, p < .001$. They were not, however, more likely to report higher levels of job stress $\chi^2 (1, N = 3,756) = 2.35, p = .125$.

Means and inter-occupational comparisons are shown in Table 32. It can be seen that Correctional Officers were not significantly different from other types of workers in terms of overall job stress. Instead, it was the Case Management Officer group who reported the highest levels of stress. Still, Correctional Officers scored significantly lower on measures of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. In fact, scores on these subscales were significantly lower than any other occupational group. Managers in the prison system provided a contrast to these findings. These individuals were significantly more committed to the Correctional Service of Canada and generally more satisfied with their job.

Table 30. Work adjustment scales by occupational group.

Outcome	COs ^a (%)	Non-COs ^a (%)
1. Stressed on the job	49.3	46.7
2. Satisfied with the job	64.6	83.3
3. Committed to the organization	50.3	75.4

^aRespondents scoring above the subscale mean.

1. $\chi^2 (1, N = 3,756) = 2.35, p = .125$
2. $\chi^2 (1, N = 3,791) = 169.97, p < .001$
3. $\chi^2 (1, N = 3,728) = 242.08, p < .001$

Table 31. Analyses of Variance for work adjustment across occupational groups.

Attitude	Source	df	SS	MS	F	p <
Job stress ^a	Between	11	104.52	9.50	5.73	.001
	Within	3,744	6,204.66	1.66		
	Total	3,756	6,309.18			
Job satisfaction ^b	Between	11	761.43	69.22	36.24	.001
	Within	3,779	7,218.75	1.91		
	Total	3,791	7,980.18			
Organizational commitment ^c	Between	11	444.30	40.39	35.91	.001
	Within	3,716	4,179.50	1.13		
	Total	3,728	4,623.80			

Note. Eta squared: a = .017, b = .095, c = .096

Table 32. Work adjustment of prison occupational groups.

Variable	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	Significant Differences
Job stress				
1. Administrative Support	3.87	1.33	380	
2. Administrative Supervisor/Manager	3.98	1.25	284	
3. Correctional Officer I	4.05	1.28	533	
4. Correctional Officer II	4.15	1.24	818	
5. Correctional Supervisor/Coordinator	3.91	1.34	168	
6. Unit Manager	4.13	1.22	77	
7. Case Management Officer/Coordinator	4.49	1.27	258	7 > 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 10, 11
8. Correctional Programs/Chaplaincy	3.85	1.30	387	
9. Technical/Institutional Services	4.02	1.30	291	
10. Health Care/Psychology	3.88	1.30	263	
11. Other	3.86	1.33	297	
Overall	4.03	1.30	3,756	
Job satisfaction				
1. Administrative Support	5.37	1.30	383	
2. Administrative Supervisor/Manager	5.64	1.07	288	
3. Correctional Officer I	4.42	1.56	535	3 < 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
4. Correctional Officer II	4.52	1.54	822	4 < 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
5. Correctional Supervisor/Coordinator	5.27	1.22	170	
6. Unit Manager	5.48	1.12	77	
7. Case Management Officer/Coordinator	4.97	1.40	259	7 < 2, 8
8. Correctional Programs/Chaplaincy	5.50	1.26	390	
9. Technical/Institutional Services	5.36	1.31	296	
10. Health Care/Psychology	5.44	1.22	267	
11. Other	5.26	1.44	210	
Overall	5.05	1.45	3,791	

(table continues)

Variable	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>n</u>	Significant Differences
Organizational commitment				
1. Administrative Support	4.70	.98	373	
2. Administrative Supervisor/Manager	4.92	.92	283	
3. Correctional Officer I	3.93	1.14	528	3 < 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
4. Correctional Officer II	4.08	1.13	816	4 < 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11
5. Correctional Supervisor/Coordinator	4.68	1.08	167	
6. Unit Manager	4.98	.98	74	
7. Case Management Officer/Coordinator	4.72	1.03	257	
8. Correctional Programs/Chaplaincy	4.70	1.02	383	
9. Technical/Institutional Services	4.51	.98	290	9 < 2
10. Health Care/Psychology	4.65	1.03	258	
11. Other	4.76	1.15	206	
Overall	4.46	1.11	3,728	

Note. Multiple comparisons were conducted using Scheffe's post-hoc procedure with $p < .05$.

Notable regional differences were found in work adjustment scores. Appendix E shows that employees in the Québec region were the most stressed, while at the same time being the least satisfied with their job and the least committed to the organization. Multiple post hoc comparisons demonstrated significant differences between the Québec region and every other region with regard to job satisfaction. Significant differences were also found between Québec region workers and Pacific and Prairie region workers on stress and commitment scores respectively.

Prediction of work adjustment

Multiple stepwise regression analyses predicting job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment were conducted with the same independent variables that were used to predict attitudes towards inmates. However, to explore the contribution of attitudes on work adjustment, the variables of empathy, punitiveness, and support for

rehabilitation were included as additional predictors. Also, in order to examine the influence of the correctional environment itself on work outcomes, three other variables were entered in the regression: institutional empathy, institutional punitiveness, and institutional support for rehabilitation. The inclusion of these variables would help determine the relative importance of individual versus workplace characteristics on stress, satisfaction, and commitment. To this end, mean attitude scores were calculated for each penitentiary and entered in the stepwise procedure. Descriptive statistics, correlation matrices, excluded variables, as well as collinearity diagnostics (including partial and semi-partial correlations) resulting from these procedures are shown in Appendix D.

As can be seen in Tables 33 to 35, attitudes towards inmates significantly predicted measures of work adjustment. In fact, these variables were the strongest predictors of work adjustment among Correctional Officers and non-Correctional Officers alike. Punitiveness was the strongest determinant of job stress, whereas job satisfaction and organizational commitment were largely explained by an individual's support for rehabilitation. Interestingly, this finding applied to all employees regardless of their specific job duties.

Security level was a significant predictor of job stress but only in the Correctional Officer sample. Specifically, minimum-security prison staff had lower job stress levels than those in medium-security, who, in turn, suffered less than maximum-security level staff did. For non-Correctional Officers, age and language were retained in the stepwise procedures. In this sample, young and French-speaking employees reported higher levels of job stress. However, it should be noted that only a small portion of the variance was

explained by these independent variables. The equation predicting job stress for Correctional Officers explained only 8.5 percent of the variance whereas only 5.0 percent of the variance was explained for non-Correctional Officers.

In addition to attitudinal variables, race and language were significant determinants of job satisfaction. Racial minorities and English-speaking Correctional Officers were significantly more satisfied with their work. Among non-Correctional Officers, education emerged as a significant predictor of job satisfaction where highly trained individuals tended to score lower on this subscale. In these equations, 13.9 percent (Correctional Officers) and 6.0 percent (non-Correctional Officers) of the variance was explained.

The largest explained variance was obtained for the prediction of organizational commitment. This equation explained 20.2 percent of the variance for the Correctional Officer sample and 13.7 percent of the variance for the non-Correctional Officer sample. Race was retained in the regression equation for both Correctional Officers and non-Correctional Officers. In short, minorities reported significantly more commitment to the Correctional Service of Canada than non-minorities. Institutional attitudes were absent from the list of significant predictors with one exception. It was observed that the overall level of punitiveness reported in an institution influenced employees' level of organizational commitment. Punitive environments were linked to a significant decrease in loyalty for non-custodial staff.

Regression diagnostics for these analyses are presented in Appendix D. Results suggested that collinearity did not adversely affect these procedures. Minimum tolerance levels were met or exceeded by all variables included in the regression equations.

Table 33. Prediction of job stress among prison workers.**Correctional Officers.**

Predictor Variable	Beta	Sig.	R Square Change	Cumulative R Squared
1. Punitiveness	.243	****	.065	.065
2. Security level	.121	**	.009	.074
3. Experience	.108	*	.011	.085

$$\text{Equation: } F(3, 507) = 15.71, p < .001$$

Excluded variables: age, gender, race, education, prison size, region, language, empathy, rehabilitation, institutional empathy, institutional punitiveness, institutional rehabilitation, rank, shift type, recent shift

Non-Correctional Officers

1. Punitiveness	.142	****	.035	.035
2. Age	-.087	****	.007	.042
3. Support for rehabilitation	-.093	****	.006	.048
4. Language	-.051	*	.003	.050

$$\text{Equation: } F(4, 1,889) = 25.11, p < .001$$

Excluded variables: experience, gender, race, education, prison size, region, security level, empathy, institutional empathy, institutional punitiveness, institutional rehabilitation

Note. Beta coefficients reported are those obtained in the last step.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. **** $p < .0001$.

Table 34. Prediction of job satisfaction among prison workers.**Correctional Officers**

Predictor Variable	Beta	Sig.	R Square Change	Cumulative R Squared
1. Support for rehabilitation	.206	****	.091	.091
2. Punitiveness	-.143	**	.021	.111
3. Race	.115	**	.017	.128
4. Language	-.105	*	.010	.139

$$\text{Equation: } F(4, 512) = 20.60, p < .001$$

Excluded variables: age, experience, gender, education, prison size, region, security level, empathy, institutional empathy, institutional punitiveness, institutions rehabilitation, rank, shift type, most recent shift

Non-Correctional Officers

1. Support for rehabilitation	.180	****	.046	.046
2. Empathy	.123	****	.011	.056
3. Education	-.066	**	.004	.060

$$\text{Equation: } F(3, 1,908) = 41.59, p < .001$$

Excluded variables: age, experience, gender, race, prison size, region, language, security level, punitiveness, institutional empathy, institutional punitiveness, institutional rehabilitation

Note. Beta coefficients reported are those obtained in the last step.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. **** $p < .0001$.

Table 35. Prediction of organizational commitment among prison workers.**Correctional Officers**

Predictor Variable	Beta	Sig.	R Square Change	Cumulative R Squared
1. Support for rehabilitation	.291	****	.167	.167
2. Empathy	.213	****	.032	.199
3. Race	.086	*	.007	.202

$$\text{Equation: } F(3, 508) = 44.11, p < .001$$

Excluded variables: age, experience, gender, education, prison size, region, language, security level, punitiveness, institutional empathy, institutional punitiveness, institutional rehabilitation, rank, shift type, most recent shift

Non-Correctional Officers

1. Support for rehabilitation	.226	****	.106	.106
2. Empathy	.136	****	.020	.125
3. Institutional punitiveness	-.057	*	.005	.131
4. Race	.057	**	.003	.134
5. Punitiveness	-.066	*	.003	.137

$$\text{Equation: } F(5, 1,879) = 59.43, p < .001$$

Excluded variables: age, experience, gender, education, prison size, region, language, security level, institutional empathy, institutional rehabilitation

Note. Beta coefficients reported are those obtained in the last step.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. **** $p < .0001$.

The importance of attitudes towards inmates on indicators of work adjustment was explored in a second fashion. Multiple stepwise regression analyses were again conducted to predict job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (Tables 36-38). This time however, the three correctional attitudes of interest were entered separately as a block rather than simultaneously with other traditional predictors. This strategy essentially removed the influence of correctional attitudes on the selection of other salient predictors, while at the same time estimating the unique contribution of these attitudes on work adjustment variance. In other words, it allowed other predictors to emerge while still estimating the total contribution of empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation on adjustment scores.

A number of results are worthy of mention. With regard to Correctional Officer stress, it was found that security level and experience were both retained in the regression equation. These results mirrored those that were obtained in the previous regressions where attitudes were not entered as a block and reinforce the importance of these variables on job stress. In both cases, experience as a Correctional Officer and employment in higher security levels was linked to higher stress levels. The situation was different among non-Correctional Officers where age seemed to play a more important role. As can be seen, older workers were less likely to complain of job-related stress.

Race was shown to be an important correlate of job satisfaction among Correctional Officers and was retained regardless of the type of regression procedure utilized (i.e., block entry vs. no block entry). Minority Correctional Officers were clearly more satisfied with their work than non-minority Correctional Officers. Interestingly,

race did not have the same effect among non-Correctional Officers. In this group, gender (i.e., being female) and prison size (i.e., small institutions) were stronger correlates of job satisfaction. Still, race was associated with higher levels of organizational commitment in both custodial and non-custodial workers as can be seen by its retention in the regression equations.

The capacity of correctional attitudes to predict the variance in work adjustment scores was striking. Whereas the previous set of regressions demonstrated that attitudes were generally the strongest predictors of work adjustment, the following tables demonstrate their overall impact compared to traditionally studied variables such as age, race, gender, education, etc. As can be seen, prior to including attitudinal scores, the most variance that could be explained for any indicator of work adjustment was 6 percent (see Table 40, organizational commitment among Correctional Officers). However, including an individual's view of inmates greatly improved these results. Among Correctional Officers, the explained variance in job stress improved from 2.7 percent to 9.1 percent. For job satisfaction, the explained variance increased to 14.3 percent from 5.9 percent and in terms of organizational commitment the explained variance rose to 23.8 percent from only 6.0 percent when attitude scores were not entered as a block. Similar, albeit not as large, findings were found for non-Correctional Officers. Thus, regardless of an individual's duties, work adjustment is best understood when consideration is first given to how correctional employees perceive those under their care.

Table 36. Prediction of job stress among prison workers.

Correctional Officers

Predictor Variable	Beta	Sig.	R Square Change	Cumulative R Squared
1. Security level	.116	**	.016	.016
2. Experience	.111	*	.011	.027
3. Attitudes towards inmates	--	--	.063	.091

Equation: $F(5, 505) = 10.08, p < .001$

Non-Correctional Officers

1. Age	-.083	*****	.009	.009
2. Prison size	.040	*	.003	.012
3. Attitudes towards inmates	--	--	.038	.050

Equation: $F(5, 1,888) = 19.91, p < .001$

Note. Beta coefficients reported are those obtained in the last step.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. ***** $p < .0001$.

Table 37. Prediction of job satisfaction among prison workers.**Correctional Officers**

Predictor Variable	Beta	Sig.	R Square Change	Cumulative R Squared
1. Language	-.115	***	.034	.034
2. Race	.112	***	.017	.051
3. Prison size	-.038	***	.008	.059
4. Attitudes towards inmates	--	--	.084	.143

Equation: $F(6, 510) = 14.21, p < .001$

Non-Correctional Officers

1. Age	.059	*	.005	.005
2. Prison size	-.038	*	.003	.008
3. Gender	.039	*	.002	.011
4. Attitudes towards inmates	--	--	.053	.064

Equation: $F(6, 1,905) = 21.61, p < .001$

Note. Beta coefficients reported are those obtained in the last step.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. **** $p < .0001$.

Table 38. Prediction of organizational commitment among prison workers.

Correctional Officers

Predictor Variable	Beta	Sig.	R Square Change	Cumulative R Squared
1. Age	.202	****	.016	.016
2. Experience	-.197	****	.034	.049
3. Race	.072	*	.011	.060
4. Attitudes towards inmates	--	--	.178	.238

$$\text{Equation: } F(6, 505) = 26.28, p < .001$$

Non-Correctional Officers

1. Language	-.058	***	.009	.009
2. Education	-.014	*	.007	.017
3. Gender	.041	*	.003	.019
4. Prison size	-.016	*	.002	.022
5. Race	.053	*	.002	.024
4. Attitudes towards inmates	--	--	.115	.139

$$\text{Equation: } F(8, 1,876) = 37.79, p < .001$$

Note. Beta coefficients reported are those obtained in the last step.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. **** $p < .0001$.

Attitude interactions

Given the significant role of correctional attitudes on work adjustment, an additional procedure was conducted to examine the extent to which views of inmates might interact to influence job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. To this end, the three correctional attitudes in question, empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation were dichotomized using the subscale mean as the cutoff point. Following this, 2 x 2 x 2 (empathy x punitiveness x support for rehabilitation) Analyses of Variance were performed.

Tables 39 to 41 show that there were no significant 2-way or 3-way interactions between correctional attitudes for any of the work adjustment variables. However, a total of 6 main effects were noted. Punitiveness accounted for three of these as it was found to significantly influence job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Two additional main effects were produced by respondents' level of support for rehabilitation. This variable had a significant effect on job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The final main effect resulted from the influence of empathy on organizational commitment. As had been suggested from the previous set of analyses, punitiveness had a strong influence on an individual's adjustment on the job. Cell means are shown in Appendix F.

Table 39. 3-way Analysis of Variance measuring job stress among Correctional Officers.

	<u>F</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p</u>
Empathy	.462	1	.497
Punitiveness	19.334	1	>.001
Support for rehabilitation	1.162	1	.281
Empathy x Punitiveness	.106	1	.745
Empathy x Support for rehabilitation	1.169	1	.280
Punitiveness x Support for rehabilitation	.504	1	.478
Empathy x Punitiveness x Support for rehabilitation	.000	1	.998
Error		1,149	
Total		1,156	

Table 40. 3-way Analysis of Variance measuring job satisfaction among Correctional Officers.

	<u>F</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p</u>
Empathy	.260	1	.610
Punitiveness	8.299	1	>.01
Support for rehabilitation	4.522	1	>.05
Empathy x Punitiveness	2.215	1	.137
Empathy x Support for rehabilitation	.674	1	.412
Punitiveness x Support for rehabilitation	.228	1	.633
Empathy x Punitiveness x Support for rehabilitation	.220	1	.639
Error		1,153	
Total		1,160	

Table 41. 3-way Analysis of Variance measuring organizational commitment among Correctional Officers.

	<u>F</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p</u>
Empathy	18.227	1	>.001
Punitiveness	11.937	1	>.01
Support for rehabilitation	15.338	1	>.001
Empathy x Punitiveness	.063	1	.802
Empathy x Support for rehabilitation	2.527	1	.112
Punitiveness x Support for rehabilitation	.946	1	.331
Empathy x Punitiveness x Support for rehabilitation	.658	1	.417
Error		1,142	
Total		1,149	

Person-institution interactions

The previous sets of analyses showed that individual attitudes towards inmates were important predictors of job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. It was also observed that a prison's overall level of empathy, punitiveness and support for rehabilitation was not as effective as individual variables in explaining the variance in work adjustment. However, Person-Organization fit theory suggests that individual and organizational variables should interact and influence work outcomes in important ways. While it was expected that pro-rehabilitation employees would generally show better work adjustment (e.g., more job satisfaction) it was felt that this effect would be accentuated in environments that were supportive of treatment and intervention. By extension, employees who did not support offender programs would be expected to be

less adjusted (e.g., less job satisfaction) in places that strongly endorsed treatment. The following section assesses the interplay between individual and institutional characteristics in explaining three measures of work adjustment.

To address this issue, and again using the subscale mean as the cutoff point, Correctional Officers were categorized as empathic/non-empathic, punitive/non-punitive, and as either supportive or non-supportive of rehabilitation. Individual prisons were also dichotomized in this way. Following this, 2 x 2 (individual attitude x institutional attitude) Analyses of Variance were conducted for each work adjustment variable.

Summary tables 42 to 44 show main effects for each correctional attitude on job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. It will be observed that individual levels of empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation significantly influenced work adjustment measures in the predicted direction. On the other hand, institutional characteristics produced only two main effects. Punitive prisons were found to significantly decrease job satisfaction while pro-rehabilitation prisons served to increase it. Surprisingly, prison characteristics had no appreciable effect on job stress or organizational commitment.

Person-environment interactions were remarkably absent in these analyses. Prison characteristics, as expressed by overall levels of empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation, neither increased nor decreased work adjustment scores in significant ways. For example, it mattered little where an empathic Correctional Officer was employed. Based on the tables below, this individual would have demonstrated lower job stress, higher job satisfaction, and more commitment to the organization. In short, individual attitudes appeared to override the institutional atmosphere, and the

interactions of the two, in determining the overall adjustment of Correctional Officers.

Cell means for these tables are presented in Appendix F.

Table 42. Analysis of Variance measuring the influence of individual and institutional empathy on work adjustment.

	Stress			Satisfaction			Commitment		
	<u>F</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p</u>
Individual empathy	5.10	1	>.05	9.82	1	>.05	59.33	1	>.001
Institutional empathy	2.10	1	.25	0.74	1	.390	.093	1	.761
Individual x institutional empathy	1.10	1	.31	4.42	1	.178	2.35	1	.125
Error		1,161			1,166			1,154	
Total		1,164			1,169			1,157	

Table 43. Analysis of Variance measuring the influence of individual and institutional punitiveness on work adjustment.

	Stress			Satisfaction			Commitment		
	<u>F</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p</u>
Individual punitiveness	41.17	1	>.001	28.18	1	>.001	53.94	1	>.001
Institutional punitiveness	2.35	1	.125	5.01	1	>.05	.002	1	.966
Individual x institutional punitiveness	.39	1	.532	.34	1	.560	.544	1	.461
Error		1,182			1,187			1,174	
Total		1,185			1,190			1,177	

Table 44. Analysis of Variance measuring the influence of individual and institutional support for rehabilitation on work adjustment.

	Stress			Satisfaction			Commitment		
	F	df	p	F	df	p	F	df	p
Individual rehabilitation	19.84	1	>.001	28.57	1	>.001	103.8	1	>.001
Institutional rehabilitation	2.60	1	.107	19.06	1	>.001	.029	1	.864
Individual x Institutional rehabilitation	.01	1	.930	1.55	1	.214	.320	1	.572
Error		1,186			1,190			1,176	
Total		1,189			1,193			1,179	

Person-organization fit was studied in a second manner. Attitudes towards inmates were tracked across 8 different age categories with an expectation that older Correctional Officers would hold views that were the most congruent with those of the employing organization. Older cohorts of workers should therefore report the highest levels of empathy and support for rehabilitation, and the least amount of punitiveness. It is assumed that attrition would result among those whose attitudes did not “fit” what was being promoted at the Correctional Service of Canada.

Trend analyses predicting attitudes were conducted for each dependent variable of interest. As can be seen in Figures 50 to 53, older Correctional Officers generally held the most positive views of inmates. Interestingly, the youngest members of the organization held attitudes very similar to those in the latter stages of their career. The greatest disparity between personal and organizational values occurred during the midyears. In

fact, a significant erosion of empathy and support for rehabilitation can be observed shortly after a Correctional Officer enters the prison environment. This was coupled with a significant increase in punitiveness. However, between the age 35 and 39, a gradual shift towards positive attitudes begins to take place.

The figures presented below show that these relationships were best explained by curvilinear trends. Significant cubic functions were obtained for each of the three attitude measures. Despite reaching statistical significance however, the equations only explained 2.4 to 3.5 percent of the total variance.

Figure 2. Mean Correctional Officer empathy scores by age.

Note. Significant cubic trend obtained. Equation: $F(3, 1,297) = 15.78, p < .001$. $R^2 = .035$.

Figure 3. Mean Correctional Officer punitiveness scores by age.

Note. Significant cubic trend obtained. Equation: $F(3, 1,323) = 4.34, p < .001$. $R^2 = .025$.

Figure 4. Mean Correctional Officer support for rehabilitation scores by age.

Note. Significant cubic trend obtained. Equation: $F(3, 1,326) = 11.31, p < .001$. $R^2 = .024$.

Figure 5. Mean Correctional Officer empathy scores by experience.

Note. Significant cubic trend obtained. Equation: $F(3, 1,310) = 13.29, p < .001$.
 $R^2 = .030$.

Figure 6. Mean Correctional Officer punitiveness scores by experience.

Note. Significant cubic trend obtained. Equation: $F(3, 1,336) = 12.60, p < .001$.
 $R^2 = .028$.

Figure 7. Mean Correctional Officer support for rehabilitation scores by experience.

Note. Significant cubic trend obtained. Equation: $F(3, 1,339) = 15.46, p < .001$.
 $R^2 = .033$.

Discussion

The current study was undertaken to assess the empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation among Canadian Federal Correctional Officers. Antecedents of these correctional attitudes were assessed using a number of predictors, some of which have not been considered in the extant literature. A second objective of the research was to determine the relationship between attitudes towards inmates and traditional indicators of occupational adjustment such as job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Expanding on recent efforts, a final objective was to explore the role of the prison environment on these measures of adjustment. Specifically, the study examined whether an institution's collective view of inmates would mediate the effect of individual attitudes on work adjustment. The hypotheses generated for the present investigation were drawn in part from Person-Organization fit theory which postulates that stress, satisfaction, and commitment are largely dependent on the congruency between personal and organizational values. In this study, the overriding corporate philosophy is one that values the potential of all persons, strongly supports rehabilitation, and encourages positive staff-inmate interactions within a non-punitive environment.

Attitudes towards inmates

Based on several studies dating as early as Zimbardo (1973), to more recent work by Robinson et al. (1996) and Simourd (1997), there was a general expectation that many, if not most Correctional Officers, would hold negative views of inmates. Furthermore, it was hypothesized that compared to other prison workers Correctional

Officers would be the least empathic, the most punitive, and the least supportive of rehabilitation.

Results demonstrated generally negative perceptions of inmates. In fact, only 26.2 percent of Correctional Officers who participated in this study were considered empathic while only 26.6 percent could be said to hold non-punitive attitudes. Despite the organization's philosophy in this regard, only about half of these participants (52.9 percent) was assessed as being supportive of offender rehabilitation.

The hypothesis that Correctional Officers would view inmates more negatively than other prison workers was strongly confirmed. Of the 10 occupational groups assessed in this study, none scored lower on measures of empathy and support for rehabilitation. As well, no other group held as punitive a view of inmates. Among non-Correctional Officers, 54.4 percent were considered empathic, 53.8 percent were punitive, and 73.8 percent were supportive of rehabilitation.

While not entirely surprising, these findings are disappointing. Proponents of the Human Services Model (e.g., Hepburn & Knepper, 1993; Johnson & Price, 1981) have long argued that Correctional Officers are ideally placed to encourage positive behavioural change and improve the atmosphere of an otherwise impoverished environment. Not only do Correctional Officers represent the largest occupational group of the prison system, compared to other workers, they also spend the most time interacting with offenders on a day-to-day basis. In line with Chang & Zastrow's (1976) views on this issue, it is likely that current rehabilitative efforts are being compromised in correctional systems.

In a situation where most front-line staff disapproves or doubts the effectiveness of rehabilitation, it is difficult to imagine how offenders can benefit fully from the programs that are currently being offered to them. At the same time, current levels of empathy and punitiveness are likely impeding efforts to improve the social atmosphere of federal prisons.

However, it should also be remembered that the work duties of Correctional Officers are primarily custodial and disciplinary. Cell searches, strip-searches, armed escorts, tower watches, counts, discipline, and general surveillance are core activities in the day-to-day routine of Correctional Officers. These are not duties that are particularly conducive to positive attitudes or affect. Continuing efforts to expand the role of Correctional Officers and to better integrate them into rehabilitation activities could lead to improvements over time. The rise in credentials in this occupational group is encouraging especially given the link between education and positive orientations.

Fortunately, the current study also showed that prison managers, those involved in delivering programs, and those providing health services do in fact support rehabilitation and are likely empathic and non-punitive in their approach. Perhaps an important challenge for this organization is to ensure that its value system is adopted among those who potentially have the greatest impact on offender behaviour.

Prediction of attitudes towards inmates

Several variables have been thought to influence the attitudes of prison workers towards inmates. The Importation-Differential Experiences Model suggests that attitudes are determined primarily by individual characteristics such as gender, race, education,

and age. In contrast, the Work-Role Prisonization Model proposes that environmental variables override personal variables in predicting attitudes. Here, experience, shift, and the type of prison should have a greater impact on attitudes than variables that are “imported” to the job. The scope of the current study permitted an examination of each of these variables and determined the extent to which they explained the variability in empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation scores. It was hypothesized that variables from both models would contribute to a better understanding of correctional attitudes. It should be kept in mind that research to date has been unable to explain much of the variance in correctional attitudes. The current study’s inclusion of additional variables such as region, language, security level, rank, and the size of an institution were predicted to explain a larger proportion of the variance than what has previously been reported in the literature.

As hypothesized, regression analyses retained both individual and environmental variables as significant determinants of correctional attitudes. Among Correctional Officers, a pattern emerged such that education and prison size significantly predicted each of the three attitudes of interest. Specifically, higher levels of education were associated with more positive views while employment in larger institutions was linked to more negative views.

The emergence of education as a strong predictor of empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation was somewhat unexpected. While a few authors have found education to be a reliable determinant of positive attitudes (Burton et al., 1991; Poole & Regoli, 1980; Teske & Williamson, 1979), most others have shown no attitudinal differences based on educational attainment (Crouch & Alpert, 1982; Cullen et al., 1989;

Jurik, 1985; Jurik et al., 1987; Jurik & Musheno, 1986; Paboojian & Teske, 1997; Shamir & Drory, 1981; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). However, most studies have selected participants from southern U.S. states. Because of the specific features of these samples, generalizations to other populations are inadvisable, especially if they are extended to the Canadian context. Recent work by Robinson et al. (1993, 1997) suggests that education is in fact important in determining the attitudes of Canadian Federal Correctional Officers. As in the current study, higher levels of education were associated with increased levels of empathy and support for rehabilitation, as well as lower levels of punitiveness.

Social scientists have yet to explore the size of a prison as a possible determinant of correctional attitudes. Its inclusion in the present study suggests that researchers may have overlooked an important correlate. Like the education variable, prison size was retained in the three regression analyses predicting the attitudes of Correctional Officers. Given the current movement towards building larger prisons and consolidating several smaller ones, this finding seems timely. If in fact an objective of the correctional system is to create an environment that is conducive to positive interactions with inmates and encouraging of rehabilitation, then increasing the size of correctional facilities may not be the best course of action. Instead, prison officials should consider the current finding that respondents from treatment centers and women's prisons were significantly more positive than respondents from more traditional prisons. Not only are these institutions smaller in size, they also tend to be more focused on programs and effective staff-inmate interactions.

It is possible that large facilities lead to a more rigid application of rules and impede meaningful interactions with offenders. Another explanation might reside in the characteristics of the inmates themselves. Women offenders and those with mental illness might be more likely to generate empathy among workers and heighten their awareness for the need for treatment. Finally, treatment centres and women's facilities probably attract individuals with positive correctional attitudes.

Similar to work by previous authors (Cullen et al., 1989; Jurik, 1985; Larivière & Robinson, 1996; Lindquist, 1989; Paboojian & Teske 1997; Teske & Williamson, 1979; Toch & Klofas, 1982; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Whitehead et al., 1987), age was also related to certain correctional attitudes. As hypothesized, senior Correctional Officers responded with more empathy and less punitiveness than junior Correctional Officers did. However, unlike Cullen et al., (1989), Jurik, (1985), Paboojian & Teske, (1997); Teske & Williamson (1979); Van Voorhis et al., (1991), age was not a significant determinant of support for rehabilitation. It may be that older Officers were less knowledgeable of treatment strategies or outcomes. Having entered the prison system at a time when programs were not widespread or thought highly of, older cohorts might also be less inclined to participate in direct intervention with inmates. Still, these individuals tended to support offender programming to a larger extent than their mid-career peers. Moreover, given their empathy and lack of punitiveness, senior Correctional Officers probably enjoy the most positive interactions with inmates.

It was clear that attitudes did not follow a clear linear pattern. Instead, trend analyses of the age and experience variables supported ideas put forth by Toch & Klofas (1982) and Rogers (1991). Attitudes did in fact assume a U-curve pattern whereby

positive attitudes declined precipitously in the early part of a Correctional Officer's career only to stabilize during the mid-career years. The pre-retirement years were characterized by significant improvements in correctional attitudes. This finding may carry interesting implications for correctional systems. For instance, it may be useful to pair new recruits with older workers to ensure that positive attitudes are maintained throughout an entire correctional career. If provided sufficient opportunities for leadership, senior Officers may also be able to influence mid-career Officers in a positive direction.

Researchers have occasionally attributed age effects to maturational or "mellowing" processes (Toch & Klofas, 1982). However, it may also be the case that attrition occurs among individuals who do not support the organization's value system. Researchers may have been witnessing a selection effect and certainly longitudinal data is needed in this regard. Still, indirect evidence of attrition can be drawn from another notable correlate of attitudes towards inmates. Regression procedures twice retained the variable of rank- once in the prediction of empathy and once in the prediction of support for rehabilitation. In fact, a Correctional Officer's rank emerged as the most important determinant of support for rehabilitation. This finding suggests that the Correctional Service of Canada is successfully promoting individuals who hold attitudes that are compatible with its mission statement. Alternatively, higher-ranking Correctional Officers are required to perform more program and treatment related duties suggesting that exposure to such activities may very well increase endorsement of them.

Interestingly, such individuals may be more difficult to find in the province of Québec. Correctional Officers employed in this region were the least likely to support

rehabilitation and the most likely to emphasize punishment as a correctional strategy. It is unclear as to why these employees held such negative views. On a purely speculative basis, one could point to a fairly distinct inmate profile in this region. For instance, gang membership is widespread in the Québec offender population. Such individuals usually do not participate in programs and tend to intimidate front-line staff and management. Presumably, these highly criminalized inmates have generated more punitiveness among correctional workers than empathy.

Race was notably absent from the final regression equations. Though most studies have taken place in the United States, the vast majority have shown that race significantly predicts correctional orientations (Cullen, 1989; Jackson, & Ammen, 1996; Jacobs & Kraft, 1978; Jurik, 1985; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989. Jackson & Ammen (1996) have proposed that minorities should have an easier time identifying with the cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds of many offenders. This general inclination towards perspective taking should lead to positive attitudes and more effective interactions with inmates. The findings of the current study may again point to the uniqueness of the Canadian Federal context. It is possible that socioeconomic disparities between racial groups are not as pronounced in Canada as they are in the United States. If this is the case, then minority workers in Canada may not be particularly advantaged in terms of their ability to understand or relate to certain offender groups.

Less surprising was the absence of gender as a significant predictor of attitudes towards inmates since Cullen et al. (1989), Jurik & Halemba (1984), Paboojian & Teske (1997), Robinson et al. (1993), Van Voorhis et al. (1991), and Zupan (1986) have all

reported similar findings. Still, the lack of gender differences is interesting given Jurik & Halemba's (1984) assertion that women tend to prefer the human service aspects of correctional work such as counseling over the custodial aspects of correctional work such as surveillance. Additional research is needed to explain why these orientations do not translate into more positive attitudes in the workplace. The over-representation of male Officers in the prison system may be partly responsible for this phenomenon. In fact, gender emerged as a significant predictor of punitiveness and support for rehabilitation in occupational groups where women were more equitably represented. Finally, unlike Jurik (1985), Saylor & Wright (1992), and Van Voorhis et al. (1991), shift did not surface as an important correlate of correctional attitudes. Correctional Officers working at night were no more negative in their views of inmates than Correctional Officers working the day shift. A selection effect may have occurred in American samples such that night workers were chosen on the basis of their custodial mindset as opposed to their interpersonal skills.

The variables that predicted the attitudes of Correctional Officers largely predicted the attitudes of non-Correctional Officers, though education had a markedly more pronounced effect in the latter group. In fact, for these participants, educational attainment remained the strongest predictor in each of the equations predicting empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation. The reasons for this outcome were not explored in this study but it is probable that Correctional Officers and non-Correctional Officers received different types of formal education prior to entering the workforce. Educated Correctional Officers likely received specialized training in security whereas educated non-Correctional Officers were more likely to receive training in the human and

social sciences. As was the case for Correctional Officers, age, prison size, and region were also found to significantly explain the variability in attitudinal scores. Notable additions to the regression equations included experience, security level and as previously mentioned, gender.

Notwithstanding the inclusion of several new variables in this study, the hypothesis that considerably more variance in correctional attitudes would be explained was not supported. For Correctional Officers, the explained variance ranged from 6.7 percent to 10.9 percent and for non-Correctional Officers, the range extended from 8.9 percent to 15.1 percent. These values were not substantially different from those reported by Van Voorhis et al. (1991) who obtained multiple R^2 s ranging from .08 to .15. To improve on these numbers, future researchers may need to look beyond traditional demographic variables to include intrapsychic factors such as personality, affect, and motivation.

Work adjustment

The hypothesis that positive attitudes towards inmates would be associated with better work adjustment was confirmed. The strength of these relationships ranged between $r = .13$ for empathy and job stress, to $r = .40$ for support for rehabilitation and organizational commitment. While directionality and causality cannot be inferred here, it is clear that empathic, non-punitive, and pro-rehabilitation workers showed better outcomes than those who did not hold such orientations.

Given their attitudes towards inmates and the corporate value system in place at the Correctional Service of Canada, which conflict with these attitudes, Correctional

Officers were expected to demonstrate poorer work adjustment than employees from other occupational groups. With the exception of job stress, this prediction was supported. Correctional Officers were significantly less satisfied with their work (64.6 percent vs. 83.3 percent) and significantly less committed to the Correctional Service of Canada than non-Correctional Officers (50.3 percent vs. 75.4 percent).

It would certainly be unfair to pin lower work adjustment scores solely on poorer attitudes towards inmates. There are probably several other reasons why Correctional Officers might feel less satisfied with their job and less committed to their employer than other workers. The fact that Case Management Officers reported higher levels of job stress despite having more positive correctional attitudes suggests that job functions and workload issues ought to be considered in future research. Still, regression analyses clearly demonstrated the strong effect of attitudes on adjustment.

Prediction of work adjustment

Having established the general relationship between empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation on work adjustment, the current research assessed the extent to which demographic and attitudinal factors explained the variability in job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Unlike previous research, consideration was also given to the institution's overall endorsement of these attitudes. The issue of the relative importance among variables and the explained variance of work adjustment scores were addressed in two separate, but related, procedures.

In the first analytic procedure, all independent variables including attitudinal variables were made available for inclusion in multiple stepwise regressions predicting

indicators of work adjustment. To explore the contribution of an institution's collective atmosphere on work adjustment three other variables were included: institutional empathy, institutional punitiveness, and institutional support for rehabilitation. Results from these analyses affirmed the central role of individual attitudes in predicting the work adjustment of employees. In fact, the strongest determinants for each indicator of work adjustment were attitudes towards inmates. This finding held for Correctional Officers and non-Correctional Officers alike. Punitiveness was the strongest predictor of job stress while support for rehabilitation was the strongest predictor of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Institutional punitiveness was the only prison-attitude variable to be retained in a regression equation. It was found to strongly predict the commitment of non-Correctional Officers. Otherwise, an institution's collective atmosphere did not significantly determine individual work adjustment.

To further demonstrate the importance of individual correctional attitudes on work adjustment, a second set of analyses were undertaken. Here, multiple stepwise regression analyses predicting work adjustment scores were conducted using the most salient variables drawn from the literature (e.g., age, gender, and education). Less studied variables such as prison size, region, and rank were also included in these analyses. Correctional attitudes were then entered separately as a block in order to determine their unique contribution to work adjustment. In the second procedure, every independent variable described thus far was entered in the stepwise regressions. This strategy would determine the ranking and strength of attitudinal versus other variables in predicting work adjustment.

Among Correctional Officers, experience and race were retained in 2 of the 3 regression equations. Membership in a racial minority group predicted job satisfaction as well as commitment to the organization. It is difficult to know why minorities demonstrated such better work adjustment scores in this study, especially in light of previous research showing the opposite (Britton, 1997; Cullen et al., 1985). On the other hand, prior studies have often described situations where minorities were disappointed about the supervision they received and were frustrated about their chances for advancement. Results of the current study point to a more successful integration of minorities in the Canadian Federal prison system.

Results for the experience variable were not as straightforward. Length of employment with the Correctional Service of Canada was associated with higher levels of stress and lower levels of commitment. This finding may seem counterintuitive. One would expect experience to increase confidence and autonomy on the job while solidifying the relationship with the organization through additional extrinsic rewards (e.g., pensions and benefits). However, it may also be the case that experience leads to additional responsibilities on the job, which in turn can augment stress. Experience may also create additional career opportunities for employees, which in turn could decrease the level of commitment felt toward the employing organization.

Prison size re-emerged as a significant determinant; this time in the equation predicting job satisfaction. Though not retained in the analyses, large facilities were also linked to increased job stress and to decreased organizational commitment. Again, recent efforts to increase the capacity of prisons (e.g., Ontario's super-jails) may have undesirable secondary effects. The current study suggests that such facilities may

adversely effect the adjustment of correctional workers. A related variable, security level, predicted the overall job stress of Correctional Officers. This finding was consistent with a recent study by Millson (2000) who found that the strongest determinant of job stress was the perception of personal security. Despite the existing research indicating the relative safety for prison staff (Ouimet, 1999), respondents in higher security institutions felt more vulnerable and more stressed than peers working in lower security levels did.

A similar pattern of findings was found for non-Correctional Officers in that race and prison size again emerged as important predictors of work outcomes. Unlike the Correctional Officer sample however, age and gender were twice retained as significant determinants of adjustment. Age was significantly associated with lower stress and greater job satisfaction whereas gender was associated with more job satisfaction and more commitment to the organization. The latter finding supports what has been described in the literature as the “paradox of the contented working woman” (Jackson, 1989) whereby women show better adjustment on the job despite working in environments unfavourable towards them. It was perhaps their general approach to correctional work (i.e., a Human Services Model) that caused female respondents to feel more satisfied and more committed to their employer.

Education however, was linked to a decrease in job satisfaction. This is consistent with research by Jurik & Musheno (1986), Robinson et al., (1997), and Rogers (1991) and supports the possibility that highly educated workers are underutilized and/or under-compensated in the correctional system. The organization may need to give special attention to this group of employees. Despite having the training and correctional

orientations most likely to effect positive change in offender behaviour, they do not appear to be drawing much satisfaction from their duties. As it currently stands, the organization seems at risk of losing a valuable segment of their workforce.

Overall, the explained variance in these equations was small. Among Correctional Officers, the multiple Rs ranged from 2.7 percent (job stress) to 6.0 percent (organizational commitment). Regressions for the non-Correctional Officer sample produced multiple Rs ranging from 1.1 percent (job satisfaction) to 2.4 percent (organizational commitment).

However, the current study expected that correctional attitude scores would add significantly to the explanation of work adjustment. In this regard, results were unequivocal. Using empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation as a block in the regression procedures, the explained variance rose to between 9.1 (job stress) percent and 23.8 percent (organizational commitment) for Correctional Officers. In the non-Correctional Officer sample, values increased from 5.0 percent (job stress) to 13.9 percent (organizational commitment) of the total variance. Clearly, the contribution of correctional attitudes on work adjustment is large.

Attitude consistency

The current study examined the number of positive attitudes held by correctional employees and related these scores to work adjustment. Consistent with findings described thus far, work adjustment improved in step with the number of positive attitudes held. However, it had been hypothesized that individuals holding incompatible attitudes (e.g., being both empathic and non-supportive of rehabilitation) would show

poorer outcomes. Conflicting attitudes should also be more prevalent among Correctional Officers since they are mostly assigned custodial and somewhat punitive tasks. Presumably, the dissonance created by such a situation would serve to decrease work adjustment.

Correctional Officers were not more likely to hold inconsistent correctional attitudes and contrary to expectation, employees holding incompatible views did not demonstrate less satisfaction or commitment, nor did they report higher levels of job stress. In fact, there was a positive relationship between the number of positive attitudes that were held and the level of work adjustment.

At a more complex level, the current study explored the potential interactive effects of correctional attitudes on job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. For instance, it may be the case that only certain combinations of attitude influence work adjustment in particular ways.

Three-way Analyses of Variance showed no significant interactions between empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation on work adjustment. However, several main effects were recorded. Punitiveness produced a main effect for each of the three work outcome measures. Interestingly, punitiveness was the only main effect found for job stress. For job satisfaction, both punitiveness and support for rehabilitation produced main effects. Finally, empathy, punitiveness, and support for rehabilitation produced main effects for the organizational commitment variable.

A number of conclusions may be drawn from the above analyses. First, there is strong link between how prison employees view inmates and how adjusted they are at work. Second, traditionally studied demographic variables are clearly inadequate in

explaining the variance in job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The inclusion of correctional attitudes significantly improved predictive capacity. In fact, these variables emerged as the strongest determinants of work outcomes. Third, attitudes cannot be said to interact with each other in any significant way. The most that can be said in this regard is that there is a shift towards better adjustment with each positive attitude held. Finally, it is important to note the relative contribution of certain variables to particular work outcomes. Punitiveness appears to be particularly important in the determination of job stress whereas support for rehabilitation is significantly related to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. These latter findings highlight the importance and implications of person and organization fit.

Person-organization fit

Person and organization fit has been defined as “the compatibility between people and organizations that occurs when a) at least one entity provides what the other needs, or b) they share similar fundamental characteristics, or c) both” (Kristof, 1996; p. 4). Typical outcomes of adequate fit include motivation on the job, better performance, and increased citizenship behaviours in the workplace (e.g., teamwork, ethical behaviour). Improvements in work adjustment such as reduced workplace stress (Friedman & Rosenman, 1974), job satisfaction, and organizational commitment are also expected.

In a strict sense, correctional systems are mandated to administer court-imposed sentences in a way that optimizes public protection. Traditionally, public protection has been equated with punishment, strict rule enforcement, paramilitary management

structures, and an emphasis on certain physical infrastructures (e.g., fences, towers, and weapons).

Recognizing that most inmates eventually return to the community, some modern systems have expressed a philosophical shift away from punishment and custody towards treatment and reintegration. This expanded interpretation of public protection is encouraging, especially in light of the accumulated evidence demonstrating the effectiveness of well-designed correctional programs (Gendreau & Ross, 1987). What is more, empathic, non-punitive, and rehabilitative milieus hold the promise of a healthier correctional environment and perhaps a healthier work environment.

A well-articulated and publicized mission statement at the Correctional Service of Canada suggests that senior administrators have embraced this new corporate orientation; one that genuinely resembles the Human Services Model described earlier. In fact, the current study confirmed managers' general agreement with this philosophy. Regrettably, adherence to these views decreased as one moved down the organization's hierarchical structure. Among Correctional Officers, arguably the employees most responsible for creating and maintaining the prison atmosphere, correctional attitudes were predominantly negative. Recalling Kristof's (1996) definition of person-organization fit, several Correctional Officers did not "share fundamental characteristics" with their employer, or did "not provide what the other entity needed". Under these conditions, Person-Organization fit theory predicts poor work adjustment such as increased job stress, decreased job satisfaction, and lower organizational commitment. The work adjustment data obtained from this large sample of prison employees strongly confirms the prediction.

Interestingly, an examination of individually held attitudes (e.g., the participant's correctional orientation) and institutionally held attitudes (e.g., the employing institution's overall correctional orientation) failed to produce any significant interactions. It had been hypothesized that a person's immediate work environment would largely determine the extent to which that person would express job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. For example, it was thought that an empathic individual employed in a non-empathic milieu would tend to demonstrate poorer work adjustment. Similarly, a person intolerant of rehabilitation should report decreased work adjustment in a prison where the prevailing sentiment was pro-treatment. None of these expectations were supported. Instead, positive correctional attitudes were related to positive work outcomes regardless of the prison's collective views. These findings suggested that compatibility with the employer's values (i.e., Person-Organization fit) was more important than compatibility with the actual work unit (i.e., Person-Workplace fit).

Indeed, a number of indicators of Person-Organization Fit were found in the current study. For instance, a strong relationship was found between employee support for rehabilitation and organizational commitment ($r = .40$). In an organization known for its emphasis on intervention, this variable was found to be the strongest determinant of commitment. Interestingly, support for rehabilitation was also the best predictor of job satisfaction. While this latter finding might have more to do with the intrinsic rewards of supporting rehabilitation than it does with Person-Organization fit, it is clear that the Correctional Service of Canada provides many opportunities for workers to participate in programs and ultimately derive satisfaction from these activities.

Support for Person-Organization fit was also demonstrated by the correctional attitudes of different age cohorts in that the eldest members of the workforce held the most positive attitudes towards inmates. These results pointed to a potential attrition effect among prison workers who did not hold attitudes congruent with the organizations'. For example, highly punitive individuals would have been prone to suffering job-related stress, perhaps leading to burnout and eventual resignation. Similarly, people who disapproved of correctional programs may have become frustrated by the amount of resources invested in these efforts.

The Correctional Service of Canada's apparent tendency to promote individuals with the "best fit" provided additional support for the theory in question. The study found that Unit Managers held more positive attitudes than Correctional Officer IIs who in turn held more positive attitudes than Correctional Officer Is. It appears that empathy, support for rehabilitation and non-punitiveness significantly increases one's chances for promotion. Alternatively, it may be that promotion or the promotional process itself, changes attitudes by providing opportunities to appreciate the importance and value of empathy and treatment. Job competitions at the Correctional Service of Canada often test candidates' understanding of the mission statement, and its accompanying values, and principles. Thus, the process of studying for job exams might in and of itself attenuate negative perceptions of inmates.

Therein lies an interesting opportunity for the organization to shape particular attitudes among their employees. A reward system that is based more fully on certain correctional orientations would build a workforce that is better equipped to reintegrate

offenders and ultimately protect the public. Added benefits would likely also include enhanced work adjustment and improved prison conditions.

Staff recruitment represents another important venue for shaping the correctional workforce. In addition to academic qualifications, recruiters at the Correctional Service of Canada should also assess candidates' attitudes towards inmates during the hiring process. As Bowen et al. (1991) argued, selecting people with compatible values instead of specific skill sets creates a more flexible workforce. In the present context, it may also create a safer and healthier environment for citizens both inside and outside of penitentiaries.

Study limitations and future research

The current findings are limited by a number of methodological and conceptual factors. Although the sample in this study was large compared to similar efforts found in the literature, the response rate for certain occupational groups raises the possibility of response bias. With a return rate of 49 percent, the Correctional Officer group would be especially prone to this problem. It is difficult to know what effect this may have had on the final results. For instance, was the sample over-represented by respondents who were disenchanted with the organization? Or, were questionnaires completed by conscientious employees who were generally more interested in employer-sponsored projects?

Caution is also advised with regard to directionality and causality. The study may have intimated that empathy, punitiveness and support for rehabilitation leads to better work adjustment. However, one could certainly take an opposite view. A hypothesis indicating that low stress, high satisfaction, and strong commitment facilitates the

development and retention of positive attitudes seems equally compelling. Furthermore, we still do not know if there is a direct path between correctional attitudes and work outcomes. Even though attitudes are related in some way to adjustment, the link between these variables is not definitive and studies have yet to show a causal connection. In fact, the relationship between these variables might be entirely spurious. For example, support for rehabilitation might be linked to job satisfaction, but only to the extent that an offender population is motivated for treatment. Future studies will need to consider other potential covariates, particularly those relating to offender characteristics.

The assessment of Person-Organization fit also needs to be improved. In this study, statements made about the employer, and the degree of fit demonstrated by its employees, was largely inferential. A more scientific approach to quantifying an organization's value system is needed. For instance, which correctional orientation is most important to this organization? What is the corporate priority, treatment, custody, or both equally? With this type of information, attitudinal scales could be tailored specifically to this organization. It may then be possible to create a quantitative index of Person-Organization fit.

As with any research of this kind, it is impossible to know the extent to which attitudes corresponded to actual behaviours. For example, individuals categorized as not supporting treatment might still respect the corporate philosophy in this regard and act in a way that encourages offender rehabilitation. And perhaps a more important question is whether or not staff attitudes actually have an effect on the ultimate goal of the correctional system: decreased recidivism. The body of knowledge accumulated thus far indicates that positive correctional attitudes might lead to positive work outcomes.

Future researchers will need to determine if such attitudes also lead to positive correctional outcomes.

References

- Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Ben-David, S. (1992). Staff-to-Inmates relations in a total institution: A model of five modes of association. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 36, 3, 209-219.
- Blau, G., & Boal, K. (1989). Using job involvement and organizational commitment interactively to predict turnover. Journal of Management, 15, 1, 115-127.
- Bonta, J., Hanson, K., & Law, M. (1998). The prediction of criminal and violent recidivism among mentally disordered offenders: A meta-analysis. Psychological Bulletin, 123, 2, 123-142.
- Bowen, D. E., Ledford, G. E., & Nathan, B. R. (1991). Hiring for the organization not the job. Academy of Management Executive, 5, 35-51.
- Boxx, W. R., Odom, R. Y., Dunn, M. G. (1991). Organizational values and value congruency and their impact on satisfaction, commitment, and cohesion. Public Personnel Management, 20, 195-205.
- Bretz, R. D., Ash, R. A., & Dreher, G. F., (1989). Do people make the place? An examination of the attraction-selection-attrition hypothesis. Personnel Psychology, 42, 561-581.
- Britton, D. M. (1997). Perceptions of the work environment among Correctional Officers: Do race and sex matter? Criminology, 35, 1, 85-105.

Burton, V. S., Ju, X., Dunaway, R. G., & Wolfe, N. T. (1991). The correctional orientation of Bermuda prison guards: An assessment of attitudes toward punishment and rehabilitation. International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice, 15, 1, 71-80.

Chang, D. H., & Zastrow, C. H. (1976). Inmates' and Security Guards' perception of themselves and of each other. International journal of Criminology and Penology, 4, 89-98.

Chatman, J. (1989). Improving interactional organizational research: A model of person-organization fit. Academy of Management Review, 14, 333-349.

Cheek, F. E. (1984). Stress management for Correctional Officers and their families. College Park, MD: American Correctional Association.

Coulton, C. J. (1981). Person-environment fit as the focus in health care. Social Work, 26, 1, 26-35.

Correctional Service of Canada. (1988). Unit Management: An orientation (CSC publication No. HV 9506U55). Ottawa, Canada.

Correctional Service of Canada. (2000).

Cressey, D. R. (1958). Achievement of an unstated organizational goal: An observation on prisons. Pacific Sociological Review, 1, 2, 43-49.

Crouch, B. M., & Alpert, G. P. (1980). Prison Guards' attitudes toward components of the criminal justice system. Criminology, 18, 2, 227-236.

Crouch, B. M., & Alpert, G. P. (1982). Sex and occupational socialization among prison guards: A longitudinal study. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 9, 2, 159-176.

Cullen, F. T., Cullen, J. B., & Wozniak, J. F. (1988). Is rehabilitation dead? The myth of the punitive public. Journal of Criminal Justice, 16, 303-317.

Cullen, F. T., Latessa, E. J., Burton, V. S., & Lombardo, L. X. (1993). The correctional orientation of prison wardens: Is the rehabilitative ideal supported? Criminology, 31, 1, 69-92.

Cullen, F. T., Link, B. G., Wolfe, N. T., & Frank, J. (1985). The social dimensions of Correctional Officer stress. Justice Quarterly, 2, 4, 505-533.

Cullen, F. T., Lutze, F. E., Link, B. G., & N. T. Wolfe (1989). The correctional orientation of Prison Guards: Do officers support rehabilitation? Federal Probation, 33-42.

Cullen, F. T., Skovron, S. E., Scott, J. E., & Burton, V. S. (1990). Public support for correctional treatment: The tenacity of rehabilitative ideology. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 17, 1, 6-18.

Culliver, C., Sigler, R., & McNeely, B. (1991). Examining prosocial organizational behavior among Correctional Officers. International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice, 15, 2, 277-284.

Dantzker, M. L., & Kubin, B. (1998). Job satisfaction: The gender perspective among police officers. American Journal of Criminal Justice, 23, 1, 19-31.

Farmer, R. E. (1977). Cynicism: A factor in corrections work. Journal of Criminal Justice, 5, 237-246.

Finn, F. (1998). Correctional Officer stress: A cause for concern and additional help. Federal Probation, 62, 2, 65-74.

Freeman, R. W., & Johnson, L. D. (1982). Health-related knowledge, attitudes, and practices of Correctional Officers. Journal of Prison and Jail Health, 2, 2, 125-138.

Friedman, M., & Rosenman, R. H. (1974). Type A behaviour and your heart. New York: Alfred Knopf.

Fry, L. J. (1990). Counselor reactions to work in prison settings. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, & Rehabilitation, 14, 1, 121-132.

Gendreau, P., & Ross, R. (1987). Revivication of rehabilitation: Evidence from the 1980s, Justice Quarterly, 4, 349-408.

Gerstein, L. H., Topp, C. G., & Correll, G. (1987). The role of the environment and person when predicting burnout among correctional personnel. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 14, 3, 352-369.

Gordon, A., & Porporino, F. (1991). Canada targets sex offenders according to treatment needs. Corrections Today, 53, 162-168.

Gross, G. R., Larson, S. J., Urban, G. D., & Zupan, L. L. (1994). Gender differences in occupational stress among Correctional Officers. American Journal of Criminal Justice, 18, 2, 219-234.

Grossi, E. L., & Berg, B. L. (1993). Stress and job dissatisfaction among Correctional Officers: An unexpected finding. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 20, 1, 61-72.

Guenther, A., & Guenther, M. (1974). Screws vs. Thugs. Society, 12, 42-50.

Hackman, J., & Oldham, G. (1980). Work redesign. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.

- Hall, D. T., Schneider, B., & Nygren, H. T. (1975). Personal factors in organizational identification. Administrative Science Quarterly, 15, 176-190.
- Haney, C., Banks, C., & Zimbardo, P. (1973). Interpersonal dynamics in a simulated prison. International Journal of Criminology and Penology, 1, 69-97.
- Held, B. S., Levine, D., & Swartz, V. D. (1979). Interpersonal aspects of dangerousness. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 6, 1, 49-58.
- Hepburn, J. R., & Albonetti, C. (1980). Role conflict in correctional institutions: An empirical examination of the treatment-custody dilemma among correctional staff. Criminology, 17, 4, 445-459.
- Hepburn, J. R. (1984). The erosion of authority and the perceived legitimacy of inmate social protest: A study of prison guards. Journal of Criminal Justice, 12, 579-590.
- Hepburn, J. R. (1985). The exercise of power in coercive organizations: A study of prison guards. Criminology, 23, 1, 145-164.
- Hepburn, J. R. (1987). The prison control structure and its effects on work attitudes: The perceptions and attitudes of prison guards. Journal of Criminal Justice, 15, 49-64.
- Hepburn, J. R., & Knepper, P. E. (1993). Correctional Officers as human services workers: the effect on job satisfaction. Justice Quarterly, 10, 2, 315-335.
- Hodson, R. (1989). Gender differences in job satisfaction: Why aren't women more dissatisfied? Sociological Quarterly, 30, 385-399.
- Homant, R. J. (1979). Correlates of satisfactory relations between Correctional Officers and prisoners. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, & Rehabilitation, 4, 1, 53-62.

- Huckabee, R. G. (1992). Stress in corrections: An overview of the issues. Journal of Criminal Justice, 20, 479-486.
- Irwin, J. (1980). Prisons in turmoil. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Jackson, L. A. (1989). Relative deprivation and the gender wage gap. Journal of Social Issues, 45, 117-133.
- Jackson, J. E. & Ammen, S. (1996). Race and Correctional Officers' punitive attitudes toward treatment programs for inmates. Journal of Criminal Justice, 24, 2, 153-166.
- Jacobs, J. B. (1978). What prison guards think: A profile of the Illinois Force. Crime and Delinquency, 1, 185-196.
- Jacobs, J. B. (1983). New perspectives on prison and imprisonment. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Jacobs, J. B., & Kraft, L. J. (1978). Integrating the keepers: A comparison of black and white prison guards in Illinois. Social Problems, 3, 304-318.
- Jenne, D. L., & Kersting, R. C. (1996). Aggression and women Correctional Officers in male prisons. The Prison Journal, 76, 4, 442-460.
- Johnson, R., & Price, S. (1981). The complete correctional officer: Human Service and the human environment of prison. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 8, 3, 343-373.
- Josi, D. A., & Sechrest, D. K. (1998). The changing career of the Correctional Officer: Policy implications for the 21st century. Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Judge, T. A., & Bretz, R. D. (1992). Effects of work values on job choice decisions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 77, 261-271.

Jurik, N. C. (1985). Individual and organizational determinants of Correctional Officer attitudes toward inmates. Criminology, 23, 3, 523-539.

Jurik, N. C., & Halembe, G. J. (1984). Gender, working conditions and the job satisfaction of women in a non-traditional occupation: Female Correctional Officers in men's prisons. The Sociological Quarterly, 25, 551-566.

Jurik, N. C., Halembe, G. J., Musheno, M. C., & Boyle, B. V. (1987). Educational attainment, job satisfaction, and the professionalization of Correctional Officers. Work and Occupations, 14, 1, 106-125.

Jurik, N. C., & Musheno, M. C. (1986). The internal crisis of corrections: Professionalization and the work environment. Justice Quarterly, 3, 4, 457-480.

Jurik, N. C., & Winn, R. (1987). Describing correctional-security dropouts and rejects: An individual or organizational profile? Criminal Justice and Behavior, 14, 1, 5-25.

Katz, J. (1982). The attitudes and decisions of probation officers. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 9, 4, 455-475.

Kauffman, K. (1981). Prison officers' attitudes and perceptions of attitudes: A case of pluralistic ignorance. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 18, 2, 272-294.

Klofas, J. M. (1986). Discretion among Correctional Officers: The influence of urbanization, age, and race. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 30, 2, 111-124.

Klofas, J., & Toch, H. (1982). The guard subculture myth. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 1, 238-254.

Kristof, A. L. (1996). Person-organization fit: An integrative review of its conceptualizations, measurement, and implications. Personnel Psychology, 49, 1-49.

Kropp, P. R., Cox, D. N., Roesch, R., & Eaves, D. (1989). The perceptions of correctional officers toward mentally disordered offenders. International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 12, 181-188.

Larivière, M. & Robinson, D. (1996). Attitudes of Federal Correctional Officers towards offenders. Correctional Service of Canada Research Report No. R-44.

Lazarus, R. S. (1968). Stress. New York: Macmillan Company.

Leiber, M. J., & Woodrick, A. C. (1997). Religious beliefs, attributional styles, and adherence to correctional orientations. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 24, 4, 495-511.

Light, S. C. (1991). Assaults on prison officers: Interactional themes. Justice Quarterly, 8, 2, 243-261.

Lindquist, C. A., & Whitehead, J. T. (1986). Correctional Officer job burnout: A path model (1986). Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 23, 1, 23-42.

Lindquist, C. A., & Whitehead, J. T. (1986). Correctional Officers as parole officers: An examination of a community supervision sanction. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 13, 2, 197-222.

Lindquist, C. A., & Whitehead, J. T. (1986). Guards released from prison: A natural experiment in job enlargement. Journal of Criminal Justice, 14, 283-294.

Lombardo, L. X. (1985). Group dynamics and the prison guard subculture: Is the subculture an impediment to helping inmates? International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 29, 1, 79-90.

Long, N., Shouksmith, G., & Roache, S. (1986). Stress in prison staff: An occupational study. Criminology, 24, 2, 331-345.

Loza, W. (1993). Attributions of blame toward incarcerated rapists among correctional workers: Implications for staffing. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 1, 59-60.

Lusignan, R. (1995). La victimisation des intervenants en criminologie: ses formes, son ampleur et ses conséquences sur la pratique clinique. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Montréal, Montréal, Québec, Canada.

Marquart, J. W. (1986). Prison guards and the use of physical coercion as a mechanism of prison control Criminology, 24, 2, 347-366.

Marques, J. K. (1999). How to answer the question: Does sex offender treatment work? Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14, 4, 437-451.

Marshall, W. L. (1993). The treatment of sex offenders: What does the outcome data tell us? A reply to Quinsey, Harris, Rice, and Lalumière. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 8, 4, 486-501.

Marshall, W. L., & Pithers, W. D. (1994). A reconsideration of treatment outcome with sex offenders. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 21, 1, 10-27.

Mathieu, J. E., & Zajac, D. M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. Psychological Bulletin, 108, 2, 171-194.

Mayes, B. T., & Ganster, D. C. (1988). Exit and voice: A test of hypotheses based on fight/flight responses to job stress. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 9, 199-216.

Melvin, K. B., Gramling, L. K., & Gardner, W. M. (1985). A scale to measure attitudes toward prisoners. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 12, 2, 241-253.

Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J. (1988). Links between work experiences and organizational commitment during the first year of employment: A longitudinal analysis. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 61, 195-209.

Millson, W. (2000). Predictors of work stress among Correctional Officers. Unpublished master's thesis. Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Morrow, P. C. (1983). Concept redundancy in organizational research: The case of work commitment. Academy of Management Review, 8, 3, 486-500.

Mottaz, C. J. (1988). Determinants of organizational commitment. Human Relations, 41, 6, 467-482.

Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). Employee-organizational linkages. New York: Academic Press.

Mowday, R. T., Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 14, 224-247.

Muchinsky, P. M., & Monahan, C. J. (1987). What is person environment congruence? Supplementary versus complementary models of fit. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 31, 268-277.

Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. (1994). The assessment of reliability. In Psychometric theory (3rd ed., pp. 248-292). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Ortet-Fabregat, G., Perez, J., & Lewis, R. (1993). Measuring attitudes toward prisoners: A psychometric assessment. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 20, 2, 190-198.

Ouimet, M. (1999). Remarkable rarity of violence toward staff in prisons. Forum on Corrections Research, 11, 1, 25-29.

Owen, B. A. (1986). The reproduction of social control: A study of prison workers at San Quentin. New York: Praeger Press.

Paboojian, A., & Teske, R. H. (1997). Pre-service Correctional Officers: What do they think about treatment? Journal of Criminal Justice, 25, 5, 425-433.

Patterson, B. L. (1992). Job experience and perceived job stress among police, correctional, and probation/parole officers. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 19, 3, 260-285.

Pedhazur, E. J. (1997). Multiple regression in behavioral research: Explanation and prediction. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Philliber, S. (1987). Thy brother's keeper: A review of the literature on correctional officers. Justice Quarterly, 4, 1, 9-37.

Plecas, D., & Maxim, P. (1991). Correctional Officer career development. Final report to the Correctional Service of Canada.

Pogrebin, M. R., & Poole, E. D. (1997). The sexualized work environment: A look at women jail officers. The Prison Journal, 77, 1, 41-57.

Poole, E. D., & Pogrebin, M. R. (1988). Deputy Sheriffs as jail guards. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 15, 2, 190-209.

Poole, E. D., & Regoli, R. M. (1980). Role stress, custody orientation, and disciplinary actions: A study of prison guards. Criminology, 18, 2, 215-226.

Randall, D. M., Fedor, D. B., & Longenecker, C. O. (1990). The Behavioral Expression of Organizational Commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 36, 210-224.

Quinsey, V. L., Khanna, A., & Malcolm, P. B. (1998). A retrospective evaluation of the Regional Treatment Centre Sex Offender Treatment Program. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 13, 5, 621-644.

Robinson, D., Lefaive, P., & Muirhead, M. (1997). Results of the 1996 Correctional Service of Canada Staff Survey: A synopsis. Correctional Service of Canada Research Report No B-17.

Robinson, D., Porporino, F. J., & Simourd, L. (1993). The influence of career orientation on support for rehabilitation among correctional staff. The Prison Journal, 73, 2, 162-177.

Robinson, D., Porporino, F., & Simourd, L. (1996). Do different occupational groups vary on attitudes and work adjustment in corrections? Federal Probation, 60, 3, 45-53.

Robinson, D., Porporino, F., & Simourd, L. (1997). The influence of educational attainment on the attitudes and job performance of Correctional Officers. Crime and Delinquency, 43, 1, 60-77.

Rogers, R. (1991). The effects of educational level on Correctional Officer job satisfaction Journal of Criminal Justice, 19, 123-137.

Rosine, L. (1992). The impact on Correctional Officers of exposure to critical incidents. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Rutter, D. R., & Fielding, P. J. (1988). Sources of occupational stress: An examination of British prison officers. Work and Stress, 2, 4, 291-299.

Saylor, W. G., & Wright, K. N. (1992). Status, longevity, and perceptions of the work environment among federal prison employees. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 17, 3, 133-160.

Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. Personnel Psychology, 40, 437-453.

Shamir, B., & Drory, A. (1981). Some correlates of prison guards' beliefs. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 8, 2, 233-249.

Simourd, L. (1996). Staff attitudes toward inmates and correctional work: an exploration of the attitude-work outcome relationship. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

Slate, R. N., & Vogel, R. E. (1997). Participative management and correctional personnel: A study of the perceived atmosphere for participation in correctional decision making and its impact on employee stress and thoughts about quitting. Journal of Criminal Justice, 25, 5, 397-408.

Smith, R. R., Milan, M. A., Wood, L. F., & McKee, J. M. (1976). The Correctional Officer as a behavioral technician. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 3, 4, 345-361.

Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W., & Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 4, 653-663.

SPSS (1999). SPSS Base 9.0: Applications Guide. Chicago: SPSS Inc.

Stohr, M. K., Lovrich, N. P., Menke, B. A., & Zupan, L. L. (1994). Staff management in correctional institutions: Comparing DiIulio's "control model" and "employee investment model" outcomes in five jails. Justice Quarterly, 11, 3, 471-497.

Stohr, M. K., Lovrich, N. P., & Wilson, G. L. (1994). Staff stress in contemporary jails: Assessing problem severity and the payoff of progressive personnel practices. Journal of Criminal Justice, 313-327.

Street, D. (1965). The Inmate Group in Custodial and Treatment Settings. American Sociological Review, 30, 1, 40-55.

Szockyj, E. (1989). Working in a man's world: Women Correctional Officers in an institution for men. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 31, 3, 319-328.

Teske, R. H., & Williamson, H. E. (1979). Correctional Officers' attitudes toward selected treatment programs. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 6, 1, 59-66.

Toch, H. (1978). Is a Correctional Officer by any other name a screw? Criminal Justice Review 3, 2, 19-35.

Toch, H., & Klofas, J. (1982). Alienation and desire for job enrichment among Correctional Officers. Federal Probation, 1, 35-44.

Turban, D. B., & Keon, T. L. (1993). Organization attractiveness: An interactionist perspective. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 184-193.

Ulmer, J. T. (1992). Occupational Socialization and Cynicism Toward Prison Administration. The Social Science Journal, 29, 4, 423-443.

Van Voorhis, P., Cullen, F. T., Link, B. G. & Wolfe, N. T. (1991). The impact of race and gender on Correctional Officers' orientation to the integrated environment. Journal of research in Crime and Delinquency, 28, 4, 472-500.

Vroom, V. H. (1960). The effects of attitudes on perception of organizational goals. Human Relations, 13, 229-240.

Wahler, C., & Gendreau, P. (1990). Perceived characteristics of effective correctional officers by officers, supervisors, and inmates across three different types of institutions. Canadian Journal of Criminology, 1, 265-277.

Walters, S. (1991). Alienation and the Correctional Officer: A multivariate analysis. American Journal of Criminal Justice, 16, 1, 50-62.

Walters, S. (1992). Attitudinal and demographic differences between male and female Corrections Officers: A study in three Midwestern prisons. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 18, 173-189.

Walters, S. (1996). The determinants of job satisfaction among Canadian and American Correctional Officers. Journal of Crime and Justice, 19, 2, 145-158.

Weekes, J., Pelletier, G., & Beaudette, D. (1995). Correctional Officers: How Do They Perceive Sex Offenders. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 39, 1, 55-61.

Whitehead, J. T., & Lindquist, C. A. (1989). Determinants of Correctional Officers' professional orientation. Justice Quarterly, 6, 1, 69-87.

Whitehead, J., Linquist, C., & Klofas, J. (1987). Correctional Officer professional orientation: A replication of the Klofas-Toch measure. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 14, 4, 468-486.

Wittig-Berman, U., & Lang, D. (1990). Organizational commitment and its outcomes: Differing effects of value commitment and continuance commitment on stress reactions, alienation, and organization-serving behaviours. Work and Stress, 4, 2, 167-77.

Zimmer, L. E. (1986). Women guarding men. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zupan, L. L. (1986). Gender-related differences in Correctional Officer's perceptions and attitudes. Journal of Criminal Justice, 14, 349-361.

Correctional Service Canada Staff Survey

1996

Coopers
& Lybrand
Consulting

Solutions
for Business™

Dear CSC Staff Member:

This is the second in a series of staff surveys which the Service plans to conduct every two years. The first survey was conducted in March 1994 and involved over 6,600 staff. In a number of the workunits, the results provided background information for operational changes. For example, some managers took action to address problems of harassment, physical security, and morale of staff. When the results are released following this survey, CSC managers will elaborate specific strategies to ensure that important issues raised by the staff in 1996 will be addressed.

The current survey will allow us to chart how far the organization has progressed in the last two years. The final report will show comparisons of the 1996 results with the 1994 results. While most questions from 1994 are repeated, the questionnaire includes issues that have emerged since the last survey.

Your participation will help the Service gain representative views of staff. Your honest opinions are essential in identifying both the strengths and weaknesses of the Service.

The results of the survey will be reported at national and regional levels. Separate reports will be made for each CSC work site (institutions, parole districts, and national/regional headquarters). Staff will have opportunities to discuss their workunit results and explore solutions.

This questionnaire was pre-tested by some of your colleagues and many suggestions were adopted. National union representatives also participated in the questionnaire design. The questionnaire contains some sections which do not apply to all employees. For example, some sections apply to institutional and community staff, but not to headquarters staff. Instructions make it clear which sections you should complete. A separate page is provided at the end of the questionnaire where you may offer suggestions on how to correct problems or make improvements in the Service.

A number of steps have been taken to ensure that your identity is protected while participating.

- The survey is completely voluntary.
- Your name will not appear on the questionnaire.
- CSC has engaged Coopers & Lybrand Consulting to compile the data and report on the results.
- The consulting firm, Coopers & Lybrand will receive the completed questionnaires and report results in the form of summary tabulations only.
- No results will be generated for work site groups composed of fewer than 6 people.
- All results will be screened by Coopers & Lybrand to ensure that personal characteristics do not identify survey participants in any way.
- The information you provide remains confidential under provisions of the Privacy Act.

Your manager has been asked to give you the time required to complete this questionnaire during working hours. After completing the questionnaire, please seal it in the envelope provided and return it to the person at your work site who is responsible for the survey by December 6 at the latest. The sealed envelopes will be mailed directly to Coopers & Lybrand. Only Coopers & Lybrand are permitted to open your envelope.

If you have any questions or issues you would like to raise, please do not hesitate to communicate with Pierre Lacasse at Coopers & Lybrand, 1 800 440-2711 ext.441. We will be available to receive calls between 8:00 and 20:00 EST, as well as weekends. All calls received after these hours will be returned promptly the next day or at a time deemed convenient by you.

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this important survey.

MARKING INSTRUCTIONS

This questionnaire, once completed, will be read by computer. Therefore, it is important that you:

- Use the black pen provided.
- Make heavy dark marks that fill the circle completely.
- Make no stray marks on the survey.

For the majority of the questions, you will be required to fill in the numbered circle completely so that the number inside cannot be seen. It is important that you mark your answers carefully. In some cases it is a box you will need to fill in.

In a few questions we ask you to write numerical digits inside boxes. Please clearly write in your answer.

The following are examples of proper and improper ways of marking your answers.

Examples

Please shade circles like this ⇒ ●

Not like this ⇒ ✕ ○

Please print numbers in boxes and avoid contact with the edge of the box as shown in the example below:

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Please mark boxes with an 'X' like this ⇒ ☒

Not like this ⇒ ✕ □

Please circle numbers like this ⇒ 1 ② 3 4

Not like this ⇒ 1 ✕ 3 4

SECTION #1 DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS

Do Not
Use

To be completed by all CSC staff.

1. What is your gender? ☐ Male ☐ Female
2. What is your official language? ☐ English ☐ French
3. Are you (check all that apply):
☐ a member of a visible minority or ethnic group?
☐ an Aboriginal?
☐ in your own opinion, a person with a disability?

4. What is your age as of your last birthday?

Age

--	--

5. What is the highest level of education that you have achieved?

☐ Less than High School	☐ College Graduate
☐ Some High School	☐ Some University
☐ High School Graduate	☐ University Graduate
☐ Some College	☐ Post Graduate Degree

6. If you completed post-secondary training, did you specialize in corrections, criminology, criminal justice or related specialties (law and security)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

7. How long have you been working for the Correctional Service of Canada?

Years		Months

8. How long have you been working at your present work site?

Years		Months

9. Is your position at or above the AS-06 or equivalent level? (e.g. WP-05, PE-05, PS-04, EN-ENG-04, NU-HOS-06, CS-04, FI-03, PG-05 or above, all EX and higher) ☐ Yes ☐ No

10. Do you work for CORCAN? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Do Not
Use

11. Using the table below, write in the code number which corresponds to your present work site. ENTER YOUR WORKSITE CODE IN THE 3 BOXES BELOW.

ENTER CODE # IN
BOXES BELOW

Pacific	
801	RHO
802	Staff College
807	Clustered Services
820	William Head Inst.
831	Matsqui Inst.
832	RHC
833	Mountain Inst.
836	Kest Inst.
847	Elbow Lake Inst.
848	Fernside Inst.
849	Mission Inst.
881	Vancouver DPO*
882	Vancouver Island DPO*
883	Fraser Valley DPO*
884	Northern Interior DPO*
899	Other

Prairie	
301	RHO
302	Staff College
304	RFC
307	Clustered Services
308	Snowy Mountain Inst.
311	Rockwood Inst.
320	Saskatchewan Pen.
321	Riverbend Inst.
322	Special Housing Unit
323	Oblique CHCI Housing Lodge
330	Dundelfer Inst.
332	Grande Cache Institution
337	Borden Inst.
338	Education Institution for Women
339	Edmonton Inst.
340	Manitoba - NW Out. DPO
345	Saskatchewan DPO*
371	Edmonton DPO
372	Calgary DPO
399	Other

--	--	--

Quebec	
301	RHO
302	Staff College
307	Clustered Services
312	Mont. St-Fran. Inst.
320	Fed. Training Cent.
321	Donnacona Inst.
325	Jolienne Institution
330	Leclerc Inst.
341	Archambault Inst.
342	Ste-A.-des-P. Inst.
343	Reg. Recept. Cent.
345	Drummond Inst.
350	Cowansville Inst.
352	La Macaza Inst.
368	Port-Carrier Inst.
370	Montréal Metro DPO*
391	Ruraux PO (Rimouski, Chicoutimi, Rouyn-Noranda)
392	Moyens PO (Trois-Rivières, Hull, Lévesque)
393	Urbain (Laurentides, Laval, Québec, Bureau du district)
399	Other

Ontario	
401	RHO
402	Staff College
407	Clustered Services
415	Reg. Treatment Centre
416	Kitchener Pen.
421	Millhaven Inst.
423	Bath Inst.
430	Place For Women
440	Collins Bay Inst.
441	Framingham Inst.
443	Bowen Creek Inst.
450	Joyceville Inst.
451	Pitchfork Inst.
460	Warkworth Inst.
465	Grand Valley Inst. for Women
470	Eastern/Northern DPO*
475	Ontario District Parole Office
480	Central Ontario DPO*
485	Hamilton District Parole Office
490	Western DPO*
499	Other

Atlantic	
201	RHO
202	Learning Centre
207	Clustered Services
210	Springhill Inst.
220	Dorchester Inst.
221	Westmorland Inst.
231	Atlantic Inst.
250	Nova Institution for Women
281	Halifax/Dartmouth DPO*
282	Truro/Kensville/Sydney P.O.
283	NS & Labrador DPO*
284	N.-B. East / P.E.I. DPO*
285	N.B. West DPO*
299	Other

100 | NHO

*District Parole Office (including Area Offices and CCCs)

Do Not Use	
------------	--

12. Using the list of codes below, please write in the code number which corresponds most closely to the type of work which you do.

ENTER CODE # IN THE
BOXES BELOW

--	--

INSTITUTIONS (Not the CCOR)	
01	Administrative support*
02	Administrative Officer / Supervisor / Manager (Finance, Personnel, Administration, Information Technology, etc.)
03	Correctional Officer I
04	Correctional Officer II
05	Correctional Supervisor / Coordinator
06	Unit Manager
07	Case Management Officer / Coordinator
08	Correctional Programs / Chaplaincy (program delivery officers, shop supervisors, instructors, teachers, social development, recreation, etc.)
09	Technical / Institutional Services
10	Health Care / Psychology
11	Other

INSTITUTIONS (Not the CCOR)	
17	Administrative Support
18	Administrative Officer (Finance, Personnel, Planning, Accountability, Administration, Information Technology, etc.)
19	Clustered Services - Administrative Support
20	Clustered Services - Administrative Officers Supervisor / Manager (Finance, Personnel, etc.)
21	Clustered Services - Correctional Programs / Chaplaincy (program delivery officers, shop supervisors, instructors, teachers, social development, recreation, etc.)
22	Clustered Services - Technical / Institutional Services (Food Services, Stores, Works, Plant Maint., Material Mgmt., etc.)
23	Other

COMMUNITY (Including CCOR)	
12	Administrative support *
13	Administrative Officer / Supervisor / Manager (Finance, Personnel, etc.)
14	Correctional Officer II
15	Case Management Officer
16	Other

COMMUNITY (Including CCOR)	
204	Administrative Support
205	Administrative Officer (Finance, Personnel, Planning, Accountability, Administration, Information Technology, etc.)
261	Other

* Clerical, Secretarial, etc.

**Do Not
Use**

SECTION #2 UNIT MANAGEMENT.

- * *If you work in a community setting, including parole offices, district offices, or CCCs skip this section and proceed directly to Section # 3 on page 6.*
- * *If you work at regional or national headquarters, skip this section and proceed directly to Section # 4 on page 7.*
- * *If you work in an institution, please respond to all the items in this section unless instructed otherwise.*

[illegible]

*** If, as an institutional staff member, you do not belong to these groups, proceed directly to Section # 3 on page 6.**

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Undecided	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
----------------------	----------	-----------------------	-----------	--------------------	-------	-------------------

- [illegible]

Do Not Use

SECTION #4 OPINIONS ABOUT OFFENDERS

To be completed by all CSC staff.

Instructions: The following statements represent possible feelings people may have about correctional work. For each question, please darken the response circle that best reflects your feelings.

Strongly Agree Agree Somewhat Disagree Partially Agree Strongly Agree
Disagree Disagree Agree Agree Agree

- [illegible]

Do Not Use

SECTION #4 OPINIONS ABOUT OFFENDERS

To be completed by all CSC staff.

Instructions: The following statements represent possible feelings people may have about correctional work. For each question, please darken the response circle that best reflects your feelings.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Partially Disagree Partially Agree Strongly Agree

- [illegible]

Questions 1 through 2 are to be completed by all CSC staff.

1. The CSC Correctional Strategy sets the overall goal for programs as reducing criminal behaviour or recidivism. DO YOU THINK THAT THIS GOAL CAN BE ACHIEVED? (Choose one of the following responses)

- No** ☐
- Yes, but it is very hard in most cases** ☐
- Yes, but it is very hard in some cases** ☐
- Yes, it is quite possible** ☐
- No opinion** ☐

2. The table below contains a list of offender programs and a list of possible results or benefits that CSC may gain as a result of offering the programs. Mark an X in the boxes below the result(s)/benefit(s) that you think actually occur for each of the programs. Select as many of the results/benefits which you think apply for each of the programs.

[illegible]

3. The items below seek your views on a number of issues surrounding the delivery of programs to offenders. This section applies to both institutional and community programs. Remember, "programs" is used to refer to programs that have a goal of educating offenders, developing certain skills, or helping them to develop or change their behaviour. For each item, please darken the response circle that best describes your feelings.

Group	Player	Points	Rebounds	Assists	Age	Height
Group	Player	Points	Rebounds	Assists	Age	Height

- [illegible]

Do Not Use	
------------	--

4. What do you think your role should be in relation to programs that have a goal of educating offenders, developing certain skills, or helping them change their behavior?

ROLE[illegible]

To be completed by all CSC staff.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Uncertain	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
----------------------	----------	-----------------------	-----------	--------------------	-------	-------------------

- [illegible]

Do Not Use	
------------	--

17. Compared to two years ago, I now work:

- ☐ More paid (lien) overtime
☐ About the same amount of (or lien) overtime
☐ Less paid (or lien) overtime
☐ I choose to not work paid (or lien) overtime
☐ Paid (or lien) overtime is not normally a part of my job

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Undecided	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
----------------------	----------	-----------------------	-----------	--------------------	-------	-------------------

18. It is easy for me to carry out my duties and responsibilities in the official language of my choice.
19. My supervisor demonstrates sensitivity to such personal needs as shift or leave requests by fairly balancing them against operational requirements.
20. I am aware of CSC's employee recognition program (e.g. awards, certificates, long service recognition).
21. I feel that there are appropriate forms of recognition for staff.
22. I feel that my supervisor uses the available recognition program in an appropriate manner.
23. I feel that CSC provides adequate facilities to:
- a) allow me to pursue fitness/exercise activities which meet my needs.
- b) allow me to pursue other wellness/program activities that meet my needs. (e.g. smoke cessation, weight management, health education).
24. I feel that employees in CSC are treated fairly, regardless of:
- a) race
- b) national or ethnic origin
- c) gender
- d) disability
- e) language
25. I feel that CSC is committed to ensuring equal opportunities for all employees.

Do Not Use

SECTION #7 CASUAL EMPLOYMENT

To be completed by all CSC staff.

Questions in this section ask you to think about the employment of casuals within CSC. For each item, please darken the response circle that best describes your feelings.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Uncertain	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	N/A

1. **The employment of caseworkers has enhanced CSC's flexibility**

- [illegible]

- [illegible]

4. Do casual employees sometimes fill positions in your classification?

☐ Yes

☐ No ⇒ IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 7 ON NEXT PAGE

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Undecided	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree	NA
----------------------	----------	-----------------------	-----------	--------------------	-------	-------------------	----

5. Casual employees receive adequate training to perform the duties of positions in any classification
- ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

Do Not
Use**SECTION #8 POLICY, RULES AND REGULATIONS***To be completed by all CSC staff.*

In this section you are asked to rate your familiarity with policy, rules and regulations. A number of categories of policy/rules/regulations are listed (e.g., CCRA). Please base your ratings on the portions of the policies/rules/regulations which apply to you. For example, if not all parts of the CCRA apply to your job, you only need to base your ratings on the parts that do apply. If no parts of the particular category apply, circle 5 to show that it is not applicable.

1. Generally, how would you rate your *understanding* of the following policies, rules and regulations "that apply to your day to day job"?

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A Does not apply to my job
a) Corrections and Conditional Release Act and Regulations (CCRA & CCRR)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Commissioner's Directives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Regional Instructions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Standing Orders	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Post Orders	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. How would you rate your *knowledge of the specific details* of the following policies, rules and regulations that apply to your day to day job?

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A Does not apply to my job
a) CCRA & CCRR	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Commissioner's Directives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Regional Instructions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Standing Orders	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Post Orders	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent	N/A - Does not apply to my job
------	------	------	-----------	--------------------------------------

-

[illegible]

-

Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	N/A Does not apply to my job
-------	--------	-----------	-------	--------	---------------------------------

-

Do Not Use	
------------	--

Please use the rating scale below to indicate how much you agree with each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Undecided	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
6. Failure to follow policies, rules and regulations may have negative consequences for the organization.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Failure to follow policies, rules and regulations may have negative consequences for me as an employee.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. My <i>immediate</i> supervisor places importance on staff knowledge and compliance with policies, rules and regulations.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. The management at this worksite places importance on staff knowledge and compliance with policies, rules and regulations.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Senior Managers in CSC place importance on staff knowledge and compliance with policies, rules and regulations.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Employees have opportunities to influence or change policies, rules and regulations.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. I find that statements of policy, rules, regulations, are usually clear and easy to interpret.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. There are too many policies, rules and regulations within this organization.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

14. Have you used Financial Services (e.g., travel claims, advances, accounts payable) in the past year?

☐ Yes

☐ No IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 16 ON NEXT PAGE

15. How would you rate the following:

- (i) The availability of support to help you resolve any problems that you encounter in the area of *Financial Services*?
- (ii) The quality of support to help you resolve any problems that you encounter in the area of *Financial Services*.

Very Poor	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent	N/A Does not apply to my job
--------------	----------------	--------------	-----------	------------------------------------

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Do Not Use	
------------	--

16. Have you used *Financial Management Services* (e.g., cash forecasting, budget transfers, financial analysis) in the past year?

☐ Yes

☐ No IF NO, GO TO SECTION 9 ON NEXT PAGE

Very Poor	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent	N/A Does not apply to my job
-----------	----------------	--------------	-----------	---------------------------------

17. How would you rate the following:

(i) The availability of support to help you resolve any problems that you encounter in the area of *Financial Management*.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

(ii) The quality of support to help you resolve any problems that you encounter in the area of *Financial Management*.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Do Not
Use**SECTION #9 SHIFTWORK**

*To be completed by all CSC staff except those who work steady days (i.e. no shift rotation).
If you work steady days without shift rotation, proceed to Section #10, page 21.*

1. My current work schedule requires me to work:

☐ days only (no shift rotation) ⇒ **SKIP TO SECTION 10**☐ shift rotation with 3 shifts☐ shift rotation with 2 shifts, including a midnight shift☐ shift rotation with 2 shifts, without a midnight shift☐ other shift pattern

2. Approximately how long are your shifts?

☐ 8 hours☐ 10 hours☐ 12 hours3a. Including today, have you worked the same shift for the last four work days? ☐ Yes ⇒ **IF YES, GO TO QUESTION 4**☐ No3b. Why not? ☐ I had a shift change in the preceding 4 days⇒ **GO TO QUESTION 5**☐ I had day(s) off (sick leave, annual leave, etc.) in the preceding 4 days ⇒ **GO TO QUESTION 5**

4. Having answered "Yes" to question #3a, please now indicate which shift you have been working.

☐ Days (having a start time between 5:00 hrs and 10:00 hrs)☐ Evenings (having a start time between 14:00 hrs and 18:00 hrs)☐ Midnights (having a start time between 19:00 hrs and 2:00 hrs)☐ Other

5. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: "Assuming that I could work the same total number of hours per year, I would prefer longer shifts with more days away from work."

Strongly
Disagree

Disagree

Partially
Disagree

Undecided

Partially
Agree

Agree

Strongly
Agree☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

6. Assuming that I could work the same total number of hours per year, I would prefer to work shifts of:

☐ 8 hours☐ 10 hours☐ 12 hours

7. Please indicate the kind of impact your current hours of work have on the following aspects of your life outside of work:

Very Negative	Somewhat Negative	None	Positive
------------------	----------------------	------	----------

a) Relations with family

☐☐☐☐

b) Relations with friends

☐☐☐☐

c) Other non-working activities

☐☐☐☐

SECTION #10 HARASSEMENT

Do Not
Use*To be completed by all CSC staff.**Note: This section deals with harassment of staff by staff (does not include offenders).*

1. I am aware of CSC's harassment complaint process. ☐ Yes ☐ No

2. Please indicate the extent to which you feel harassment of the following types exists at your worksite.

TYPE	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Don't Know
a) Personal	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Sexual	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Abuse of Authority	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Discrimination	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement: If I observed an incident of harassment, I would agree to be a witness.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Undecided	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

4. Please indicate whether you believe you have experienced harassment in any of the following areas listed below during the last 12 months, and level of seriousness of that harassment.

TYPE	Were you harassed in this area	Somehow serious	Very seriously (would warrant disciplinary action)
a) Personal	☐ No ☐ Yes ⇒ If yes, how seriously?	☐	☐
b) Sexual	☐ No ☐ Yes ⇒ If yes, how seriously?	☐	☐
c) Abuse of Authority	☐ No ☐ Yes ⇒ If yes, how seriously?	☐	☐
d) Discrimination	☐ No ☐ Yes ⇒ If yes, how seriously?	☐	☐

- [illegible]

Do Not Use	
------------	--

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Undecided	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	--------------------	-----------	-----------------	-------	----------------

12. There is adequate information at the end of the selection process to understand how merit was determined. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
13. Self Study Modules assist in my career development. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
14. I believe that the assessment process used in the competitive process fairly determines the qualifications of candidates. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
15. The assessment tools used in the selection process for competitions appropriately assess candidates against the standards of positions. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
16. The Performance Evaluation/ Appraisal process provides me with enough feedback on my performance to manage my career. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ I have never had one
17. The standards used to evaluate my last performance appraisal have been fair and objective. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ N/A
18. My last annual performance rating presented a fair and accurate picture of my actual job performance. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ N/A
19. Are you in a Career Managed position? ☐ Yes
☐ No ⇒ IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 21

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Undecided	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
-------------------	----------	--------------------	-----------	-----------------	-------	----------------

20. I am generally satisfied with the way the Career Management Program helps me. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ N/A
21. I receive a performance appraisal at least once per year. ☐ Yes
☐ No

To be completed by all CSC staff.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Undecided	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
----------------------	----------	-----------------------	-----------	--------------------	-------	-------------------

- [illegible]

[illegible]

SECTION #13 OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH

Questions #1 through #3 are to be completed by all CSC staff.

Questions in this section ask you to think about occupational health and safety within CSC. For each item, please darken the response circle that best describes your feelings.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Partially Disagree Undecided Partially Agree Agree Strongly Agree

- [illegible]

If you work at national or regional headquarters, skip the remainder of this section and proceed directly to Section # 16 on page 31.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Undecided	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
----------------------	----------	-----------------------	-----------	--------------------	-------	-------------------

- [illegible]

Strongly Agree

-

If you work in a community setting, skip the remainder of this section and proceed directly to Section # 14 on page 29.

SECRET
APPROVED

-
- A 7x7 grid of 49 small circles, each containing a lowercase letter. The letters are arranged in a pattern that reads 'abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz' across the rows.

* This section is to be completed by all community staff (Parole Offices, District Offices, CCCs) and all institutional staff.

*** If you do not fall within these groups, proceed directly to Section # 15 on next page.**

Questions in this section ask you to think about strategies to deal with drug offenders within CSC. For each item, please darken the response circle that best describes your feelings.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Undecided	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
----------------------	----------	-----------------------	-----------	--------------------	-------	-------------------

- [illegible]

To be completed by Institutional and Community staff. If you work at National or Regional Headquarters, proceed to Section #16 on next page.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Indifferent	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
----------------------	----------	-----------------------	-------------	--------------------	-------	-------------------

- [illegible]

To be completed by all CSC staff.

Strongly
Disagree

Disagree

Partially
Disagree

Undecided

Partially
Agree

Agree

Strongly
Agree

- [illegible]

Do Not
Use**SECTION #17 HEALTH AND LIFESTYLE***To be completed by all CSC staff.*

The following section concerns your health and lifestyle patterns. The questions have been used in other surveys of Government of Canada employees. The information will help CSC plan health programming for staff if required. The questions will also provide Health Canada with important information for assessing the overall health and lifestyle patterns of working Canadians.

1. How often do you eat breakfast? ☐ Every day
☐ Sometimes
☐ On weekends only
☐ Rarely or never ⇒ IF RARELY OR NEVER GO TO QUESTION 3

2. In the last seven (7) days, on how many days did your breakfast include... (darken only one circle per line)

NUMBER OF DAYS

a) Eggs, bacon, ham or other meat, cheese or whole milk	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Bread, toast, pastries, pancakes or cereals	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Fruit juice or fresh fruit	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Just coffee or tea	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. In the past four months, how often did you work out or participate in sports, to the point of **SWEATING**?

- ☐ Not at all ⇒ IF NOT AT ALL, GO TO QUESTION 5
☐ Once a month or less
☐ Two or three times a month
☐ Once or twice a week
☐ Three or more times a week

4. When do you usually work out? ☐ On my own free time
☐ During the working day
☐ A combination of both

5. In general, what do you consider to be the most important barrier to your own physical activity?

- ☐ No real barriers ☐ Lack of facilities, including showers
☐ Lack of motivation ☐ Medical condition
☐ Lack of time

Do Not Use	
------------	--

6. Do you use tobacco products? ☐ Yes

☐ No, I quit ⇒ GO TO QUESTION 10

☐ Never ⇒ GO TO QUESTION 11

7. Please indicate which tobacco products you use (check all applicable items).

☐ Smokeless products (such as chewing tobacco or snuff)

☐ Cigarettes

☐ Pipe and/or cigars

8. If you smoke, on average how many cigarettes a day do you smoke?

☐ 1-4

☐ 20-29

☐ 5-9

☐ 30 or more

☐ 10-19

9. Do you want to stop using tobacco products?

☐ Yes ⇒ GO TO QUESTION 11

☐ No ⇒ GO TO QUESTION 11

10. How long ago did you stop using tobacco products?

☐ Less than 1 month ago

☐ 1 to 2 years ago

☐ 1 month to 1 year ago

☐ More than 2 years ago

11. Do you drink alcohol (beer, wine, cooler, or hard liquor)?

☐ Yes

⇒ GO TO QUESTION 13

☐ No, but I used to drink alcohol

☐ No, I've never used alcohol

⇒ GO TO QUESTION 16
ON NEXT PAGE

12. How long ago did you quit drinking?

☐ Less than 1 year ago

⇒ GO TO QUESTION 16 ON NEXT PAGE

☐ 1-3 years ago

⇒ GO TO QUESTION 16 ON NEXT PAGE

☐ More than 3 years ago

⇒ GO TO QUESTION 16 ON NEXT PAGE

13. In the *LAST 3 MONTHS*, how many times did you have five or more drinks *ON ONE OCCASION*?

☐ Never

☐ 4-6 times

☐ Once

☐ 7-9 times

☐ 2-3 times

☐ 10 or more times

14. During an average week, on how many days do you have *AT LEAST ONE* drink of alcohol?

☐ Less than once a week

☐ 4 to 6 days a week

☐ Once a week

☐ Every day

☐ 2 to 3 days a week

15. Starting with yesterday, how many drinks of alcoholic beverages have you taken in the **PAST SEVEN DAYS**? Please circle the number that corresponds to your answer. Please note that 14 refers to 14 or more drinks per day. (Note: If you did not drink on a given day, please circle the "0" for that day).

NUMBER OF DRINKS

a) Yesterday	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14+
b) 2 days ago	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14+
c) 3 days ago	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14+
d) 4 days ago	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14+
e) 5 days ago	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14+
f) 6 days ago	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14+
g) 7 days ago	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14+

16. How often do you use the following over-the-counter drugs or medication?

	About every day	About once a week	About once a month	Rarely or Never
a) Painkillers (e.g., Tylenol, Aspirin)	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Antacids (e.g., Tums, Rolaids, Maalox)	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Antihistamines (e.g., Seldane, Histamin)	☐	☐	☐	☐

17. Height. Please record your height in centimeters (cm). Refer to conversion chart below.

Height in cm

--	--	--

18. Weight. Please record your weight in kilograms (kg). Refer to conversion chart below.

Weight in kg

--	--	--

CONVERSION CHART

Height Chart

4'10"	148cm	5'8"	173cm
4'11"	150cm	5'9"	175cm
5'	153cm	5'10"	178cm
5'1"	155cm	5'11"	180cm
5'2"	158cm	6'	183cm
5'3"	160cm	6'1"	185cm
5'4"	163cm	6'2"	188cm
5'5"	165cm	6'3"	191cm
5'6"	168cm	6'4"	193cm
5'7"	170cm	6'5"	196cm

Weight Chart

100lbs	45kg	165lbs	75kg
105lbs	48kg	170lbs	77kg
110lbs	50kg	175lbs	80kg
115lbs	52kg	180lbs	82kg
120lbs	54kg	185lbs	84kg
125lbs	57kg	190lbs	86kg
130lbs	59kg	195lbs	87kg
135lbs	61kg	200lbs	91kg
140lbs	64kg	205lbs	93kg
145lbs	66kg	210lbs	96kg
150lbs	68kg	215lbs	98kg
155lbs	70kg	220lbs	100kg
160lbs	73kg	225lbs	102kg

Do Not Use	
------------	--

SECTION #18 INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

To be completed by all CSC staff.

This section of the questionnaire pertains to information technology and the CSC computing environment as it relates to personal computers, office automation software (Microsoft WORD, EXCEL, Powerpoint, OnTime, electronic mail, etc.), CSC computer applications (OMS, CAMS, SIMS, EIS, Fincon, etc.) and any of the other applications used within CSC.

1. My job performance has improved as a direct result of the introduction of computer technology into the workplace.

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Undecided	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. At what rate is computer technology (e.g. hardware and applications) being introduced into your area?

Much Too Fast	Too Fast	About Right	Too Slow	Much Too Slow
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. Do you have a need for remote access to the network (e.g. ~~ORDER~~ to work from home, while on travel) ☐ Yes ☐ No

4. How often do you have a requirement to access a personal computer or a computer terminal as a function of your job?

Every Day	At Least Once A Week	Less Than Once A Week	Never
☐	☐	☐	☐

* The remainder of the questions in this section are based on your personal use and exposure to personal computers, office automation software and CSC computer based applications.

* If you answered "NEVER" to question #4 above, please skip the remainder of this section and proceed directly to the COMMENTS section on page 42.

5. How would you rate the quality of the following office automation software that you use?

	Very Poor	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent	Do Not Use
a. WORD for word processing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b. EXCEL for spreadsheets	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c. Powerpoint for presentations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d. Teamlinks/AI Mail for electronic mail	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e. OnTime for scheduling	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f. Overall rating of office automation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g. Other (specify) _____	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Do Not
Use

6. How would you rate the following:

a) the availability of support to help you resolve any problems that you encounter with the personal computerb) the quality of support to help you resolve any problems that you encounter with the personal computer.

Very Poor	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent	Not Applicable
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

7. How would you rate the following:

a) the availability of training for the personal computer.b) the quality of training for the personal computer

8. How do you rate the quality of information you receive prior to system upgrades?

For questions # 9 to # 18, rate only the information management systems which you use.

9. Do you use Automated Records Management System (ARMS)?

☐ Yes☐ No ⇒ IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 18a. Please rate the overall quality of ARMS.b. How would you rate the availability of support to help you resolve problems that you encounter with ARMS?c. How would you rate the quality of support to help you resolve problems that you encounter with ARMS?d. How would you rate the availability of training in ARMS?e. How would you rate the quality of training in ARMS?f. How would you rate the quality (accuracy up-to-date) of the information in ARMS?

Very Poor	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐

g. Do you think the quality of ARMS has improved over the last two years?

Disagree	Agree	The Same	No opinion
☐	☐	☐	☐

h. Do you know whom to approach if you have a problem with ARMS?

☐ Yes☐ No

Do Not
Use

10. Do you use Corporate Acquisition Management System (CAMS)?

☐ Yes☐ No ⇒ IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 11

Very Poor Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Excellent

a. Please rate the overall quality of CAMS.☐ ☐ ☐ ☐b. How would you rate the availability of support to help you resolve problems that you encounter with CAMS?☐ ☐ ☐ ☐c. How would you rate the quality of support to help you resolve problems that you encounter with CAMS?☐ ☐ ☐ ☐d. How would you rate the availability of training in CAMS?☐ ☐ ☐ ☐e. How would you rate the quality of training in CAMS?☐ ☐ ☐ ☐f. How would you rate the quality (accuracy/up-to-date) of the information in CAMS?☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Disagree Agree The Same No Opinion

g. Do you think the quality of CAMS has improved over the last two years?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐h. Do you know whom to approach if you have a problem with CAMS? ☐ Yes☐ No

11. Do you use Executive Information System (EIS)?

☐ Yes☐ No ⇒ IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 12

Very Poor Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Excellent

a. Please rate the overall quality of EIS.☐ ☐ ☐ ☐b. How would you rate the availability of support to help you resolve problems that you encounter with EIS?☐ ☐ ☐ ☐c. How would you rate the quality of support to help you resolve problems that you encounter with EIS?☐ ☐ ☐ ☐d. How would you rate the availability of training in EIS?☐ ☐ ☐ ☐e. How would you rate the quality of training in EIS?☐ ☐ ☐ ☐f. How would you rate the quality (accuracy/up-to-date) of the information in EIS?☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Disagree Agree The Same No Opinion

g. Do you think the quality of EIS has improved over the last two years?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

h. Do you know whom to approach if you have a problem with EIS?

☐ Yes☐ No

15241

12. Do you use *Management Information Component (MIC)*?

☐ Yes

☐ No ⇒ IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 13

a. Please rate the overall quality of MIC.

b. How would you rate the availability of support to help you resolve problems that you encounter with MIC?

c. How would you rate the quality of support to help you resolve problems that you encounter with MIC?

d. How would you rate the availability of training in MIC?

e. How would you rate the quality of training in MIC?

f. How would you rate the quality (accurate/up-to-date) of the information in MIC?

g. Do you think the quality of MIC has improved over the last two years?

h. Do you know whom to approach if you have a problem with MIC?

☐ Yes

☐ No

13. Do you use *Claims Settlement Management System (CSMS)*?

☐ Yes

☐ No ⇒ IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 14

a. Please rate the overall quality of CSMS.

b. How would you rate the availability of support to help you resolve problems that you encounter with CSMS?

c. How would you rate the quality of support to help you resolve problems that you encounter with CSMS?

d. How would you rate the availability of training in CSMS?

e. How would you rate the quality of training in CSMS?

f. How would you rate the quality (accurate/up-to-date) of the information in CSMS?

g. Do you think the quality of CSMS has improved over the last two years?

h. Do you know whom to approach if you have a problem with CSMS?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Do Not
Use

Very Poor Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Excellent

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Disagree Agree The Same No Opinion

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Very Poor Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Excellent

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Disagree Agree The Same No Opinion

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

14. Do you use Financial Control System (FINCON)?

☐ Yes

☐ No => IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 15

- a. Please rate the overall quality of FINCON?
- b. How would you rate the availability of support to help you resolve problems that you encounter with FINCON?
- c. How would you rate the quality of support to help you resolve problems that you encounter with FINCON?
- d. How would you rate the availability of training in FINCON?
- e. How would you rate the quality of training in FINCON?
- f. How would you rate the quality (accurate/up-to-date) of the information in FINCON?

Very Poor	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
-----------	----------------	--------------	-----------

☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐

Disagree	Agree	The Same	No Opinion
----------	-------	----------	------------

☐	☐	☐	☐
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

g. Do you think the quality of FINCON has improved over the last two years?

h. Do you know whom to approach if you have a problem with FINCON? ☐ Yes

☐ No

15. Do you use Budget Module System (BMS)?

☐ Yes

☐ No => IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 16

- a. Please rate the overall quality of BMS.
- b. How would you rate the availability of support to help you resolve problems that you encounter with BMS?
- c. How would you rate the quality of support to help you resolve problems that you encounter with BMS?
- d. How would you rate the availability of training in BMS?
- e. How would you rate the quality of training in BMS?
- f. How would you rate the quality (accurate/up-to-date) of the information in BMS?

Very Poor	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
-----------	----------------	--------------	-----------

☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐

Disagree	Agree	The Same	No Opinion
----------	-------	----------	------------

☐	☐	☐	☐
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

g. Do you think the quality of BMS has improved over the last two years?

h. Do you know whom to approach if you have a problem with BMS?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Do Not Use	
------------	--

18. Do you use Office Automation Tools and Applications (Word, Excel, Powerpoint, OutTime, Government and CSC Phonebook, CD Finder, Host Directory, Teamlink/AlMail System, Project Initiatives System) (OA)?

☐ Yes

☐ No ⇒ IF NO, GO TO NEXT PAGE

- a. Please rate the overall quality of OA.
- b. How would you rate the availability of support to help you resolve problems that you encounter with OA?
- c. How would you rate the quality of support to help you resolve problems that you encounter with OA?
- d. How would you rate the availability of training in OA?
- e. How would you rate the quality of training in OA?
- f. How would you rate the quality (accuracy-up-to-date) of the information in OA?
- g. Do you think the quality of OA has improved over the last two years?
- h. Do you know whom to approach if you have a problem with OA?

Very Poor	Dissatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
-----------	-----------------	--------------	-----------

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Disagree	Agree	The Same	No Opinion
----------	-------	----------	------------

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ Yes

☐ No

Do Not
Use**COMMENTS**

If you wish to do so, feel free to provide us with your suggestions on how to correct any problem regarding issues addressed in this survey. Comments should not be offered which you would not wish to have shared with your colleagues.

Your comments will be transcribed by Coopers & Lybrand and an electronic version will be provided to CSC. Your transcribed comments will then be returned to the attention of your worksite manager.

For coding
purposes
Please do
Not Use

--	--

--	--

--	--

--	--

--	--

--	--

--	--

THANK YOU

Please put the completed questionnaire in the envelope and return to the worksite survey coordinator by December 6

Appendix B

Modifications to correctional attitude subscales

Social Distance

Four of the five items from the Social Distance subscale were retained for this study (items 1, 2, 3, and 5). Modifications to specific items are presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Modifications to the Social Distance subscale.

Klofas & Toch (1982)	1996 All Staff Survey
An officer should work hard to earn trust from inmates.	1. Staff should work hard to earn trust from offenders.
It's important for an officer to have compassion.	2. It's important for staff to have compassion for offenders.
The way to get respect from inmates is to take an interest in them.	3. No change.
You get to like the inmates you work with.	4. Omit.
Sometimes an officer should be an advocate for an inmate.	5. Sometimes staff should advocate for an offender.

Counseling Roles

Klofas and Toch's (1982) Counseling Roles subscale was omitted entirely from this study. Instead, a more comprehensive assessment of an individual's desire to engage in the process of offender rehabilitation was designed (Table 5).

Table 2. Counseling Roles subscale versus the 1996 All Staff Survey Desire to Participate in Treatment subscale.

Klofas & Toch (1982)	1996 All Staff Survey
Rehabilitation should be left to mental health professionals. Counseling is a job for counselors, not officers. If an officer wants to do counseling, he should change jobs.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I should deliver some of these correctional programs myself. 2. I should refer offenders to programs. 3. I should monitor/observe the progress of the offenders I work with. 4. I should support or reinforce the progress offenders make in programs. 5. I should stay informed about programs being offered.

Punitive Orientation

The Punitive Orientation subscale of Klofas and Toch's (1982) instrument was kept in its entirety with a small modification to item 2 (Table 6).

Table 3. Modifications to the Punitive Orientation subscale.

Klofas & Toch (1982)	1996 All Staff Survey
There would be much less crime if prisons were more uncomfortable. Improving prisons for inmates makes them worse for officers. A military regime is the best way of running a prison. Rehabilitation programs are a waste of time and money.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No change. 2. Improving prisons for inmates makes things worse for staff. 3. No change. 4. No change.

Concern with Corruption of Authority

Three of Klofas and Toch's (1982) five items were retained in this subscale. Item selection and modifications are shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Modifications to the Concern with Corruption of Authority subscale.

Klofas & Toch (1982)	1996 All Staff Survey
. You can't ever completely trust an inmate.	1. No Change
. A good principle is not to get "close" to inmates.	2. A good principle is not to get "close" to offenders.
. A personal relationship with an inmate invites corruption.	3. Omit.
. You must keep conversations with inmates short and businesslike.	4. Omit
. If an officer is lenient with inmates, they will take advantage of him.	5. If staff are lenient, offenders will take advantage of them.

Global support for rehabilitation

In addition to measuring Correctional Officers' willingness to participate in offender treatment, the current study also assessed their global support for rehabilitation. The following three items are drawn directly from Cullen et al.'s (1989) Rehabilitation Scale. Again, each item scored on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Table 5. Support for Rehabilitation subscale.

Cullen, Lutze, Link, & Wolfe (1989)	1996 All Staff Survey
<p>Rehabilitating a criminal is just as important as making a criminal pay for his or her crime.</p> <p>We should stop viewing criminals as victims of society who deserve to be rehabilitated and start paying more attention to the victims of these criminals.</p> <p>I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs with criminals that are now being undertaken in our prisons.</p>	<p>1. Rehabilitating an offender is just as important as making an offender pay for his or her crime.</p> <p>2. We should stop viewing offenders as victims of society.</p> <p>3. I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs, which are presently being offered in our institutions.</p>

Appendix C

Correlation matrices for correctional attitude and work adjustment scales

.

Table 1. Factor analysis correlation matrix- correctional attitudes (full sample).

Correlation	S4Q1	S4Q2	S4Q3	S4Q4	S4Q9	S4Q10	S4Q11	S4Q5	S4Q6	S4Q7	S4Q13	S4Q8	S4Q12	S4Q14
S4Q1	1.000													
S4Q2	.456	1.000												
S4Q3	.536	.485	1.000											
S4Q4	.412	.414	.469	1.000										
S4Q9	-.207	-.247	-.240	.207	1.000									
S4Q10	-.238	-.249	-.261	-.253	.429	1.000								
S4Q11	-.260	-.240	-.271	-.233	.411	.447	1.000							
S4Q5	-.197	-.280	-.192	-.204	.301	.257	.301	1.000						
S4Q6	-.221	-.301	-.232	-.205	.385	.238	.266	.536	1.000					
S4Q7	-.270	-.290	-.271	-.257	.290	.274	.388	.506	.452	1.000				
S4Q13	-.096	-.180	-.138	-.119	.210	.202	.157	.254	.233	.196	1.000			
S4Q8	-.297	-.358	-.296	-.267	.331	.259	.316	.469	.446	.521	.227	1.00		
S4Q12	.262	.218	.233	.224	-.071	-.084	-.101	-.175	-.419	-.205	-.031	-.334	1.000	
S4Q14	.292	.363	.315	.270	-.281	-.209	-.232	-.338	-.381	-.360	-.168	-.568	.333	1.000
Sig(1-tailed)	S4Q1	S4Q2	S4Q3	S4Q4	S4Q9	S4Q10	S4Q11	S4Q5	S4Q6	S4Q7	S4Q13	S4Q8	S4Q12	S4Q14
S4Q1	.000													
S4Q2	.000	.000												
S4Q3	.000	.000	.000											
S4Q4	.000	.000	.000	.000										
S4Q9	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000									
S4Q10	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000								
S4Q11	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000							
S4Q5	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000						
S4Q6	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000					
S4Q7	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000				
S4Q13	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000			
S4Q8	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		
S4Q12	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.029	.000	.000	
S4Q14	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

N = 3,648

Table 2. Factor analysis correlation matrix- correctional attitudes (Correctional Officers).

Correlation	S4Q1	S4Q2	S4Q3	S4Q4	S4Q9	S4Q10	S4Q11	S4Q5	S4Q6	S4Q7	S4Q13	S4Q8	S4Q12	S4Q14
S4Q1	1.000													
S4Q2	.430	1.000												
S4Q3	.541	.500	1.000											
S4Q4	.414	.428	.474	1.000										
S4Q9	-.173	-.234	-.226	-.228	1.000									
S4Q10	-.245	-.260	-.276	-.277	.418	1.000								
S4Q11	-.220	-.248	-.251	-.242	.396	.470	1.000							
S4Q5	-.163	-.236	-.221	-.216	.306	.287	.328	1.000						
S4Q6	-.212	-.246	-.261	-.234	.344	.264	.248	.502	1.000					
S4Q7	-.272	-.255	-.297	-.286	.301	.309	.377	.448	.421	1.000				
S4Q13	-.119	-.178	-.185	-.150	.203	.189	.142	.292	.219	.197	1.000			
S4Q8	-.306	-.334	-.326	-.301	.369	.296	.344	.417	.428	.495	.204	1.000		
S4Q12	.261	.167	.244	.236	-.073	.076	-.092	-.114	-.113	-.165	-.056	-.274	1.000	
S4Q14	.293	.371	.339	.320	-.303	-.249	-.261	-.306	-.339	-.347	-.200	-.588	.314	1.000
Sig(1-tailed)	S4Q1	S4Q2	S4Q3	S4Q4	S4Q9	S4Q10	S4Q11	S4Q5	S4Q6	S4Q7	S4Q13	S4Q8	S4Q12	S4Q14
S4Q1	.000													
S4Q2	.000	.000												
S4Q3	.000	.000	.000											
S4Q4	.000	.000	.000	.000										
S4Q9	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000									
S4Q10	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000								
S4Q11	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000							
S4Q5	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000						
S4Q6	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000					
S4Q7	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000				
S4Q13	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000			
S4Q8	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		
S4Q12	.000	.000	.000	.000	.004	.003	.000	.000	.000	.000	.021	.000	.000	
S4Q14	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000

N = 1,315

Table 3. Factor analysis correlation matrix- work adjustment (full sample).

Correlation	S6Q30	S6Q31	S6Q32	S6Q33	S6Q34	S6Q35	S6Q36	S6Q15	S6Q28	S12Q1	S12Q2	S12Q3	S12Q4	S6Q5
S6Q30	1.000													
S6Q31	.612	1.000												
S6Q32	-.447	-.385	1.000											
S6Q33	-.563	-.491	.501	1.000										
S6Q34	.595	.501	-.434	-.505	1.000									
S6Q35	.523	.644	-.375	-.432	.510	1.000								
S6Q36	.487	.397	-.340	-.412	.511	.406	1.000							
S6Q15	-.286	-.372	.263	.343	-.223	-.323	-.144	1.000						
S6Q28	-.378	-.478	.340	.420	-.296	-.420	-.185	.632	1.000					
S12Q1	.003	-.007	.016	-.012	-.005	-.009	-.002	.018	.009	1.000				
S12Q2	-.003	-.013	-.035	-.009	-.019	-.038	.004	.018	-.008	.326	1.000			
S12Q3	-.024	-.041	.024	.019	-.042	-.053	-.033	.054	.039	.395	.395	1.000		
S12Q4	-.036	-.040	.024	.015	-.038	-.052	-.038	.035	.033	.417	.467	.590	1.000	
S12Q5	-.019	-.014	.009	.008	-.021	-.045	-.023	.017	-.015	.057	.176	.126	.163	1.000
Sig(1-tailed)	S6Q30	S6Q31	S6Q32	S6Q33	S6Q34	S6Q35	S6Q36	S6Q15	S6Q28	S12Q1	S12Q2	S12Q3	S12Q4	S6Q5
S6Q31	.000													
S6Q32	.000	.000												
S6Q33	.000	.000	.000											
S6Q34	.000	.000	.000	.000										
S6Q35	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000									
S6Q36	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000								
S6Q15	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000							
S6Q28	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000						
S12Q1	.418	.334	.176	.227	.379	.303	.441	.143	.285	.000				
S12Q2	.421	.210	.018	.297	.123	.011	.400	.140	.318	.000	.000			
S12Q3	.076	.006	.074	.127	.006	.001	.023	.001	.010	.000	.000	.000		
S12Q4	.015	.008	.071	.179	.012	.001	.012	.018	.025	.000	.000	.000	.000	
S12Q5	.132	.203	.290	.305	.099	.003	.087	.157	.187	.000	.000	.000	.000	

N = 3,604

Table 4. Factor analysis correlation matrix- work adjustment (Correctional Officers).

Correlation	S6Q30	S6Q31	S6Q32	S6Q33	S6Q34	S6Q35	S6Q36	S6Q15	S6Q28	S12Q1	S12Q2	S12Q3	S12Q4	S6Q5
S6Q30	1.000													
S6Q31	.610	1.000												
S6Q32	-.440	-.396	1.000											
S6Q33	-.564	-.464	.528	1.000										
S6Q34	.598	.503	-.432	-.528	1.000									
S6Q35	.520	.624	-.361	-.397	.502	1.000								
S6Q36	.490	.410	-.327	-.431	.484	.399	1.000							
S6Q15	-.260	-.318	.242	.289	-.269	-.267	-.201	1.000						
S6Q28	-.343	-.453	.335	.365	-.319	-.380	-.237	.591	1.000					
S12Q1	-.019	-.025	-.012	-.012	.003	-.034	.004	.043	.015	1.000				
S12Q2	-.012	-.039	-.019	-.004	-.039	-.037	-.008	.037	-.008	.340	1.000			
S12Q3	-.004	-.023	.006	.010	-.029	-.050	-.016	.088	.043	.392	.402	1.000		
S12Q4	-.019	-.045	-.006	-.011	-.015	-.035	-.030	.058	.023	.412	.476	.605	1.000	
S12Q5	.003	-.005	.032	.039	-.025	-.048	-.012	.012	-.043	.071	.177	.180	.205	1.000
Sig(1-tailed)	S6Q30	S6Q31	S6Q32	S6Q33	S6Q34	S6Q35	S6Q36	S6Q15	S6Q28	S12Q1	S12Q2	S12Q3	S12Q4	S6Q5
S6Q31	.000													
S6Q32	.000	.000												
S6Q33	.000	.000	.000											
S6Q34	.000	.000	.000	.000										
S6Q35	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000									
S6Q36	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000								
S6Q15	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000							
S6Q28	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000						
S12Q1	.245	.185	.339	.337	.463	.111	.440	.061	.298					
S12Q2	.331	.080	.250	.440	.080	.094	.389	.091	.385	.000				
S12Q3	.446	.204	.421	.366	.147	.038	.289	.001	.063	.000	.000			
S12Q4	.249	.052	.420	.350	.301	.106	.139	.019	.207	.000	.000	.000		
S12Q5	.458	.424	.128	.084	.185	.042	.331	.330	.063	.005	.000	.000	.000	
N = 1,286														

Appendix D

SPSS data output for multiple stepwise regression analyses

List of variables

Variable

Empathy
Punitiveness
Support for rehabilitation
Job stress
Job satisfaction
Organizational commitment
Age
Experience
Gender
Race
Education
Prison size
Region
Official language
Security Level
Type of shift
Most recent shift
Rank
Institutional empathy
Institutional punitiveness
Institutional support for rehabilitation

Regression

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Empathy Toward Offenders	4.00	.97	1939
Age	43.65	8.31	1939
Experience	13.07	7.36	1939
Gender	1.41	.49	1939
Minority Status	7.37E-02	.26	1939
Education	4.90	1.85	1939
Prison Size	236.26	79.75	1939
Region	4.19	1.78	1939
Official Language	1.39	.49	1939
Security level	2.03	.64	1939

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Education		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	Age		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	Region		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
4	Prison Size		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
5	Experience		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a. Dependent Variable: Empathy Toward Offenders

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.181 ^a	.033	.032	.95	.033	65.325	1 1937 .000
2	.254 ^b	.085	.064	.94	.032	66.006	1 1936 .000
3	.282 ^c	.080	.078	.93	.015	31.732	1 1935 .000
4	.293 ^d	.086	.084	.93	.007	13.786	1 1934 .000
5	.299 ^e	.089	.087	.93	.003	6.511	1 1933 .011

a. Predictors: (Constant), Education

b. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age

c. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age, Region

d. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age, Region, Prison Size

e. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age, Region, Prison Size, Experience

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	59.395	1	59.395	65.325	.000 ^a
	Residual	1761.169	1937	.909		
	Total	1820.564	1938			
2	Regression	117.460	2	58.730	66.761	.000 ^b
	Residual	1703.104	1936	.880		
	Total	1820.564	1938			
3	Regression	144.939	3	48.313	55.792	.000 ^c
	Residual	1675.625	1935	.866		
	Total	1820.564	1938			
4	Regression	156.799	4	39.200	45.567	.000 ^d
	Residual	1663.765	1934	.860		
	Total	1820.564	1938			
5	Regression	162.384	5	32.477	37.859	.000 ^e
	Residual	1658.180	1933	.858		
	Total	1820.564	1938			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Education

b. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age

c. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age, Region

d. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age, Region, Prison Size

e. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Age, Region, Prison Size, Experience

f. Dependent Variable: Empathy Toward Offenders

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients				Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta						Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	3.535	.061				57.663	.000					
	Education	9.468E-02	.012	.181			8.082	.000	.181	.181	.181	1.000	1.000
2	(Constant)	2.544	.136				18.704	.000					
	Education	.109	.012	.208			9.353	.000	.181	.208	.206	.977	1.023
	Age	2.108E-02	.003	.181			8.124	.000	.149	.182	.179	.977	1.023
3	(Constant)	2.747	.140				19.667	.000					
	Education	.109	.012	.208			9.423	.000	.181	.209	.206	.977	1.023
	Age	2.291E-02	.003	.186			8.830	.000	.149	.197	.193	.982	1.040
	Region	-6.742E-02	.012	-.124			-5.633	.000	-.103	-.127	-.123	.984	1.018
4	(Constant)	3.000	.155				19.353	.000					
	Education	.109	.012	.208			8.454	.000	.181	.210	.206	.977	1.023
	Age	2.285E-02	.003	.186			8.835	.000	.149	.197	.192	.982	1.040
	Region	-7.162E-02	.012	-.132			-5.977	.000	-.103	-.135	-.130	.975	1.025
	Prison Size	-8.855E-04	.000	-.081			-3.713	.000	-.072	-.084	-.081	.981	1.009
5	(Constant)	3.003	.155				19.400	.000					
	Education	.111	.012	.211			9.608	.000	.181	.214	.209	.973	1.028
	Age	1.970E-02	.003	.189			6.885	.000	.149	.155	.149	.783	1.277
	Region	-6.859E-02	.012	-.126			-5.704	.000	-.103	-.129	-.124	.988	1.036
	Prison Size	-9.600E-04	.000	-.079			-3.820	.000	-.072	-.082	-.079	.989	1.011
	Experience	8.158E-03	.003	.082			2.552	.011	.116	.058	.055	.800	1.249

^a Dependent Variable: Empathy Toward Offenders

Excluded Variables^f

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics			
					Partial Correlation	Tolerance	VIF	Minimum Tolerance
1	Age	.181 ^a	8.124	.000	.182	.977	1.023	.977
	Experience	.140 ^a	6.275	.000	.141	.985	1.015	.985
	Gender	-.075 ^a	-3.344	.001	-.076	1.000	1.000	1.000
	Minority Status	.008 ^a	.370	.711	.008	.998	1.002	.998
	Prison Size	-.072 ^a	-3.232	.001	-.073	1.000	1.000	1.000
	Region	-.100 ^a	-4.474	.000	-.101	1.000	1.000	1.000
	Official Language	.056 ^a	2.488	.013	.056	1.000	1.000	1.000
	Security level	-.025 ^a	-1.137	.268	-.028	1.000	1.000	1.000
2	Experience	.078 ^b	3.186	.001	.072	.809	1.236	.802
	Gender	-.041 ^b	-1.819	.069	-.041	.960	1.041	.939
	Minority Status	-.001 ^b	-.044	.965	-.001	.995	1.005	.974
	Prison Size	-.069 ^b	-3.135	.002	-.071	1.000	1.000	.977
	Region	-.124 ^b	-5.633	.000	-.127	.984	1.016	.962
	Official Language	.062 ^b	2.804	.005	.064	.999	1.001	.976
	Security level	-.024 ^b	-1.087	.277	-.025	1.000	1.000	.977
3	Experience	.065 ^c	2.681	.007	.051	.802	1.248	.783
	Gender	-.034 ^c	-1.505	.132	-.034	.957	1.045	.922
	Minority Status	.006 ^c	.282	.778	.006	.992	1.008	.960
	Prison Size	-.081 ^c	-3.713	.000	-.084	.991	1.009	.962
	Official Language	-.003 ^c	-.112	.911	-.003	.731	1.368	.720
	Security level	-.021 ^c	-.858	.338	-.022	.999	1.001	.962
4	Experience	.062 ^d	2.552	.011	.058	.800	1.249	.783
	Gender	-.037 ^d	-1.645	.100	-.037	.956	1.046	.922
	Minority Status	.010 ^d	.448	.654	.010	.990	1.010	.980
	Official Language	-.018 ^d	-.708	.479	-.016	.713	1.403	.701
	Security level	.038 ^d	1.440	.160	.033	.668	1.498	.662
5	Gender	-.026 ^e	-1.147	.251	-.026	.915	1.092	.767
	Minority Status	.013 ^e	.601	.548	.014	.986	1.014	.780
	Official Language	-.025 ^e	-.985	.325	-.022	.705	1.419	.700
	Security level	.042 ^e	1.594	.111	.036	.665	1.503	.662

a. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Education

b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Education, Age

c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Education, Age, Region

d. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Education, Age, Region, Prison Size

e. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Education, Age, Region, Prison Size, Experience

f. Dependent Variable: Empathy Toward Offenders

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions					
				(Constant)	Education	Age	Region	Prison Size	Experience
1	1	1.936	1.000	.03	.03				
	2	6.448E-02	5.479	.97	.97				
2	1	2.885	1.000	.00	.01	.00			
	2	.100	5.362	.02	.79	.09			
	3	1.471E-02	14.003	.98	.19	.90			
3	1	3.761	1.000	.00	.01	.00	.01		
	2	.142	5.138	.00	.40	.00	.56		
	3	8.223E-02	6.763	.03	.40	.15	.42		
	4	1.452E-02	16.093	.96	.19	.84	.02		
4	1	4.659	1.000	.00	.01	.00	.01	.00	
	2	.150	5.565	.00	.14	.00	.67	.10	
	3	.116	6.328	.00	.61	.01	.01	.33	
	4	6.112E-02	8.731	.03	.07	.26	.28	.48	
	5	1.300E-02	18.930	.97	.18	.72	.03	.13	
5	1	5.446	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.01
	2	.233	4.835	.00	.07	.00	.05	.01	.62
	3	.150	6.017	.00	.14	.00	.67	.09	.00
	4	.112	6.971	.00	.51	.00	.00	.45	.04
	5	4.615E-02	10.863	.07	.12	.28	.26	.33	.30
	6	1.264E-02	20.757	.93	.16	.71	.02	.11	.03
a. Dependent Variable: Empathy Toward Offenders									

a. Dependent Variable: Empathy Toward Offenders

Regression

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Punitiveness	4.35	1.33	1990
Age	43.69	8.30	1990
Experience	13.04	7.33	1990
Gender	1.41	.49	1990
Minority Status	7.49E-02	.26	1990
Education	4.87	1.85	1990
Prison Size	235.62	80.17	1990
Region	4.22	1.79	1990
Official Language	1.39	.49	1990
Security level	2.02	.64	1000

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Education		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	Official Language		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	Age		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
4	Prison Size		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
5	Experience		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
6	Gender		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
7	Region		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
8	Security level		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a. Dependent Variable: Puniliveness

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics			
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2
1	.303 ^a	.092	.092	1.27	.092	201.540	1	1988
2	.345 ^b	.119	.118	1.25	.027	60.750	1	1987
3	.363 ^c	.132	.130	1.24	.013	29.302	1	1986
4	.371 ^d	.138	.136	1.24	.006	14.227	1	1985
5	.378 ^e	.143	.140	1.23	.005	10.687	1	1984
6	.383 ^f	.147	.144	1.23	.004	10.263	1	1983
7	.386 ^g	.149	.146	1.23	.002	4.900	1	1982
8	.389 ^h	.151	.148	1.23	.002	4.869	1	1981

a. Predictors: (Constant), Education

b. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language

c. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age

d. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age, Prison Size

e. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age, Prison Size, Experience

f. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age, Prison Size, Experience, Gender

g. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age, Prison Size, Experience, Gender, Region

h. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age, Prison Size, Experience, Gender, Region, Security level

ANOVA¹

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1					
Regression	324.213	1	324.213	201.540	.000 ^a
Residual	3198.061	1988	1.609		
Total	3522.274	1989			
2					
Regression	419.089	2	209.545	134.174	.000 ^b
Residual	3103.185	1987	1.562		
Total	3522.274	1989			

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
3		3		100.491	.000^c
Regression	464.210		154.737		
Residual	3058.065	1986	1.540		
Total	3522.274	1989			
4		4		79.427	.000^d
Regression	485.971		121.493		
Residual	3036.303	1985	1.530		
Total	3522.274	1989			
5		5		65.989	.000^e
Regression	502.239		100.448		
Residual	3020.036	1984	1.522		
Total	3522.274	1989			
6		6		56.958	.000^f
Regression	517.788		86.298		
Residual	3004.486	1983	1.515		
Total	3522.274	1989			
7		7		49.617	.000^g
Regression	525.198		75.028		
Residual	2997.076	1982	1.512		
Total	3522.274	1989			
8		8		44.123	.000^h
Regression	532.697		66.587		
Residual	2989.578	1981	1.509		
Total	3522.274	1989			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Education

b. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language

c. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age

d. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age, Prison Size

e. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age, Prison Size, Experience

f. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age, Prison Size, Experience, Gender

g. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age, Prison Size, Experience, Gender, Region

h. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age, Prison Size, Experience, Gender, Region, Security level

i. Dependent Variable: Punitivevness

Coefficients*

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients			Standardized Coefficients		Sig.	Correlations				Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	Partial	Zero-order		Partial	Zero-order	Partial	Tolerance	VIF	
1	(Constant)	5.412	.000			.67635		.000				
	Education	.218	.015	.303	.303	.14196	.303	.303	.303	.303	1.000	
2	(Constant)	4.791	.112			42.709		.000				
	Education	.218	.015	.303	.303	.14196	.303	.303	.303	.303	1.000	
	Official Language	.449	.058	.164	.164	7.794	.172	.164	.164	.164	1.000	
3	(Constant)	5.672	.197			28.760		.000				
	Education	.231	.015	.321	.321	.15176	.322	.303	.317	.975	1.025	
	Official Language	.438	.057	.160	.160	7.682	.169	.164	.160	.999	1.001	
	Age	-1.839E-02	.003	-.115	-.115	-.5413	-.121	-.069	-.113	.974	1.027	
4	(Constant)	5.323	.217			24.502		.000				
	Education	.231	.015	.321	.321	.15223	.323	.303	.317	.975	1.025	
	Official Language	.456	.057	.167	.167	7.971	.176	.164	.166	.992	1.008	
	Age	-1.803E-02	.003	-.112	-.112	-.5335	-.119	-.069	-.111	.973	1.027	
5	(Constant)	5.256	.218			24.145		.000				
	Education	.234	.015	.325	.325	.15423	.327	.303	.321	.972	1.028	
	Official Language	.463	.058	.177	.177	8.380	.185	.164	.174	.971	1.030	
	Age	-1.285E-02	.004	-.080	-.080	-.3445	-.077	-.069	-.072	.968	1.253	
	Prison Size	1.296E-03	.000	.078	.078	3.747	.084	.087	.078	.993	1.008	
	Experience	-1.383E-02	.004	-.076	-.076	-.3268	-.073	-.053	-.068	.768	1.256	
6	(Constant)	5.626	.246			22.664		.000				
	Education	.235	.015	.327	.327	.15551	.330	.303	.323	.971	1.030	
	Official Language	.485	.058	.178	.178	8.435	.186	.164	.175	.971	1.030	
	Age	-1.401E-02	.004	-.087	-.087	-.3745	-.084	-.069	-.078	.791	1.263	
	Prison Size	1.240E-03	.000	.075	.075	3.584	.080	.087	.074	.990	1.010	
	Experience	-1.673E-02	.004	-.092	-.092	-.3376	-.087	-.053	-.080	.761	1.314	
	Gender	-.168	.059	-.069	-.069	-.3704	-.037	.001	-.068	.918	1.091	
7	(Constant)	5.368	.273			19.665		.000				
	Education	.235	.015	.327	.327	.15549	.330	.303	.322	.971	1.030	
	Official Language	.564	.068	.206	.206	8.345	.184	.164	.173	.703	1.423	
	Age	-1.502E-02	.004	-.094	-.094	-.3990	-.089	.000	-.083	.779	1.284	
	Prison Size	1.370E-03	.000	.083	.083	3.906	.087	.087	.081	.982	1.039	
	Experience	-1.684E-02	.004	-.092	-.092	-.3860	-.086	.000	-.080	.761	1.314	
	Gender	-.194	.059	-.072	-.072	-.3308	-.037	.001	-.074	.914	1.094	
	Region	4.078E-02	.018	.055	.055	2.214	.050	.027	.048	.888	1.433	
8	(Constant)	5.441	.274			19.828		.000				
	Education	.236	.015	.328	.328	.15615	.331	.303	.323	.970	1.031	
	Official Language	.578	.068	.211	.211	8.523	.188	.164	.176	.697	1.436	
	Age	-1.491E-02	.004	-.093	-.093	-.3983	-.089	.000	-.082	.779	1.284	
	Prison Size	1.931E-03	.000	.116	.116	4.476	.100	.067	.100	.993	1.003	
	Experience	-1.730E-02	.004	-.095	-.095	-.4008	-.093	.000	-.083	.758	1.320	
	Gender	-.195	.059	-.072	-.072	-.3337	-.037	.001	-.075	.914	1.094	
	Region	4.606E-02	.019	.062	.062	2.483	.056	.013	.064	.886	1.457	
	Security level	-.119	.053	-.057	-.057	-.2229	-.050	.016	-.046	.655	1.527	

* Dependent Variable: Posters

Excluded Variables¹

Model	Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics		
					Tolerance	VIF	Minimum Tolerance
1	Age	-.120 ^a	.595	.000	.975	1.025	.975
	Experience	-.091 ^a	.423	.000	.986	1.014	.986
	Gender	-.033 ^a	.152	.128	.934	1.000	1.000
	Minority Status	.001 ^a	.928	.979	.001	.998	.998
	Prison Size	.068 ^a	.319	.001	.971	1.000	1.000
	Region	-.072 ^a	.354	.001	.975	.999	.999
	Official Language	.164 ^a	.784	.000	.172	1.000	1.000
	Security level	.013 ^a	.621	.535	.014	1.000	1.000
	Age	-.115 ^b	.543	.000	.121	.974	.974
	Experience	-.112 ^b	.526	.000	.118	.972	.972
2	Gender	-.031 ^b	.147	.140	.933	1.000	1.000
	Minority Status	.013 ^b	.623	.533	.014	.992	.992
	Prison Size	.068 ^b	.319	.000	.997	1.000	.997
	Region	-.072 ^b	.354	.001	.971	.999	.999
	Official Language	.164 ^b	.784	.000	.172	1.000	1.000
	Security level	.013 ^b	.621	.535	.014	1.000	1.000
	Age	-.115 ^c	.543	.000	.121	.974	.974
	Experience	-.112 ^c	.526	.000	.118	.972	.972
	Gender	-.031 ^c	.147	.140	.933	1.000	1.000
	Minority Status	.013 ^c	.623	.533	.014	.992	.992
3	Prison Size	.068 ^c	.319	.000	.997	1.000	.997
	Region	-.072 ^c	.354	.001	.971	.999	.999
	Official Language	.164 ^c	.784	.000	.172	1.000	1.000
	Security level	.013 ^c	.621	.535	.014	1.000	1.000
	Age	-.115 ^d	.543	.000	.121	.974	.974
	Experience	-.112 ^d	.526	.000	.118	.972	.972
	Gender	-.031 ^d	.147	.140	.933	1.000	1.000
	Minority Status	.013 ^d	.623	.533	.014	.992	.992
	Prison Size	.068 ^d	.319	.000	.997	1.000	.997
	Region	-.072 ^d	.354	.001	.971	.999	.999
4	Official Language	.164 ^d	.784	.000	.172	1.000	1.000
	Security level	.013 ^d	.621	.535	.014	1.000	1.000
	Age	-.115 ^e	.543	.000	.121	.974	.974
	Experience	-.112 ^e	.526	.000	.118	.972	.972
	Gender	-.031 ^e	.147	.140	.933	1.000	1.000
	Minority Status	.013 ^e	.623	.533	.014	.992	.992
	Prison Size	.068 ^e	.319	.000	.997	1.000	.997
	Region	-.072 ^e	.354	.001	.971	.999	.999
	Official Language	.164 ^e	.784	.000	.172	1.000	1.000
	Security level	.013 ^e	.621	.535	.014	1.000	1.000
5	Age	-.115 ^f	.543	.000	.121	.974	.974
	Experience	-.112 ^f	.526	.000	.118	.972	.972
	Gender	-.031 ^f	.147	.140	.933	1.000	1.000
	Minority Status	.013 ^f	.623	.533	.014	.992	.992
	Prison Size	.068 ^f	.319	.000	.997	1.000	.997
	Region	-.072 ^f	.354	.001	.971	.999	.999
	Official Language	.164 ^f	.784	.000	.172	1.000	1.000
	Security level	.013 ^f	.621	.535	.014	1.000	1.000
	Age	-.115 ^g	.543	.000	.121	.974	.974
	Experience	-.112 ^g	.526	.000	.118	.972	.972
6	Gender	-.031 ^g	.147	.140	.933	1.000	1.000
	Minority Status	.013 ^g	.623	.533	.014	.992	.992
	Prison Size	.068 ^g	.319	.000	.997	1.000	.997
	Region	-.072 ^g	.354	.001	.971	.999	.999
	Official Language	.164 ^g	.784	.000	.172	1.000	1.000
	Security level	.013 ^g	.621	.535	.014	1.000	1.000
	Age	-.115 ^h	.543	.000	.121	.974	.974
	Experience	-.112 ^h	.526	.000	.118	.972	.972
	Gender	-.031 ^h	.147	.140	.933	1.000	1.000
	Minority Status	.013 ^h	.623	.533	.014	.992	.992
7	Prison Size	.068 ^h	.319	.000	.997	1.000	.997
	Region	-.072 ^h	.354	.001	.971	.999	.999
	Official Language	.164 ^h	.784	.000	.172	1.000	1.000
	Security level	.013 ^h	.621	.535	.014	1.000	1.000
	Age	-.115 ⁱ	.543	.000	.121	.974	.974
	Experience	-.112 ⁱ	.526	.000	.118	.972	.972
	Gender	-.031 ⁱ	.147	.140	.933	1.000	1.000
	Minority Status	.013 ⁱ	.623	.533	.014	.992	.992
	Prison Size	.068 ⁱ	.319	.000	.997	1.000	.997
	Region	-.072 ⁱ	.354	.001	.971	.999	.999
8	Official Language	.164 ⁱ	.784	.000	.172	1.000	1.000
	Security level	.013 ⁱ	.621	.535	.014	1.000	1.000
	Age	-.115 ^j	.543	.000	.121	.974	.974
	Experience	-.112 ^j	.526	.000	.118	.972	.972
	Gender	-.031 ^j	.147	.140	.933	1.000	1.000
	Minority Status	.013 ^j	.623	.533	.014	.992	.992
	Prison Size	.068 ^j	.319	.000	.997	1.000	.997
	Region	-.072 ^j	.354	.001	.971	.999	.999
	Official Language	.164 ^j	.784	.000	.172	1.000	1.000
	Security level	.013 ^j	.621	.535	.014	1.000	1.000

^a Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Education^b Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Education, Official Language^c Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age^d Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age, Prison Size^e Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age, Prison Size, Experience^f Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age, Prison Size, Experience, Gender^g Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age, Prison Size, Experience, Gender, Region^h Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Age, Prison Size, Experience, Gender, Region, Security levelⁱ Dependent Variable: Purchases

Collinearity Diagnostics^a

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	(Constant)	Variance Proportions						
					Education	Official Language	Age	Prison Size	Experience	Gender	Region
1	1	1.935	1.000	.03	.03						Security level
2	2	6.522E-02	5.445	.97	.97						
3	1	2.840	1.000	.01	.01	.01					
4	2	4.897	4.897	.43	.43						
5	3	4.121E-02	6.302	.99	.41	.56					
6	1	3.788	1.000	.00	.01	.01	.00				
7	2	120	5.608	.00	.66	.30	.01				
8	3	7.788E-02	6.975	.02	.15	.56	.18				
9	4	1.323E-02	16.920	.98	.18	.11	.82				
10	1	4.689	1.000	.00	.01	.00	.00	.00			
11	2	.121	6.236	.00	.72	.23	.01	.01			
12	3	.115	6.383	.00	.07	.35	.00	.50			
13	4	6.318E-02	8.617	.02	.04	.29	.28	.36			
14	5	1.178E-02	19.950	.98	.17	.13	.71	.13			
15	1	5.486	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.01		
16	2	.225	4.934	.00	.11	.00	.00	.03	.61		
17	3	.115	6.901	.00	.17	.23	.00	.52	.00		
18	4	.110	7.065	.00	.48	.00	.00	.01	.11		
19	5	6.280E-02	10.212	.04	.11	.15	.27	.32	.22		
20	6	1.181E-02	22.095	.96	.14	.14	.72	.11	.05		
21	1	6.302	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	
22	2	.252	5.020	.00	.04	.00	.00	.01	.52	.06	
23	3	.119	7.313	.00	.66	.09	.00	.00	.01	.20	
24	4	.115	7.433	.00	.09	.29	.00	.52	.00	.00	
25	5	9.617E-02	6.133	.00	.02	.45	.00	.17	.11	.36	
26	6	4.572E-02	11.795	.03	.05	.05	.36	.18	.35	.19	
27	7	9.506E-03	23.670	.97	.13	.11	.63	.11	.01	.17	
28	1	7.199	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
29	2	.258	5.286	.00	.03	.00	.00	.00	.50	.03	.03
30	3	.199	6.011	.00	.02	.13	.00	.01	.03	.01	.31
31	4	.119	7.789	.00	.74	.02	.00	.01	.00	.20	.00
32	5	.111	8.070	.00	.02	.04	.00	.71	.01	.10	.01
33	6	7.384E-02	9.973	.00	.07	.33	.01	.01	.28	.48	.17
34	7	3.304E-02	14.761	.01	.00	.24	.56	.11	.18	.01	.33
35	8	8.306E-03	29.439	.98	.12	.24	.43	.15	.00	.16	.15
36	1	6.119	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
37	2	.262	5.566	.00	.02	.01	.00	.00	.51	.04	.02
38	3	.200	6.372	.00	.01	.12	.00	.01	.03	.00	.32
39	4	.145	7.474	.00	.15	.03	.00	.17	.00	.06	.01
40	5	.118	8.287	.00	.62	.03	.00	.01	.00	.27	.00
41	6	7.442E-02	10.445	.00	.05	.33	.01	.04	.23	.45	.17
42	7	3.998E-02	14.250	.01	.02	.00	.08	.47	.09	.02	.00
43	8	3.253E-02	15.799	.01	.00	.25	.48	.22	.13	.00	.35
44	9	8.261E-03	31.350	.98	.12	.23	.42	.07	.00	.14	.01

^a Dependent Variable: Performance

Regression

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Rehabilitation	4.97	1.30	1996
Age	43.71	8.29	1996
Experience	13.04	7.34	1996
Gender	1.41	.49	1996
Minority Status	7.36E-02	.26	1996
Education	4.87	1.85	1996
Prison Size	235.73	80.13	1996
Region	4.22	1.79	1996
Official Language	1.38	.49	1996
Security level	2.02	.64	1996

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Education		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	Official Language		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	Gender		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
4	Prison Size		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
5	Age		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
6	Region		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
7	Minority Status		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a. Dependent Variable: Rehabilitation

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.239 ^a	.057	.056	1.26	.057	120.331	1	1994	.000
2	.269 ^b	.072	.071	1.25	.015	32.966	1	1993	.000
3	.283 ^c	.080	.079	1.24	.008	17.019	1	1992	.000
4	.291 ^d	.084	.083	1.24	.004	9.441	1	1991	.002
5	.297 ^e	.088	.086	1.24	.004	8.408	1	1990	.004
6	.303 ^f	.092	.089	1.24	.004	8.282	1	1989	.004
7	.307 ^g	.094	.091	1.24	.002	4.820	1	1988	.028

a. Predictors: (Constant), Education

b. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language

c. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Gender

d. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Gender, Prison Size

e. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Gender, Prison Size, Age

f. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Gender, Prison Size, Age, Region

g. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Gender, Prison Size, Age, Region, Minority Status

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1					.000 ^a
Regression	190.791	1	190.791	120.331	
Residual	3161.596	1994	1.586		
Total	3352.387	1995			
2					.000 ^b
Regression	242.235	2	121.118	77.613	
Residual	3110.151	1993	1.561		
Total	3352.387	1995			
3					.000 ^c
Regression	268.582	3	89.527	57.831	
Residual	3083.805	1992	1.548		
Total	3352.387	1995			
4					.000 ^d
Regression	283.135	4	70.784	45.917	
Residual	3069.251	1991	1.542		
Total	3352.387	1995			
5					.000 ^e
Regression	296.049	5	59.210	38.552	
Residual	3056.338	1990	1.536		
Total	3352.387	1995			
6					.000 ^f
Regression	308.721	6	51.454	33.624	
Residual	3043.665	1989	1.530		
Total	3352.387	1995			
7					.000 ^g
Regression	316.083	7	45.155	29.565	
Residual	3036.304	1988	1.527		
Total	3352.387	1995			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Education

b. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language

c. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Gender

d. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Gender, Prison Size

e. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Gender, Prison Size, Age

f. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Gender, Prison Size, Age, Region

g. Predictors: (Constant), Education, Official Language, Gender, Prison Size, Age, Region, Minority Status

h. Dependent Variable: Rehabilitation

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients				Standardized Coefficients				Correlations				Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	Sig.					Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF	
1														
(Constant)	4.156	.079		.62436	.000									
Education	.167	.015	.239	.10970	.000			.239	.239	.239	.239	1.000	1.000	
2														
(Constant)	4.613	.112		.41240	.000									
Education	.167	.016	.239	.11057	.000			.239	.240	.239	.239	1.000	1.000	
Official Language	-.330	.058	-.124	-.5742	.000			-.124	-.128	-.124	-.124	1.000	1.000	
3														
(Constant)	4.288	.136		.31414	.000									
Education	.166	.015	.237	.11013	.000			.239	.240	.237	.237	1.000	1.000	
Official Language	-.329	.057	-.123	-.5735	.000			-.124	-.127	-.123	-.123	1.000	1.000	
Gender	.234	.057	.089	.4125	.000			.084	.082	.089	.089	1.000	1.000	
4														
(Constant)	4.508	.164		.27871	.000									
Education	.166	.016	.237	.11060	.000			.239	.241	.237	.237	1.000	1.000	
Official Language	-.343	.057	-.129	-.5979	.000			-.124	-.133	-.128	-.128	.983	1.007	
Gender	.227	.057	.088	.4011	.000			.084	.090	.086	.086	.988	1.002	
Prison Size	-.1070E-03	.000	-.066	-.3073	.002			-.057	-.069	-.066	-.066	.992	1.008	
5														
(Constant)	4.031	.247		.18320	.000									
Education	.173	.015	.247	.11387	.000			.239	.246	.244	.244	.975	1.028	
Official Language	-.336	.057	-.126	-.5873	.000			-.124	-.131	-.128	-.128	.992	1.008	
Gender	.260	.058	.090	.4516	.000			.084	.101	.097	.097	.958	1.044	
Prison Size	-.1034E-03	.000	-.064	-.2973	.003			-.057	-.067	-.064	-.064	.991	1.009	
Age	1.004E-02	.003	.084	.2900	.004			.011	.085	.082	.082	.935	1.070	
6														
(Constant)	4.369	.273		.15909	.000									
Education	.173	.015	.247	.11401	.000			.239	.248	.244	.244	.975	1.028	
Official Language	-.439	.067	-.165	-.6516	.000			-.124	-.145	-.139	-.139	.715	1.400	
Gender	.269	.058	.102	.4669	.000			.094	.104	.100	.100	.950	1.047	
Prison Size	-.1203E-03	.000	-.074	-.3415	.001			-.057	-.076	-.073	-.073	.963	1.038	
Age	1.134E-02	.003	.073	.3254	.001			.011	.073	.070	.070	.919	1.088	
7														
Region	-.5314E-02	.018	-.074	-.2878	.004			.026	-.084	-.081	-.081	.700	1.429	
(Constant)	4.369	.273		.16016	.000									
Education	.172	.016	.245	.11337	.000			.239	.246	.242	.242	.974	1.027	
Official Language	-.446	.067	-.167	-.6615	.000			-.124	-.147	-.141	-.141	.713	1.402	
Gender	.271	.058	.103	.4712	.000			.094	.105	.101	.101	.955	1.047	
Prison Size	-.1174E-03	.000	-.073	-.3334	.001			-.057	-.075	-.071	-.071	.962	1.040	
Age	1.170E-02	.003	.075	.3358	.001			.011	.075	.072	.072	.917	1.091	
Region	-.5194E-02	.018	-.072	-.2814	.005			.026	-.063	-.060	-.060	.699	1.430	
Minority Status	-.234	.107	-.047	-.2105	.028			-.046	-.049	-.047	-.047	.988	1.012	

^a. Dependent Variable: Rehabilitation

Excluded Variables^h

Model	Beta In	t	S _e	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics		
					Tolerance	VIF	Minimum Tolerance
1							
Age	.050 ^a	2.285	.022	.051	.975	1.025	.975
Experience	-.008 ^a	-.360	.719	-.008	.986	1.014	.980
Gender	.090 ^a	4.133	.000	.092	1.000	1.000	1.000
Minority Status	-.037 ^a	-1.708	.088	-.038	.968	1.002	.998
Prison Size	-.059 ^a	-2.719	.007	-.061	1.000	1.000	1.000
Region	.031 ^a	1.439	.150	.032	.999	1.001	.999
Official Language	-.124 ^a	-5.742	.000	-.128	1.000	1.000	1.000
Security level	-.034 ^a	-1.551	.121	-.035	1.000	1.000	1.000
2							
Age	.046 ^b	2.110	.035	.047	.974	1.027	.974
Experience	.007 ^b	.303	.762	.007	.973	1.028	.973
Gender	.089 ^b	4.125	.000	.092	1.000	1.000	1.000
Minority Status	-.047 ^b	-2.165	.030	-.048	.993	1.007	.993
Prison Size	-.070 ^b	-3.220	.001	-.072	.993	1.007	.993
Region	-.044 ^b	-1.767	.077	-.040	.733	1.364	.733
Security level	-.037 ^b	-1.735	.083	-.039	.999	1.001	.999
3							
Age	.007 ^c	3.001	.003	.067	.936	1.069	.936
Experience	.034 ^c	1.485	.138	.033	.901	1.110	.901
Minority Status	-.048 ^c	-2.207	.027	-.049	.993	1.008	.993
Prison Size	-.066 ^c	-3.073	.002	-.069	.992	1.008	.992
Region	-.048 ^c	-1.910	.056	-.043	.733	1.365	.733
Security level	-.030 ^c	-1.088	.092	-.038	.999	1.001	.999
4							
Age	.064 ^d	2.900	.004	.065	.935	1.070	.935
Experience	.031 ^d	1.378	.168	.031	.900	1.111	.900
Minority Status	-.046 ^d	-2.117	.034	-.047	.992	1.008	.998
Region	-.063 ^d	-2.471	.014	-.055	.712	1.405	.712
Security level	.002 ^d	.004	.925	.002	.669	1.495	.664
5							
Experience	.007 ^e	.282	.778	.008	.765	1.308	.765
Minority Status	-.049 ^e	-2.276	.023	-.051	.989	1.011	.932
Region	-.074 ^e	-2.878	.004	-.064	.700	1.429	.700
Security level	.002 ^e	.080	.930	.002	.669	1.495	.684
6							
Experience	.000 ^f	.252	.801	.008	.765	1.307	.700
Minority Status	-.047 ^f	-2.195	.028	-.049	.988	1.012	.899
Security level	.012 ^f	.453	.650	.010	.658	1.520	.635
7							
Experience	.003 ^g	.138	.890	.003	.763	1.310	.899
Security level	.013 ^g	.483	.629	.011	.658	1.520	.635

^a Predictors in the Model (Constant), Education^b Predictors in the Model (Constant), Education, Official Language^c Predictors in the Model (Constant), Education, Official Language, Gender^d Predictors in the Model (Constant), Education, Official Language, Gender, Prison Size^e Predictors in the Model (Constant), Education, Official Language, Gender, Prison Size, Age^f Predictors in the Model (Constant), Education, Official Language, Gender, Prison Size, Age, Region^g Predictors in the Model (Constant), Education, Official Language, Gender, Prison Size, Age, Region, Minority Status^h Dependent Variable: Rehabilitation

Collinearity Diagnostics^a

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions							
				(Constant)	Education	Official Language	Gender	Prison Size	Age	Region	Minority Status
1	1	1.935	1.000	.03	.03						
	2	6.536E-02	5.441	.97	.97						
2	1	2.840	1.000	.01	.01	.01					
	2	.119	4.895	.00	.57	.43					
	3	4.129E-02	8.294	.99	.41	.56					
3	1	3.740	1.000	.00	.01	.01	.01				
	2	.119	5.595	.00	.71	.25	.06				
	3	.110	6.839	.00	.03	.39	.58				
4	1	3.078E-02	11.023	1.00	.26	.36	.35				
	2	.110	5.830	.00	.03	.39	.58				
	3	3.078E-02	11.023	1.00	.26	.36	.35				
5	1	4.635	1.000	.00	.01	.00	.00	.00			
	2	.120	6.226	.00	.62	.30	.06	.01			
	3	.114	6.373	.00	.21	.23	.02	.49			
6	1	.108	6.541	.00	.00	.17	.66	.16			
	2	2.360E-02	14.320	1.00	.17	.29	.26	.33			
	3	.121	6.798	.00	.73	.22	.02	.00	.01		
7	1	.115	6.970	.00	.09	.28	.01	.64	.00		
	2	.110	7.130	.00	.02	.16	.72	.04	.00		
	3	6.149E-02	9.529	.01	.02	.23	.05	.30	.31		
8	1	9.593E-03	24.125	.98	.14	.11	.20	.12	.68		
	2	.112	7.556	.00	.00	.02	.38	.48	.00		
	3	9.072E-02	8.149	.00	.01	.17	.41	.22	.03	.09	
9	1	3.808E-02	12.987	.01	.00	.40	.01	.11	.49	.43	
	2	8.368E-03	27.705	.99	.12	.24	.16	.15	.47	.15	
	3	.112	7.612	.00	.00	.02	.38	.48	.00	.00	
10	1	6.509	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	
	2	.916	2.600	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.98
	3	.200	6.698	.00	.00	.14	.00	.00	.00	.33	.01
11	1	.119	7.387	.00	.86	.02	.05	.03	.01	.00	.00
	2	.112	7.612	.00	.00	.02	.38	.48	.00	.00	.00
	3	9.670E-02	8.204	.00	.01	.17	.40	.22	.03	.09	.00
12	1	3.800E-02	13.087	.01	.00	.41	.01	.10	.49	.43	.00
	2	8.367E-03	27.891	.99	.12	.24	.16	.15	.47	.15	.00
	3	.112	7.612	.00	.00	.02	.38	.48	.00	.00	.00

• Dependent Variable: Rehabilitation

^a Dependent Variable: Rehabilitation

Regression

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Empathy Toward Offenders	3.22	1.10	520
Age	40.61	8.98	520
Experience	12.75	7.51	520
Gender	1.17	.37	520
Minority Status	.13	.33	520
Education	4.40	1.55	520
Prison Size	244.43	73.74	520
Region	4.41	1.98	520
Official Language	1.37	.48	520
Security level	2.26	.62	520
Shift Type	2.70	1.01	520
Recent shift	1.67	.88	520
Rank	1.58	.49	520

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Age		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	Prison Size		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	Education		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
4	Rank		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a. Dependent Variable: Empathy Toward Offenders

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.225 ^a	.051	.049	1.07	.051	27.715	.000
2	.263 ^b	.069	.066	1.06	.019	10.312	.001
3	.294 ^c	.086	.081	1.05	.017	9.574	.002
4	.311 ^d	.097	.090	1.05	.011	6.006	.015

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age

b. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Prison Size

c. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Prison Size, Education

d. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Prison Size, Education, Rank

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	31.894	1	31.894	27.715	.000 ^a
	Residual	596.120	518	1.151		
	Total	628.014	519			
2	Regression	43.552	2	21.776	19.262	.000 ^b
	Residual	584.463	517	1.130		
	Total	628.014	519			
3	Regression	54.199	3	18.066	16.246	.000 ^c
	Residual	573.816	516	1.112		
	Total	628.014	519			
4	Regression	60.814	4	15.203	13.804	.000 ^d
	Residual	567.201	515	1.101		
	Total	628.014	519			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age

b. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Prison Size

c. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Prison Size, Education

d. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Prison Size, Education, Rank

e. Dependent Variable: Empathy Toward Offenders

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients			Standardized Coefficients		Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta				Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1											
	(Constant)	2.101	.218		9.640	.000					
	Age	2.759E-02	.005	.225	5.284	.000	.225	.225	.225	1.000	1.000
2											
	(Constant)	2.680	.281		9.528	.000					
	Age	2.566E-02	.005	.210	4.906	.000	.225	.211	.208	.987	1.013
	Prison Size	-2.046E-03	.001	-.137	-3.211	.001	-.161	-.140	-.136	.987	1.013
3											
	(Constant)	2.012	.353		5.705	.000					
	Age	3.114E-02	.005	.254	5.682	.000	.225	.243	.239	.883	1.132
	Prison Size	-1.989E-03	.001	-.133	-3.146	.002	-.161	-.137	-.132	.986	1.014
	Education	9.790E-02	.032	.138	3.094	.002	.054	.135	.130	.895	1.117
4											
	(Constant)	1.693	.374		4.524	.000					
	Age	2.971E-02	.005	.243	5.415	.000	.225	.232	.227	.873	1.145
	Prison Size	-1.808E-03	.001	-.121	-2.854	.004	-.161	-.125	-.120	.972	1.028
	Education	9.057E-02	.032	.127	2.863	.004	.054	.125	.120	.887	1.127
	Rank	.232	.085	.104	2.451	.016	.150	.107	.103	.988	1.033

^a Dependent Variable: Empathy Toward Offenders

Excluded Variables^a

Model	Beta In	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics		
				Partial Correlation	Tolerance	Minimum Tolerance
1						
Experience	.032 ^a	.573	.567	.025	.573	.573
Gender	.054 ^a	1.229	.220	.054	.944	.944
Minority Status	.038 ^a	.873	.383	.038	.903	.903
Education	.142 ^a	3.181	.002	.138	.896	.896
Prison Size	-.137 ^a	-3.211	.001	-.140	.087	.087
Region	.089 ^a	2.081	.038	.091	1.000	1.000
Official Language	-.014 ^a	-.333	.740	-.015	.995	.995
Security level	-.101 ^a	-2.283	.022	-.100	.927	.927
Shift Type	.074 ^a	1.720	.086	.075	.975	.975
Recent shift	-.057 ^a	-1.333	.183	-.059	.907	.907
Rank	.130 ^a	3.058	.002	.133	.991	.991
2						
Experience	.037 ^a	.484	.638	.021	.873	.873
Gender	.051 ^a	1.188	.243	.051	.944	.944
Minority Status	.023 ^a	.627	.598	.023	.981	.981
Education	.138 ^a	3.094	.002	.135	.895	.895
Region	.065 ^a	1.514	.131	.067	.964	.964
Official Language	-.007 ^a	-.158	.874	-.007	.992	.992
Security level	-.050 ^a	-1.247	.213	-.055	.811	.811
Shift Type	.067 ^a	2.243	.025	.068	.953	.953
Recent shift	-.063 ^a	-1.535	.125	-.087	.994	.994
Rank	.118 ^a	2.715	.007	.119	.977	.977
3						
Experience	.091 ^a	1.554	.121	.068	.515	.515
Gender	.035 ^a	.793	.428	.035	.929	.929
Minority Status	.019 ^a	.450	.653	.020	.980	.980
Region	.059 ^a	1.309	.172	.060	.961	.961
Official Language	-.002 ^a	-.036	.971	-.002	.990	.990
Security level	-.059 ^a	-1.269	.205	-.058	.811	.811
Shift Type	.095 ^a	2.218	.027	.097	.953	.953
Recent shift	-.057 ^a	-1.352	.177	-.059	.990	.990
Rank	.104 ^a	2.451	.015	.107	.968	.968
4						
Experience	.071 ^a	1.200	.231	.053	.503	.503
Gender	.043 ^a	.980	.328	.043	.924	.924
Minority Status	.026 ^a	.618	.537	.027	.976	.976
Region	.056 ^a	1.320	.188	.059	.901	.901
Official Language	.013 ^a	.396	.690	.013	.971	.971
Security level	-.038 ^a	-.798	.425	-.035	.778	.778
Shift Type	.077 ^a	1.761	.079	.077	.913	.913
Recent shift	-.050 ^a	-1.191	.234	-.052	.985	.985
5						
Experience	.071 ^a	1.200	.231	.053	.503	.503
Gender	.043 ^a	.980	.328	.043	.924	.924
Minority Status	.026 ^a	.618	.537	.027	.976	.976
Region	.056 ^a	1.320	.188	.059	.901	.901
Official Language	.013 ^a	.396	.690	.013	.971	.971
Security level	-.038 ^a	-.798	.425	-.035	.778	.778
Shift Type	.077 ^a	1.761	.079	.077	.913	.913
Recent shift	-.050 ^a	-1.191	.234	-.052	.985	.985

^a Predictors in the Model (Constant), Age^b Predictors in the Model (Constant), Age, Prison Size^c Predictors in the Model (Constant), Age, Prison Size, Education^d Predictors in the Model (Constant), Age, Prison Size, Education, Rank^e Dependent Variable: Empathy Toward Offenders

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions				
				(Constant)	Age	Prison Size	Education	Rank
1	1	1.976	1.000	.01	.01			
	2	2.357E-02	9.157	.99	.99			
2	1	2.908	1.000	.00	.01	.01		
	2	7.444E-02	6.250	.01	.23	.68		
	3	1.768E-02	12.824	.99	.76	.33		
3	1	3.804	1.000	.00	.00	.01	.01	
	2	.109	5.903	.00	.08	.05	.64	
	3	7.416E-02	7.162	.01	.18	.72	.01	
	4	1.221E-02	17.655	.99	.74	.22	.35	
4	1	4.724	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
	2	.111	6.534	.00	.08	.00	.64	.05
	3	9.811E-02	6.939	.00	.00	.48	.02	.35
	4	5.571E-02	9.209	.01	.30	.27	.05	.52
	5	1.143E-02	20.319	.99	.62	.25	.29	.08

a. Dependent Variable: Empathy Toward Offenders

Regression

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Puniliveness	5.11	1.28	533
Age	40.59	8.99	533
Experience	12.75	7.47	533
Gender	1.17	.37	533
Minority Status	.13	.34	533
Education	4.42	1.55	533
Prison Size	245.28	73.07	533
Region	4.42	2.00	533
Official Language	1.37	.48	533
Security level	2.26	.62	533
Shift Type	2.70	1.01	533
Recent shift	1.87	.88	533
Rank	1.57	.50	533

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Region		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	Prison Size		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	Official Language		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
4	Age		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
5	Education		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a. Dependent Variable: Puniliveness

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.204 ^a	.042	.040	1.25	.042	23.029	.000
2	.255 ^b	.065	.062	1.24	.024	13.438	.000
3	.278 ^c	.077	.072	1.23	.012	6.912	.009
4	.297 ^d	.088	.081	1.23	.011	6.300	.012
5	.330 ^e	.109	.100	1.21	.021	12.177	.001

a. Predictors: (Constant), Region

b. Predictors: (Constant), Region, Prison Size

c. Predictors: (Constant), Region, Prison Size, Official Language

d. Predictors: (Constant), Region, Prison Size, Official Language, Age

e. Predictors: (Constant), Region, Prison Size, Official Language, Age, Education

ANOVA^f

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	36.131	1	36.131	23.029	.000 ^a
	Residual	833.101	531	1.569		
	Total	869.233	532			
2	Regression	58.732	2	28.366	18.503	.000 ^b
	Residual	812.501	530	1.533		
	Total	869.233	532			
3	Regression	67.212	3	22.404	14.777	.000 ^c
	Residual	802.021	529	1.516		
	Total	869.233	532			
4	Regression	76.668	4	19.167	12.769	.000 ^d
	Residual	792.564	528	1.501		
	Total	869.233	532			
5	Regression	94.668	5	18.914	12.887	.000 ^e
	Residual	774.665	527	1.470		
	Total	869.233	532			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Region

b. Predictors: (Constant), Region, Prison Size

c. Predictors: (Constant), Region, Prison Size, Official Language

d. Predictors: (Constant), Region, Prison Size, Official Language, Age

e. Predictors: (Constant), Region, Prison Size, Official Language, Age, Education

f. Dependent Variable: Puniliveness

Coefficients^a

Model	Standardized Coefficients				Correlations				Collinearity Statistics	
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t						
1										
(Constant)	5.689	.132		43.121	.000					
Region	-.131	.027	-.204	-4.789	.000	-.204	-.204	-.204	1.000	1.000
2										
(Constant)	4.936	.243		20.331	.000					
Region	-.113	.027	-.176	-4.117	.000	-.204	-.176	-.173	.988	1.033
Prison Size	2.738E-03	.001	.166	3.666	.000	.166	.167	.164	.966	1.039
3										
(Constant)	4.262	.363		12.080	.000					
Region	-7.065E-02	.032	-.110	-2.242	.025	-.204	-.097	-.094	.720	1.369
Prison Size	2.858E-03	.001	.163	3.840	.000	.168	.165	.160	.964	1.037
Official Language	.337	.126	.127	2.628	.009	.189	.114	.110	.743	1.346
4										
(Constant)	4.878	.428		11.386	.000					
Region	-6.861E-02	.031	-.107	-2.187	.029	-.204	-.095	-.091	.720	1.389
Prison Size	2.654E-03	.001	.152	3.583	.000	.188	.153	.148	.953	1.050
Official Language	.360	.128	.136	2.816	.005	.189	.122	.117	.739	1.353
Age	-1.498E-02	.006	-.105	-2.510	.012	-.115	-.109	-.104	.982	1.016
5										
(Constant)	5.723	.486		11.721	.000					
Region	-6.530E-02	.031	-.102	-2.103	.036	-.204	-.091	-.088	.719	1.391
Prison Size	2.585E-03	.001	.148	3.508	.000	.188	.151	.144	.952	1.050
Official Language	.350	.127	.132	2.766	.006	.189	.120	.114	.739	1.363
Age	-2.177E-02	.006	-.163	-3.604	.000	-.116	-.161	-.144	.885	1.130
Education	-.125	.036	-.151	-3.480	.001	-.116	-.150	-.143	.897	1.114

^a. Dependent Variable: Punitiveness

Excluded Variables^f

Model		Beta In	t	S _e	Collinearity Statistics		
					Partial Correlation	Tolerance	VIF
1	Age	-.113 ^a	-2.614	.006	-.115	1.000	1.000
	Experience	-.083 ^a	1.913	.056	-.083	.945	1.056
	Gender	-.019 ^a	-.454	.650	-.020	.998	1.002
	Minority Status	-.034 ^a	-.782	.435	-.034	.976	1.025
	Education	-.107 ^a	-2.517	.012	-.109	.998	1.002
	Prison Size	.156 ^a	3.666	.000	.157	.966	1.033
	Official Language	.116 ^a	2.368	.018	.107	.746	1.341
	Security Level	.107 ^a	2.320	.012	.109	.999	1.001
	Shift Type	-.023 ^a	-.532	.595	-.023	.999	1.001
	Recent Shift	-.001 ^a	-.027	.979	-.001	.997	1.003
	Rank	-.108 ^a	-2.551	.011	-.110	.999	1.001
	Age	-.097 ^a	-2.798	.022	-.099	.987	1.013
	Experience	-.082 ^a	-1.420	.156	-.082	.926	1.080
	Gender	-.021 ^a	-.503	.615	-.022	.999	1.002
2	Minority Status	-.027 ^a	-.578	.598	-.023	.971	1.020
	Education	-.108 ^a	-2.591	.010	-.112	.998	1.003
	Official Language	.127 ^a	2.679	.009	.114	.743	1.346
	Security Level	.053 ^a	1.288	.198	.056	.666	1.155
	Shift Type	-.044 ^a	-1.035	.301	-.045	.981	1.019
	Recent Shift	.009 ^a	.220	.826	.010	.932	1.008
	Rank	-.081 ^a	-2.189	.031	-.094	.948	1.014
	Age	-.105 ^a	-2.510	.012	-.108	.982	1.018
	Experience	-.078 ^a	-1.718	.016	-.077	.911	1.099
	Gender	-.011 ^a	-.260	.795	-.011	.889	1.011
	Minority Status	-.017 ^a	-.799	.765	-.013	.983	1.036
	Education	-.104 ^a	-2.490	.013	-.108	.996	1.004
	Security Level	.046 ^a	1.022	.307	.044	.856	1.166
	Shift Type	-.037 ^a	-1.220	.223	-.033	.977	1.024
3	Recent Shift	-.006 ^a	-.149	.882	-.006	.973	1.028
	Rank	-.019 ^a	-1.864	.063	-.081	.971	1.030
	Age	-.088 ^a	-1.145	.865	-.086	.505	1.980
	Gender	-.039 ^a	-.815	.361	-.040	.928	1.077
	Minority Status	-.021 ^a	-.484	.678	-.021	.958	1.044
	Education	-.151 ^a	-3.490	.001	-.150	.897	1.114
	Security Level	.019 ^a	.419	.616	.018	.804	1.244
	Shift Type	-.034 ^a	-.791	.429	-.034	.916	1.057
	Recent Shift	-.002 ^a	-.049	.961	-.002	.971	1.029
	Rank	-.010 ^a	-1.665	.096	-.072	.864	1.038
	Experience	-.081 ^a	-1.329	.184	-.056	.454	2.204
	Gender	-.027 ^a	-.500	.617	-.022	.914	1.094
	Minority Status	-.016 ^a	-.387	.699	-.017	.957	1.045
	Security Level	.034 ^a	.520	.603	.023	.803	1.245
4	Shift Type	-.027 ^a	-.760	.448	-.033	.916	1.058
	Recent Shift	-.011 ^a	-.264	.792	-.012	.966	1.033
	Rank	-.057 ^a	-1.381	.174	-.059	.855	1.047
	Age	-.097 ^a	-2.798	.022	-.099	.987	1.013
	Experience	-.082 ^a	-1.420	.156	-.082	.926	1.080
	Gender	-.021 ^a	-.503	.615	-.022	.999	1.002
	Minority Status	-.027 ^a	-.578	.598	-.023	.971	1.020
	Education	-.108 ^a	-2.591	.010	-.112	.998	1.003
	Official Language	.127 ^a	2.679	.009	.114	.743	1.346
	Security Level	.053 ^a	1.288	.198	.056	.666	1.155
	Shift Type	-.044 ^a	-1.035	.301	-.045	.981	1.019
	Recent Shift	.009 ^a	.220	.826	.010	.932	1.008
	Rank	-.081 ^a	-2.189	.031	-.094	.948	1.014
	Age	-.105 ^a	-2.510	.012	-.108	.982	1.018
5	Experience	-.078 ^a	-1.718	.016	-.077	.911	1.099
	Gender	-.011 ^a	-.260	.795	-.011	.889	1.011
	Minority Status	-.017 ^a	-.799	.765	-.013	.983	1.036
	Education	-.104 ^a	-2.490	.013	-.108	.996	1.004
	Security Level	.046 ^a	1.022	.307	.044	.856	1.166
	Shift Type	-.037 ^a	-1.220	.223	-.033	.977	1.024
	Recent Shift	-.006 ^a	-.149	.882	-.006	.973	1.028
	Rank	-.019 ^a	-1.864	.063	-.081	.971	1.030
	Age	-.088 ^a	-1.145	.865	-.086	.505	1.980
	Gender	-.039 ^a	-.815	.361	-.040	.928	1.077
	Minority Status	-.021 ^a	-.484	.678	-.021	.958	1.044
	Education	-.151 ^a	-3.490	.001	-.150	.897	1.114
	Security Level	.019 ^a	.419	.616	.018	.804	1.244
	Shift Type	-.034 ^a	-.791	.429	-.034	.916	1.057
	Recent Shift	-.002 ^a	-.049	.961	-.002	.971	1.029
5	Rank	-.010 ^a	-1.665	.096	-.072	.864	1.038
	Experience	-.081 ^a	-1.329	.184	-.056	.454	2.204
	Gender	-.027 ^a	-.500	.617	-.022	.914	1.094
	Minority Status	-.016 ^a	-.387	.699	-.017	.957	1.045
	Security Level	.034 ^a	.520	.603	.023	.803	1.245
	Shift Type	-.027 ^a	-.760	.448	-.033	.916	1.058
	Recent Shift	-.011 ^a	-.264	.792	-.012	.966	1.033
	Rank	-.057 ^a	-1.381	.174	-.059	.855	1.047
	Age	-.097 ^a	-2.798	.022	-.099	.987	1.013
	Experience	-.082 ^a	-1.420	.156	-.082	.926	1.080
	Gender	-.021 ^a	-.503	.615	-.022	.999	1.002
	Minority Status	-.027 ^a	-.578	.598	-.023	.971	1.020
	Education	-.108 ^a	-2.591	.010	-.112	.998	1.003
	Official Language	.127 ^a	2.679	.009	.114	.743	1.346
	Security Level	.053 ^a	1.288	.198	.056	.666	1.155
	Shift Type	-.044 ^a	-1.035	.301	-.045	.981	1.019
	Recent Shift	.009 ^a	.220	.826	.010	.932	1.008
	Rank	-.081 ^a	-2.189	.031	-.094	.948	1.014
	Age	-.105 ^a	-2.510	.012	-.108	.982	1.018
	Experience	-.078 ^a	-1.718	.016	-.077	.911	1.099
	Gender	-.011 ^a	-.260	.795	-.011	.889	1.011
	Minority Status	-.017 ^a	-.799	.765	-.013	.983	1.036
	Education	-.104 ^a	-2.490	.013	-.108	.996	1.004
	Security Level	.046 ^a	1.022	.307	.044	.856	1.166
	Shift Type	-.037 ^a	-1.220	.223	-.033	.977	1.024
	Recent Shift	-.006 ^a	-.149	.882	-.006	.973	1.028
	Rank	-.019 ^a	-1.864	.063	-.081	.971	1.030
	Age	-.088 ^a	-1.145	.865	-.086	.505	1.980
	Gender	-.039 ^a	-.815	.361	-.040	.928	1.077
	Minority Status	-.021 ^a	-.484	.678	-.021	.958	1.044
	Education	-.151 ^a	-3.490	.001	-.150	.897	1.114
	Security Level	.019 ^a	.419	.616	.018	.804	1.244
	Shift Type	-.034 ^a	-.791	.429	-.034	.916	1.057
	Recent Shift	-.002 ^a	-.049	.961	-.002	.971	1.029
	Rank	-.010 ^a	-1.665	.096	-.072	.864	1.038
	Experience	-.081 ^a	-1.329	.184	-.056	.454	2.204
	Gender	-.027 ^a	-.500	.617	-.022	.914	1.094
	Minority Status	-.016 ^a	-.387	.699	-.017	.957	1.045
	Security Level	.034 ^a	.520	.603	.023	.803	1.245
	Shift Type	-.027 ^a	-.760	.448	-.033	.916	1.058
	Recent Shift	-.011 ^a	-.264	.792	-.012	.966	1.033
	Rank	-.057 ^a	-1.381	.174	-.059	.855	1.047

^a Predictors in the Model: Constant, Payon, Prison Size^b Predictors in the Model: Constant, Payon, Prison Size^c Predictors in the Model: Constant, Payon, Prison Size, Official Language^d Predictors in the Model: Constant, Payon, Prison Size, Official Language, Age^e Predictors in the Model: Constant, Payon, Prison Size, Official Language, Age, Education^f Excluded Variables: Prisoners

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions					
				(Constant)	Region	Prison Size	Official Language	Age	Education
1	1	1.912	1.000	.04	.04				
	2	8.948E-02	4.848	.98	.98				
	3								
2	1	2.816	1.000	.01	.02	.01			
	2	.153	4.283	.01	.66	.16			
	3	3.082E-02	9.558	.98	.32	.81			
3	1	3.684	1.000	.00	.01	.01	.01		
	2	.217	4.121	.00	.36	.01	.12		
	3	8.181E-02	6.711	.00	.08	.61	.32		
	4	1.673E-02	14.841	1.00	.56	.38	.55		
4	1	4.637	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	
	2	.217	4.821	.00	.37	.01	.12	.00	
	3	8.438E-02	7.413	.00	.03	.65	.20	.03	
	4	4.922E-02	9.707	.00	.27	.02	.39	.60	
	5	1.200E-02	19.681	1.00	.33	.32	.28	.37	
5	1	6.631	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
	2	.217	5.044	.00	.36	.01	.12	.00	.00
	3	.112	7.019	.00	.05	.00	.02	.06	.65
	4	8.307E-02	8.160	.00	.02	.69	.19	.01	.04
	5	4.698E-02	10.850	.00	.35	.05	.44	.47	.06
	6	9.327E-03	24.352	1.00	.22	.24	.21	.46	.25

a. Dependent Variable: Punitiveness

Regression

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Rehabilitation	3.95	1.42	537
Age	40.59	9.01	537
Experience	12.76	7.46	537
Gender	1.17	.37	537
Minority Status	.13	.34	537
Education	4.42	1.55	537
Prison Size	245.01	73.33	537
Region	4.42	1.99	537
Official Language	1.37	.48	537
Security level	2.26	.61	537
Shift Type	2.70	1.01	537
Recent shift	1.67	.88	537
Rank	1.57	.50	537

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Rank		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	Official Language		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	Prison Size		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
4	Education		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a. Dependent Variable: Rehabilitation

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.174 ^a	.030	.029	1.40	.030	16.748	.000
2	.215 ^b	.046	.043	1.39	.016	8.895	.003
3	.239 ^c	.057	.052	1.39	.011	6.186	.013
4	.258 ^d	.067	.060	1.38	.010	5.465	.020

a. Predictors: (Constant), Rank

b. Predictors: (Constant), Rank, Official Language

c. Predictors: (Constant), Rank, Official Language, Prison Size

d. Predictors: (Constant), Rank, Official Language, Prison Size, Education

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	32.944	1	32.944	16.748	.000 ^a
	Residual	1052.408	535	1.967		
	Total	1085.352	536			
2	Regression	50.188	2	25.094	12.945	.000 ^b
	Residual	1035.165	534	1.939		
	Total	1085.352	536			
3	Regression	62.064	3	20.688	10.776	.000 ^c
	Residual	1023.289	533	1.920		
	Total	1085.352	536			
4	Regression	72.468	4	18.117	9.516	.000 ^d
	Residual	1012.884	532	1.904		
	Total	1085.352	536			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Rank

b. Predictors: (Constant), Rank, Official Language

c. Predictors: (Constant), Rank, Official Language, Prison Size

d. Predictors: (Constant), Rank, Official Language, Prison Size, Education

e. Dependent Variable: Rehabilitation

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients				Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta						Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1													
	(Constant)	3.162	.202		15.686		.000						
	Rank	.501	.122	.174	4.082		.000		.174	.174	.174	1.000	1.000
2													
	(Constant)	3.744	.279		13.396		.000						
	Rank	.458	.122	.159	3.728		.000		.174	.159	.158	.985	1.015
	Official Language	-.375	.128	-.127	-2.982		.003		-.146	-.128	-.126	.985	1.015
3													
	(Constant)	4.290	.354		12.107		.000						
	Rank	.420	.123	.146	3.424		.001		.174	.147	.144	.971	1.030
	Official Language	-.368	.125	-.124	-2.923		.004		-.146	-.126	-.123	.984	1.016
	Prison Size	-2.040E-03	.001	-.108	-2.487		.013		-.129	-.107	-.108	.984	1.016
4													
	(Constant)	3.903	.390		10.018		.000						
	Rank	.404	.122	.141	3.303		.001		.174	.142	.138	.968	1.033
	Official Language	-.351	.125	-.119	-2.812		.005		-.146	-.121	-.118	.982	1.019
	Prison Size	-2.079E-03	.001	-.107	-2.537		.011		-.129	-.109	-.108	.984	1.017
	Education	9.029E-02	.039	.098	2.338		.020		.113	.101	.098	.993	1.007

a. Dependent Variable: Rehabilitation

Excluded Variables^a

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics		
						Tolerance	VIF	Minimum Tolerance
1	Age	.043 ^a	1.014	.311	.044	.992	1.008	.992
	Experience	-.058 ^b	-1.347	.178	-.058	.977	1.023	.977
	Gender	.107 ^c	2.521	.012	.108	.994	1.006	.994
	Minority Status	.085 ^d	1.989	.047	.086	.996	1.004	.996
	Education	.103 ^e	2.417	.016	.104	.996	1.004	.996
	Prison Size	-.109 ^f	-2.555	.011	-.110	.985	1.015	.985
	Region	.084 ^g	1.987	.047	.086	.999	1.001	.999
	Official Language	-.127 ^h	-2.982	.003	-.128	.985	1.015	.985
	Security level	-.061 ⁱ	-1.387	.168	-.060	.938	1.066	.938
	Shift Type	.039 ^j	.889	.375	.038	.962	1.040	.962
	Recent shift	-.047 ^k	-1.100	.272	-.048	.998	1.002	.998
2	Age	.052 ^a	1.233	.218	.053	.987	1.013	.975
	Experience	-.028 ^b	-.034	.527	-.027	.917	1.091	.917
	Gender	.094 ^c	2.209	.028	.095	.961	1.016	.972
	Minority Status	.060 ^d	1.548	.122	.067	.971	1.030	.981
	Education	.093 ^e	2.284	.023	.098	.964	1.008	.982
	Prison Size	-.105 ^f	-2.487	.013	-.107	.984	1.018	.971
	Region	.028 ^g	.871	.386	.028	.746	1.341	.735
	Security level	.068 ^h	1.588	.111	.064	.938	1.066	.927
	Shift Type	.046 ⁱ	1.069	.285	.046	.958	1.043	.946
	Recent shift	-.020 ^j	-.874	.500	-.028	.978	1.025	.914
						.977	1.024	.984
3	Age	.042 ^a	.994	.321	.043	.977	1.024	.984
	Experience	-.038 ^b	-.853	.394	-.037	.910	1.099	.910
	Gender	.093 ^c	2.207	.028	.095	.981	1.019	.984
	Minority Status	.056 ^d	1.310	.191	.057	.961	1.040	.960
	Education	.096 ^e	2.338	.020	.101	.963	1.007	.968
	Region	.005 ^f	.110	.912	.005	.720	1.380	.720
	Security level	-.021 ^g	-.446	.658	-.019	.830	1.205	.830
	Shift Type	.064 ^h	1.472	.142	.064	.936	1.068	.925
	Recent shift	-.036 ⁱ	-.840	.401	-.036	.972	1.029	.962
						.977	1.141	.977
						.725	1.379	.725
4	Age	.082 ^a	1.848	.065	.080	.977	1.141	.977
	Experience	.011 ^d	.221	.825	.010	.725	1.379	.725
	Gender	.077 ^d	1.794	.073	.076	.945	1.058	.945
	Minority Status	.050 ^d	1.175	.240	.051	.958	1.044	.958
	Region	.002 ^d	.047	.992	.002	.719	1.381	.719
	Security level	-.033 ^d	-.722	.471	-.031	.819	1.222	.819
	Shift Type	.070 ^d	1.608	.108	.070	.933	1.071	.920
	Recent shift	-.030 ^d	-.693	.489	-.030	.968	1.034	.961
						.977	1.141	.977
						.725	1.379	.725
						.945	1.058	.945

^a Predictors in the Model (Constant), Rank^b Predictors in the Model (Constant), Rank, Official Language^c Predictors in the Model (Constant), Rank, Official Language, Prison Size^d Predictors in the Model (Constant), Rank, Official Language, Prison Size, Education^e Dependent Variable: Rehabilitation

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions				
				(Constant)	Rank	Official Language	Prison Size	Education
1	1	1.954	1.000	.02	.02			
	2	4.616E-02	6.506	.98	.98			
2	1	2.857	1.000	.01	.01	.01		
	2	.113	5.026	.00	.36	.52		
	3	3.041E-02	9.691	.99	.63	.48		
3	1	3.777	1.000	.00	.01	.01	.01	
	2	.113	5.770	.00	.40	.45	.01	
	3	8.831E-02	6.540	.00	.13	.29	.58	
	4	2.097E-02	13.422	1.00	.47	.25	.41	
4	1	4.878	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
	2	.123	6.188	.00	.12	.48	.02	.22
	3	9.457E-02	7.033	.00	.51	.00	.04	.45
	4	8.635E-02	7.360	.00	.00	.27	.60	.17
	5	1.832E-02	15.979	1.00	.36	.24	.33	.16

a. Dependent Variable: Rehabilitation

Regression

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Job Stress	3.97	1.31	1894
Age	43.65	8.32	1894
Experience	13.08	7.36	1894
Gender	1.41	.49	1894
Minority Status	7.39E-02	.26	1894
Education	4.91	1.85	1894
Prison Size	236.28	79.97	1894
Region	4.21	1.78	1894
Official Language	1.39	.49	1894
Security level	2.03	.64	1894
Empathy Toward Offenders	4.00	.97	1894
Punitiveness	4.34	1.33	1894
Rehabilitation	4.98	1.30	1894
Average empathy score per Inst	3.7607	.2519	1894
average punitive score per Inst	4.5779	.4365	1894
average rehabilitation score per Inst	4.6705	.3530	1894

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Punitiveness		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	Age		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	Rehabilitation		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
4	Official Language		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a. Dependent Variable: Job Stress

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.186 ^a	.035	.034	1.29	.035	68.049	.000
2	.205 ^b	.042	.041	1.28	.007	14.178	.000
3	.219 ^c	.048	.046	1.28	.006	12.038	.001
4	.225 ^d	.050	.048	1.28	.003	5.022	.025

a. Predictors: (Constant), Punitiveness

b. Predictors: (Constant), Punitiveness, Age

c. Predictors: (Constant), Punitiveness, Age, Rehabilitation

d. Predictors: (Constant), Punitiveness, Age, Rehabilitation, Official Language

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	112.559	1	112.559	68.049	.000 ^a
	Residual	3129.553	1892	1.654		
	Total	3242.112	1893			
2	Regression	135.850	2	67.925	41.351	.000 ^b
	Residual	3106.263	1891	1.643		
	Total	3242.112	1893			
3	Regression	155.510	3	51.837	31.741	.000 ^c
	Residual	3086.602	1890	1.633		
	Total	3242.112	1893			
4	Regression	163.693	4	40.923	25.112	.000 ^d
	Residual	3078.419	1889	1.630		
	Total	3242.112	1893			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Punitiveness

b. Predictors: (Constant), Punitiveness, Age

c. Predictors: (Constant), Punitiveness, Age, Rehabilitation

d. Predictors: (Constant), Punitiveness, Age, Rehabilitation, Official Language

e. Dependent Variable: Job Stress

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients			Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta					Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1												
	(Constant)	3.170	.101			31.404	.000					
	Punitiveness	.183	.022	.186		8.249	.000	.186	.186	.186	1.000	1.000
2												
	(Constant)	3.777	.190			19.880	.000					
	Punitiveness	.176	.022	.181		8.013	.000	.186	.181	.180	.996	1.004
	Age	-1.336E-02	.004	-.085		-3.765	.000	-.097	-.086	-.085	.996	1.004
3												
	(Constant)	4.434	.268			16.552	.000					
	Punitiveness	.133	.026	.135		5.196	.000	.166	.119	.117	.743	1.345
	Age	-1.359E-02	.004	-.086		-3.841	.000	-.097	-.088	-.086	.995	1.005
	Rehabilitation	-9.084E-02	.028	-.090		-3.470	.001	-.160	-.080	-.078	.748	1.340
4												
	(Constant)	4.616	.280			16.507	.000					
	Punitiveness	.140	.026	.142		5.436	.000	.166	.124	.122	.732	1.366
	Age	-1.374E-02	.004	-.087		-3.886	.000	-.097	-.089	-.087	.995	1.005
	Rehabilitation	-9.405E-02	.026	-.093		-3.567	.000	-.160	-.082	-.080	.744	1.344
	Official Language	-.137	.061	-.051		-2.241	.025	-.012	-.051	-.050	.997	1.034

^a Dependent Variable: Job Stress

Excluded Variables^a

Model	Base In	1	Bg	Panel Correlation	Correlation Statistics Yr	Minimum Tolerance
1	Age	-0.03 ^a	0.00	-0.06	996	1.004
	Experience	-0.16 ^a	-0.08	-0.16	997	1.003
	Gender	0.12 ^a	0.19	0.12	999	1.001
	Minority Status	0.04 ^a	0.13	0.04	1.000	1.000
	Education	0.41 ^a	1.737	0.42	906	1.103
	Prison Site	0.44 ^a	1.932	0.45	995	1.005
	Region	0.29 ^a	1.290	0.17	994	1.008
	Official Language	-0.15 ^a	-0.10	-0.15	970	1.031
	Security level	0.25 ^a	1.271	0.25	999	1.001
	Empathy Toward Offenders	-0.00 ^a	-2.345	-0.01	918	1.228
	Rehabilitation	-0.04 ^a	-3.366	-0.04	917	1.228
	Average empathy score per unit	-0.03 ^a	-1.36	-0.03	947	1.013
	Average punishment score per unit	-0.19 ^a	-0.16	-0.19	886	1.114
	Average rehabilitation score per unit	0.11 ^a	0.40	0.11	937	1.067
2	Experience	0.24 ^a	1.022	0.24	918	1.235
	Gender	0.43 ^a	2.18	0.43	917	1.048
	Minority Status	0.09 ^a	0.18	0.10	996	1.004
	Education	0.29 ^a	1.037	0.29	918	1.141
	Prison Site	0.43 ^a	1.918	0.44	995	1.005
	Region	0.40 ^a	1.773	0.41	978	1.031
	Official Language	-0.07 ^a	-2.047	-0.07	970	1.031
	Security level	0.29 ^a	1.265	0.29	999	1.001
	Empathy Toward Offenders	-0.04 ^a	-1.813	-0.04	902	1.247
	Rehabilitation	-0.09 ^a	-3.470	-0.09	748	1.540
	Average empathy score per unit	-0.09 ^a	-2.332	-0.09	946	1.014
	Average punishment score per unit	-0.11 ^a	-0.82	-0.11	896	1.114
	Average rehabilitation score per unit	0.10 ^a	0.34	0.10	937	1.067
3	Experience	0.20 ^a	1.297	0.20	908	1.240
	Gender	0.12 ^a	0.61	0.12	951	1.032
	Minority Status	0.09 ^a	0.27	0.09	995	1.006
	Education	0.35 ^a	1.448	0.35	987	1.133
	Prison Site	0.40 ^a	1.786	0.41	994	1.008
	Region	0.40 ^a	1.773	0.41	978	1.031
	Official Language	-0.03 ^a	-2.241	-0.03	947	1.034
	Security level	0.35 ^a	1.127	0.35	996	1.002
	Empathy Toward Offenders	-0.03 ^a	-1.018	-0.03	711	1.331
	Rehabilitation	-0.05 ^a	-1.06	-0.05	944	1.018
	Average empathy score per unit	-0.03 ^a	-1.090	-0.03	935	1.118
	Average punishment score per unit	-0.10 ^a	-0.43	-0.10	918	1.081
	Average rehabilitation score per unit	0.20 ^a	0.43	0.20	937	1.067
4	Experience	0.29 ^a	1.134	0.29	789	1.367
	Gender	0.13 ^a	0.20	0.13	911	1.032
	Minority Status	0.02 ^a	0.07	0.02	996	1.012
	Education	0.36 ^a	1.919	0.36	944	1.137
	Prison Site	0.40 ^a	1.787	0.41	994	1.008
	Region	0.19 ^a	1.718	0.19	917	1.395
	Official Language	-0.04 ^a	-1.064	-0.04	997	1.003
	Security level	0.24 ^a	1.246	0.24	997	1.003
	Empathy Toward Offenders	-0.19 ^a	-2.720	-0.17	731	1.368
	Rehabilitation	-0.07 ^a	-3.21	-0.07	948	1.034
	Average empathy score per unit	-0.07 ^a	-0.37	-0.07	943	1.034
	Average punishment score per unit	-0.03 ^a	-1.170	-0.03	742	1.348
	Average rehabilitation score per unit	0.20 ^a	0.43	0.20	937	1.067

^a Predictors in the Model: Criminal Record, Employment^b Predictors in the Model: Criminal Record, Employment, Age^c Predictors in the Model: Criminal Record, Employment, Age, Education^d Predictors in the Model: Criminal Record, Employment, Age, Education, Official Language^e Dependent Variable: Job Status

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions				
				(Constant)	Punitiveness	Age	Rehabilitation	Official Language
1	1	1.956	1.000	.02	.02			
	2	4.381E-02	6.682	.98	.98			
2	1	2.916	1.000	.00	.01	.00		
	2	6.865E-02	6.508	.02	.79	.16		
	3	1.490E-02	13.991	.98	.20	.84		
3	1	3.841	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00	
	2	.113	5.830	.00	.33	.00	.17	
	3	3.669E-02	10.232	.00	.19	.61	.32	
	4	8.903E-03	20.772	1.00	.48	.39	.50	
4	1	4.749	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
	2	.121	6.266	.00	.17	.01	.18	.15
	3	8.468E-02	7.489	.00	.23	.02	.00	.78
	4	3.667E-02	11.380	.00	.19	.60	.33	.00
	5	8.438E-03	23.724	1.00	.40	.37	.49	.08

a. Dependent Variable: Job Stress

Regression

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Job Satisfaction	5.39	1.28	1912
Age	43.64	8.32	1912
Experience	13.05	7.35	1912
Gender	1.41	.49	1912
Minority Status	7.37E-02	.26	1912
Education	4.90	1.85	1912
Prison Size	236.04	79.97	1912
Region	4.20	1.79	1912
Official Language	1.39	.49	1912
Security level	2.03	.84	1912
Empathy Toward Offenders	4.00	.97	1912
Punitiveness	4.34	1.33	1912
Rehabilitation	4.98	1.30	1912
Average empathy score per Inst	3.7613	.2520	1912
average punitive score per Inst	4.5781	.4354	1912
average rehabilitation score per Inst	4.6709	.3528	1912

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Rehabilitation		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	Empathy Toward Offenders		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	Education		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics			
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	Sig. F Change
1	.214 ^a	.046	.046	1.25	.046	92.108	1	.000
2	.239 ^b	.057	.056	1.24	.011	22.973	1	.000
3	.248 ^c	.081	.060	1.24	.004	8.201	1	.004

a. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation

b. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders

c. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders, Education

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1					
Regression	144.280	1	144.280	92.108	.000 ^a
Residual	2991.883	1910	1.566		
Total	3136.163	1911			
2					
Regression	179.857	2	89.929	58.070	.000 ^b
Residual	2956.306	1909	1.549		
Total	3136.163	1911			
3					
Regression	192.509	3	64.170	41.593	.000 ^c
Residual	2943.654	1908	1.543		
Total	3136.163	1911			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation

b. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders

c. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders, Education

d. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients				Standardized Coefficients				Correlations				Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.	Beta				Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF	
1														
	(Constant)	4.340	.113	38.279				.000						
	Rehabilitation	.212	.022	9.597	.214			.000	.214	.214	.214	1.000	1.000	
2														
	(Constant)	3.958	.138	28.668				.000						
	Rehabilitation	.165	.024	6.853	.167			.000	.214	.155	.152	.833	1.200	
	Empathy Toward Offenders	.154	.032	4.793	.117			.000	.185	.109	.107	.833	1.200	
3														
	(Constant)	4.082	.144	28.255				.000						
	Rehabilitation	.177	.024	7.276	.180			.000	.214	.184	.161	.805	1.242	
	Empathy Toward Offenders	.163	.032	5.050	.123			.000	.185	.115	.112	.828	1.211	
	Education	-4.552E-02	.016	-2.884	-.086			.004	.000	-.065	-.084	.934	1.070	

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Excluded Variables^d

Model	Bets In	1	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics		
					Tolerance	VIF	Minimum Tolerance
1	Age	.068 ^a	.002	.069	1.000	1.000	1.000
	Experience	.051 ^a	.023	.052	.999	1.001	.999
	Gender	.016 ^a	.732	.464	.991	1.009	.991
	Minority Status	.032 ^a	.1421	.156	.998	1.002	.998
	Education	-.055 ^a	-.2383	.017	-.054	.943	.943
	Prison Size	-.048 ^a	-.2098	.040	-.047	.998	1.004
	Region	.018 ^a	.786	.432	.018	.999	.999
	Official Language	-.008 ^a	-.276	.780	-.008	.984	.984
	Security level	-.038 ^a	-.1817	.106	-.037	.998	1.002
	Empathy Toward Offenders	.117 ^a	4.783	.000	.109	.833	.833
	Punitiveness	-.067 ^a	-.2580	.010	-.059	.749	.749
	Average empathy score per inst	.007 ^a	.305	.760	.007	.991	.991
	average punitive score per inst	-.014 ^a	-.618	.537	-.014	.958	.958
	average rehabilitation score per inst	.004 ^a	.193	.847	.004	.950	.950
2	Age	.052 ^b	.2332	.020	.053	.975	1.025
	Experience	.036 ^b	1.614	.107	.037	.978	1.023
	Gender	.030 ^b	1.335	.182	.031	.976	1.024
	Minority Status	.029 ^b	1.321	.187	.030	.987	1.003
	Education	-.066 ^b	-.2864	.004	-.065	.934	1.070
	Prison Size	-.041 ^b	-.1828	.068	-.042	.993	1.007
	Region	.032 ^b	1.420	.156	.032	.982	1.018
	Official Language	-.019 ^b	-.838	.402	-.019	.971	1.030
	Security level	-.035 ^b	-.1572	.116	-.038	.998	1.002
	Punitiveness	-.034 ^b	-.1288	.199	-.028	.889	1.432
	Average empathy score per inst	-.010 ^b	-.435	.864	-.010	.987	1.034
	average punitive score per inst	-.016 ^b	-.704	.481	-.016	.957	1.046
	average rehabilitation score per inst	.006 ^b	.284	.792	.006	.950	1.053
3	Age	.042 ^c	1.848	.065	.042	.943	1.060
	Experience	.028 ^c	1.237	.216	.028	.960	1.042
	Gender	.031 ^c	1.361	.174	.031	.976	1.024
	Minority Status	.027 ^c	1.206	.228	.028	.998	1.004
	Prison Size	-.039 ^c	-.1765	.078	-.040	.993	1.007
	Region	.031 ^c	1.368	.171	.031	.982	1.018
	Official Language	-.018 ^c	-.797	.426	-.018	.970	1.031
	Security level	-.035 ^c	-.1592	.112	-.036	.998	1.002
	Punitiveness	-.052 ^c	-.1698	.058	-.043	.861	1.512
	Average empathy score per inst	-.011 ^c	-.471	.637	-.011	.967	1.024
	average punitive score per inst	-.017 ^c	-.768	.443	-.018	.957	1.045
	average rehabilitation score per inst	.005 ^c	.215	.830	.005	.950	1.053
	Age	.042 ^c	1.848	.065	.042	.943	1.060
	Experience	.028 ^c	1.237	.216	.028	.960	1.042
	Gender	.031 ^c	1.361	.174	.031	.976	1.024
	Minority Status	.027 ^c	1.206	.228	.028	.998	1.004
	Prison Size	-.039 ^c	-.1765	.078	-.040	.993	1.007
	Region	.031 ^c	1.368	.171	.031	.982	1.018
	Official Language	-.018 ^c	-.797	.426	-.018	.970	1.031
	Security level	-.035 ^c	-.1592	.112	-.036	.998	1.002
	Punitiveness	-.052 ^c	-.1698	.058	-.043	.861	1.512
	Average empathy score per inst	-.011 ^c	-.471	.637	-.011	.967	1.024
	average punitive score per inst	-.017 ^c	-.768	.443	-.018	.957	1.045
	average rehabilitation score per inst	.005 ^c	.215	.830	.005	.950	1.053

^a Predictors in the Model (Constant, Rehabilitation^b Predictors in the Model (Constant, Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders^c Predictors in the Model (Constant, Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders, Education^d Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

		Variance Proportions				
Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	(Constant)	Rehabilitation	Empathy Toward Offenders Education
1	1	1.968	1.000	.02	.02	
	2	3.240E-02	7.793	.98	.98	
2	1	2.936	1.000	.00	.01	.01
	2	3.614E-02	9.013	.07	.94	.38
	3	2.782E-02	10.273	.92	.06	.61
3	1	3.846	1.000	.00	.00	.00 .01
	2	9.112E-02	6.497	.02	.05	.06 .96
	3	3.614E-02	10.318	.07	.91	.38 .00
	4	2.710E-02	11.899	.91	.04	.68 .03

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Regression

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Commitment to CSC	4.70	1.00	1885
Age	43.67	8.34	1885
Experience	13.07	7.35	1885
Gender	1.41	.49	1885
Minority Status	7.32E-02	.26	1885
Education	4.90	1.85	1885
Prison Size	238.71	79.80	1885
Region	4.21	1.79	1885
Official Language	1.38	.49	1885
Security level	2.04	.64	1885
Empathy Toward Offenders	4.00	.97	1885
Punitiveness	4.34	1.33	1885
Rehabilitation	4.98	1.30	1885
Average empathy score per Inst	3.7605	.2518	1885
average punitive score per Inst	4.5758	.4356	1885
average rehabilitation score per Inst	4.6722	.3527	1885

Correlations

Pearson Correlation		Commitment to CSC										Empathy Toward Offenders					Average			Average		Average	
		Age	Experience	Gender	Morale Status	Education	Prison Size	Region	Official Language	Security Level	Rehabilitation	Punitiveness	Rehabilitation	Empathy score per inst	Rehabilitation	Punitiveness	Rehabilitation	Empathy score per inst	Rehabilitation	Punitiveness	Rehabilitation	Empathy score per inst	
Sig. (1-tailed)	Age	1.000	.014	.030	.054	.048	-.041	.002	-.027	.009	.261	-.257	.325	.071	.325	-.257	.325	.071	.325	-.257	.325	.071	
	Experience	.014	1.000	.435	.201	-.156	-.073	.178	-.029	-.010	.148	-.069	.017	-.017	.017	-.069	.017	-.017	.017	-.069	.017	-.017	
	Gender	.030	.435	1.000	-.270	-.036	-.137	-.078	.118	-.069	.110	-.059	-.029	.034	.034	-.059	-.029	.034	.034	-.059	-.029	.034	
	Morale Status	.054	.201	-.270	1.000	.017	-.040	.032	-.006	-.015	-.074	-.035	.092	.009	.009	-.035	.092	.009	.009	-.035	.092	.009	
	Education	.048	.017	-.036	.017	1.000	.039	.067	-.006	.036	.003	-.039	.036	.003	.003	-.039	.036	.003	.003	-.039	.036	.003	
	Prison Size	.041	.073	-.006	.032	.039	1.000	.001	-.022	-.008	.017	.004	.240	.025	.025	.004	.240	.025	.025	.004	.240	.025	
	Region	.002	.178	.118	.069	.017	.006	1.000	-.018	.016	.016	-.009	.071	-.004	-.004	.071	-.004	-.004	.071	-.004	.071	-.004	
	Official Language	.027	.017	.069	.003	-.006	-.018	-.018	1.000	-.018	.047	.173	.035	.035	.035	.173	.035	.035	.035	.173	.035	.035	
	Security Level	.009	.010	-.069	.015	.008	.017	.066	.018	1.000	-.024	.072	.047	.351	.351	.072	.047	.351	.351	.072	.047	.351	
	Empathy Toward Offenders	.261	.148	.110	.059	.017	.003	.182	.009	-.024	1.000	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	
	Punitiveness	-.257	.017	-.069	-.035	-.009	-.004	-.004	.074	.072	.047	1.000	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	
	Rehabilitation	.325	.009	.009	.009	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	1.000	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	
	Average empathy score per inst	.071	.009	.009	.009	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	1.000	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	
	Average punitiveness score per inst	-.137	.043	.055	.044	-.027	-.071	.237	.251	.243	.072	.118	.095	.100	.095	.118	.095	.100	.095	.118	.095	.100	
	Average rehabilitation score per inst	.137	.043	.055	.044	-.027	-.071	.237	.251	.243	.072	.118	.095	.100	.095	.118	.095	.100	.095	.118	.095	.100	
	Commitment to CSC		1.000	.014	.030	.054	.048	-.041	.002	-.027	.009	.261	-.257	.325	.071	.325	-.257	.325	.071	.325	-.257	.325	.071
	Age		.014	1.000	.435	.201	-.156	-.073	.178	-.029	-.010	.148	-.069	.017	-.017	.017	-.069	.017	-.017	.017	-.069	.017	-.017
	Experience		.030	.435	1.000	-.270	-.036	-.137	-.078	.118	-.069	.110	-.059	-.029	.034	.034	-.059	-.029	.034	.034	-.059	-.029	.034
Gender		.054	.201	-.270	1.000	.017	-.040	.032	-.006	-.015	-.074	-.035	.092	.009	.009	-.035	.092	.009	.009	-.035	.092	.009	
Morale Status		.048	.017	-.036	.017	1.000	.039	.067	-.006	.036	.003	-.039	.036	.003	.003	-.039	.036	.003	.003	-.039	.036	.003	
Education		.041	.073	-.006	.032	.039	1.000	.001	-.022	-.008	.017	.004	.240	.025	.025	.004	.240	.025	.025	.004	.240	.025	
Prison Size		.002	.178	.118	.069	.017	.006	1.000	-.018	.016	.016	-.009	.071	-.004	-.004	.071	-.004	-.004	.071	-.004	.071	-.004	
Region		.027	.017	.069	.003	-.006	-.018	-.018	1.000	-.018	.047	.173	.035	.035	.035	.173	.035	.035	.035	.173	.035	.035	
Official Language		.009	.010	-.069	.015	.008	.017	.066	.018	1.000	-.024	.072	.047	.351	.351	.072	.047	.351	.351	.072	.047	.351	
Security Level		.261	.148	.110	.059	.017	.003	.182	.009	-.024	1.000	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	
Empathy Toward Offenders		-.257	.017	-.069	-.035	-.009	-.004	-.004	.074	.072	.047	1.000	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	
Punitiveness		.325	.009	.009	.009	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	1.000	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	
Rehabilitation		.071	.009	.009	.009	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	1.000	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	
Average empathy score per inst		-.137	.043	.055	.044	-.027	-.071	.237	.251	.243	.072	.118	.095	.100	.095	.118	.095	.100	.095	.118	.095	.100	
Average punitiveness score per inst		.137	.043	.055	.044	-.027	-.071	.237	.251	.243	.072	.118	.095	.100	.095	.118	.095	.100	.095	.118	.095	.100	
Average rehabilitation score per inst		.137	.043	.055	.044	-.027	-.071	.237	.251	.243	.072	.118	.095	.100	.095	.118	.095	.100	.095	.118	.095	.100	
Commitment to CSC		1.000	.014	.030	.054	.048	-.041	.002	-.027	.009	.261	-.257	.325	.071	.325	-.257	.325	.071	.325	-.257	.325	.071	
Age		.014	1.000	.435	.201	-.156	-.073	.178	-.029	-.010	.148	-.069	.017	-.017	.017	-.069	.017	-.017	.017	-.069	.017	-.017	
Experience		.030	.435	1.000	-.270	-.036	-.137	-.078	.118	-.069	.110	-.059	-.029	.034	.034	-.059	-.029	.034	.034	-.059	-.029	.034	
Gender		.054	.201	-.270	1.000	.017	-.040	.032	-.006	-.015	-.074	-.035	.092	.009	.009	-.035	.092	.009	.009	-.035	.092	.009	
Morale Status		.048	.017	-.036	.017	1.000	.039	.067	-.006	.036	.003	-.039	.036	.003	.003	-.039	.036	.003	.003	-.039	.036	.003	
Education		.041	.073	-.006	.032	.039	1.000	.001	-.022	-.008	.017	.004	.240	.025	.025	.004	.240	.025	.025	.004	.240	.025	
Prison Size		.002	.178	.118	.069	.017	.006	1.000	-.018	.016	.016	-.009	.071	-.004	-.004	.071	-.004	-.004	.071	-.004	.071	-.004	
Region		.027	.017	.069	.003	-.006	-.018	-.018	1.000	-.018	.047	.173	.035	.035	.035	.173	.035	.035	.035	.173	.035	.035	
Official Language		.009	.010	-.069	.015	.008	.017	.066	.018	1.000	-.024	.072	.047	.351	.351	.072	.047	.351	.351	.072	.047	.351	
Security Level		.261	.148	.110	.059	.017	.003	.182	.009	-.024	1.000	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	
Empathy Toward Offenders		-.257	.017	-.069	-.035	-.009	-.004	-.004	.074	.072	.047	1.000	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	
Punitiveness		.325	.009	.009	.009	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	1.000	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	
Rehabilitation		.071	.009	.009	.009	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	1.000	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	
Average empathy score per inst		-.137	.043	.055	.044	-.027	-.071	.237	.251	.243	.072	.118	.095	.100	.095	.118	.095	.100	.095	.118	.095	.100	
Average punitiveness score per inst		.137	.043	.055	.044	-.027	-.071	.237	.251	.243	.072	.118	.095	.100	.095	.118	.095	.100	.095	.118	.095	.100	
Average rehabilitation score per inst		.137	.043	.055	.044	-.027	-.071	.237	.251	.243	.072	.118	.095	.100	.095	.118	.095	.100	.095	.118	.095	.100	
Commitment to CSC		1.000	.014	.030	.054	.048	-.041	.002	-.027	.009	.261	-.257	.325	.071	.325	-.257	.325	.071	.325	-.257	.325	.071	
Age		.014	1.000	.435	.201	-.156	-.073	.178	-.029	-.010	.148	-.069	.017	-.017	.017	-.069	.017	-.017	.017	-.069	.017	-.017	
Experience		.030	.435	1.000	-.270	-.036	-.137	-.078	.118	-.069	.110	-.059	-.029	.034	.034	-.059	-.029	.034	.034	-.059	-.029	.034	
Gender		.054	.201	-.270	1.000	.017	-.040	.032	-.006	-.015	-.074	-.035	.092	.009	.009	-.035	.092	.009	.009	-.035	.092	.009	
Morale Status		.048	.017	-.036	.017	1.000	.039	.067	-.006	.036	.003	-.039	.036	.003	.003	-.039	.036	.003	.003	-.039	.036	.003	
Education		.041	.073	-.006	.032	.039	1.000	.001	-.022	-.008	.017	.004	.240	.025	.025	.004	.240	.025	.025	.004	.240	.025	
Prison Size		.002	.178	.118	.069	.017	.006	1.000	-.018	.016	.016	-.009	.071	-.004	-.004	.071	-.004	-.004	.071	-.004	.071	-.004	
Region		.027	.017	.069	.003	-.006	-.018	-.018	1.000	-.018	.047	.173	.035	.035	.035	.173	.035	.035	.035	.173	.035	.035	
Official Language		.009	.010	-.069	.015	.008	.017	.066	.018	1.000	-.024	.072	.047	.351	.351	.072	.047	.351	.351	.072	.047	.351	
Security Level		.261	.148	.110	.059	.017	.003	.182	.009	-.024	1.000	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	
Empathy Toward Offenders		-.257	.017	-.069	-.035	-.009	-.004	-.004	.074	.072	.047	1.000	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	
Punitiveness		.325	.009	.009	.009	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	.003	1.000	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	.032	
Rehabilitation		.071																					

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Rehabilitation		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	Empathy Toward Offenders		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	average punitive score per inst		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
4	Minority Status		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
5	Punitiveness		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

^a. Dependent Variable: Commitment to CSC

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.325 ^a	.106	.105	.94	.106	222.123	.000
2	.354 ^b	.125	.124	.93	.020	42.655	.000
3	.361 ^c	.131	.129	.93	.005	11.272	.001
4	.366 ^d	.134	.132	.93	.003	6.979	.008
5	.370 ^e	.137	.134	.93	.003	6.066	.014

^a. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation^b. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders^c. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders, average punitive score per inst^d. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders, average punitive score per inst, Minority Status^e. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders, average punitive score per inst, Minority Status, Punitiveness

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	197.421	1	197.421	222.123	.000 ^a
	Residual	1673.589	1883	.889		
	Total	1871.010	1884			
2	Regression	234.512	2	117.256	134.846	.000 ^b
	Residual	1636.498	1882	.870		
	Total	1871.010	1884			
3	Regression	244.260	3	81.420	94.146	.000 ^c
	Residual	1626.749	1881	.865		
	Total	1871.010	1884			
4	Regression	250.277	4	62.569	72.578	.000 ^d
	Residual	1620.733	1880	.862		
	Total	1871.010	1884			
5	Regression	255.492	5	51.098	59.432	.000 ^e
	Residual	1615.518	1879	.860		
	Total	1871.010	1884			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation

b. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders

c. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders, average punitive score per inst

d. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders, average punitive score per inst, Minority Status

e. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders, average punitive score per inst, Minority Status, Punitiveness

f. Dependent Variable: Commitment to CSC

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients				Standardized Coefficients		Correlations				Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	1	Sig.	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF		
1												
(Constant)	3.450	.086		40.080	.000							
Rehabilitation	.250	.017	.325	14.904	.000	.325	.325	.325	1.000	1.000		
2												
(Constant)	3.064	.104		28.379	.000							
Rehabilitation	.201	.018	.262	11.094	.000	.325	.248	.239	.834	1.189		
Empathy Toward Offenders	.168	.024	.154	6.631	.000	.281	.149	.141	.834	1.189		
3												
(Constant)	3.894	.269		14.625	.000							
Rehabilitation	.180	.018	.246	10.240	.000	.325	.230	.220	.801	1.248		
Empathy Toward Offenders	.159	.024	.155	6.595	.000	.261	.150	.142	.834	1.200		
average punitive score per inst	-.169	.050	-.074	-3.357	.001	-.137	-.077	-.072	.866	1.046		
4												
(Constant)	3.849	.269		14.352	.000							
Rehabilitation	.192	.018	.249	10.378	.000	.325	.233	.223	.789	1.262		
Empathy Toward Offenders	.158	.024	.154	6.546	.000	.261	.149	.141	.833	1.200		
average punitive score per inst	-.184	.050	-.072	-3.265	.001	-.137	-.075	-.070	.854	1.048		
Minority Status	.217	.082	.057	2.642	.008	.049	.081	.057	.907	1.003		
5												
(Constant)	4.068	.282		14.417	.000							
Rehabilitation	.174	.020	.228	8.783	.000	.325	.189	.188	.693	1.443		
Empathy Toward Offenders	.140	.025	.136	6.526	.000	.201	.126	.118	.769	1.317		
average punitive score per inst	-.120	.052	-.057	-2.478	.013	-.137	-.087	-.053	.884	1.131		
Minority Status	.218	.082	.087	2.652	.008	.049	.081	.087	.897	1.003		
Punitiveness	-4.908E-02	.020	-.000	-2.483	.014	-.267	-.057	-.053	.833	1.681		

^a. Dependent Variable: Commitment to CSC

Collinearity Diagnostics^a

Variance Proportions									
Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	(Constant)	Rehabilitation	Empathy Toward Offenders	average punitive score per inst	Minority Status	Punitiveness
1	1	1.968	1.000	.02	.02				
	2	3.222E-02	7.815	.98	.98				
2	1	2.936	1.000	.00	.01	.01			
	2	3.602E-02	9.029	.07	.93	.40			
	3	2.782E-02	10.274	.93	.06	.60			
3	1	3.912	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00		
	2	5.002E-02	8.843	.02	.46	.08	.05		
	3	3.417E-02	10.700	.00	.44	.91	.00		
	4	3.774E-03	32.195	.98	.10	.01	.94		
4	1	4.004	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00	.01	
	2	.908	2.100	.00	.00	.00	.00	.99	
	3	4.991E-02	8.958	.02	.45	.08	.05	.00	
	4	3.414E-02	10.830	.00	.44	.91	.00	.00	
	5	3.764E-03	32.619	.98	.10	.01	.94	.00	
5	1	4.901	1.000	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
	2	.911	2.319	.00	.00	.00	.00	.99	.00
	3	.133	6.076	.00	.08	.05	.00	.00	.24
	4	3.484E-02	11.861	.00	.59	.64	.00	.00	.01
	5	1.646E-02	17.255	.06	.22	.28	.19	.00	.74
	6	3.730E-03	36.249	.94	.12	.02	.81	.00	.01

a. Dependent Variable: Commitment to CSC

Regression

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Job Stress	4.11	1.31	511
Age	40.65	8.96	511
Experience	12.74	7.52	511
Gender	1.16	.37	511
Minority Status	.13	.33	511
Education	4.40	1.55	511
Prison Size	244.55	73.69	511
Region	4.42	2.00	511
Official Language	1.37	.48	511
Security level	2.25	.62	511
Empathy Toward Offenders	3.21	1.10	511
Punitiveness	5.12	1.28	511
Rehabilitation	3.95	1.41	511
Average empathy score per Inst	3.6778	.2650	511
average punitive score per Inst	4.6421	.4541	511
average rehabilitation score per Inst	4.5870	.3828	511
Rank	1.57	.50	511
Shift Type	2.71	1.02	511
Recent shift	1.67	.88	511

Prison Corruption																
Job Stress	Age	Experience	Gender	Memory Span	Education	Prison Size	Region	Official Language	Security Level	Empathy Toward Offenders	Punishments	Rehabilitation	Average Empathy Score per Inmate	Average Punishment Score per Inmate	Recid Rate	Recid Type
Age	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Experience	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Gender	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Memory Span	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Education	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Prison Size	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Region	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Official Language	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Security Level	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Empathy Toward Offenders	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Punishments	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Rehabilitation	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Average empathy score per inmate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Average punishment score per inmate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Average recidivism score per inmate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Type	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04
Recid Rate	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.05	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.04	0.02	0.01	

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Punitiveness		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	Security level		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	Experience		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a. Dependent Variable: Job Stress

Model Summary

Model	N	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
						R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	256 ^a	.065	.063	.063	1.27	.065	35.571	.000
2	272 ^b	.074	.070	.070	1.27	.009	4.800	.029
3	292 ^c	.085	.080	.080	1.26	.011	6.091	.014

a. Predictors: (Constant), Punitiveness

b. Predictors: (Constant), Punitiveness, Security level

c. Predictors: (Constant), Punitiveness, Security level, Experience

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1					
Regression	57.568	1	57.568	35.571	.000 ^a
Residual	823.768	509	1.618		
Total	881.335	510			
2					
Regression	65.278	2	32.639	20.318	.000 ^b
Residual	816.057	508	1.606		
Total	881.335	510			
3					
Regression	74.965	3	24.988	15.711	.000 ^c
Residual	806.370	507	1.590		
Total	881.335	510			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Punliveness

b. Predictors: (Constant), Punliveness, Security level

c. Predictors: (Constant), Punliveness, Security level, Experience

d. Dependent Variable: Job Stress

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients				Standardized Coefficients				Correlations				Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	t	Sig.	Beta	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF				
1	(Constant)	2.760	.233	11.858		.000								
	Puniliveness	.263	.044	5.984	.256	.256	.258	.258	.258	1.000				
										1.000				
2	(Constant)	2.374	.291	8.154		.000								
	Puniliveness	.250	.044	5.638	.243	.256	.243	.241	.982	1.018				
	Security level	.201	.092	2.191	.094	.127	.097	.094	.982	1.018				
3	(Constant)	2.008	.328	6.155		.000								
	Puniliveness	.250	.044	5.680	.243	.256	.244	.240	.982	1.018				
	Security level	.258	.094	2.741	.121	.127	.121	.116	.923	1.084				
	Experience	1.892E-02	.008	2.468	.108	.071	.109	.105	.939	1.065				

a. Dependent Variable: Job Stress

a. Dependent Variable: Job Stress

Excluded Variables^a

Model	Beta In	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics		
				Partial Correlation	Tolerance	VIF
1						
Age	.000 ^a	.004	.997	.000	.987	1.013
Experience	.019 ^a	1.839	.065	.041	.999	1.001
Gender	-.021 ^a	-.481	.631	-.021	.999	1.001
Marital Status	.023 ^a	.538	.591	.024	.996	1.004
Education	-.069 ^a	-1.601	.110	-.071	.989	1.011
Prison Size	.078 ^a	1.781	.075	.079	.983	1.018
Region	-.047 ^a	-.103	.924	-.048	.994	1.004
Official Language	.031 ^a	.710	.478	.032	.998	1.002
Security Level	.094 ^a	2.181	.033	.097	.982	1.018
Employment Toward Offenders	-.082 ^a	-1.251	.212	-.055	.740	1.351
Rehabilitation	-.045 ^a	-.173	.869	-.078	.711	1.297
Average empathy score per unit	-.006 ^a	-.140	.889	-.008	.978	1.025
Average punitive score per unit	.028 ^a	.632	.528	.028	.910	1.099
Average rehabilitation score per unit	-.031 ^a	-.683	.495	-.030	.918	1.089
Rank	.033 ^a	.712	.478	.034	.985	1.018
Shift Type	-.000 ^a	-1.396	.163	-.042	1.000	1.000
Recidivism	-.003 ^a	-.080	.936	-.004	1.000	1.000
2						
Age	.025 ^a	.813	.567	.025	.925	1.081
Experience	.108 ^a	2.468	.014	.109	.939	1.065
Gender	-.024 ^a	-.569	.570	-.025	.998	1.003
Marital Status	.037 ^a	.832	.402	.038	.995	1.005
Education	-.019 ^a	-.186	.866	-.041	.980	1.020
Prison Size	.048 ^a	1.032	.293	.047	.933	1.201
Region	-.048 ^a	-.104	.924	-.049	.953	1.048
Official Language	.038 ^a	.800	.424	.037	.948	1.045
Employment Toward Offenders	-.032 ^a	-.139	.901	-.046	.722	1.368
Rehabilitation	-.082 ^a	-.179	.864	-.074	.718	1.398
Average empathy score per unit	.034 ^a	.787	.429	.034	.921	1.081
Average punitive score per unit	-.007 ^a	-.081	.936	-.002	.922	1.087
Average rehabilitation score per unit	.004 ^a	.078	.937	.002	.908	1.108
Rank	.048 ^a	1.317	.184	.056	.932	1.073
Shift Type	-.054 ^a	-1.281	.208	-.056	.998	1.002
Recidivism	-.004 ^a	-.087	.931	-.004	1.000	1.000
3						
Age	-.071 ^a	-1.215	.214	-.055	.942	1.060
Gender	.005 ^a	.135	.893	.006	.917	1.091
Marital Status	.040 ^a	1.070	.285	.048	.968	1.035
Education	-.040 ^a	-.838	.402	-.037	.794	1.260
Prison Size	.050 ^a	1.078	.281	.048	.933	1.201
Region	-.019 ^a	-.430	.667	-.019	.980	1.021
Official Language	-.004 ^a	-.078	.938	-.003	.904	1.101
Employment Toward Offenders	-.072 ^a	-1.431	.153	-.063	.718	1.397
Rehabilitation	-.072 ^a	-1.609	.112	-.067	.706	1.305
Average empathy score per unit	.022 ^a	.456	.648	.020	.904	1.243
Average punitive score per unit	-.016 ^a	-.342	.732	-.015	.910	1.234
Average rehabilitation score per unit	.012 ^a	.258	.798	.011	.904	1.244
Rank	.048 ^a	1.095	.274	.049	.974	1.082
Shift Type	-.087 ^a	-1.561	.119	-.069	.983	1.018
Recidivism	-.010 ^a	-.218	.831	-.011	.998	1.004

a. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 b. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 c. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 d. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 e. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 f. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 g. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 h. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 i. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 j. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 k. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 l. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 m. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 n. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 o. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 p. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 q. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 r. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 s. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 t. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 u. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 v. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 w. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 x. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 y. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)
 z. Predictors in the Model (Constant Excluded)

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions		
				(Constant)	Punitiveness	Security level Experience
1	1	1.970	1.000	.01	.01	
	2	2.967E-02	8.150	.99	.99	
2	1	2.920	1.000	.00	.01	.01
	2	5.591E-02	7.226	.01	.44	.69
	3	2.453E-02	10.909	.99	.55	.31
3	1	3.689	1.000	.00	.00	.01
	2	.237	3.946	.00	.01	.77
	3	5.317E-02	8.330	.00	.58	.05
	4	2.087E-02	13.295	.99	.40	.17

a. Dependent Variable: Job Stress

Regression

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Job Satisfaction	4.47	1.53	517
Age	40.58	8.97	517
Experience	12.72	7.51	517
Gender	1.16	.37	517
Minority Status	.13	.33	517
Education	4.41	1.55	517
Prison Size	244.81	73.44	517
Region	4.41	1.99	517
Official Language	1.37	.48	517
Security level	2.26	.62	517
Empathy Toward Offenders	3.21	1.10	517
Punitiveness	5.11	1.28	517
Rehabilitation	3.95	1.41	517
Average empathy score per Inst	3.6786	.2656	517
average punitive score per Inst	4.6433	.4539	517
average rehabilitation score per Inst	4.5856	.3828	517
Rank	1.57	.50	517
Shift Type	2.70	1.02	517
Recent shift	1.67	.88	517

Variables Entered/Removed^a

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Rehabilitation		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	Punitiveness		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	Minority Status		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
4	Official Language		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.301 ^a	.091	.089	1.46	.091	51.405	.000
2	.334 ^b	.111	.108	1.45	.021	11.838	.001
3	.358 ^c	.128	.123	1.43	.017	9.928	.002
4	.372 ^d	.139	.132	1.43	.010	6.145	.014

a. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation

b. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Punitiveness

c. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Punitiveness, Minority Status

d. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Punitiveness, Minority Status, Official Language

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	109.650	1	109.650	51.405	.000 ^a
	Residual	1098.523	515	2.133		
	Total	1208.173	516			
2	Regression	134.582	2	67.291	32.217	.000 ^b
	Residual	1073.591	514	2.089		
	Total	1208.173	516			
3	Regression	154.964	3	51.655	25.160	.000 ^c
	Residual	1053.209	513	2.053		
	Total	1208.173	516			
4	Regression	167.454	4	41.863	20.595	.000 ^d
	Residual	1040.719	512	2.033		
	Total	1208.173	516			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation

b. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Punliveness

c. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Punliveness, Minority Status

d. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Punliveness, Minority Status, Official Language

e. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients			Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta					Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1												
(Constant)	3.187	.191		16.712			.000					
Rehabilitation	.326	.045	.301	7.170			.000	.301	.301	.301	1.000	1.000
2												
(Constant)	4.527	.431		10.498			.000					
Rehabilitation	.241	.051	.223	4.700			.000	.301	.203	.195	.770	1.299
Punitiveness	-.198	.057	-.164	-3.455			.001	-.271	-.151	-.144	.770	1.299
3												
(Constant)	4.470	.428		10.448			.000					
Rehabilitation	.231	.051	.213	4.532			.000	.301	.196	.187	.787	1.304
Punitiveness	-.192	.058	-.160	-3.413			.001	-.271	-.149	-.141	.770	1.299
Minority Status	.597	.190	.130	3.151			.002	.156	.138	.130	.992	1.008
4												
(Constant)	4.861	.454		10.708			.000					
Rehabilitation	.223	.051	.206	4.401			.000	.301	.191	.181	.784	1.309
Punitiveness	-.172	.057	-.143	-3.036			.003	-.271	-.133	-.126	.753	1.327
Minority Status	.626	.191	.116	2.766			.006	.166	.121	.114	.971	1.030
Official Language	.433	.139	-.106	-2.479			.014	-.184	-.109	-.103	.839	1.070

^a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

		Variance Proportions						
Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	(Constant)	Rehabilitation	Punitiveness	Minority Status	Official Language
1	1	1.942	1.000	.03	.03			
	2	5.842E-02	5.765	.97	.97			
2	1	2.858	1.000	.00	.01	.01		
	2	.128	4.729	.00	.40	.14		
	3	1.399E-02	14.296	1.00	.59	.85		
3	1	3.040	1.000	.00	.01	.00	.02	
	2	.819	1.926	.00	.00	.00	.97	
	3	.127	4.891	.00	.40	.14	.01	
	4	1.398E-02	14.747	.99	.59	.85	.00	
4	1	3.921	1.000	.00	.01	.00	.01	.01
	2	.851	2.147	.00	.00	.00	.94	.00
	3	.144	5.227	.00	.40	.05	.03	.12
	4	7.176E-02	7.392	.01	.01	.23	.02	.81
	5	1.399E-02	17.109	.99	.59	.72	.00	.06

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Regression

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Commitment to CSC	3.98	1.15	512
Age	40.59	9.02	512
Experience	12.68	7.52	512
Gender	1.16	.37	512
Minority Status	.13	.34	512
Education	4.41	1.55	512
Prison Size	244.83	73.41	512
Region	4.42	2.00	512
Official Language	1.37	.48	512
Security level	2.26	.62	512
Empathy Toward Offenders	3.21	1.10	512
Punitiveness	5.11	1.28	512
Rehabilitation	3.95	1.41	512
Average empathy score per inst	3.6773	.2660	512
average punitive score per inst	4.6436	.4539	512
average rehabilitation score per inst	4.5853	.3829	512
Rank	1.57	.49	512
Shift Type	2.70	1.02	512
Recent shift	1.67	.88	512

Program	Personal Information										Academic Performance										Social & Behavioral										Health & Safety									
	Commitment	Age	Experience	Gender	Identity	Education	Prison	Region	Official	Security	Employment	Publications	Rehabilitation	Average	Prison	Score	Rank	Shift	Recent																					
Program A	1000	178	054	001	115	076	004	004	105	022	245	307	409	013	006	006	006	006	006																					
	176	1000	654	013	083	371	173	015	075	249	276	103	044	106	062	105	092	103	046																					
	054	854	1000	035	114	440	170	214	211	249	102	021	041	272	071	075	116	134	074																					
	001	243	241	1000	179	202	007	044	106	037	011	047	113	102	040	073	077	018	039																					
	115	083	144	020	051	1000	001	115	119	057	014	060	045	011	119	116	004	004	001																					
	076	076	076	007	104	001	1000	041	081	015	087	111	176	001	043	044	043	045	041																					
	004	013	154	044	115	015	118	1000	044	073	040	184	118	134	134	134	134	134	004																					
	105	075	241	106	118	081	041	184	1000	044	090	312	106	117	241	174	044	041	004																					
	071	249	219	017	037	075	273	030	044	1000	041	201	182	049	049	174	044	041	185																					
	345	378	103	011	074	067	114	090	003	113	1000	106	017	276	114	174	116	116	001																					
	307	103	071	047	006	111	184	070	201	122	006	1000	475	119	216	116	123	082	001																					
	409	044	043	115	083	114	135	106	182	093	017	478	1000	117	216	289	173	082	012																					
	015	186	232	013	031	007	336	000	046	046	378	118	187	1000	871	311	116	081	001																					
	076	083	013	040	119	082	340	081	039	378	116	281	118	1000	871	311	116	081	001																					
	004	105	015	019	118	044	378	174	027	046	176	278	248	871	016	1000	311	004	010																					
Program B	079	081	148	077	084	043	115	044	119	046	114	114	173	211	216	278	1000	207	001																					
	046	183	144	018	054	045	115	114	071	071	116	017	014	871	016	871	1000	207	001																					
	040	046	083	038	037	161	084	080	183	000	011	017	011	009	016	011	001	002	1000																					
	Avg (1 value)																																							
	002	101	000	483	004	278	094	017	017	008	307	000	000	000	045	013	379	008	103																					
	102	000	000	000	011	000	003	344	045	000	000	010	160	000	031	008	019	000	103																					
	102	000	000	000	012	000	012	000	000	000	000	010	160	000	031	008	019	000	103																					
	483	000	000	000	000	000	012	000	000	000	349	112	004	011	184	191	041	360	107																					
	004	011	000	000	002	122	008	000	000	000	096	087	017	204	001	111	006	101	109																					
	279	000	000	008	122	493	000	105	062	046	046	096	087	017	204	001	111	006	101																					
	004	003	012	436	009	083	000	000	000	117	000	000	000	001	800	000	000	003	973																					
	017	344	000	1181	000	106	200	000	000	000	211	011	060	007	000	000	000	163	687																					
	009	045	000	000	000	083	177	000	000	000	018	018	000	000	133	200	000	003	276																					
	307	000	000	200	009	046	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	018	000	000	000	003	490																					
	000	000	000	399	000	004	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000																					
019	317	142	047	008	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000																						
000	160	144	005	017	027	001	007	000	018	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000																						
114	000	000	011	011	014	014	000	000	133	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000																						
045	011	303	184	001	022	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000																						
013	009	243	181	004	114	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000	000																						
379	019	000	041	096	081	003	183	003	183	003	003	003	003	000	000	000	000	000																						
079	000	001	360	001	115	183	003	183	003	003	003	003	003	000	000	000	000	000																						
183	103	012	012	187	189	004	073	087	008	488	004	004	004	004	004	004	004	004																						
Program C	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012																					
	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012																					
	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012																					
	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012																					
	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012																					
	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012																					
	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012																					
	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012																					
	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012																					
	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012																					
	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012																					
	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012																					
	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012																					
	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012																					
	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012	012																					

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Rehabilitation		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	Empathy Toward Offenders		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
3	Minority Status		Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a. Dependent Variable: Commitment to CSC

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.409 ^a	.167	.165	1.05	.167	102.250	.000
2	.447 ^b	.199	.196	1.03	.032	20.588	.000
3	.455 ^c	.207	.202	1.03	.007	4.054	.031

a. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation

b. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders

c. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders, Minority Status

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1					
Regression	112.729	1	112.729	102.250	.000 ^a
Residual	562.270	510	1.102		
Total	674.999	511			
2					
Regression	134.587	2	67.294	63.382	.000 ^b
Residual	540.412	509	1.062		
Total	674.999	511			
3					
Regression	139.493	3	46.498	44.109	.000 ^c
Residual	535.506	508	1.054		
Total	674.999	511			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation

b. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders

c. Predictors: (Constant), Rehabilitation, Empathy Toward Offenders, Minority Status

d. Dependent Variable: Commitment to CSC

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients				Standardized Coefficients				Correlations				Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Partial	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1														
(Constant)	2.665	.138		19.354	.000									
Rehabilitation	.332	.033	.409	10.112	.000	.409	.409	.409	.409	.409	.409	.409	1.000	1.000
2														
(Constant)	2.309	.156		14.771	.000									
Rehabilitation	.244	.038	.300	6.472	.000	.409	.276	.267	.276	.409	.276	.267	.732	1.366
Empathy Toward Offenders	.220	.048	.210	4.637	.000	.365	.197	.180	.197	.365	.197	.180	.732	1.366
3														
(Constant)	2.291	.156		14.684	.000									
Rehabilitation	.237	.038	.291	6.288	.000	.409	.269	.248	.269	.409	.269	.248	.727	1.376
Empathy Toward Offenders	.222	.048	.213	4.603	.000	.365	.200	.182	.200	.365	.200	.182	.732	1.368
Minority Status	.203	.138	.086	2.167	.031	.115	.095	.085	.095	.115	.095	.085	.992	1.008

a. Dependent Variable: Commitment to CSC

Excluded Variables^d

Model	Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics			
					Tolerance	VIF	Minimum Tolerance	
1	Age	.108 ^a	2.692	.007	.118	.948	1.002	.948
	Experience	-.039 ^b	-.959	.338	-.042	.948	1.002	.948
	Gender	-.046 ^b	-.1128	.960	-.050	.947	1.013	.947
	Marital Status	.081 ^a	2.010	.045	.089	.933	1.007	.933
	Education	-.025 ^b	-.621	.535	-.028	.945	1.016	.945
	Prison Size	-.002 ^a	-.079	.937	-.004	.942	1.019	.942
	Region	.050 ^a	1.238	.216	.055	.948	1.012	.948
	Official Language	-.040 ^b	-.976	.329	-.043	.974	1.027	.974
	Security level	.016 ^a	.346	.699	.017	.991	1.009	.991
	Employment/Offenders	.210 ^a	4.937	.000	.187	.722	1.365	.722
	Poverty level	-.144 ^b	-3.183	.002	-.139	.771	1.297	.771
	Average empathy score per unit	-.011 ^b	-.272	.786	-.012	.975	1.025	.975
	Average punitive score per unit	.814 ^a	3.348	.001	.018	.945	1.048	.945
	Average rehabilitation score per unit	-.021 ^b	-.508	.612	-.022	.917	1.091	.917
	Rank	-.032 ^b	-.1280	.901	-.037	.910	1.031	.910
	Shift Type	.061 ^a	1.508	.131	.067	.948	1.004	.948
	Recent shift	-.018 ^b	-.487	.641	-.021	.997	1.003	.997
2	Age	.065 ^a	1.700	.090	.075	.942	1.062	.942
	Experience	-.081 ^b	-2.008	.045	-.089	.952	1.051	.952
	Gender	-.011 ^b	-.780	.434	-.035	.941	1.020	.941
	Marital Status	.046 ^a	2.157	.031	.095	.992	1.008	.992
	Education	-.026 ^b	-.648	.517	-.026	.945	1.018	.945
	Prison Size	.015 ^a	.381	.703	.017	.972	1.029	.972
	Region	.043 ^a	1.082	.280	.048	.947	1.014	.947
	Official Language	-.055 ^b	-1.471	.142	-.065	.963	1.038	.963
	Security level	.025 ^a	.981	.377	.042	.979	1.024	.979
	Poverty level	-.093 ^b	-1.735	.093	-.077	.919	1.473	.919
	Average empathy score per unit	-.051 ^b	-1.374	.170	-.061	.972	1.044	.972
	Average punitive score per unit	.017 ^a	.413	.680	.018	.953	1.049	.953
	Average rehabilitation score per unit	-.028 ^b	-.678	.500	-.030	.915	1.092	.915
	Rank	-.060 ^b	-1.640	.102	-.073	.965	1.036	.965
	Shift Type	.041 ^a	1.090	.276	.048	.946	1.014	.946
	Recent shift	-.017 ^b	-.424	.672	-.018	.997	1.003	.997
3	Age	.077 ^a	1.895	.059	.084	.935	1.069	.935
	Experience	-.070 ^b	-1.721	.088	-.078	.932	1.072	.932
	Gender	-.042 ^b	-.1047	.298	-.048	.947	1.034	.947
	Education	-.030 ^b	-.741	.459	-.033	.933	1.017	.933
	Prison Size	.025 ^a	.994	.333	.026	.943	1.019	.943
	Region	.031 ^a	.773	.410	.034	.965	1.036	.965
	Official Language	-.046 ^b	-1.172	.241	-.052	.943	1.061	.943
	Security level	.045 ^a	1.081	.280	.048	.974	1.027	.974
	Poverty level	-.080 ^b	-1.971	.095	-.074	.978	1.475	.978
	Average empathy score per unit	-.056 ^b	-1.468	.160	-.062	.972	1.044	.972
	Average punitive score per unit	.076 ^a	2.048	.043	.031	.938	1.066	.938
	Average rehabilitation score per unit	-.037 ^b	-.890	.374	-.040	.907	1.103	.907
	Rank	-.060 ^b	-1.493	.136	-.068	.960	1.042	.960
	Shift Type	.040 ^a	1.221	.272	.054	.943	1.017	.943
	Recent shift	-.020 ^b	-.516	.608	-.022	.995	1.003	.995

^a Predictors in the Model: Constant, Experience, Employment/Offenders^b Predictors in the Model: Constant, Experience, Employment/Offenders, Prison Size^c Predictors in the Model: Constant, Experience, Employment/Offenders, Prison Size, Region^d Dependent Variable: Conviction Rate

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	Variance Proportions			
				(Constant)	Rehabilitation	Empathy Toward Offenders	Minority Status
1	1	1.942	1.000	.03	.03		
	2	5.848E-02	5.762	.97	.97		
2	1	2.890	1.000	.01	.01	.01	
	2	5.854E-02	7.026	.80	.63	.01	
	3	5.155E-02	7.487	.19	.36	.98	
3	1	3.074	1.000	.01	.01	.01	.02
	2	.816	1.941	.00	.00	.00	.97
	3	5.853E-02	7.247	.80	.62	.01	.00
	4	5.134E-02	7.738	.19	.37	.98	.00

a. Dependent Variable: Commitment to CSC

Appendix E

Regional variations in correctional attitudes and work adjustment

Mean correctional attitudes by region.

	Empathy ^a	Punitiveness ^b	Support for rehabilitation ^c
1. Atlantic	3.29	4.80	4.47
2. Québec	3.37	5.32	3.87
3. Ontario	3.30	4.69	4.35
4. Prairies	3.27	4.99	4.25
5. Pacific	3.46	4.62	4.44
Multiple comparisons (Scheffe)	4 < 5	2 > 1, 3, 5 4 > 5	2 < 1, 3, 5

^a $F(4, 1,172) = 3.84, p < .01$. ^b $F(4, 1,194) = 15.55, p < .001$. ^c $F(4, 1,197) = 9.62, p < .001$.

Work adjustment scores by region.

	Job Stress ^a	Job satisfaction ^b	Organizational Commitment ^c
1. Atlantic	4.00	4.89	4.13
2. Québec	4.25	4.12	3.86
3. Ontario	4.22	4.53	3.89
4. Prairies	4.08	4.63	4.18
5. Pacific	3.87	4.66	4.13
Multiple comparisons (Scheffe)	2 > 5	2 < 1, 3, 4, 5	2 < 4

^a $F(4, 1,346) = 4.33, p < .01$. ^b $F(4, 1,352) = 9.93, p < .001$. ^c $F(4, 1,339) = 5.42, p < .001$.

Appendix F
Analysis of Variance cell means

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Job Stress

yes/no empathic	YNINSEMP	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
non-empathic	non-empathic	4.22	1.28	616
	empathic	4.07	1.22	350
	Total	4.16	1.26	966
empathic	non-empathic	3.89	1.22	143
	empathic	4.00	1.24	203
	Total	3.96	1.23	346
Total	non-empathic	4.16	1.28	759
	empathic	4.04	1.23	553
	Total	4.11	1.26	1312

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

yes/no empathic	YNINSEMP	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
non-empathic	non-empathic	4.29	1.60	619
	empathic	4.54	1.50	352
	Total	4.38	1.57	971
empathic	non-empathic	4.83	1.50	143
	empathic	4.77	1.42	203
	Total	4.79	1.45	346
Total	non-empathic	4.39	1.59	762
	empathic	4.62	1.48	555
	Total	4.49	1.55	1317

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Commitement to CSC

yes/no empathic	YNINSEMP	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
non-empathic	non-empathic	3.77	1.10	613
	empathic	3.99	1.10	349
	Total	3.85	1.10	962
empathic	non-empathic	4.60	1.10	142
	empathic	4.41	1.07	201
	Total	4.49	1.08	343
Total	non-empathic	3.93	1.14	755
	empathic	4.15	1.11	550
	Total	4.02	1.13	1305

Descriptive Statistics

291

Dependent Variable: Job Stress

yes or no punitive	yes no punitive institution	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
punitive	non punitive	4.19	1.26	413
	punitive	4.26	1.23	572
	Total	4.23	1.25	985
non-punitive	non punitive	3.78	1.22	222
	punitive	3.78	1.18	130
	Total	3.78	1.20	352
Total	non punitive	4.04	1.26	635
	punitive	4.17	1.24	702
	Total	4.11	1.25	1337

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

yes or no punitive	yes no punitive institution	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
punitive	non punitive	4.51	1.55	413
	punitive	4.20	1.58	574
	Total	4.33	1.57	987
non-punitive	non punitive	4.93	1.44	223
	punitive	4.81	1.39	132
	Total	4.89	1.42	355
Total	non punitive	4.66	1.53	636
	punitive	4.31	1.56	706
	Total	4.48	1.55	1342

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Commitement to CSC

yes or no punitive	yes no punitive institution	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
punitive	non punitive	3.92	1.12	413
	punitive	3.82	1.12	566
	Total	3.86	1.12	979
non-punitive	non punitive	4.44	1.08	222
	punitive	4.49	1.02	128
	Total	4.46	1.06	350
Total	non punitive	4.10	1.13	635
	punitive	3.94	1.13	694
	Total	4.02	1.14	1329

Dependent Variable: Job Stress

yes or no support for rehabilitation	yes no rehab institution	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
non-supportive of rehabilitation	non-rehab	4.31	1.31	435
	rehab	4.18	1.30	198
	Total	4.27	1.30	633
supportive of rehabilitation	non-rehab	3.98	1.14	333
	rehab	3.96	1.23	374
	Total	3.97	1.19	707
Total	non-rehab	4.17	1.25	768
	rehab	4.03	1.26	572
	Total	4.11	1.25	1340

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

yes or no support for rehabilitation	yes no rehab institution	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
non-supportive of rehabilitation	non-rehab	4.00	1.63	435
	rehab	4.51	1.50	198
	Total	4.16	1.60	633
supportive of rehabilitation	non-rehab	4.64	1.43	334
	rehab	4.89	1.46	377
	Total	4.77	1.45	711
Total	non-rehab	4.28	1.57	769
	rehab	4.76	1.48	575
	Total	4.48	1.55	1344

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Commitement to CSC

yes or no support for rehabilitation	yes no rehab institution	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
non-supportive of rehabilitation	non-rehab	3.62	1.11	432
	rehab	3.71	1.10	196
	Total	3.65	1.11	628
supportive of rehabilitation	non-rehab	4.33	1.05	327
	rehab	4.36	1.06	375
	Total	4.35	1.06	702
Total	non-rehab	3.93	1.14	759
	rehab	4.13	1.12	571
	Total	4.02	1.13	1330

Dependent Variable: Job Stress

yes/no empathic	yes or no punitive	yes or no support for rehabilitation	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
non-empathic	punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.39	1.32	452
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.06	1.14	285
		Total	4.26	1.26	737
	non-punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	3.77	1.31	58
		supportive of rehabilitation	3.61	1.17	92
		Total	3.67	1.23	150
	Total	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.32	1.33	510
		supportive of rehabilitation	3.95	1.16	377
		Total	4.16	1.28	887
empathic	punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.15	1.28	50
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.07	1.15	96
		Total	4.10	1.19	146
	non-punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	3.61	1.08	16
		supportive of rehabilitation	3.69	1.14	108
		Total	3.68	1.13	124
	Total	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.02	1.25	66
		supportive of rehabilitation	3.87	1.16	204
		Total	3.90	1.18	270
Total	punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.36	1.32	502
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.06	1.14	381
		Total	4.23	1.25	883
	non-punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	3.73	1.26	74
		supportive of rehabilitation	3.65	1.15	200
		Total	3.67	1.18	274
	Total	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.28	1.33	576
		supportive of rehabilitation	3.92	1.16	581
		Total	4.10	1.26	1157

Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

yes/no empathic	yes or no punitive	yes or no support for rehabilitation	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
non-empathic	punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.03	1.63	452
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.58	1.52	285
		Total	4.24	1.61	737
	non-punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.78	1.40	58
		supportive of rehabilitation	5.06	1.33	95
		Total	4.95	1.36	153
	Total	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.11	1.62	510
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.70	1.49	380
		Total	4.36	1.59	890
empathic	punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.49	1.54	50
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.68	1.39	97
		Total	4.61	1.44	147
	non-punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.69	1.26	16
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.87	1.54	108
		Total	4.85	1.50	124
	Total	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.54	1.47	66
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.78	1.47	205
		Total	4.72	1.47	271
Total	punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.07	1.62	502
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.60	1.49	382
		Total	4.30	1.59	884
	non-punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.76	1.37	74
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.96	1.45	203
		Total	4.90	1.42	277
	Total	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.16	1.61	576
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.72	1.48	585
		Total	4.44	1.57	1161

Dependent Variable: Commitement to CSC

yes/no empathic	yes or no punitive	yes or no support for rehabilitation	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
non-empathic	punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	3.53	1.10	449
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.09	1.04	282
		Total	3.74	1.11	731
	non-punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	3.91	1.07	57
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.43	.96	93
		Total	4.23	1.03	150
	Total	non-supportive of rehabilitation	3.57	1.10	506
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.17	1.03	375
		Total	3.83	1.11	881
empathic	punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.05	1.09	49
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.45	1.02	97
		Total	4.32	1.05	146
	non-punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.54	.87	16
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.59	1.08	107
		Total	4.58	1.06	123
	Total	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.17	1.05	65
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.52	1.05	204
		Total	4.44	1.06	269
Total	punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	3.58	1.11	498
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.18	1.05	379
		Total	3.84	1.12	877
	non-punitive	non-supportive of rehabilitation	4.05	1.05	73
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.52	1.03	200
		Total	4.39	1.05	273
	Total	non-supportive of rehabilitation	3.64	1.11	571
		supportive of rehabilitation	4.30	1.05	579
		Total	3.97	1.13	1150