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[®]

Predictors of Work Stress Among Correctional Officers

by

William A. Millson, B.A. (Hons.)

A thesis submitted to

the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Psychology

**Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
© Copyright
May, 2000**

**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.

0-612-57920-4

Canada

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

"Predictors of Work Stress Among Correctional Officers"

submitted by

Bart Millson

in Partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Chair

Thesis Supervisor

Carleton University
May, 2000

Abstract

The research literature is replete with studies of stress experienced by correctional officers. However, the majority of current knowledge in this area is based on research that has been conducted on relatively small samples drawn from one or a few worksites. Additionally, most studies examine a limited number of independent variables and report more descriptive than correlational or predictive results. The present study examined the influence of 26 independent variables on self-reported work stress among a large sample of correctional officers ($n = 1,358$) employed across 46 institutions. Results showed that perceptions of personal security was the best predictor of stress for the overall sample as well as for subsamples examined by institutional security level. In addition, staff empowerment and career-based variables were identified as additional predictors of job stress. The results are encouraging for correctional decision makers since the factors identified as major contributors to stress are alterable and amenable to change in management practices.

Acknowledgements

It is without question that the person I am most indebted in completion of this thesis is my wife Maureen. Constant explanations to “where’s daddy” and “why can’t daddy come” are challenging, and her constant support, love and commitment was invaluable. I also enjoyed and benefited from her reviews of my drafts and ensuing debates regarding interpretation of the findings.

On a similar level, I wish to acknowledge the enthusiasm and support of my thesis supervisor, Dr. David Robinson. With a wiggle of a pen, I had the opportunity to meet and work closely with Dr. Robinson and benefit greatly from his patience and extensive talents in conducting applied research. His detailed reviews and push for understanding the “bigger picture” helped tremendously in completion of this thesis.

I would also like to express my gratitude for the helpful comments provided by the prospectus committee members, Dr. Adelle Forth and Dr. Mary Gick. Similarly, I appreciate that given current time constraints and demands, Dr. Charles Gordon and Dr. Lise Paquet have agreed to serve as committee members for the thesis defence.

Lastly, I would like to acknowledge the support of my co-workers, Alex Stringer, Sarah Williamson, Frank Porporino, and Liz Fabiano, for their support and encouragement.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Tables	vi
Introduction	1
Measuring workplace stress	2
Models or theories of occupational stress	7
Research literature on correctional officer stress	14
Present Study	44
Hypotheses	47
Methods	
Questionnaire design	49
Procedure	49
Sample selection	50
Measures	
Independent variables	51
Dependent variable	55

Table of Contents cont'd

Results	
Participants	58
Scale psychometrics	60
Criterion validity of the dependent variable	63
Full sample analyses	64
Subsample analyses	76
 Discussion	
Full sample analyses	88
Subsample analyses	94
Theoretical implications	97
Practical Implications	98
Limitations	100
 References	102
 Appendices	111

List of Tables

1:	Cronbach alphas from other studies for dependent and independent scales	57
2:	Descriptive information – all correctional officers	59
3:	Cronbach alphas for dependent and independent scales	61
4:	Means and standard deviations of dependent and independent scales	62
5:	Criterion validity of job stress scale	65
6:	Intercorrelation matrix – all correctional officers	66
7:	Sources of job stress – full sample	69
8:	Sources of job stress – full sample Perceptions of personality security removed	71
9:	Sources of job stress – full sample Perceptions of personality security & staff empowerment removed	72
10:	Analysis of variance – full sample	74
11:	Means and standard deviations of job stress – full sample	75
12:	Descriptive information by security level – subsample analyses	77
13:	Intercorrelation matrix – minimum security subsample	78
14:	Intercorrelation matrix – medium security subsample	80
15:	Intercorrelation matrix – maximum security subsample	82
16:	Sources of job stress – minimum security subsample	85
17:	Sources of job stress – medium security subsample	86
18:	Sources of job stress – maximum security subsample	87

Introduction

The focused study of stress in the workplace is far from a recent development. As early as the 1960's, researchers and practitioners had identified stress as a prominent area of cause for physical and psychological problems in workers across a variety of occupational categories (Kahn et al., 1964; Lazarus, 1966). Much of the earlier literature examined stress levels among persons working in well-established industrial occupations where the experience of stress was, at varying levels, expected to occur (Donovan, 1987; Handy, 1988).

It was not until the late 1970's that more attention was devoted to the human service sector (Handy, 1988). Occupations such as nursing and police work were at the forefront of research efforts to delineate the causes of stress and identify possible remedies. At about the same time, a greater number of studies were focusing on stress experienced by individuals employed in correctional institutions (Brodsky, 1977; McCall, 1979). Specifically, stress-related research began to converge on the largest employee cohort in the correctional work environment: the correctional officer (Cheek & Miller, 1978; Cheek & Miller, 1979; Pogrebin, 1977). As some researchers have noted, this focus of attention helped trigger a new research agenda where ... "the prison guard was now a worthy, if not fashionable, object of study" (Cullen et al., 1985:506).

Over the past two decades, studies on the causes and levels of stress among correctional officers have proliferated (Huckabee, R.G., 1992). Before turning to these results, it is important to first review the broader literature to investigate how workplace stress is measured and examine competing models or theories of occupational stress. In

this way, the literature on workplace stress experienced by correctional officers can be placed in the broader context of occupational stress research.

Measuring Workplace Stress

The literature on occupational stress usually defines stress as an individual experience caused by subjectively perceived stressors (Handy, 1988). McGrath's (1970) definition of job stress as "a perceived substantial imbalance between demand and response capability under conditions where failure to meet demand has important perceived consequences" identifies the individuality of stress by emphasizing the interrelationship between the immediate environment and personal characteristics.

One of the difficulties in describing workplace stress as an individually-based phenomenon is that many working conditions are potentially stressful but not all workers perceive the same conditions as stressful. The individual's perception of stressful conditions and not the objective conditions themselves are normally linked with varying levels of stress. It is assumed, however, that widespread perceptions of stress derive from objectively stressful conditions (Donovan, 1987). As a result, workers will manifest stress in more indirect ways and quantities such as increased job dissatisfaction, reduced work performance, and mental and physical health problems.

A major challenge in the measurement of occupational stress is to employ methods that are appropriate to the workplace setting and, at the same time, yield results that truly represent an individual's experience of stress. In order to understand how these

various phenomena are examined, it is helpful to identify the four methods along which stress is normally measured: biochemical, physiological, behavioural, and self-report.

Biochemical Measure of Stress

Biochemical measures assess stress-related to changes in the body's systems that control various enzymes and hormones (e.g., epinephrine, norepinephrine, and corticosteroids). It is these biochemical factors that have been most often found to be responsible for generating responses to stress and mediating many aspects of physiologic responses to stress (Fleming and Baum, 1987). The two most common methods for the biochemical measurement of stress involve the collection of blood and urine samples across a variety of work situations and times. Enzyme and hormone levels are then compared to determine if fluctuations correspond with certain events that may, or may not, be perceived by an individual as stress provoking.

Physiological Measure of Stress

Similar to the biochemical method of relying on biological responses to stress measurement, physiological measures assess stress through its impact on specific physiological systems or organs (Baum et al., 1982). The cardiovascular system, the respiratory system, muscle retention and skin response all reflect stress related to physiological arousal. Although each of these has been used as an index of stress, heart rate and blood pressure are among the more frequently reported physiological measures

of stress. Consistent with biochemical indices, fluctuations in these physiologic factors are examined as indicators of stress levels.

Limitations of Biochemical and Physiological Measures of Stress

Although the biochemical and physiological methods have generally been found to be valid and reliable measures of stress, limitations have been noted that are common to both (Fleming & Baum, 1987). The equipment required for these measures is expensive and most of the techniques require intrusive and novel procedures, such as placement of electrodes or use of needles, which may in themselves be stressors. Even though this is less problematic for some methods (e.g., urine collection), it is important to note that most of these techniques are not suitable for field use since the equipment is difficult to move, subject to decalibration, and can only be used one subject at a time.

Behavioural Measure of Stress

Given the difficulties in the use of biochemical or physiological measurements of stress, a number of field research studies have relied more on behavioural and self-report measures. Behavioural measures of stress generally examine coping, the effects of stress on skilled performance, and aftereffects of stress (Baum et al., 1981). These measures generally involve direct observation of behaviour, or performance measures on tasks likely to reflect stress-related deficits in motivation or performance. The underlying hypothesis for behavioural measures is that stress can reduce motivation, concentration, and attention to detail with persistence and performance tasks.

Limitations of Behavioural Measures of Stress

One of the shortcomings of behavioural stress measures is that interpreting performance as a measure of stress is difficult since performance is likely to be affected by skill, educational level, practice, and interest (Fleming & Baum, 1987). As well, practice and interest are often independently affected by stress. For use of behavioural measures in human service workplace settings, further complications arise since it may be difficult to identify a set of tasks for observation that accurately represent day-to-day activities. Adaptation of standardized tasks to fit the occupation under study would be necessary.

Self-report Measure of Stress

As a result of the various complications outlined for the biochemical, physiological, and behavioural measurements of stress in the workplace, it is not surprising that the majority of work in this area has been conducted using self-report measures (Brinner, 1997). After all, the easiest and most direct way of determining if people are stressed is to simply ask them. Self-report measures directly involve asking individuals about their attitudes, beliefs, feelings, and behaviours.

Limitations of Self-report Measures of Stress

The advantage of the self-report approach is that interviews and questionnaires are easy and inexpensive to administer, and often have a high degree of face validity. For

particular occupational groups, the questions can be designed to assess factors and situations specific to the work and responses can be interpreted accordingly. Although these are beneficial attributes in the use of self-report stress measures in the workplace, it has been noted that this approach can be subject to deliberate and unconscious sources of error. Responses may be influenced by change in awareness, attitudes towards or against something, and by coping styles which may involve repressing or denying that there is a problem (Brinner, 1997).

Summary of Different Measures of Workplace Stress

Given the various research goals of stress measurement, the choice of particular measures and the method of administration obviously depend on the nature and goals of the specific study. The parameters of the biochemical, physiological, and behavioural methods suggest they are more useful in studies of acute stress or chronic stress (Fleming & Baum, 1987). In determining the general prevalence of stress in a rather stable environment (i.e., typical work day or week, etc.), self-report stress measures may be most useful since reporting can be oriented to a particular time frame (e.g., last week, last month, etc.). In addition to the ease of administration and the fact that many individuals can be tested at once, they can also consider the totality of the specified time period rather than responding to a specific induced stressor or set of stressors (e.g., consider your level of stress over the last 30 days). In this way, the determination of stress will likely be more stable and representative of the workplace under study.

Models or Theories of Occupational Stress

The extent that a theory can be operationalized and tested according to accepted empirical criteria is directly dependent on the ability to collect accurate data on the phenomena under investigation (Eulberg et al., 1988). In terms of occupational stress research, the different methods available to measure stress are important to understand since they are relied on to support or indeed discount hypotheses put forward according to various models or theories of stress (Vagg & Spielberger, 1998). Although there are a number of theories of occupational stress, this section will focus on four representative models: identity theory, transactional model, person-environment (P-E) fit model, and demand-control model.

Identity Theory

According to identity theory, the day-to-day social roles fulfilled by adults (e.g., worker, parent, spouse, etc.) form the basis of an individual's identity or sense of self (Burke, 1991; Thoits, 1991). Since social roles are composed of normative expectations for behaviour, the adequacy that an individual is able to perform in the various social roles has direct implications for self-evaluation. Accordingly, stress that negatively affects a person's ability to fulfill a particular social role will undoubtedly influence their level of well-being (Schlenker, 1987).

With regard to job stress, the implication of identity theory is directly applicable. Job involvement represents a cognitive state of psychological identification with one's present job (Kanungo, 1982). As a result, job involvement is a potentially important

moderator of the relationship between job-related stress and the individual since negative reactions (i.e., stress) to job conditions will only occur in workers for whom the job is a central concern (Locke, 1976).

While identity theory was shown to have some merit (e.g., Frone & Major, 1988), little empirical evidence is available to suggest that it is a useful model for understanding the relationship between work and stress (Frone et al., 1995). This may be partly due to difficulties inherent in measuring job involvement and extending the results to ratings of job stress. Although mixed results are not surprising given the extensive number of intrapersonal and interpersonal factors that can impact on the relationship between one's job and experiences of stress, additional research is required to determine if identity theory can truly assist in explaining the causes of occupational stress.

Transactional Model

The transactional model conceptualizes occupational stress as a process involving a transaction between an individual and his or her work environment (Lazarus, 1991). A transaction means not only that in a particular situation the person influences the environment and vice-versa, but also that person-environment relationships are constantly subject to change. The model distinguishes between stressful antecedent conditions (stressors) and how they are cognitively appraised by a particular person (threat), taking into account the individual's coping resources. Anxiety, anger, or both are evoked when a stressor is perceived as threatening, and these emotional reactions are more intense when the person does not have the resources needed to cope effectively with them.

Lazarus (1991) has argued that the traditional outlook toward work stress, while correctly identifying many antecedent and consequent environmental and personality variables, falls short in considering individual working people and groups who are experiencing stress. Quite simply, psychological stress and its damaging effects should be individually focused. The rationale for this argument is based on the assertion that without knowing what is involved personally for individuals and the particular contexts in which they operate, it would be next to impossible to understand where efforts should be focused to assist them in dealing with stress in the workplace.

While a body of research supports the utility of the transactional model in explaining stress (see Harris, 1991), it has been criticized as less applicable in the study of workplace stress because of its primary focus on the individual, at the expense of the work environment. Brief and George (1991) explain that, from an organizational perspective, it is important to identify stressful working conditions that adversely affect groups of employees, as well as individual workers. Similarly, Harris (1991) observed that the entire climate or culture of an organization may be adversely influenced by specific occupational stressors that profoundly affect many employees, even though this impact may also be markedly influenced by individual differences in personality, coping skills, and the gender of the worker.

The disparity noted by some organizational researchers regarding the transactional model does not negate the utility of the theory in advancing the understanding of how and why individuals respond differentially to stress. Indeed, even some critics who describe limitations of the model in studying occupational stress have

praised the work of Lazarus and others, explaining that the transactional model has had a major impact on the understanding of psychological stress and the focus on the transaction between the person and environment, primary and secondary appraisal, and coping has advanced the field considerably (Brief & George, 1991). What is needed to enhance the transactional model in the study of job stress is a greater recognition of the environment within the model and a broader understanding of how it influences or indeed mediates stress for specific individuals as well as groups of individuals (Barone, 1991).

Person-Environment (P-E) Fit Model

The P-E fit model is one of the most widely cited models of stress. This model postulates that a lack of fit between the person and his or her immediate environment can lead to unmet individual needs or unmet job demands, and thus to experiences of stress (Van Harrison, 1978). Responses to stress would include those activities which reduce misfit in a manner that better allows for individual needs to be adequately met.

Extended to the work setting, stress can result from the interaction of an individual with his or her work environment (Caplan & Harrison, 1993). Occupational stress occurs when job demands that pose a threat to the worker contribute to an incompatible person-environment fit, thereby producing stress. The expected reaction of a worker would be to rely on available internal or external resources to mitigate the source of stress and once again achieve a balanced fit with the environment (French et al., 1982).

Research guided by P-E fit theory has stimulated the construction of numerous measures of organizational and job characteristics, employee skills, job satisfaction, individual differences in attitudes and personality traits, and health status (e.g., Beehr & Newman, 1978; Cooper et al., 1994; Sharit & Salvendy, 1982). P-E fit concepts such as role ambiguity and role conflict have also been investigated in studies of a variety of occupations (Fisher & Gitleson, 1983; Jackson & Shuler, 1985).

While the P-E fit model has contributed extensively to understanding the relationship between the work environment and stress, some researchers have expressed frustration that the theory has not yielded a highly focused approach to the assessment of occupational stress (e.g., Chemers et al., 1985). Additionally, Edwards and Cooper (1990) have stated that P-E fit theory is repeatedly plagued with serious theoretical and methodological problems that include inadequate distinction between different versions of fit, confusion of different functional forms of fit, poor measurement of fit components, and inappropriate analysis of the effects of fit.

Although criticisms surround the P-E fit model, it is important to point-out that they have more to do with methodological limitations and the application of the model rather than the theory itself. More recent research has controlled for such earlier shortcomings and has clearly shown that the model is useful for understanding and conceptualizing stress and the level of fit between a person and the work environment (e.g., Edwards & Rothbard, 1999). Accordingly, future research will likely broaden this understanding relying on the P-E fit theory as long as noted methodological problems are properly addressed.

Demand-Control Model

Initially developed by Karasek (1979), the demand-control model proposes that the joint effects of 'demands' and the 'range of decision-making freedom available to the worker' (i.e., job control) were important in predicting strain or stressful outcomes. A key aspect of the model is the interactive relationship between job demands and job control. More recently, Karasek and Theorell (1990) have asserted that the risk of psychological strain (i.e., stress) increases in a demanding job only when these demands occur in interaction with low job control.

According to the model, the highest levels of stress would be found in high-stress jobs where the demands of the job cannot be moderated by the worker. Lower levels of stress would be found in low-stress jobs where demands are low but control is high. Intermediate levels of stress could be expected in passive jobs (i.e., low demands, low controls) and active jobs (i.e., high demands, high controls) (Dollard & Winefield, 1998).

While level of stress is an important component of the demand-control model, three additional hypotheses are also central to model. One is the iso-stress hypothesis (iso- referring to isolation) which proposes that workers in jobs combining high demands and low control that are also socially isolating would show the highest levels of stress (Karasek, 1979). Second, the active learning hypothesis predicts that increased motivation, learning, and competency will occur when the challenge of the situation (demand) is matched by the individual's level of skill or control in dealing with the challenge (Karasek & Theorell, 1990). Lastly, the dynamic demand-control hypothesis is

used to explain the impact of the work environment over time. For instance, an active job over a significant period of time may lead to feelings of mastery, which in turn inhibit the perception of job stress during periods of high demands, thereby reducing the impact of new stressful situations at work (Theorell & Karasek, 1996). Alternatively, daily residual stress arising from high-stress jobs over time may give rise to stressful outputs (e.g., anxiety, depression, etc.), which in turn may inhibit learning to deal with future stress by leading to withdrawal from new job challenges.

The abundance of research in support of the demand-control model indicates it is a useful theory for understanding the relationship between work setting and individual levels of stress. Although some criticisms have centered on the conceptualization and operationalization of the control construct (e.g., Sauter & Hurrell, 1989), advances have been made in refining the construct. For example, Sauter and Hurrell (1989) recognized the importance of autonomy and control and maintained that control is essential to overcome the stress inevitably associated with demanding work. Accordingly, the model is able to accommodate a wide range of several different job characteristics (i.e., demands) and consider the factors (i.e., controls) that are responsible for stress experienced at work.

Summary of Different Models of Workplace Stress

The prevailing models of occupational stress have been shown to have both merit and limitations, and appear to be complementary and overlapping rather than contradictory frameworks for understanding stress in the workplace. Although more

expansive reviews have noted a number of limitations in current theories of occupational stress (e.g., Cooper & Cartwright, 1994; Cooper et al., 1988), these same authors have explained that the central tenets of most theories are defensible – what is needed is greater consistency of the models to facilitate comparison of stress levels in various occupational groups (Murphy & Hurrell, 1987). Accordingly, a comprehensive model of occupational stress will require taking into account the working conditions that produce job stress, how specific stressor events are perceived and appraised, and the emotional reactions and coping skills of the individual worker.

Research Literature on Correctional Officer Stress

The prevalence of occupational models and the measures constructed to test these models have been applied to a number of different work settings. As described earlier, growing interest in the consequences of job stress for correctional officers has resulted in a growing body of research literature that has examined stress at a number of levels. To provide a framework for discussing the disparate stresses experienced by correctional officers, five general sources will be examined: external organizational factors, internal organizational factors, work environment, demographic factors, and attitudes toward correctional work.

External Organizational Factors

The study of extra-organizational sources of stress for correctional officers is not extensive. Traditional approaches to organizational research have focused almost

exclusively on intra-organizational aspects such as communication, management support, and decision-making (Drory & Shamir, 1988). The existing literature on the causes of work stress outside of the institution or prison has centered mainly on two factors: public's view of correctional officers and level of pay.

Public's view of correctional officers. The common perception of correctional officers in the public mainstream as portrayed in movies, literature, and television is one of stern, brutal disciplinarians who mistreat and abuse prisoners (Jacobs, 1978; Van Fleet, 1992). As a result, many officers feel they are a stigmatized minority and are often embarrassed or hesitant to reveal their occupations to others (Johnson, 1978). This poor public perception has often been cited as a stressor for correctional officers for the job they perform (McCall, 1979).

A more recent study examined the community's respect and appreciation for the job of a correctional officer. Drory and Shamir (1988) administered self-report questionnaires to a total of 266 prison guards from four prison facilities. Among other scales, the questionnaire included measures of community support and respect of the employee's job, job satisfaction and burnout. Results showed that this form of extraorganizational support was the single best correlate of job satisfaction while also contributing uniquely to the prediction of burnout.

Level of pay. Although not a direct inquiry of most studies, many have nevertheless reported that correctional officers cite low pay as a source of stress (Brodsky, 1982; Stohr et al., 1994). In one study, higher levels of stress were shown for correctional officers who take second jobs to help with financial problems (Menard,

1978). Additionally, some evidence suggests that the majority of officers welcome overtime to supplement their low levels of income (Finn, 1998).

Internal Organizational Factors

The largest body of research examining stress among correctional officers has focused primarily on stresses that are internal to an institution or prison. The rationale stems from the observation that it is most often 'organizational factors' or 'management expectations' that are most commonly identified by correctional officers as regular sources of stress (Finn, 1998; Tellier & Robinson, 1995; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1986). Issues frequently reviewed in the research literature include: understaffing, overtime, management support, career progression, communication and decision-making, and role conflict and ambiguity.

Understaffing. Understaffing in a correctional context refers to not having enough officers available to staff authorized posts. In considering some of the reasons for understaffing (e.g., sick leave, unattractive salaries, high turnover, etc.), Finn (1998) observed that understaffing can create different kinds of stress: lack of time to complete required tasks at all or in a conscientious manner (e.g., counts, paper work, searches, etc.), working quickly every day to complete the required work, concern that there are too few officers available if inmate violence occurs, and the inability to schedule time-off for special occasions or family crises. Brodsky (1982) noted that achieving adequate staffing in many correctional facilities is a chronic problem. Even when staffing is sufficient, employee absenteeism can create worker shortages, increasing staff pressures to complete

the required day-to-day duties in the manner expected with a full complement of correctional officers.

Surveys have shown that understaffing is often reported as a major source of stress. Rutter and Fielding (1988) examined the responses of 81 British prison officers who were asked to complete a self-report questionnaire. A central component of the questionnaire involved the ranking of likely sources of stress. Results showed that of the rankings for each of the 52 sources of stress, lack of staff and resources to complete required tasks was rated the most stressful aspect of their occupation.

In a similar study, Lindquist and Whitehead (1986) surveyed 241 Alabama correctional officers to examine burnout, job stress, and job satisfaction. Thirty-nine percent of the officers considered their job to be either very or more than moderately stressful, 29% reported moderate stress, and 32% were in either the slightly or more than slightly stressful category. Although not found to be a significant predictor of stress, a sizable 21% of respondents reported stress caused by work overload – described as being assigned a job with not enough manpower or materials to do the job right.

Overtime. Likely a direct result of understaffing, the constant demand to work overtime has been identified in surveys of correctional officers as an on-going source of stress. Rutter and Fielding (1988) found that officers ranked working overtime and long hours as the fifth greatest source of stress among 52 stress indicators. Kauffman (1988) describes that, separate from actually having to work overtime, just the possibility of being asked (or told) to work overtime when correctional officers are near the end of a shift has been identified as stress provoking. Finn (1998) reported that the need for

extensive and stress-producing overtime lead some officers to routinely avoid answering their phones on days off while others keep a second, unlisted number for family and friends only. In some jurisdictions, Finn (1998) found that officers are allowed to refuse overtime only once a year; the second refusal results in a warning, the third results in a 1-day suspension, and the fourth may result in termination.

Management Support. Although understaffing and overtime may be characterized as components of management support, the concept is meant to be broader based and often centers on the day-to-day interactions of correctional officers and their supervisors as a focused source of stress (Launey & Fielding, 1989; Huckabee, 1992; Slate & Vogel, 1997). As the research literature has shown, the type of interactions can vary tremendously. For instance, in a study conducted by Dollard and colleagues (1993), correctional officers stated that some of their job pressures were caused by superiors giving more credence to what inmates had to say versus line officers. Similar results were reported by Cheek and Miller (1983) where correctional officers ranked 'criticism from supervisors in front of inmates' (ranked #12) and 'having feelings of pressure from having to please too many bosses' (ranked #19) in the top twenty of an extensive list of the most stressful aspects of working in corrections.

In Rutter and Fielding's (1988) study of British prison officers, significant correlations with ratings of stress were found for correctional officers who agreed with such statements as 'not receiving enough praise for their work' as well as 'management's failure to see staff needs'. In order to examine these results in a more consistent manner, the responses were factor analysed into five constructs – one focusing specifically on

relationships with supervisors. However, this construct failed to significantly predict stress levels.

In a sample of 2,000 prison staff drawn from 67 different Swedish prisons, researchers compared physiological stress levels against a number of categories of self-reported working conditions, including management style (Harenstam et al., 1988). Respondents who rated management style as relatively poor reported significantly higher rates of sick leave and symptoms of ill health compared to prison staff who indicated satisfactory management style. The authors concluded that a proactive management style might help to counteract the effects of stress at work.

Grossi, Keil and Vito (1996) used a path model to explain the relationship between supervisor support and work stress, life stress and job satisfaction. A total of 106 correctional officers from three separate institutions completed a self-report questionnaire. Results showed no significant relationship between supervisor support and either measure of stress. However, there was a significant direct negative effect of supervisor support on job dissatisfaction. Correctional officers who perceive that their supervisors support them are less likely to be dissatisfied with their jobs than are those who believe that they are not fully supported by their supervisors.

Lastly, Hughes and Zamble (1993) examined levels of stress and coping among a sample of 118 correctional officers working in three federal penitentiaries. Interviews were conducted with respondents to review the type of stressful situations experienced by correctional officers. Ratings of sources of stress while at work showed that 52% indicated 'management' as stress provoking – the third highest percentage behind

coworkers (58%) and physical work environment (56%). However, when asked to rate the most stressful source, the highest percentage (27%) of correctional officers cited management.

Career Progression. The issue of career progression for correctional officers as a possible source of work stress has received little attention in the research literature. Few studies have considered that career based factors such as promotions or career planning and development could be a significant source of job stress. This is unfortunate since the broader occupational literature has identified career progression as a major factor in the prediction of workplace stress (Greenhaus & Sklarew, 1981).

One of the earliest studies to include a measure of career progression as an indicator of stress among correctional officers was conducted by Long and colleagues (1986). Close to 600 New Zealand prison staff completed a questionnaire that was factor analysed to reveal six job specific sources of stress factors – including promotion. The promotion factor included such items as ‘lack of promotion and opportunity’ and ‘activities needed for promotion’. Correlational analyses showed that the promotion factor was significantly related to general health as measured by the General Health Questionnaire.

A more recent study conducted by Tellier and Robinson (1995) examined, among other variables, career progression and work stress among a large sample of 1,750 correctional officers employed in Canadian federal institutions. Participants completed a self-report questionnaire that included a measure of career progression that measured correctional officer’s satisfaction with the information available to manage their careers.

Results showed that lower satisfaction with career progression was significantly related to higher levels of work stress. Further, a stepwise regression model revealed that, second to perceptions of personal security which accounted for 19% of the variance of job stress, the career progression measure accounted for an additional 7% of unique variance.

Lastly, Robinson, Proporino and Simourd (1996) tapped into career progression and stress in a study on attitudes and work adjustment among different correctional occupational groups. Six occupational groups, including correctional officers, completed a self-administered questionnaire which included two career progression measures – career salience and growth need strength. Career salience assessed the extent to which staff members express interest in career planning and development. Growth need strength measures the relative importance employees assigned to the need to “grow on-the-job”. Results showed that correctional officers reported significantly lower means on the growth need strength measure compared to the other occupational groups. Similarly, the correctional officer group reported one of the highest levels of job stress. The findings demonstrated that although correctional officers appeared to place little emphasis on career growth compared to other occupations, they in turn were one of the highest stressed groups.

Communication and Decision-Making. Both communication and decision-making are core requirements of a correctional officer’s ability to perform his or her job duties in an effective and efficient manner. In some senses, they can be viewed as vital to the role of a correctional officer since the inability to communicate or make decisions

could cause serious repercussions for inmates, prison staff, or both (Lasky et al., 1986; Saylor & Wright, 1992). Accordingly, it is not surprising that a number of studies have identified poor communication or restricted decision-making abilities as major sources of stress for correctional officers.

Lombardo (1981) cited poor communication between corrections officers as well as administrators as significant stressors. He also found a belief that “administrators, supervisors, and, at times, other officers not only fail to assist them but also actually work against them” (p. 135). Additional findings in Lombardo’s study was that correctional officers also complained that departmental policies denied them opportunities for decision-making and for taking increased responsibility.

Cheek and Miller (1983) investigated the experience of stress for 143 mostly male New Jersey correctional officers. Each completed a questionnaire eliciting information regarding perceptions of sources of correctional stress. Survey findings resulted in the identification of 21 distinct most stressful aspects of working in corrections. Ranked second was ‘facility policies not being clearly communicated to all staff members of the facility’ while ‘officers in the department not being quickly informed about policy changes’ was ranked eleventh, ‘not having pretty good sharing of information among the officers on all three shifts’ was ranked sixteenth and ‘lack of opportunity to participate in decision-making’ was ranked twenty-first.

Lasky, Gordon and Srebalus (1986) examined the stress levels of 147 federal correctional officers. Self-administered questionnaires were completed to gather responses on 13 predictor variables. Multiple regression analyses was used to determine

a prediction equation for stress and only two of the 13 variables were significant predictors: lack of participation in decision-making and years of continual employment. The authors suggested that a more supportive environment for decision-making would likely mediate the experience of stress among the correctional officers.

Considering results from Rutter and Fielding's (1988) study, 'poor sharing of information among shifts' and 'lack of opportunity to participate in decision-making' were both significantly related to ratings of overall stress. As was described earlier for supervisor support, the various ratings were factor analysed into five factors – one being staff communication. However, similar to earlier results, the construct was not found to be significantly related to levels of stress.

Patterson (1992) studied job experience and perceived job stress among a cross-section of nearly 4,500 police, correctional, and probation and parole officers. The 59 item self-administered questionnaire designed to measure perceived stress was factor analysed, producing nine meaningful factors. Of particular interest was the emergence of a 'demands of decision-making' construct which included items of 'amount of responsibility', 'use of discretion', and 'making critical, on-the-spot decisions'. However, analyses of this factor by job experience was not found to be significantly related to mean stress scores.

Role conflict and ambiguity. Role conflict and ambiguity are products of the occupational and organizational literature and refer to negative consequences of role problems such as ambiguous or conflicting expectations (Kahn et al., 1964; House, 1981). Accordingly, it is not surprising that studies of correctional officers have also

examined the effects of role stressors (Stalgaitis et al., 1982). Earlier research reported that role problems had a negative impact on job-related affect and attitudes expressed by correctional officers (Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980; Poole & Regoli, 1980). As well, interview data has shown that correctional officers identify ambiguous and conflicting expectations as a source of on-the-job stress (Cheek & Miller, 1983; Lombardo, 1981).

Cullen and colleagues (1985) provided a basis for better understanding the concepts of role conflict and ambiguity in a correctional environment. The researchers explain that while the central goal of an officer's job is well-defined (maintaining order and security), the prescribed means of keeping the peace are not easily transmitted. While correctional officers work in a paramilitary organization marked by explicit lines of authority and a host of formal regulations, their task of managing inmates demands flexibility, the judicious application of discretionary justice, and the ability to secure inmate compliance through informal exchanges which deviate from written rules (Sykes, 1958). In a sense, officers are expected to exercise professional expertise within a bureaucratic setting in which they are not granted the formal authority to be professional (Jurik & Musheno, 1985). Consequently, knowledge of which rules can be bent, and under what circumstances is not always apparent or understood. Ambiguous and conflicting expectations are a likely result and a potential source of stress.

To examine this hypothesis, Cullen, Link, Wolfe and Frank (1985) randomly sampled a total of 155 correctional officers employed in a southern correctional system. Self-administered questionnaires were completed that collected a variety of information on stress (work and life) and possible contributing factors. Among the later, role

problems were examined using a five-item scale measuring the degree to which officers experienced such problems as role conflict and ambiguity. Results showed that ratings on the role problems measure were significantly related to levels of work stress as well as life stress.

Gerstein, Topp and Correll (1987) examined a number of environmental and person-based indicators in the prediction of stress and burnout among correctional personnel. The latter was measured using a cumulated number of total exhaustion scores and number of bad day scores. While role ambiguity was not related to total exhaustion, it accounted for a significant 9% of the variance in the total number of bad day scores. The authors interpreted the results as consistent with the underlying concept of role ambiguity – correctional officers who experienced a greater proportion of bad work days felt that the rules accompanying their jobs were too rigid and limiting in terms of opportunities for creativity.

In a study conducted by Stohr, Lovrich and Wilson (1994), correctional officer stress was measured against four sub-scales tapping into varying kinds of role conflict. The first sub-scale measure assessed the level of conflict between a person's internal standards or values and the defined role behaviour. The second measured the level of conflict between the focal person and defined role behavior. The third and fourth sub-scales assessed the conflicting expectations and organizational demands in the form of incompatible policies and conflicting requests from others. Analyses showed that jails reporting significantly higher levels of work stress were also experiencing significantly greater levels of role conflict as evidenced on all four sub-scales.

Work Environment

It is important to differentiate work environment from organizational factors that can cause stress. While the latter may be considered just another component of work, work environment focuses more on the actual tasks and interactions required to conduct the work expected of a correctional officer (Finn, 1998). A review of the literature has identified four stressful aspects of correctional officer work: dangerousness, inmate interactions, boredom, and problems with coworkers:

Dangerousness. The term 'dangerousness' was offered by researchers in the late '70's to describe the general milieu of working in correctional settings (Brodsky, 1977; Jacobs, 1978). It is often used by correctional officers themselves when surveyed about the causes of stress while at work. For instance, in a survey of over 900 prison guards, danger was the most frequently mentioned disadvantage of prison work (Jacobs, 1978). Shamir and Drory (1982) explain that such findings should not be surprising since officers deal daily with people who have past records of violence. They are often required to perform tasks that necessarily involve the frustration of prisoners' wishes and hence the aggravation of potentially violent people. In addition, in most cases the officers are far outnumbered by offenders.

A central aspect of dangerousness concerns the threat of violence erupting between inmates or between staff and inmates. As Finn (1998) explains, several published surveys of officers have identified the ever-present potential for inmate violence against officers as a significant source of stress. In his study, more officer interviewees identified the threat of inmate violence as a source of stress than any other

single feature of their occupation. Similar results were reported by Cullen and colleagues (1985) who found the threat to be the second highest source of stress among correctional officers. Lombardo (1981) stated that feelings of danger thus may derive less from repeated assaults and more from the realization that officers face the constant and often unpredictable possibility of violence.

Grossi, Keil and Vito (1996) argued that the officer's perception of dangerousness may also be influenced by the nature and extent of inmate contact. For instance, officer's with limited inmate contact may perceive the threat of physical assault by an inmate to be less likely to occur. Likewise, officer's working in institutions where their duties involve extensive daily contact with inmates may perceive themselves to be vulnerable to physical assault. Conversely, those with frequent contact with inmates may perceive themselves to be exposed to less dangerous conditions because they have become more familiar with the inmates and have established a certain level of trust or mutual respect.

To test this hypothesis, the researchers examined the survey responses of 106 correctional officers employed at three institutions in a southern correctional system. Dangerousness was measured by a five-item Likert type scale. Analyses showed that ratings of dangerousness had a significant direct effect on work stress. Correctional officers who perceived their jobs as dangerous were more likely to report higher levels of work stress than others. Dangerousness was also found to have a significant indirect positive effect on role stress. The relationship was mediated by work stress. Perceived dangerousness leads to higher levels of work stress which in turn leads to higher levels of role stress.

Patterson (1992) examined the relationship between experience, job stress, and a number of stress dimensions. Using a factor analytic approach, a seven-item factor of 'Danger' was identified as intrinsic to the job of a correctional officer. Not surprisingly, the items were specific to dangerous situations such as 'dealing with aggressive groups', 'risk of physical attack on the job', and 'threat of injury on the job'. Comparing the stress dimensions to overall ratings of stress, results showed higher stress scores among officers with more years of experience. Interestingly, the danger dimension was also rated significantly higher for more experienced workers. The author concluded that since this was the only scale where a significant difference was found, the results suggest that the more experienced officers receive the more dangerous assignments or that they perceived more danger within the context of the job than did the less experienced officers.

Tellier and Robinson (1996) examined the correlates of job stress among a large sample of front-line correctional officers. Possible danger on the job was measured by a four item perception of personal security scale. Results showed that greater concerns of personal security was significantly correlated with job stress. In addition, regression analyses found that this measure of dangerousness accounted for the greatest variance of job stress.

One aspect of dangerousness that has received scant attention in the research literature concerns the degree to which stress is present in different correctional security settings. It might be assumed that experiences of stress would be greater in higher security institutions as offenders are more likely to be violent and more resistant to follow

rules and regulations as set out by the prison. However, the following two studies reveal differing results. Lasky, Gordon and Srebalus (1986) found no significant differences of self-reported stress across six security levels. Conversely, Cullen and colleagues (1985) reported that correctional officers working in maximum security institutions were more stressed than those employed in less secure settings.

Inmate Interactions. Separate from possibly violent interactions with inmates that would constitute 'dangerousness', officers also report stressors that revolve around daily interactions with the offenders and the environment in which they work (Stalgaitis et al., 1982; Long et al., 1986). Previous studies of the work of correctional officers have invariably emphasized that routine staff-inmate interactions are often reported as stressors. Gerstein and colleagues (1987) and Rutter and Fielding (1988) for instance have argued that contact with inmates is the most important contributor to stress, showing that officers who report themselves as being stressed are more likely to identify inmates as a major source of stress (Rutter & Fielding, 1988) and rate inmates negatively (Gerstein et al., 1987).

A study of 575 New Zealand prison staff (21.8% ranking officers; 59.1% prison officers; 18.9% instructors) was conducted to survey the sources of occupational stress and their effects on levels of health (Long et al., 1986). Factor analysis of the stress questionnaire revealed six job-specific sources of stress factors – including 'relationships with inmates'. Across the three subgroups, mean stress scores were significantly higher for prison officers compared to instructors on the 'relationship with inmates' factor. In

addition, this factor was also the most highly significant correlate of the six job stressors in relation to the combined health measure.

Launey and Fielding (1989) asked 89 prison officers to rate the importance of 25 potential sources of stress in their work. A factor analysis of the sources of stress suggested that stress originated from two main sources – inmates and management. The ‘inmate’ factor included items such as ‘having to deal with the unreasonable demands of some inmates’, ‘the unpredictable behaviour of certain inmates’, and ‘need for skills in interpersonal relationships’. Using a regression equation to predict general health [as measured by the General Health Questionnaire], the ‘inmate’ factor was the only one to predict general health significantly.

In a study of stressful situations of front-line correctional workers in the Canadian federal prison system, dealing with inmates was reported as a source of stress by almost 34% of the sample (Hughes & Zamble, 1993). However, it was rated as the most stressful aspect of the job by only about 10% of the correctional officers. The researchers explained that given the nature of the job, mentions of problems in dealing with inmates were fewer than expected. One reason for the lower percentage of responses may be due to the fact that the information was gathered using an interview format. Accordingly, a certain portion of officers may have intentionally not identified inmate interactions as stressful in order to preserve their ‘macho’ image (see Cheek & Miller, 1983).

Boredom. Given that the central role of correctional officer work is monitoring of inmate actions and behaviours, it is perhaps not surprising that many report boredom as a source of stress while on the job (Kiely & Hodgson, 1990). Grossi, Keil and Vito (1996)

state that part of the reason for boredom being cited as stressful is that, in correctional facilities, interactions with co-workers is generally limited to staff meetings and roll call activities. This minimal interaction is often exacerbated by the independent and solitary nature of the correctional officer role. Additionally, work assignments of correctional officers are typically designed to maximize security while minimize cost. Therefore, officers work alone in most posts throughout the prison.

Although boredom and inactivity are often mentioned as sources of stress while at work, few studies have considered its impact on reported stress levels of correctional officers (Black, 1982; Pollack & Sigler, 1998). However, for those studies where boredom was examined, results suggest it plays a major role in reported work stress. For instance, Rutter and Fielding (1988) reported that ratings of 'periods of inactivity and boredom' were significantly correlated with overall stress levels. Similarly, Hughes and Zamble (1993) found that about 47% of the correctional officer respondents in their study reported boredom as a source of stress. In fact, it was rated the fourth highest out of a possible list of 13 at-work stressors. The percentage dropped to 13% when officers were asked to rate the most stressful aspect of their work.

In a study of prison staff from 17 different penal institutions in New Zealand, the researchers identified a six-factor solution based on questionnaire responses – including one focusing on 'task pressures' (Long et al., 1986). Although not limited to boredom specifically, the factor tapped into it and related issues associated with inactivity on the job. Among the items included in the factor were 'boredom with constant routine of job', 'lack of breaks during shifts', and 'long periods without days off'. Results showed that

mean stress scores were significantly higher for prison officers on the 'task pressures' factor when compared to comparison samples of ranking officers and instructors.

Problems with co-workers. At first consideration, co-workers as a possible source of stress may seem contradictory to the supportive roles expected of fellow correctional officers where elements of danger are central to the job (Cullen et al., 1985). However, a number of studies have reported that many officers experience stress working with other officers. One survey found that 22% of staff viewed 'other staff' as creating more stress than any other single factor except for dealing with hostile, demanding inmates (Martson, 1993). Finn (1998) found that correctional officer interviewees in his study expressed much the same opinion.

Brodsky (1982) was one of the earliest researchers who brought attention to the relationship between correctional officer stress levels and problems with co-workers. In his review of work stress in correctional institutions, problems with co-workers was cited as a core condition precipitating long-term stress for officers. Four areas of co-worker problems were identified: competition for choice slots and assignments; personality clashes; fear they will not be backed up or protected by their co-workers; and belief that they are being excluded.

Cullen and colleagues (1985) examined the relationship between co-workers and reported levels of stress in their study of 155 correctional officers. A self-administered questionnaire gathered information on peer support, including 5 items with alternating valences such as 'my fellow officers often compliment someone who has done his/her job well' and 'my fellow officers often blame each other when things go wrong'. In relation

to three separate measures of stress (work stress, job dissatisfaction, life stress), the peer support measure was significantly related to only the work stress measure. The authors suggested this finding highlights the critical role that co-workers can play regarding the experience of stress while at work.

In their study of New Zealand prison staff, Long, Shouksmith, Voges, and Roache (1986) identified 'staff relationships' as one significant factor of a six-factor solution of a self-administered, job-specific 'sources of stress' questionnaire. Such items as 'poor staff relationships', 'need to keep up a false front', and 'lack of concern for officer after being assaulted' comprised the factor. Analyses showed that mean stress levels for this factor were significantly higher for prison officers when compared to samples of ranking officers and instructors. Additionally, the 'staff relationships' factor was also significantly related to indices of general health as measured by the General Health Questionnaire.

Similar results were reported in a study of 118 correctional officers who were randomly sampled from three federal institutions in Canada (Hughes & Zamble, 1993). From a list of 13 at-work stressors, co-workers were rated most frequently with 58% of respondents citing co-workers as a source of stress. However, when asked to consider the most stressful aspect of work, only 14% of correctional officers in the sample continued to identify co-workers.

One method of examining co-workers as a possible source of stress has been to measure levels of social support while at work. The social support concept refers to overall levels of helpful social interaction available on the job from both co-workers and

supervisors (Karasek & Theorell, 1990). Some have argued that social interactions at work are viewed as major contributors to health and behavioural reactions of workers, possibly because they provide workers with a sense of social integration (e.g., Cohen & Wills, 1985). It is important that some researchers have examined social support in correctional settings since it has been suggested that '...support of co-workers and supervisors may be one of the most important factors ameliorating stress in the working environment' (Karasek & Theorell, 1990; p.135).

Morrison and colleagues (1992) examined social support as one dimension of job design and levels of physical and mental strain among Australian prison officers. A total of 274 officers completed a self-administered questionnaire that collected indicators of social support. Although the researchers expected a positive influence of social support among officers, the data suggested that high levels of social support were associated with lower levels of well-being. One explanation offered for this finding is that even though the working environment offers the opportunity for support, it may not always be accepted immediately. Social support may only be accepted once the effects of exposure to stress cannot be tolerated.

Dollard and Winefield (1995) surveyed 419 officers to examine the role of social support in the relationship between work demand and psychological distress. Support was assessed by the Work Environment Scale which includes two subscales: peer cohesion, the extent to which employees are friendly and supportive of one another; and supervisor support, the extent to which management is supportive and encourages employees to be supportive of each other. Results showed that higher levels of social

support were related to lower levels of work stress. The authors noted this finding was inconsistent with other reports of social support among correctional officers (e.g., Morrison et al., 1992) but is consistent with findings from the majority of occupational stress studies.

Demographic Factors

Age. Studies that have examined the relationship between age and work stress have shown somewhat contradictory results. For example, Lasky, Gordon and Srebalus (1986) found a significant positive relationship between officer age and reported levels of stress – older officers experienced more stress than their younger counterparts.

Conversely, Gerstein, Topp and Correll (1987) reported that age was unrelated to stress levels as measured by total exhaustion scores and number of bad day scores.

Although some studies have found inconclusive results on the relationship between age and stress, a number have shown that older officers appear to adapt to the correctional environment and therefore report lower levels of stress compared to younger workers. In a study of 241 Alabama correctional officers, Lindquist and Whitehead (1986) found that age was inversely related to levels of stress - older officers reported significantly lower levels of job stress compared to younger officers. Similarly, analyses conducted by Blau, Light and Chamlin (1986) revealed that older correctional officers report less stress than younger ones. As well, Whitehead and Lindquist (1986) found that older workers reported lower stress scores.

Gender. Cullen, Link, Wolfe and Frank (1985) included gender in their examination of stressors among 155 correctional officers. Results showed that female officers reported significantly higher levels of work stress in comparison to their male counterparts. In a multivariate prediction analysis conducted on the same set of data, Van Voorhis and colleagues (1991) confirmed the impact of gender on stress showing that women were more likely to experience work stress.

Only two studies were identified that focused specifically on gender differences in occupational stress among correctional officers. Gross, Larson, Urban and Zupan (1994) analysed the impact of gender using a stratified random sample of 1,000 correctional officers drawn from 40 institutions and correctional camps. Relying on objective (e.g., blood pressure) and subjective (e.g., questionnaire) measures of stress, results showed that female and male officers experienced similar levels of stress. The authors argue that the findings should not be surprising, especially given the progressive working conditions in most prisons today.

A second study examined gender differences in mediation of severe occupational stress among correctional officers (Hurst & Hurst, 1997). A total of 244 officers (167 men and 77 women) were surveyed to assess coping processes used to deal with stressful events at work as well as assess severe occupational stress. Results revealed that, although male and female officers cope with stress in different ways, no differences were found in how they are affected by occupational stress in terms of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and personal accomplishment.

Education. Researchers have pointed-out that any relationship between educational attainment and reported levels of stress among correctional officers should be interpreted cautiously (e.g., Grossi et al., 1996; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). The need for caution stems from findings that the more educated officer is more likely to experience job dissatisfaction (Cullen et al., 1985), perhaps as a result of a lack of social integration and of frustrated career expectations and working conditions. Accordingly, it may be these factors that are moderating the experience of stress more so than educational achievement.

Interestingly, a number of studies have found no relationship between education and work stress. For instance, Blau, Light and Chamlin (1986) reported that correctional officers with little or much education did not differ in terms of rated stress levels. Similarly, Lasky, Gordon and Srebalus (1986) found that completed educational level was unrelated to reported levels of stress. As well, analyses conducted by Lindquist and Whitehead (1986) showed that education did not significantly predict job stress.

Conversely, some studies have shown a significant relationship between education and stress. A study conducted by Grossi and Berg (1990) showed that officers with more education tend to be more satisfied and less stressed by their work. Significant findings in the opposite direction were reported by Robinson and colleagues – correctional officers who obtained post-secondary education were more stressed than university graduates and officers who had completed high school or less (Robinson et al., 1997).

Correctional Experience. Philliber (1987) has noted that age and experience as measured by time on the job are often confounded in most of the existing research on correctional officer stress. In the measurement of stress, this confound is critical as years on the job can be viewed as indicative of the impact of organizational and work-related conditions whereas age cannot be considered in the same manner. This may account for the contradictory findings associated with years of experience and reported levels of stress among correctional officers.

Lasky, Gordon and Srebalus (1986) found that years of continual employment in a correctional setting were significantly related to higher levels of stress. Moreover, regression analyses identified this factor as a significant contributor to the prediction equation. Cullen and colleagues (1985) reported similar results where correctional experience was significantly related to work stress but not to job dissatisfaction or a general measure of life stress.

Conversely, other research has shown no relationship between experience and job stress. For instance, Dignam, Barrera and West (1986) studied length of employment in relation to job stress indices and found no significant relationship. As well, Gerstein, Topp and Correll (1987) found that time in present job was unrelated to two indicators of job stress: total exhaustion scores and number of bad day scores. Grossi, Keil and Vito (1996) reported that experience had a significant positive effect on role stress – the longer an officer had served, the more likely the occurrence of role stress. However, no relationship was reported between experience and the measure of work stress.

Only one study was identified that focused specifically on job experience and perceived job stress among correctional officers (Patterson, 1992). In this study, a cross-section of nearly 4,500 police, correctional, and probation and parole officers completed a 59-item self-administered questionnaire. A significant relationship between years of experience and stress was found for police officers but no consistent patterns were reported for correctional or probation and parole officers. At best, a non-significant curvilinear relationship was identified. The author interpreted the data to indicate that as job experience increases beyond the middle years of one's career, so does the ability to cope with stress. It was also posited that officers experiencing the greatest stress left the job early in their career, resulting in a less stressed senior group of officers.

Attitudes toward Correctional Work

Correctional Orientation. The study of correctional orientation emanates from a shift in the role of the correctional officer from one of mainly security to a more enhanced role supporting rehabilitative ideals (Cullen et al., 1985). There is extensive research showing that the correctional orientation of officers includes not only advocacy of punishment but also healthy support of rehabilitation as the purpose of imprisonment (Cullen & Gilbert, 1982; Robinson et al., 1993). This attitudinal diversity raises the question of how officers' correctional orientation influences stress.

Poole and Regoli (1980) found that stress increased as orientation toward custody increased among officers working in a maximum security setting. The authors suggested that as stress increases, officers attempt to reduce stress by embracing a custodial

orientation. Similar results were reported by Rutter and Fielding (1988) where indicators of a more custodial orientation (e.g., resentment of inmates' advantages, lenient inmate adjudications undermining morale, etc.) were significantly related to higher levels of overall stress. As well, Robinson, Porporino and Simourd (1996) reported that correctional officers were more custody oriented, less likely to endorse rehabilitation, and more stressed than other occupational groups.

Conversely, other studies have shown no relationship between correctional orientation and work stress. Analyses conducted by Cullen, Link, Wolfe and Frank (1985) showed that orientation was unrelated to work stress but significantly related to job dissatisfaction – officers who were more punitive in their views were more likely to be dissatisfied with their jobs. Similarly, Whitehead, Linquist and Klofas (1987) studied correctional officer professional orientation using the Klofas-Toch measure which includes four factors – counseling roles, concern with corruption of authority, social distance, and punitive orientation. High ratings on the counseling roles and social distance factors suggest support for rehabilitative ideals while high ratings on concerns with corruption of authority and punitive orientation indicate a more custodial orientation. None of the four factors showed a significant relationship with measures of job stress.

Poole and Pogrebin (1988) explored the correctional orientations and stress experiences of deputy sheriffs during their career as jail guards. The researchers examined not only restraint- or reform-oriented perceptions but also rehabilitative- or reintegrative-orientations as well. The percentage committed to a more custodial

orientation is greater during the later career phases, while the proportion supporting a rehabilitation orientation is greater during the earlier career phases. In relation to stress, higher levels were evidenced for security-oriented officers during their middle career phase while those oriented toward rehabilitation showed higher levels of stress during the later phases of their careers.

More focused studies of correctional orientation and job stress have shown more positive results. Saylor and Wright (1992) included a dimension of personal efficacy in their survey of over 3,330 prison staff. The central tenet of the dimension, ease which individuals experience in working with inmates, was found to be inversely correlated with job-related stress. Lastly, Lariviere and Robinson (1996) showed that empathic correctional officers reported lower levels of job stress as did those who had high support for rehabilitation. Consistent with earlier findings, it was also shown that correctional officers high in punitiveness reported greater levels of job stress.

Job Satisfaction. Intuitively, it is expected that officer's who were satisfied with their jobs would experience less stressors while at work. Empirical evidence has shown to support this position. For instance, Blau, Light and Chamlin (1986) found that levels of stress had a relatively strong negative influence on reported job satisfaction. Similarly, analyses conducted by Whitehead and Lindquist (1986) showed that lack of job satisfaction was significantly correlated with greater work stress. Saylor and Wright (1992) found that higher ratings of job satisfaction were significantly, inversely correlated with job-related stress. Lastly, Robinson and colleagues (1996) found that

front-line correctional officers were the least satisfied with their job and also reported the highest levels of stress.

Summary of Research Literature on Correctional Officer Stress

The most important finding of this review of research literature is that correctional officers report considerable stress on the job. A number of studies have demonstrated that stress is pervasive and emanates from organizational, work, and personal factors that have been shown to be significantly correlated with correctional officer stress. Despite this progress in the literature, there remain a number of shortcomings.

One of the issues concerns the relatively small sample sizes of correctional officers that studies have used to guide our understanding of workplace stress. Although not all studies can be expected to yield sizable samples for analyses, it is nevertheless unfortunate that most research has been conducted on samples of 100 to 200 officers. For instance, in Cullen's and colleagues (1985) often cited study, a multivariate regression analysis was conducted using twelve independent variables and three dependent variables on a sample totaling only 155 correctional officers. Given that in the United States alone there are over 280,000 correctional officers (ACA, 1997) working custodial and security functions in state prisons, jail and detention facilities, and federal institutions, there is a clear need to increase sampling targets to achieve generalizability of results and extend the level of analyses.

A second observation, perhaps resulting from the use of small sample sizes, is that a number of studies examine independent variables that often produce null findings. For

example, in Rutter and Fielding's (1988) study, only one of a five-factor solution was significantly related to overall stress levels. Similarly, Grossi, Keil, and Vito (1996) examined five exogenous variables in a path model and found that only two had a significant effect on work stress. The sample size of correctional officers for each of these studies was 81 and 106 respectively. Given that both studies included independent variables that did not significantly contribute to reports of stress levels but had been shown in other studies to be significantly related to stress (e.g., relationship with supervisors, communication, experience, etc.), it is expected that additional significant findings would have been detected if the sample sizes were larger.

Another area of concern is the limited range of independent variables used to examine the causes or correlates of correctional officer stress in individual studies. The majority of studies to date have focused on a particular area (e.g., management, inmates, etc.) and have only used measures designed to tap into these constructs. Other than controlling for basic demographic variables such as age or gender, few studies have been broad enough to examine, or at least control for, additional factors that may enhance or indeed eliminate observed relationships. Relying on a narrow focus may result in findings that either support or discount a relationship when in fact the findings may actually be a result of unmeasured variables that were correlated with the independent variables under study.

A fourth issue observed is the lack of studies that attempted to examine interaction effects or conducted hierarchical analyses of independent variables on correctional officer stress. Likely due to limitations imposed by smaller sample sizes, it

was nevertheless unfortunate to find few studies that had moved beyond main effects to examine the corresponding relationship between independent variables and their impact on work stress. As noted by Brinner (1997), these more detailed analyses are necessary to further understand the factors, either on their own or in combination, that contribute to experiences of stress. Workplace impacts on stress are undoubtedly complex and will be best understood when researchers use more complex analytic methods to untangle the factors.

A final observation concerns the presence of inconsistent findings. As the research literature expanded, a number of studies employed similar independent variables that often produced contradictory results. For example, management support is a common construct used in the study of correctional officer stress. However, most studies do not rely on standardized methods for defining or measuring management support. In this review of literature, three studies demonstrated that management support was significantly related to stress while three other studies reported non-significant results. Similar inconsistencies were also found with the demographic and attitudinal variables. Accordingly, such findings illustrate that similar constructs should be used across studies of correctional officers, augmented only by new or additional factors that have been empirically demonstrated as broadening the understanding of correctional officer stress.

Present Study

Although a number of the observations outlined above can be considered limitations, it is important to recognize that the accumulation of results have contributed

significantly toward understanding the correlates of correctional officer stress. Equally important, the findings have identified specific avenues of research to pursue.

The present study will build on the existing research literature by expanding the range of variables that are used to predict work stress among correctional officers. As described earlier, most studies to date have examined a limited number of independent variables. In addition to demographic and work environment variables, this study will include an array of external organizational factors, internal organizational factors, and attitudinal variables. In total, 26 independent variables that have been identified in the research literature as possible predictors of correctional officer stress will be included in this study.

The current study will also not be limited by sample size as the survey data is based on a representative sample of close to 1,400 correctional officers employed across 46 worksites including minimum, medium, and maximum security institutions. Accordingly, the large sample will allow for multivariate analyses and more detailed analyses such as testing for interaction effects among independent variables.

The number of institutions classified at different security levels will overcome the limitations often noted in studies that have used correctional officer samples from only one or a few institutional sites. As the literature review identified, the experience of stress can vary depending on the work environment. For this study, the analyses can tap into the diverse working environments to examine stress levels.

Another contribution of the present study is the addition of career orientation variables in the study of workplace stress among correctional officers. Although a

number of studies have reported significant correlations with more obvious or intuitive indicators of stress (e.g., dangerousness, inmate interactions, etc.), more recent research using a broader set of independent variables has suggested career based indicators may further the understanding of work stress. For instance, using stepwise regression analyses, in an earlier Canadian sample similar to the current study, Tellier and Robinson (1995) found that perceptions of personal security accounted for the largest amount of variance (19%) in predicting job stress. However, career progression as rated by the level of satisfaction with the information available to manage their careers, accounted for an additional 7% of unique variance. In view of these results, the current study includes the career progression measure along with four additional measures to examine the impact of career-related indices on job stress (e.g., performance appraisal, support for personal development on the job, satisfaction with employment competition process, and employment security).

A final area that has remained largely unexplored is the influence of perceived dangerousness as a stressor for correctional officers. Although a number of studies have shown that danger, or the perception of, is a significant predictor of reported stress levels, little is known about the factors that may or may not be related to dangerousness. This relationship will be explored in the present study by examining the influence of the independent variables within different security level classifications.

The rationale for these analyses is based on findings that explain higher security institutions house more dangerous and violent offenders, thereby increasing the perceptions of dangerousness among correctional officers compared to less secure

institutions (see Cullen et al., 1985; Lasky et al., 1986). Empirical evidence supports these perceptions as shown in a survey of federal inmates housed in Correctional Service of Canada institutions (Robinson & Mirabelli, 1996). Results showed that inmate respondents in maximum security institutions reported the highest percentage of inmate-to-inmate assaults (27%), compared to 20% of those in mediums and only 10% housed in minimums. Further, only about 7% of inmates in minimums believed that staff were likely to be assaulted in their institution, compared to 13% in mediums and 19% in maximum security settings. Studies in American prison settings have shown that a greater number of assaults on staff occurred in maximum security institutions compared to lower security levels (Light, 1991; McCorkle et al., 1995). Since it is likely that perceived dangerousness will vary by security level, the proposed analyses may reveal different sets of factors that contribute to the prediction of correctional officer stress across security levels.

Hypotheses

It is hypothesized that many of the relationships with work stress already established in the research literature will be identified in the present study. Namely, it is expected that the measures of internal organizational factors, work environment, and attitudes toward correctional work will be significantly correlated with the job stress measure. Due to the inconsistent findings on the external organizational factors as well as the demographic factors, no hypotheses can be offered for these independent variables.

From the overall regression analyses, it is hypothesized that measures of dangerousness will account for the highest percentage of variance. It is also expected that the career-based measures will add unique variance in the prediction of job stress. Although the measure of career progression is hypothesized to account for additional variance, no hypotheses can be proposed on the other career measures due to the absence of research in this area.

For the separate regression analyses, it is hypothesized that the set of predictors for job stress will be different for each level of institutional security. This hypothesis is based on earlier research which has shown that perceptions of dangerousness increase, and are significantly related to stress, in maximum security institutions compared to those of lower security levels. Accordingly, it is expected that dangerousness will account for the largest percentage of job stress variance in maximum security institutions. In minimum security sites, it is hypothesized that dangerousness will have less influence, although the identification of independent variables that will supercede dangerousness cannot be offered as a result of the limited available research. Finally, it is hypothesized that dangerousness will influence work stress in medium security institutions. However, no hypotheses can be provided on whether it will account for the most variance, since little is known about these institutions that represent the “midway point” between minimum and maximum security sites.

Methods

In 1996, the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) conducted a survey on a representative sample of its employees (Robinson et al., 1997). The survey was a follow-up to an earlier one conducted in 1994 on all CSC employees (Robinson & Stevenson, 1995). The intent of both surveys was to collect information on a wide range of issues affecting both staff and the organization as a whole.

Questionnaire Design

A self-administered questionnaire was designed by a working group consisting of subject area experts from CSC's national headquarters, a national survey team from CSC's research branch, and representatives from the two major unions representing CSC employees, the Union of Solicitor General Employees (USGE) and the Professional Institute of the Public Service of Canada (PIPSC). At the final stages of drafting the questionnaire, the working group was joined by representatives from each region who coordinated regional input on the questionnaire.

The majority of questions employed in 1994 were repeated in 1996. The questionnaire contained a total of 18 sections and included 43 composite scales. It was designed to be completed in about 30 minutes.

Procedure

Prior to questionnaire administration, worksite coordinators posted flyers explaining the upcoming dates and times the survey would be taking place. The flyers

also explained that questionnaire completion was voluntary, the surveys would be completely confidential and anonymous, and that only Coopers and Lybrand, the firm contracted by CSC to conduct the survey, would see the individual questionnaires. It was hoped the notices would serve to motivate staff to participate in the survey if they were identified as respondents.

On the day of distribution at each worksite, survey coordinators made questionnaires available to each staff member who had been randomly selected. All worksite managers were instructed to give staff the necessary time required to complete the questionnaire during working hours.

Most sites chose to administer the questionnaire in groups that were scheduled in advance. After completing the survey, respondents sealed their questionnaires in envelopes marked confidential that were provided by the consulting firm. Participants had the option of returning the questionnaire to the site coordinator to be mailed in batches, or mail the questionnaire directly to Coopers and Lybrand in the self-addressed stamped envelopes.

Sample Selection

The random selection procedure was administered entirely by Coopers and Lybrand Consulting. Respondents were randomly selected from a list of employees provided by CSC. The sample was designed so that a minimum number of respondents would be selected to optimize confidence placed in the results for each worksite. The occupational groups within each worksite were also considered to ensure

representativeness at the site level. The sample size for each worksite was calculated to provide a minimum confidence interval of plus/minus 5 percentage points, 95 times out of 100 (i.e., 95% confidence interval). The sample design led to lower sampling proportions by occupational groups for the larger worksites and oversampling of smaller worksites in order to increase the statistical confidence in the survey results.

Measures

Independent Variables

Consistent with the review of literature, specific measures were selected according to the five major categories: external organizational factors, internal organizational factors, work environment, demographic factors, and attitudes toward correctional work. Participants rated the items in each measure according to a seven-point likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

External Organizational Factors

Public Image of CSC. This measure is comprised of three items and examines how CSC is viewed by the general public (i.e., positive or negative).

Greater Accountability to the Public. This scale consists of five items and taps into the level and quality of accountability that CSC provides to the public.

Internal Organizational Factors

Employment Competition Process. This scale contains four items that examine satisfaction with the employment competition process. Items include questions on available information, assessment, and the selection process.

Organizational Communication. This four item scale assesses employee satisfaction with internal communication procedures.

Staff Empowerment. The staff empowerment scale is adapted from items used by the Federal Bureau of Prisons (FBP) Social Climate Survey. This four item scale investigates the employee's sense of empowerment based on their view of themselves as change agents in the organization. They were further asked to report if they were given sufficient authority to accomplish their work objectives.

Quality of Supervision. This scale was also adapted from items used in the FBP Social Climate Survey. This six item scale measures satisfaction with the quality of supervision provided by supervisors.

Fair Treatment of Employees. This scale consists of three items and examines how fairly CSC treats employees regarding opportunities and discipline.

Satisfaction with Physical Environment. In this four item scale, respondents were asked if the workplace environment was satisfactory with respect to: air quality, heating, lighting, and ergonomic factors.

Performance Appraisal. This three item scale addresses the issue of the fairness of performance standards and whether the respondent felt that his/her performance appraisal was a true depiction of performance. They were further asked to assess if enough feedback on their performance was provided to assist their career management.

Career Management. The three items of the career management scale measures respondent satisfaction with the available information to manage their careers.

Specifically, they were asked to assess whether their professional development plan satisfied their developmental and training needs, and whether their supervisor played an active role in their career planning.

Support for Personal Development on the Job. This two item scale examines staff development within CSC and the extent it is promoted by management. It also asks if CSC provides a work environment that facilitates learning.

Satisfaction with Employment Competition Process. This measure consists of four items and taps into the extent that employees are satisfied with the competition process for job opportunities. Participants respond to items that examine supervisor input into the selection process, the assessment process used in the competitive process, and the tools used for competition.

Employment Security. The three items included in this scale measure the extent that respondents feel secure in their positions with CSC. Items assess fears about employment security and the level of effort CSC is providing to maintain employment security of all staff.

Work Environment

Perception of Personal Security. In this four-question scale, respondents are asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the measures, policies and procedures put in

place by CSC to minimize the risk of being injured by offenders and if the threat that offenders posed to their personal safety was a source of stress.

Understanding of Work Procedures. This five item scale measures respondents understanding and knowledge of their post orders. It further asks if they feel they are properly trained and whether adequate information is available in the application of the post orders.

Security Level. This one item represents the security level of the institution in which the respondent is working – minimum, medium, or maximum.

Shiftwork. The shiftwork scale consists of three items that ask respondents to rate the impact that shiftwork has on relations with family, friends, and other non-working activities. The response categories are based on a four point scale from very negatively to positively.

Demographic Factors

Single items were included in the questionnaire to solicit information about age, gender, education, and years of experience.

Attitudes toward Correctional Work

Commitment to CSC. This scale is adapted from Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulian's (1974) fifteen item Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. Five items were selected from the questionnaire to assess CSC employees loyalty to the

organization, level of pride in working for CSC, and the degree to which they shared similar values with those of the organization.

Support for CSC Objectives. This is a two item scale which asked respondents to indicate their level of support for the CSC Mission document and the corporate objectives.

Rehabilitation. This scale consists of three items from the nine item Rehabilitation scale developed by Cullen, Lutze, Link and Wolfe (1989) to measure the degree of endorsement of rehabilitation in CSC.

Empathy toward Offenders. This seven item scale was adapted from the Whitehead and Lindquist (1989) Concern with Corruption of Authority scale, which was derived from Klofas and Toch's (1982) items. This measure evaluates staff perceptions of their counseling roles, authority and social distance vis-a-vis the offenders.

Punitiveness. The four items in this scale are based on the Punitive Orientation scale that was also used by Whitehead and Lindquist (1989) in reference to the work of Klofas and Toch's (1982) items. This scale examines the endorsement of punitiveness of prison conditions, versus whether offenders should be viewed as victims of society.

Dependent Variable

Job Stress. The job stress measure was adapted from the Cullen, Link, Wolfe and Frank (1985) Work Stress scale. It consists of seven items that examine various indicators of stress while at work (e.g., "When I'm at work, I often feel tense and uptight"). Consistent with the majority of independent variables, participants responded

to items on this measure according to a seven-point likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Table 1 present the cronbach alphas of some of the dependent and independent variables obtained in other studies of correctional officers. Results show high levels of internal consistency across studies for the job stress measure as well as for empathy and punitiveness. Based on two previous studies of earlier surveys of CSC correctional officers, the alphas reported by Tellier and Robinson (1995) and Robinson, Porporino, and Simourd (1997) display acceptable levels of internal consistency.

The relatively high alphas across various studies reported for job stress suggests that the scale means roughly the same to different groups of correctional officers in different settings and countries. This lends added confidence that the job stress scale is reliable. Regarding validity, Cullen and colleagues (1985) indicated that their work stress measure correlated .456 with job dissatisfaction and .628 with a measure of life stress. Accordingly, these results provide evidence of validity for the job stress scale.

Table 1
Cronbach alphas from other studies for dependent and independent scales

Scales	Study			
	Klofas & Toch, (1982).	Cullen et al., (1989).	Tellier & Robinson, (1995).	Robinson et al., (1997).
Job Stress		.74	.87	.83
External Organizational Factors				
Greater Accountability to the Public				
Public Image				
Internal Organizational Factors				
Employment Competition Process				
Organizational Communication			.72	
Staff Empowerment			.72	
Quality of Supervision			.87	
Staff Recognition				
Fair Treatment of Employees				
Performance Appraisal			.83	
Career Management			.75	
Policy Orientation				
Support for Personal Development on the Job				
Satisfaction with Physical Environment			.83	
Employment Security				
Work Environment				
Perceptions of Personal Security			.78	
Understanding of Work Procedures				
Impact of Shiftwork				
Attitudes toward Correctional Work				
Commitment to CSC			.72	
Support for CSC Objectives			.70	
Rehabilitation			.74	
Empathy toward Offenders	.75		.82	.68
Punitiveness	.72		.72	.79

Results

Participants

The present study is based on archival data that was collected through a 1996 survey of Correctional Service of Canada staff. In total, 7,157 staff were randomly selected to participate in the staff survey, and 4,961 of this number completed a questionnaire. This represents a response rate of 69%. Of these numbers, 2,815 correctional officers were randomly selected and 1,358 completed questionnaires were received from this occupational group. Accordingly, the response rate for correctional officers was 49%. The response rate is slightly higher than that reported for other large, national surveys of correctional officers. For instance, Saylor and Wright reported a response rate of 41% for correctional officers employed in 46 institutions across the Federal Bureau of Prisons (Saylor & Wright, 1992). In another large study that sampled correctional officers from six adult and four juvenile institutions, the response rate was 46.9% (Hepburn & Knepper, 1993). The response rate for the present study is, therefore, quite satisfactory.

Table 2 shows that the average age of correctional officers at the time of the survey was 40.18 years ($SD=8.92$). The percentage of females in the sample was 20.9%. Slightly more than 6% (6.10%) of correctional officers had some high school or less, 33.10% were high school graduates, 14.80% had some college, 19.80% had a college diploma, 10.90% had some university, 14.50% were university graduates, and the remaining 0.90% had a post graduate degree.

The average length of time correctional officers had been working for CSC was 12.54 years ($SD=7.65$). The length of time working at their present institution was 8.47 years ($SD=6.53$).

Table 2

Descriptive information – all correctional officers

Descriptor	<u>n</u>	Mean / %	<u>SD</u>
Age	1,333	40.18	8.92
Gender	1,350		
Male		79.10	
Female		20.90	
Education	1,342		
Less than high school		1.30	
Some high school		4.80	
High school graduate		33.10	
Some college		14.80	
College graduate		19.80	
Some university		10.90	
University graduate		14.50	
Post graduate degree		0.90	
Years working for CSC	1,346	12.54	7.65
Years working at present institution	1,345	8.47	6.53
Security Level (of present institution)	1,358		
Minimum		11.30	
Medium		52.80	
Maximum		35.90	

The smallest percentage of correctional officers (11.30%) was employed in minimum security institutions, 52.80% in medium security institutions, and 35.90% of the correctional officers worked in maximum security institutions.

Scale Psychometrics

Table 3 shows the internal consistency of the dependent and each independent scale as measured by Cronbach's Alpha. The dependent variable, job stress, had an alpha of 0.86 suggesting a high degree of internal consistency. The majority of independent variables had alpha levels above 0.70 while only two scales were below 0.66. Both external organizational scales had noticeably lower alpha levels of 0.49 and 0.34, indicating that some caution should be exercised in interpreting the results of these variables.

Means for each scale are presented in Table 4. The mean of 4.11 for the job stress scale indicates that the majority of correctional officers responded in the neutral range for items that considered various forms of stress while at work. In other words, about the same number of respondents rated the items in the 'disagree' range as those who did in the 'agree' range. Such results are important for the proposed analyses since the variance is more evenly distributed across the scale.

The highest means for the independent scales were reported for policy orientation, punitiveness, and greater accountability to the public. These response patterns show that correctional officers' felt that a high level of importance was placed on policy, rules and regulations by management, held a punitive view toward inmates, and thought that CSC should be more accountable to the public. With the exception of the impact of shiftwork measure, which is based on a four-item response scale, the lowest means were found for

Table 3

Cronbach alphas for dependent and independent scales

Scales	<u>n</u>	no. of items	alpha
Job Stress	1,327	7	.86
External Organizational Factors			
Greater Accountability to the Public	1,318	5	.49
Public Image	1,309	3	.34
Internal Organizational Factors			
Employment Competition Process	1,301	4	.81
Organizational Communication	1,330	4	.67
Staff Empowerment	1,330	4	.70
Quality of Supervision	1,323	6	.84
Staff Recognition	1,330	3	.66
Fair Treatment of Employees	1,289	7	.89
Performance Appraisal	1,280	3	.84
Career Management	1,230	3	.78
Policy Orientation	1,314	5	.74
Support for Personal Development on the Job	1,325	2	.75
Satisfaction with Physical Environment	1,325	4	.79
Employment Security	1,328	3	.68
Work Environment			
Perceptions of Personal Security	1,316	4	.72
Understanding of Work Procedures	1,268	5	.71
Impact of Shiftwork	1,216	3	.85
Attitudes toward Correctional Work			
Commitment to CSC	1,320	5	.68
Support for CSC Objectives	1,333	2	.73
Rehabilitation	1,331	3	.66
Empathy toward Offenders	1,304	7	.78
Punitiveness	1,329	4	.68

Table 4
Means and standard deviations of dependent and independent scales

Scales	<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
Job Stress	1,327	4.11	1.25
External Organizational Factors			
Greater Accountability to the Public	1,318	4.94	0.84
Public Image	1,309	4.76	1.07
Internal Organizational Factors			
Employment Competition Process	1,301	3.00	1.20
Organizational Communication	1,330	3.39	1.21
Staff Empowerment	1,330	3.32	1.23
Quality of Supervision	1,323	3.88	1.32
Staff Recognition	1,330	3.43	1.36
Fair Treatment of Employees	1,289	4.09	1.49
Performance Appraisal	1,280	4.03	1.51
Career Management	1,230	3.88	1.44
Policy Orientation	1,314	5.26	0.98
Support for Personal Development on the Job	1,325	3.40	1.47
Satisfaction with Physical Environment	1,325	3.79	1.51
Employment Security	1,328	3.89	1.42
Work Environment			
Perceptions of Personal Security	1,316	3.29	1.27
Understanding of Work Procedures	1,268	2.89	0.51
Impact of Shiftwork	1,216	1.99	0.71
Attitudes toward Correctional Work			
Commitment to CSC	1,320	4.01	1.13
Support for CSC Objectives	1,333	4.17	1.54
Rehabilitation	1,331	4.19	1.37
Empathy toward Offenders	1,304	3.34	1.08
Punitiveness	1,329	4.97	1.31

the employment competition process, perceptions of personal security, and staff empowerment scales. Lower means indicate less satisfaction with these dimensions.

Criterion Validity of the Dependent Variable

In order to examine how likely the job stress scale was tapping into indices of stress, correlational analyses were conducted with ratings of job satisfaction as well as a number of lifestyle and health indicators. Table 5 shows the results. Correctional officers who reported high levels of job stress rated satisfaction with their job as low. This is consistent with other research that has shown a strong relationship between high levels of workplace stress and job dissatisfaction (e.g., Robinson et al., 1996; Saylor & Wright, 1992).

The lifestyle and health indicators were included as criterion variables since research has shown that difficulties in these areas are consistent with higher ratings of stress (Kiely & Hodgson, 1990). Due to the number of lifestyle and health variables, a Bonferroni correction was applied, reducing the significance level to .006. Results showed relatively weak correlations with rate of painkiller and antacid use, suggesting more frequent use is associated with greater experiences of stress. Although the findings suggest that these non-job factors are not closely related to on-the-job stress, the strong relationship with job dissatisfaction nevertheless indicates that the job stress scale exhibits satisfactory criterion-related validity.

Full Sample Analyses

Table 6 displays the Pearson product moment correlation matrix that was used for the regression analysis conducted on the full sample of correctional officers. The correlations provide important information about the relationships between the dependent and predictor variables. When using multiple regression, an ideal predictive situation is typically one in which each predictor variable displays a relatively strong correlation with the criterion, while the predictor variables display relatively weak correlations among themselves. However, as Pedhauzer (1982) points-out, this is only one of many methods for getting a sense of the “bigger picture” since some of the independent variables that show little or no relationship with the dependent variable may still play a significant role in the multiple regression model (e.g., suppressor variables).

Results show that the dependent variable job stress was correlated with all but three of the 27 independent variables. Gender, age, and the public image scale were not found to be significantly related to job stress. Only modest correlations were shown for education, years employed and the security level variables. Similar results were found for the empathy toward offenders, understanding of work procedures, and rehabilitation scales.

Job stress was most negatively correlated with the variables of personal security and staff empowerment. Correctional workers with higher levels of stress were generally preoccupied with personal security and dissatisfied with how ‘empowered’ they felt to sufficiently accomplish their work objectives.

Table 5
Criterion validity of job stress scale

Criterion	<u>n</u>	Correlation with job stress scale	Sig.
Job satisfaction scale	1,321	-.46	****
Frequency of eating breakfast	1,308	-.06	
Frequency of exercise	1,311	-.08	
Use tobacco products	1,313	.08	
Drink alcohol	1,309	.01	
Times 5+ drinks on one occasion in last three months	1,113	.08	
Days during average week have at least one drink	1,112	.09	
Frequency of painkillers (e.g., tylenol, aspirin)	1,300	.13	****
Frequency of antacids (e.g., tums, rolaids, Maalox)	1,245	.11	***

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

Table 6
Intercorrelation matrix – all correctional officers

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1 Job Stress	1.0													
2 Gender	-.01	1.0												
3 Age	-.02	.29	1.0											
4 Education	-.06	.27	.32	1.0										
5 Years Employed	.11	.38	.65	.42	1.0									
6 Security Level	.10	.08	.19	.06	.24	1.0								
7 Accountability	.26	.05	.01	.01	.01	.09	1.0							
8 Public Image	-.01	.04	-.04	-.01	-.05	.03	.19	1.0						
9 Satisfaction with Employment	.27	.06	-.07	.01	.11	.05	.20	.09	1.0					
10 Org Communication	.36	.04	-.01	-.01	.06	.07	.32	.11	.43	1.0				
11 Staff Empowerment	.44	.08	.03	.04	.11	.04	.31	.15	.48	.63	1.0			
12 Quality of Supervision	.35	.02	-.02	-.02	.03	.03	.22	.15	.44	.58	.62	1.0		
13 Staff Recognition	.24	.09	.19	.10	.17	.05	.13	.05	.37	.38	.37	.47	1.0	
14 Fair Tmt of Employees	.26	.01	.01	-.01	.01	.03	.17	.05	.41	.44	.41	.44	.35	1.0
15 Performance Appraisal	.31	.06	.06	-.02	.08	.01	.20	.12	.50	.39	.41	.55	.34	.36
16 Career Management	.35	.05	.01	-.07	.09	.03	.20	.15	.50	.46	.49	.57	.42	.34
17 CSC Policy Orientation	.22	.09	.05	.02	.01	.05	.09	.09	.31	.36	.33	.39	.31	.30
18 Personal Development	.32	.09	.01	.05	.10	.05	.22	.09	.53	.50	.55	.48	.38	.37
19 Satisfaction Physical Env't	.27	.08	.08	.04	.02	.14	.19	.03	.31	.39	.37	.34	.25	.32
20 Employment Security	.31	.03	.02	.11	.08	.06	.19	.02	.21	.28	.30	.25	.16	.26
21 Perc Personal Security	.47	.03	.12	.01	.06	.18	.35	.10	.32	.41	.45	.37	.26	.32
22 Understanding of Work Procedures	.17	.03	.05	.03	.09	.08	.09	.05	.09	.22	.18	.15	.09	.16
23 Impact of Shiftwork	.27	.11	.11	.09	.04	.01	.18	.03	.18	.21	.24	.22	.13	.18
24 Commitment to CSC	.29	.02	.02	.05	.14	.02	.27	.12	.35	.43	.44	.34	.28	.34
25 Support CSC Objectives	.24	.01	.01	.15	.17	.02	.23	.14	.37	.36	.41	.27	.23	.29
26 Rehabilitation	.17	.01	.01	.11	.08	.03	.23	.09	.21	.25	.38	.23	.12	.19
27 Empathy toward Offenders	.15	.08	.15	.06	.02	.06	.20	.01	.19	.25	.32	.23	.21	.24
28 Punitiveness	.22	.03	.03	.17	.04	.05	.39	.07	.19	.23	.35	.17	.08	.18

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

Table 6 cont'd
Intercorrelation matrix – all correctional officers

	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28
15 Performance Appraisal	1.0													
16 Career Management	.57 ****	1.0												
17 CSC Policy Orientation	.27 ****	.33 ****	1.0											
18 Personal Development	.47 ****	.59 ****	.33 ****	1.0										
19 Self Physical Env't	.27 ****	.33 ****	.24 ****	.33 ****	1.0									
20 Employ Security	.22 ****	.22 ****	.19 ****	.25 ****	.25 ****	1.0								
21 Peer Personal Security	.33 ****	.30 ****	.20 ****	.34 ****	.35 ****	.29 ****	1.0							
22 Understanding of Work Procedures	.17 ****	.20 ****	.29 ****	.14 ****	.13 ****	.13 ****	.07 ****	1.0						
23 Impact of Shiftwork	.17 ****	.28 ****	.11 ****	.22 ****	.21 ****	.13 ****	.18 ****	.09 ****	1.0					
24 Commitment to CSC	.27 ****	.29 ****	.27 ****	.42 ****	.27 ****	.21 ****	.35 ****	.21 ****	.21 ****	1.0				
25 Support CSC Objectives	.28 ****	.27 ****	.29 ****	.36 ****	.23 ****	.19 ****	.33 ****	.19 ****	.12 ****	.55 ****	1.0			
26 Rehabilitation	.16 ****	.17 ****	.21 ****	.25 ****	.19 ****	.16 ****	.30 ****	.11 ****	.05 ****	.39 ****	.49 ****	1.0		
27 Empathy toward Offenders	.15 ****	.16 ****	.18 ****	.23 ****	.16 ****	.17 ****	.28 ****	.07 ****	.07 ****	.36 ****	.45 ****	.53 ****	1.0	
28 Punitiveness	.13 ****	.11 ****	.11 ****	.23 ****	.17 ****	.22 ****	.34 ****	.05 ****	.09 ****	.31 ****	.39 ****	.49 ****	.52 ****	1.0

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

The correlation matrix indicated that there was some overlap in the composite scales. This was particularly the case for the scales measuring internal organizational factors such as satisfaction with the employment competition process, organizational communication, staff empowerment, and quality of supervision. These variables were also found to be correlated with scales measuring work environment and attitudinal factors such as commitment and working with offenders.

Perception of personal security was also found to be highly correlated with a number of the other independent scales. Specifically, organizational communication and staff empowerment were both found to correlate above 0.40 with perceptions of personal security. These findings suggest that the amount and quality of communication as well as the level of empowerment possessed by correctional officers influenced perceived dangerousness while at work. Intercorrelations of this sort sometimes result in nonsignificant regression coefficients for at least some predictor variables when the data are analysed with multiple regression (Hatcher & Stepanski, 1994).

To examine the hypothesis that dangerousness would account for the majority of variance and that career-based measures would add unique variance in the prediction of job stress, a stepwise regression analysis was performed on the entire sample of correctional officers. Table 7 shows the significant beta weights along with the squared partial correlations¹. The regression model accounted for 35.87% of the variance and included nine of the independent variables. The relative magnitude of the beta weights indicated that perception of personal security was the most influential variable in the

¹ Listwise deletion of missing cases resulted in a sample of 851 correctional officers for inclusion in the regression model. Analyses of the descriptive variables in Table 2 showed no significant differences between this group and the group excluded from the regression model.

Table 7
Sources of job stress – full sample

Predictor Variables	Beta Weight	Sig.	Squared Partial	Cumulative R Squared
1. Perceptions of Personal Security	-.33	****	.2393	.2393
2. Staff Empowerment	-.14	****	.0507	.2899
3. Impact of Shiftwork	-.13	****	.0223	.3122
4. Employment Security	-.11	***	.0145	.3267
5. Understanding of Work Procedures	-.09	***	.0113	.3380
6. Career Management	-.09	**	.0063	.3443
7. Gender	.09	**	.0063	.3506
8. Years Working for CSC	.11	***	.0043	.3549
9. Security Level	.06	*	.0038	.3587

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

n = 851 with listwise deletion of missing cases

model accounting for 23.93% of the variance followed by staff empowerment which accounted for 5.07% of the variance. These two factors thus explained about 29% of the variance. Impact of shiftwork (2.23%), employment security (1.45%), and understanding of work procedures (1.13%) accounted for minimal yet significant variance followed by career management (0.63%), gender (0.63%), years employed (0.43%), and security level (0.38%).

To examine the influence of other correlates of job stress and the practical implications that may arise, exploratory regression analyses were conducted by removing the predictor variable that accounted for the greatest amount of variance: perceptions of personal security. Table 8 shows the results. Staff empowerment accounted for 17.95% of the variance in job stress followed by employment security (3.79%), impact of shiftwork (2.56%) and satisfaction with performance appraisals (1.93%). A number of other significant predictor variables were identified, however, their contribution to the model was negligible.

To extend the exploratory analyses, a final regression analyses was conducted with the removal of both the perceptions of personal security variable and the staff empowerment variable. The results are shown in Table 9. Unlike earlier results, career management accounted for the greatest variance (12.10%) while employment security (5.71%), impact of shiftwork (2.12%), performance appraisal (1.26%), and punitiveness (1.02%) all accounted for variance at or above the 1.0% level.

Table 8
Sources of job stress – full sample
Perceptions of personality security removed

Predictor Variables	Beta Weight	Sig.	Squared Partial	Cumulative R Squared
1. Staff Empowerment	-.20	****	.1795	.1795
2. Employment Security	-.14	****	.0379	.2174
3. Impact of Shiftwork	-.14	****	.0256	.2429
4. Performance Appraisal	-.13	****	.0193	.2622
5. Greater Accountability to the Public	.07	*	.0081	.2703
6. Security Level	.11	***	.0079	.2782
7. Understanding of Work Procedures	-.09	**	.0067	.2849
8. Gender	.08	*	.0039	.2888
9. Staff Recognition	-.07	*	.0037	.2925
10. Years Working for CSC	.09	**	.0036	.2961
11. Punitiveness	.07	*	.0033	.2994

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

n = 851 with listwise deletion of missing cases

Table 9
Sources of job stress – full sample
Perceptions of personality security & staff empowerment removed

Predictor Variables	Beta Weight	Sig.	Squared Partial	Cumulative R Squared
1. Career Management	-.11	**	.1210	.1210
2. Employment Security	-.16	****	.0571	.1781
4. Impact of Shiftwork	-.15	****	.0212	.1993
5. Performance Appraisal	-.12	***	.0126	.2119
6. Punitiveness	.13	****	.0102	.2221
9. Security Level	.11	***	.0063	.2284
8. Understanding of Work Procedures	-.09	**	.0052	.2336
12. Staff Recognition	-.09	**	.0046	.2382
10. Greater Accountability to the Public	.09	**	.0042	.2424
11. Years Working for CSC	.09	**	.0040	.2464
13. Gender	.07	*	.0038	.2502

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

n = 861 with listwise deletion of missing cases

Prior to an examination of the results obtained for the subsample analyses, an analysis of variance was conducted on the full sample to test the hypothesis that dangerousness and security level would show an interaction effect in predicting job stress. To facilitate the analysis of variance, the independent variable of perceptions of dangerousness was trichotomized using the values associated with the ranges of response categories which indicate average responses of 'strongly disagree' to 'disagree' (1-2), 'partially disagree' to 'partially agree' (3-5), and 'agree' to 'strongly agree' (6-7). As displayed in Table 10, results showed significant main effects for both dangerousness ($F=123.71$, $p < .0001$) and security level ($F=5.91$, $p < .01$). The interaction effect between the two variables was found to be non-significant.

Table 11 shows the means and standard deviations for the analysis of variance. Mean scores show that higher levels of job stress were associated with greater concerns for personal safety as well as working in more secure institutions. However, within each category of perceptions of personal security, no relationship is present between job stress scores and security level. Similar to the results obtained for the regression model, these findings suggest that perceptions of dangerousness plays a significant role in the prediction of job stress but does not interact significantly with security level.

Table 10
Analysis of variance – full sample

Independent Variables	F	df	p <
Perceptions of Personal Security	123.71	2,1303	****
Security Level	5.19	2,1303	**
Perceptions of Personal Security X Security Level	1.19	4,1301	.32

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

n = 1305 with listwise deletion of missing cases

Table 11
Means and standard deviations of job stress – full sample

Perceptions of Personal Security		<u>n</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>
Negative		605	4.61	1.20
Undecided		542	3.83	1.08
Positive		158	3.20	1.15
Security Level				
Minimum		152	3.87	1.22
Medium		701	4.06	1.24
Maximum		474	4.27	1.26
Security Level	Perceptions of Personal Security			
Minimum	Negative	27	4.69	1.22
	Undecided	72	3.91	1.08
	Positive	50	3.36	1.15
Medium	Negative	352	4.58	1.16
	Undecided	267	3.68	1.04
	Positive	71	2.98	1.03
Maximum	Negative	226	4.64	1.27
	Undecided	203	4.00	1.09
	Positive	37	3.43	1.32

n = 1305 with listwise deletion of missing cases

Subsample Analyses

Even though an interaction effect was not found between dangerousness and security level, it was nevertheless important to examine if other predictors of job stress varied by security level. Accordingly, separate analyses were conducted on staff employed in minimum, medium, and maximum security institutions. Table 12 shows that the descriptive characteristics of correctional officers varied significantly across the three security levels. Compared to their counterparts working in minimum and medium security institutions, correctional officers employed in maximums were younger, a greater proportion were female, more educated, had worked fewer years for CSC, and had worked fewer years at their present institution.

Tables 13, 14, and 15 display the Pearson product moment correlation matrices that were used for each regression analysis conducted by security level. Significant correlations with job stress and 18 of the independent variables were observed among staff in minimum security institutions while 22 of the independent variables were correlated with job stress in both the medium and maximum security facilities. Staff empowerment, perceptions of personal security, and employment security were most negatively correlated with job stress in minimum security institutions. The pattern was reversed for medium security institutions where perceptions of personal security was most negatively correlated with job stress followed by staff empowerment and quality of supervision. Similar results were found for maximum security institutions as perceptions of personal security and staff empowerment were most negatively correlated with job stress followed by organizational communication.

Table 12
Descriptive information by security level – subsample analyses

Descriptor	Security Level			F / χ^2	df.	Sig.
	Minimum	Medium	Maximum			
Age	43.68 (7.61)	40.76 (8.94)	38.23 (8.83)	50.76	1,1331	****
Gender				9.81	2	**
Male	83.66	81.21	74.59			
Female	16.34	18.79	25.41			
Education				44.18	14	***
Less than high school	0.65	2.11	0.21			
Some high school	7.14	5.07	3.77			
High school graduate	30.52	36.90	26.24			
Some college	14.29	14.79	14.85			
College graduate	11.69	19.15	23.43			
Some university	14.29	10.00	11.09			
University graduate	21.43	11.13	17.15			
Post graduate degree	0.00	0.85	1.26			
Years working for CSC	17.60 (6.10)	12.64 (7.70)	10.79 (7.28)	85.50	1,1345	****
Years working at present institution	8.72 (6.25)	8.92 (7.19)	7.73 (5.47)	6.59	1,1343	**

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

n's ranged from 1,332 to 1,358

Table 13
Intercorrelation matrix – minimum security subsample

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1 Job Stress	1.0												
2 Gender	-.14	1.0											
3 Age	.12	-.39	1.0										
4 Education	-.14	.29	-.27	1.0									
5 Years Employed	.19	-.42	.59	-.53	1.0								
6 Accountability	.30	.03	.03	.04	.01	1.0							
7 Public Image	-.07	.01	-.03	-.09	-.01	-.21	1.0						
8 Satis. Employ. Competition	-.19	.01	-.13	.01	-.06	-.14	.17	1.0					
9 Org. Communication	.23	.15	.04	-.05	.05	-.45	.26	.29	1.0				
10 Staff Empowerment	.46	-.01	.03	-.01	-.09	-.35	.27	.32	.61	1.0			
11 Quality of Supervision	-.26	-.01	-.06	.02	-.08	-.22	.31	.43	.53	.65	1.0		
12 Staff Recognition	-.21	-.08	.15	-.05	.11	-.10	.05	.29	.27	.36	.47	1.0	
13 Fair Tmt of Employees	.21	.03	.01	-.01	-.03	-.17	.09	.39	.39	.27	.33	.36	1.0
14 Performance Appraisal	.28	-.01	-.09	.01	-.06	-.26	.28	.56	.36	.45	.56	.40	.35
15 Career Management	-.22	-.05	.06	-.12	.01	-.23	.21	.45	.35	.41	.49	.50	.30
16 CSC Policy Orientation	.14	-.06	.13	-.10	.04	-.23	.16	.32	.39	.35	.47	.45	.35
17 Personal Development	.21	-.01	.01	-.03	-.08	-.14	-.01	.42	.40	.41	.44	.44	.36
18 Satis. Physical Env't	.11	.27	.11	-.06	.06	-.13	.14	.33	.30	.39	.42	.19	.16
19 Employ. Security	.32	.16	-.03	.21	-.06	-.16	.02	.21	.20	.35	.19	.18	.17
20 Perc. Personal Security	.39	.10	.16	-.09	.04	-.32	.18	.32	.25	.30	.25	.15	.24
21 Understanding of Work Procedures	.22	.11	.15	.01	.03	-.17	.14	.16	.24	.21	.21	.29	.19
22 Impact of Shiftwork	.28	.13	.04	-.01	-.12	-.09	.09	.16	.04	.21	.22	.23	.12
23 Commitment to CSC	-.26	.01	.04	.09	-.14	-.18	.11	.35	.38	.42	.37	.25	.29
24 Support CSC Objectives	-.19	.01	-.06	.23	-.14	-.16	.08	.40	.36	.30	.25	.17	.25
25 Rehabilitation	-.12	.06	-.01	.09	-.19	-.27	.09	.23	.21	.31	.19	.08	.11
26 Empathy toward Offenders	-.04	-.19	.22	-.03	.15	-.24	.02	.10	.18	.18	.11	.11	.15
27 Punitiveness	.27	-.04	.08	-.14	.11	.26	-.13	-.21	-.21	-.35	-.19	-.03	-.13

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

Table 13 cont'd
Intercorrelation matrix – minimum security subsample

	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
14 Performance Appraisal	1.0													
15 Career Management	.58 ****	1.0												
16 CSC Policy Orientation	.32 ****	.42 ****	1.0											
17 Personal Development	.46 ****	.60 ****	.33 ****	1.0										
18 Satis Physical Env't	.28 ***	.31 ***	.31 ***	.25 **	1.0									
19 Employ Security	.20 *	.17 *	.22 **	.24 **	.12 *	1.0								
20 Perc Personal Security	.42 ****	.32 ****	.25 **	.31 ***	.29 ***	.17 *	1.0							
21 Understanding of Work Procedures	.15 *	.21 *	.44 ****	.22 **	.27 **	.10 *	.17 *	1.0						
22 Impact of Shiftwork	.21 *	.16 *	.08 *	.15 *	.14 *	.18 *	.19 *	.01 *	1.0					
23 Commitment to CSC	.32 ****	.25 **	.32 ****	.39 ****	.28 ***	.15 *	.23 **	.31 ***	.13 *	1.0				
24 Support CSC Objectives	.42 ****	.27 **	.25 **	.29 **	.19 *	.19 *	.33 ***	.19 *	-.03 *	.53 ****	1.0			
25 Rehabilitation	.19 *	.22 **	.27 **	.19 *	.15 *	.13 *	.27 **	.18 *	-.03 *	.34 ***	.44 ****	1.0		
26 Empathy toward Offenders	.15 *	.27 **	.14 *	.13 *	.06 *	.17 *	.27 **	.15 *	.02 *	.32 ***	.39 ****	.36 ****	1.0	
27 Punitiveness	.22 **	.21 *	-.08 *	-.17 *	-.08 *	-.27 ***	-.29 ***	-.08 *	.02 *	-.26 **	-.36 ****	-.40 ****	-.48 ****	1.0

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

Table 14
Intercorrelation matrix – medium security subsample

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1 Job Stress	1.0												
2 Gender	.01	1.0											
3 Age	-.01	.18	1.0										
4 Education	.03	.20	-.34	1.0									
5 Years Employed	.11	.39	.64	-.39	1.0								
6 Accountability	.27	-.01	-.03	.03	-.02	1.0							
7 Public Image	.03	-.01	-.01	-.01	-.06	-.21	1.0						
8 Salis Employ Competition	.29	.01	-.07	-.03	-.10	-.18	.05	1.0					
9 Org Communication	.35	.07	-.04	-.03	-.06	-.26	.08	.42	1.0				
10 Staff Empowerment	.46	.06	-.01	-.04	-.10	-.29	.12	.49	.52	1.0			
11 Quality of Supervision	.37	.01	.01	-.04	-.01	-.23	.08	.39	.56	.63	1.0		
12 Staff Recognition	.22	.10	.21	-.14	.18	-.14	.06	.39	.38	.39	.47	1.0	
13 Fair Trm of Employees	.27	-.02	.04	-.08	.02	-.15	-.01	.43	.46	.43	.45	.36	1.0
14 Performance Appraisal	.31	.04	-.04	.01	-.08	-.19	.09	.48	.37	.43	.55	.32	.39
15 Career Management	.35	.08	-.03	-.05	-.14	-.17	.13	.49	.47	.51	.59	.40	.40
16 CSC Policy Orientation	.23	.09	-.06	-.02	.04	-.06	.03	.30	.37	.37	.41	.32	.31
17 Personal Development	.10	.06	-.02	.11	-.09	-.17	.09	.53	.48	.55	.46	.39	.39
18 Salis Physical Env't	.26	.13	.07	-.08	.04	-.16	.04	.27	.34	.32	.30	.26	.32
19 Employ Security	.30	.03	.01	.05	-.06	-.21	-.02	.22	.26	.29	.28	.17	.26
20 Perc Personal Security	.53	.04	.11	-.01	.01	-.37	.09	.29	.40	.51	.39	.26	.33
21 Understanding of Work Procedures	.20	.05	-.04	.04	-.09	.08	.06	.07	.25	.18	.11	.04	.14
22 Impact of Shiftwork	.23	-.01	.13	-.15	-.01	-.15	.02	.16	.23	.25	.22	.15	.19
23 Commitment to CSC	.32	.02	.07	-.06	-.12	-.26	.12	.29	.40	.43	.33	.29	.29
24 Support CSC Objectives	.26	.13	.03	.06	-.13	-.19	.14	.33	.33	.40	.26	.19	.25
25 Rehabilitation	.21	.14	.06	.01	-.01	-.19	.07	.17	.26	.37	.25	.11	.16
26 Empathy toward Offenders	.18	.04	.21	.01	.09	-.14	.04	.19	.20	.31	.25	.19	.23
27 Punitiveness	.27	.07	-.09	-.07	-.01	.28	.05	.16	.22	.34	.17	-.08	.17

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

Table 14 cont'd
Intercorrelation matrix – medium security subsample

	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
14 Performance Appraisal	1.0													
15 Career Management	.57 ****	1.0												
16 CSC Policy Orientation	.30 ****	.37 ****	1.0											
17 Personal Development	.46 ****	.59 ****	.35 ****	1.0										
18 Self Physical Env't	.29 ****	.29 ****	.21 ****	.28 ****	1.0									
19 Employ Security	.26 ****	.28 ****	.21 ****	.21 ****	.26 ****	1.0								
20 Perc Personal Security	.33 ****	.31 ****	.24 ****	.35 ****	.36 ****	.29 ****	1.0							
21 Understanding of Work Procedures	.17 ****	.19 ****	.28 ****	.13 ****	.14 ****	.13 ****	.13 ****	1.0						
22 Impact of Shiftwork	.15 ****	.29 ****	.13 ****	.24 ****	.22 ****	.18 ****	.23 ****	.14 ****	1.0					
23 Commitment to CSC	.29 ****	.31 ****	.25 ****	.42 ****	.22 ****	.18 ****	.35 ****	.22 ****	.25 ****	1.0				
24 Support CSC Objectives	.27 ****	.27 ****	.29 ****	.35 ****	.14 ****	.14 ****	.35 ****	.18 ****	.15 ****	.53 ****	1.0			
25 Rehabilitation	.18 ****	.18 ****	.17 ****	.22 ****	.15 ****	.12 ****	.32 ****	.14 ****	.05 ****	.39 ****	.47 ****	1.0		
26 Empathy toward Offenders	.19 ****	.17 ****	.19 ****	.23 ****	.13 ****	.12 ****	.24 ****	.08 ****	.08 ****	.36 ****	.45 ****	.51 ****	1.0	
27 Punitiveness	.14 ****	.11 ****	.13 ****	.21 ****	.13 ****	.17 ****	.17 ****	.09 ****	.11 ****	.32 ****	.36 ****	.49 ****	.44 ****	1.0

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

Table 15
Intercorrelation matrix – maximum security subsample

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1 Job Stress	1.0												
2 Gender	-.01	1.0											
3 Age	-.01	-.39	1.0										
4 Education	-.09	.34	-.33	1.0									
5 Years Employed	.08	-.46	.64	-.47	1.0								
6 Accountability	.22	-.14	.04	-.06	.09	1.0							
7 Public Image	.03	.09	-.08	.01	-.04	-.15	1.0						
8 Sails Employ. Competition	-.29	.09	-.03	.03	-.13	-.26	.12	1.0					
9 Org. Communication	-.39	.03	-.01	.05	-.15	-.35	.10	.49	1.0				
10 Staff Empowerment	-.40	.13	-.09	.13	-.19	-.29	.14	.52	.63	1.0			
11 Quality of Supervision	-.35	.06	-.05	-.04	-.09	-.18	.19	.49	.60	.59	1.0		
12 Staff Recognition	-.27	.06	.19	-.09	.12	-.09	.05	.36	.38	.32	.47	1.0	
13 Fair Trmt of Employees	-.27	.05	-.07	.09	-.12	-.21	.11	.38	.41	.41	.44	.32	1.0
14 Performance Appraisal	-.34	.11	-.06	-.07	-.09	-.19	.11	.52	.42	.39	.54	.36	.32
15 Career Management	-.38	.02	.01	-.07	-.07	-.25	.16	.54	.46	.49	.58	.41	.26
16 CSC Policy Orientation	-.24	.10	.03	.09	-.04	-.09	.15	.29	.35	.27	.35	.24	.26
17 Personal Development	-.37	.17	-.03	.02	-.19	-.29	.14	.58	.57	.61	.52	.34	.32
18 Sails Physical Env't	-.32	.06	.01	.04	-.13	-.23	-.01	.38	.45	.37	.36	.25	.37
19 Employ Security	-.29	.08	-.09	.15	-.19	-.17	-.02	.21	.31	.28	.20	.12	.28
20 Perc Personal Security	-.41	.09	.04	.03	-.02	-.27	.11	.37	.42	.37	.35	.25	.30
21 Understanding of Work Procedures	-.14	.03	-.08	.04	-.08	-.12	.01	.11	.22	.20	.19	.13	.21
22 Impact of Shiftwork	-.32	.02	.09	-.01	-.06	-.26	.02	.23	.25	.24	.22	.08	.19
23 Commitment to CSC	-.29	.16	-.05	.16	-.22	-.30	.12	.41	.49	.44	.33	.25	.40
24 Support CSC Objectives	-.23	.24	-.04	.23	-.27	-.29	.12	.41	.30	.44	.29	.29	.35
25 Rehabilitation	-.12	.20	-.08	.25	-.23	-.26	.14	.26	.34	.37	.21	.12	.23
26 Empathy toward Offenders	.11	.16	.08	.16	-.09	-.22	.04	.23	.29	.35	.22	.19	.22
27 Punitiveness	.15	.26	.05	-.29	.17	.29	.06	.23	.22	.33	.15	.08	.17

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

Table 15 cont'd
Interrelation matrix -- maximum security subsample

	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27
14 Performance Appraisal	1.0													
15 Career Management	.58 ****	1.0												
16 CSC Policy Orientation	.22 ****	.23 ****	1.0											
17 Personal Development	.49 ****	.61 ****	.29 ****	1.0										
18 Self Physical Env't	.25 ****	.37 ****	.28 ****	.41 ****	1.0									
19 Employment Security	.17 ***	.15 **	.17 ***	.29 ****	.26 ****	1.0								
20 Perc Personal Security	.32 ****	.29 ****	.14 **	.34 ****	.29 ****	.29 ****	1.0							
21 Understanding of Work Procedures	.19 ****	.23 ****	.29 ****	.16 **	.13 **	.15 **	.02 **	1.0						
22 Impact of Shiftwork	.18 ****	.28 ****	.10 **	.21 ***	.23 ****	.07 **	.15 **	.05 **	1.0					
23 Commitment to CSC	.22 ****	.28 ****	.33 ****	.42 ****	.34 ****	.28 ****	.37 ****	.20 ****	.17 ***	1.0				
24 Support CSC Objectives	.25 ****	.28 ****	.29 ****	.39 ****	.37 ****	.27 ****	.32 ****	.23 ****	.13 **	.57 ****	1.0			
25 Rehabilitation	.12 **	.13 **	.25 ****	.31 ****	.23 ****	.19 ****	.26 ****	.07 **	.08 **	.39 ****	.53 ****	1.0		
26 Empathy toward Offenders	.11 **	.15 **	.21 ****	.28 ****	.19 ****	.20 ****	.23 ****	.07 **	.11 **	.35 ****	.45 ****	.49 ****	1.0	
27 Punitiveness	.09 **	.07 **	.08 **	.26 ****	.23 ****	.25 ****	.27 ****	-.02 **	-.11 **	-.29 ****	-.43 ****	-.40 ****	-.45 ****	1.0

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

Table 16 displays the results of the stepwise regression analysis performed for the subsample of correctional officers working in minimum security institutions. The regression model accounted for a sizable 48.87% of the variance and included eight of the independent variables. The relative magnitude of the beta values indicated that perception of personal security (21.98%) was the most influential variable in the model followed by staff empowerment accounting for 8.71% of the variance. These two factors thus explained about 31% of the variance. Employment security (3.72%), age (3.34%), and understanding of work procedures (3.27%) accounted for over ten percent of additional variance.

The regression results for medium security institutions is shown in Table 17. Similar to the results reported for minimum security facilities, perceptions of personal security (27.06%) and staff empowerment (5.13%) accounted for the majority of variance in the regression model. Employment security (1.64%), understanding of work procedures (1.24%), performance appraisal (0.67%), and impact of shiftwork (0.67%) accounted for additional significant variance. In total, 36.40% of the variance in job stress was explained by these six scales.

Table 18 displays the regression model results for correctional staff employed in maximum security institutions. Perceptions of personal security was the most influential variable accounting for 21.46% of the variance. Career management was the second highest predictor of job stress (6.90%) followed by impact of shiftwork (3.30%), employment security (1.78%), staff recognition (1.40%), empathy toward offenders (1.53%), and staff empowerment (0.94%). The total variance explained by these seven independent variables was 37.31%.

Table 16
Sources of job stress – minimum security subsample

Predictor Variables	Beta Weight	Sig.	Squared Partial	Cumulative R Squared
1. Perceptions of Personal Security	-.39	***	.2198	.2198
2. Staff Empowerment	-.24	**	.0871	.3069
3. Employment Security	-.25	**	.0372	.3441
4. Age	.27	**	.0334	.3775
5. Understanding of Work Procedures	-.21	*	.0327	.4102
6. Support for Personal Development on the Job	.25	**	.0282	.4384
7. Impact of Shiftwork	-.21	**	.0273	.4657
8. Public Image of CSC	.16	*	.0230	.4887

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

n = 97 with listwise deletion of missing cases

Table 17
Sources of job stress – medium security subsample

Predictor Variables	Beta Weight	Sig.	Squared Partial	Cumulative R Squared
1. Perceptions of Personal Security	-.35	****	.2706	.2706
2. Staff Empowerment	-.18	****	.0513	.3219
3. Employment Security	-.10	**	.0164	.3383
4. Understanding of Work Procedures	-.10	**	.0124	.3507
5. Performance Appraisal	-.09	*	.0067	.3574
6. Impact of Shiftwork	-.09	*	.0067	.3640

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

n = 451 with listwise deletion of missing cases

Table 18
Sources of job stress – maximum security subsample

Predictor Variables	Beta Weight	Sig.	Squared Partial	Cumulative R Squared
1. Perceptions of Personal Security	-.31	****	.2146	.2146
2. Career Management	-.13	*	.0690	.2836
3. Impact of Shiftwork	-.18	***	.0330	.3166
4. Employment Security	-.13	**	.0178	.3344
6. Empathy Toward Offenders	.16	**	.0153	.3497
5. Staff Recognition	-.15	**	.0140	.3637
7. Staff Empowerment	-.13	*	.0094	.3731

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

n = 301 with listwise deletion of missing cases

Discussion

The present study provided an opportunity to further investigate the predictors of job stress in correctional officers. Job stress was significantly correlated with all but three of the 27 independent variables. Perceptions of dangerousness was the best predictor of stress, both for the full sample analyses as well as the subsample analyses. Stepwise regression analysis enabled isolation of other contributing factors.

Full Sample Analyses

The current study aids in clarifying previous research that has shown inconsistent results regarding the impact of demographic factors on job stress. Similar to earlier studies, no significant correlations were found for gender (Gross et al., 1994; Hurst & Hurst, 1997), age (Gerstein et al., 1987), or education (Blau et al., 1986; Lasky et al., 1986). Additionally, only a modest correlation was found between years employed and job stress (Cullen et al., 1985; Lasky et al., 1986). The findings confirm the results of other research that has shown limited utility of these static variables in understanding job stress.

It was interesting to observe that job tenure was not found to be a strong correlate of job stress. As Stotland (1986) has argued, time on the job would reduce stress because increased job experience would be expected to enhance competence and self-confidence. However, studies have shown that work stress increases with correctional experience (Cullen et al., 1985; Patterson, 1992; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1985). The modest correlation in the present study between years employed and job stress is consistent with

these earlier results. Further analyses might better explain the impact that job experience has on reported stress levels.

Only one of the two external organizational factors was correlated with job stress. A significant correlation was found for correctional officers who felt that CSC should have greater accountability to the public. However, no relationship was observed for ratings of how CSC is viewed by the general public. Although these results should be viewed cautiously due to the lower alpha levels, the findings nevertheless bring some empirical understanding to the often anecdotal reporting of how external organizational factors influence job stress (Drory & Shamir, 1988).

More consistent results were found when examining the relationships between the internal organizational factors and job stress. In fact, significant negative correlations were identified for all the measures within this category, ranging from a correlation of -0.22 for CSC's policy orientation to -0.44 for staff empowerment. The findings suggest that such organizational aspects of correctional work play a major role in influencing on-the-job stress. Although the number of internal organizational factors included in the present study totaled 12, they can be considered to tap into three areas specific to the internal operations of a correctional environment: career advancement, management of staff, and management of work.

It is perhaps not surprising that issues regarding career advancement were significantly correlated with job stress. In today's work force, advancing in one's career is a central tenet of recognition for a job well done as well as one of the only ways to secure an increase in pay. Accordingly, the scales that measure such factors that directly influence career advancement (satisfaction with employment competition process,

performance appraisal, career management, support for personal development on the job, employment security) were identified as being significant sources of job stress.

The relationship between the career advancement variables and job stress are consistent with other research, albeit limited, that has been conducted in this area. As Long and colleagues (1986) found, career-related factors such as 'lack of promotion and opportunity' and 'activities needed for promotion' were significantly correlated with general health problems. As well, the study conducted by Tellier and Robinson (1995) was the only one identified that linked job stress and a more general measure of career progression. The present study confirms these earlier findings and expands the scope of career factors that impact on job stress.

Internal organizational measures that examine management of staff (quality of supervision, staff recognition, fair treatment of employees) suggest that the way in which correctional officers perceive how they are managed and recognized for their work can be a source of on-the-job stress. These results are consistent with previous research that identified management support, or lack of, as a cause of work stress (Cheek & Miller, 1983; Rutter & Fielding, 1988). Although some earlier studies failed to show a relationship between these factors and job stress (e.g., Grossi et al., 1996), it should not be surprising to find that stress can result from failure to manage effectively, recognize staff appropriately, and treat employees fairly. Indeed, it is these issues that are often at the forefront of worker concerns and readily identifiable by correctional officers as stress provoking (Hughes & Zamble, 1993).

Management of work, the third area of internal organizational factors that were found to be significantly correlated with job stress, considers factors that can directly

influence the ability of a correctional officer to carry-out his or her work (organizational communication, staff empowerment, CSC policy orientation, satisfaction with physical environment). As found with earlier studies, deficits in these organizational factors have been identified as correlates as well as a predictors of job stress (Cheek & Miller, 1983; Lasky et al., 1986).

Staff empowerment and CSC's policy orientation as significant correlates of job stress confirm previous research in this area (Tellier & Robinson, 1995). The results also suggest that the concepts of role conflict and ambiguity may influence ratings on these two measures. As described earlier, ambiguous and conflicting expectations of the duties of a correctional officer can occur since they are expected to exercise professional discretion within a setting in which they are primarily tasked with maintaining order and control. Both scales examine the presence of such conflicting expectations by measuring empowerment issues (e.g., 'I have the authority I need to accomplish my work objectives.') and the relevance of policies and procedures (e.g., 'Failure to follow policies, rules and regulations may have negative consequences for me as an employee.'). The fact that higher levels of stress were reported by correctional staff who felt they were not 'empowered' enough to perform in the role expected of them and that workplace policies and procedures were less relevant in the conduct of their work, suggests that role conflict and ambiguity contributes to the experience of job stress.

The work environment variables (perceptions of personal security, understanding of work procedures, impact of shiftwork) were also significantly negatively correlated with job stress. In fact, the dangerousness measure was the most negatively correlated (-0.47) of all the 27 independent variables. Given the stability of such results in earlier

studies (e.g., Finn, 1998; Tellier & Robinson, 1995), it was not surprising to find in the present study that perceptions of danger while at work is a significant correlate of job stress.

Although correlated to a lesser degree, the two other work environment variables were identified as being related to work stress. For instance, the understanding of, and level of training provided for, work procedures (i.e., policies, rules, and regulations that apply to the correctional officer job) was related to job stress. This finding suggests that correctional officers who feel they do not understand institutional work procedures well enough or did not receive adequate training to carry-out their work, experience more stress on-the-job. Additionally, the results observed for the impact of shiftwork indicates that the correctional officer's work schedule, which normally includes shifts through-out the day, evening, and midnight hours, can be stress-provoking. While previous research regarding the impact of shiftwork on job stress is quite limited, it is nevertheless consistent with the present findings (Hughes & Zamble, 1993).

The last major category of correctional officer research, attitudes toward correctional work, was identified as an area that was significantly related to job stress. Two general components were examined, dedication to the overarching goals of CSC (commitment to CSC, support for CSC objectives) and specific attitudes in dealing with offenders (rehabilitation, empathy toward offenders, punitiveness). The significant results for the more global attitudinal variables are consistent with previous research (Cullen et al., 1985; Tellier & Robinson, 1995) and suggests that correctional officers who are less committed to CSC and do not necessarily support its objectives experience higher levels of work stress.

The correlations observed for the offender-based attitudinal variables indicate that staff who are less empathic in their dealings with offenders and give little consideration to the goals of rehabilitation also report on-the-job stress. These findings were confirmed by the significant positive correlation of having a punitive attitude toward offenders and job stress. Although limited research has been conducted in this area, the results of the current study are consistent with earlier findings (Cullen et al., 1985; Robinson et al., 1996; Saylor & Wright, 1992).

Given the breadth of significant correlations reported for the independent variables and job stress, the stepwise regression analysis was an important method for determining what factors were the most influential in predicting stress experienced while at work. As hypothesized, perceptions of personal security was the most important variable accounting for the majority of variance, almost fivefold more than the second significant variable in the regression model, staff empowerment. Although most of the correlational results showed a relationship with job stress, the regression analysis suggests that the impact of such variables are minimal in relation to correctional officer's perceptions of their safety while at work. The fact that the staff empowerment scale contributed unique variance suggests that feelings of lack of empowerment to conduct their work is also a contributor to work stress, above and beyond perceptions of dangerousness. The contribution of other variables, although limited, indicates that routine work-related factors such as work procedures and shiftwork can cause stress.

Little support was found for the second hypothesis posed for the full sample analyses. Unlike earlier research (e.g., Tellier & Robinson, 1995), the contributions of career-based variables to the regression model were minimal. Only about 2% of unique

variance was accounted for by the employment security (1.45%) and career management (0.63%) scales. Although the exploratory analyses suggested the influence of such variables increase when other, stronger predictors were removed from the regression equation, the results suggest that identified causes of stress were not centered on such internal organizational factors as was hypothesized.

A specific hypothesis for the present study offered that perceptions of dangerousness would vary by security level in the prediction of reported job stress. While mean scores on the job stress scale were found to be significantly higher for more secure institutions as well as for greater perceptions of dangerousness, analyses failed to support an interaction effect between these two variables. This finding indicates that personal security is a consistent indicator of work stress regardless of worksite security level.

Subsample Analyses

The separate regression analyses conducted by security level supports this contention. Each regression model showed that perceptions of personal security was by far the most influential variable, often accounting for three to four times more variance than the second most important variable in the prediction equation. The hypothesis that dangerousness would be less of a concern in lower security settings was not supported. These results suggest that although the institutional environments may vary by security level (i.e., more open and less controlled contact with offenders in minimums compared to mediums and maximums), perceptions of dangerousness are relatively constant.

The findings give rise to the likelihood that dangerousness manifests itself in different ways depending on the security level of the prison. For instance, dangerousness is likely to cause stress for correctional officers working in maximum security prisons since these facilities are normally reserved for more serious offenders and for those who have been difficult to manage in lower security settings. Movement is more controlled and inmate contact occurs less compared to minimums and mediums. CSC's own research has shown that compared to inmate respondents in less secure institutions, a higher percentage of inmates in maximums indicated that staff were likely to get assaulted (Robinson & Mirabelli, 1996). Other research has also posited this argument (Cullen et al., 1985) as an explanation for stress reported by correctional officers working in maximums.

In minimum security settings, dangerousness was identified as being of equal concern. It can be argued, however, that dangerousness is likely a cause of stress for different reasons. Since the intent of minimums is to house offenders who have been assessed as lower risk and more amenable to community reintegration, inmate movement is much less controlled and emphasis is placed on greater contact between staff and inmates. Even though inmates in minimums report the lowest likelihood of staff being assaulted (Robinson & Mirabelli, 1996), the results of the present study suggest correctional officers report stress due to concerns for personal safety. Rather than interpreting this perception as unjustified given the ample evidence that staff-inmate assaults are lowest in minimums (see Ouimet, 1999), the findings are more consistent with the assertion offered by Lombardo (1981) who explained that feelings of danger may derive less from actual assaults and more from the realization that officers face the

constant and often unpredictable possibility of victimization. Accordingly, a minimum security environment with greater inmate contact in a more open and less controlled environment appears to be considered by correctional officers as just as stressful as working in a more secure and controlled setting. As noted by Brodsky (1982, p.106) ... "Any organization or social structure which consists of one group of people kept inside who do not want to be there and the other group who are there to make sure they stay in will be an organization under stress".

The explanation for dangerousness as the most influential variable among correctional officers employed in medium security settings is consistent with this explanation. The best definition of mediums is that they represent a mid-way point between minimum and maximum security institutions. As such, the environment is less controlled than a maximum but more controlled than a minimum. The same is true for the amount of inmate contact. Accordingly, it is likely that reported stress levels are influenced by the amount a medium security setting encapsulates features of maximums and minimums regarding the level of control over, and the amount of contact with, inmates.

Observation of other predictors of job stress showed that employment security was a unique contributor of variance in each security level regression model. Although the amount of variance was relatively small in each analyses, it nevertheless suggests that concern over security of employment is consistent across settings. Interestingly, the second most influential variable in both minimums and mediums was staff empowerment while in maximums it was career management. These results are likely due to the demographic features of correctional officers in maximum security institutions who, as a

group, were younger, more educated, and had fewer years of experience. As explained by Matthieu and Zajac (1990), such characteristics are consistent with a focus on career advancement and impediments in this regard are not a surprising cause of stress.

Theoretical Implications

Although the findings of the present study can be interpreted based on other research on correctional officers and stress, it is also useful to examine the results in a broader context offered by models or theories of occupational stress. Examination of identity theory would have required a measure of job involvement to determine whether work-related stress occurred in workers for whom the job is a central concern. The present study did not include any independent variables that examined job involvement. Accordingly, the utility of the identity theory for understanding the current findings cannot be evaluated.

The transactional model and person-environment fit model each consider individual-level coping factors in responding to potentially stressful situations while at work. However, both require the measurement of personality-based indicators (e.g., extroversion–introversion, anxiety-coping, etc.) as coping resources to draw upon to in the experience of stress. Although one could argue some of the independent variables included in the present study consider personality factors (i.e., attitudes toward working with offenders), it is important to point-out that attitudes are amenable to change and can be managed. As a result, the absence of pure personality scales limits a discussion on the utility of either the transactional model or person-environment model.

Considering the central tenets of each model, it can be argued that the demand-control model is most useful for interpreting the various results reported in the present study. To review, recall that a key aspect of the model is the interactive relationship between job demands and job control. Stress is suggested to increase in a job where the demands are high but the ability to control these demands are low. Similar to that posited for the P-E model, a high job demand can be characterized by the role the correctional officer fulfills where the possibility of physical harm is ever present. However, distinct from the P-E model, the ability to control this form of job demand is minimized as suggested by the influence of the staff empowerment variable on job stress – correctional officers feel little empowerment to perform in their job as required. As a result, the demand of the job combined with the lack of empowerment to conduct the job is hypothesized by the demand-control model to be a central cause stress.

Practical Implications

While a number of significant correlates and predictors of job stress were reported in the current study, it is important to consider the practical implications of these findings. Managing stress in an organization is difficult when the sources of stress are not readily susceptible to adjustment or manipulation. In this study, results are encouraging as those factors which have been identified as contributing significantly to job stress are, to a certain degree, manageable. As reported earlier, perceptions of personal security and staff empowerment accounted for approximately 29% of the variance in job stress. Consequently, efforts to manage these two variables must be a high priority for corrections if job stress is to be minimized.

Perceptions of personal security is unique to corrections and inherent in the nature of the correctional environment. Corporate attention should be directed towards ensuring that policies and procedures utilized by CSC minimize the risk of employee injury by offenders. Additional training focusing on interacting with offenders and de-escalating aggressive situations may assist in better managing perceptions of dangerousness.

Perceptions of empowerment as a stressor should also be addressed. As shown in the exploratory analyses, once perceptions of personality security was removed from the regression model, staff empowerment accounted for the majority of variance in predicting job stress. This finding indicated that employees must feel a sense of being involved in organizational change through enhanced consultation and participation in the operations of their worksite. Involvement in key on-site activities through special projects or working committees may help to ameliorate feelings of lack of empowerment.

Attention to such organizational factors can be reinforced based on the regression model with perceptions of personal security and staff empowerment removed. These results showed that career management was the most influential variable in the prediction equation. Management should ensure that emphasis is placed on creating opportunities for employees in their career aspirations. Support could be offered by way of personal development and lateral transfers.

The results observed across security levels suggest similar efforts to address experiences of job stress as a result of perceived dangerousness and lack of empowerment could be employed for correctional officers employed in both minimum and medium security institutions. However, career management was identified as a

predictor among those working in maximums indicating that attention could be given to this area as described above.

Limitations

While a number of important and unique findings were found in the present study, there are also possible limitations to the study that should be commented on. First, although the analyses were based on a large sample of correctional officers, the response rate was just under 50% indicating that only half of those identified in the random selection process completed a questionnaire. Issues of response bias may account for some of the current findings. It could be speculated that less variance was observed for some scales due to response bias. As well, it could be that only certain groups of correctional officers (i.e., pessimistic, dissatisfied, etc.) were motivated enough to “make their views known” by way of completing the questionnaire. Alternatively, it is just such a group that may not have bothered to participate in the first place.

Another possible limitation concerns the measure of job stress employed in the present study. It is important to point-out that the scale has been used in other corrections-based research and has shown a relatively high level of internal consistency across studies. Although the confidential nature of the survey was intended to reduce subject bias in responding, it is nevertheless possible that the job stress measure was susceptible to a responses whereby correctional officers would downplay experiences of stress in an effort to preserve their “macho image”.

Caution should also be exercised in the interpretation of findings with scales that showed lower than acceptable levels of internal consistency. Such results indicate that a

scale is less reliable in terms of tapping into the construct it was designed to measure. Accordingly, relationships with the job stress variable may be due to other factors the scale is, perhaps inadvertently, measuring.

Lastly, it is important to note that the present study did not include all predictors variables that have been shown in the research literature to predict job stress. One area concerns co-workers such as the amount of support and amount and type of interactions while at work. No data was collected for this dimension although the literature identifies it as a significant correlate and predictor of work stress. As well, no personality variables were examined in the current research. Inclusion of such factors in the future could assist in furthering the understanding of job stress experienced by correctional officers.

References

- Barone, D.F. (1991). Developing a transactional psychology of work stress. Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality, 6(7), 31-38.
- Baum, A., Grunberg, N.E., & Singer, J.E. (1982). The use of psychological and neuroendocrinological measurements in the study of stress. Health Psychology, 1, 217-236.
- Baum, A. Singer, J.E., & Baum, C.S. (1981). Stress and the environment. Journal of Social Issues, 37(1), 4-34.
- Black, R. (1982). Stress and the correctional officer. Police Stress, Feb., 10-16.
- Blau, J.R., Light, S.C., & Chamlin, M. (1986). Individual and contextual effects on stress and job satisfaction. Work and Occupations, 13(1), 131-156.
- Brief, A.P., & George, J.M. (1991). Psychological stress and the workplace: A brief comment on Lazarus' outlook. Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality, 6(7), 15-20.
- Brinner, R.B. (1997). Improving stress assessment: Toward an evidence-based approach to organizational stress interventions. Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 43(1), 61-71.
- Brodsky, C.M., (1977). Long-term work stress in teachers and prison guards. Journal of Occupational Medicine, 22-34.
- Brodsky, C.M. (1982). Work stress in correctional institutions. Journal of Prison and Jail Health, 2(2), 74-102.
- Burke, P.J. (1991). Identity processes and social stress. American Sociological Review, 56, 836-849.
- Caplan, R.D., & Van Harrison, R. (1993). Person-environment fit theory: Some history, recent developments, and future directions. Journal of Social Issues, 49, 253-275.
- Cheek, F.E., & Miller, M.D. (1978). Stress awareness and coping techniques for correctional personnel. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Correctional Association, Philadelphia, August.
- Cheek, F.E., & Miller, M.D. (1979). The experience of stress for correctional officers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Academy of Criminal Justice Society, Cincinnati, September.

- Cheek, F.E., & Miller, M.D. (1983). The experience of stress for correctional officers: A double-blind theory of correctional stress. Journal of Criminal Justice, 11, 105-120.
- Chemers, M.M., Hayes, R.B., Rhodewalt, F., & Wysocki, J. (1985). A person-environment analysis of job stress: A contingency model explanation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, 628-635.
- Cherniss, C. (1980). Staff Burnout: Job Stress in the Human Services. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Cohen, S., & Wills, T.A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis. Psychological Bulletin, 98, 310-357.
- Cooper, C.L., & Cartwright, S. (1994). Healthy mind, healthy organization: A proactive approach to occupational stress. Human Relations, 47, 455-470.
- Cooper, C.L., Sloan, S.G., & Williams, S. (1988). The Occupational Stress Indicator: Management Guide. Windsor, England: NFER-Wilson.
- Cullen, F.T., & Gilbert, K.E. (1982). Reaffirming Rehabilitation. Cincinnati: Anderson.
- 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.
- Dignam, J.T., Barrera, M., & West, S.G. (1986). Occupational stress, social support, and burnout among correctional officers. American Journal of Community Psychology, 14(2), 177-193.
- Dollard, M.F., Winefield, A.H. (1998). A test of the demand-control/support model of work stress in correctional officers. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 3(3), 243-264.
- Dollard, M.F., Winefield, A.H., & McGuirk, T. (1993). Job stress in correctional officers. Report prepared for South Australian Department of Corrections. In Dollard, M.F. & Winefield, A.H. (1995). Trait anxiety, work demand, social support, and psychological distress in correctional officers. Anxiety, Stress and Coping, 8, 25-35.
- Donovan, R., (1987). Stress in the workplace: A framework for research and practice. Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary Social Work, 68(5), 259-266.
- Drory, A., & Shamir, B. (1988). Effects of organizational and life variables on job satisfaction and burnout. Group and Organizational Studies, 13(4), 441-455.

- Edwards, J.R., & Cooper, C.L. (1990). The person-environment fit approach to stress: Recurring problems and some suggested solutions. Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 11, 293-307.
- Edwards, J.R., & Rothbard, N.P. (1999). Work and family stress and well-being; An examination of person-environment fit in the work and family domains. Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes, 77(2), 85-129.
- Eulberg, J.R., Weekley, J.A., & Bhagat, R.S. (1988). Models of stress in organizational research: A metatheoretical perspective. Human Relations, 41(4), 331-350.
- Finn, P. (1998). Correctional officer stress: A cause for concern and additional help. Federal Probation, December, 65-74.
- Fleming, I., & Baum, A. (1987). Stress: Psychological assessment. Journal of Organizational Behaviour Management, 8, 117-140.
- French, J.R.P., Caplan, R.D., & Van Harrison, R. (1982). The mechanics of job stress and strain. Chichester, England: Wiley.
- Frone, M.R., & Major, B. (1988). Communication quality and job satisfaction among managerial nurses: The moderating influence of job involvement. Group and Organizational Studies, 13, 332-347.
- Frone, M.R., Russell, M., & Cooper, M.L. (1995). Job stressors, job involvement and employee health: A test of identity theory. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 68, 1-11.
- 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 Behaviour, 14(3), 352-369.
- Greenhaus, J.H., & Sklarew, N.D. (1981). Some sources and consequences of career exploration. Journal of Vocational Behaviour, 18, 1-12.
- Grossi, E.L., & Berg, B.L. (1991). Stress and job dissatisfaction among correctional officers: An unexpected finding. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 35(1), 73-81.
- Grossi, E.L., Keil, T.J., & Vito, G.F. (1996). Surviving "the joint": Mitigating factors of correctional officer stress. Journal of Crime and Justice, XIX(2), 103-120.
- 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), 219-231.

- Handy, J.A., (1988). Theoretical and methodological problems within occupational stress and burnout research. Human Relations, 41(5), 351-369.
- Hatcher, L., & Stepanski, E.J. (1994). A Step-by-Step Approach to Using the SAS System for Univariate and Multivariate Statistics. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc.
- Harenstam, A., Palm, U.B., & Theorell, T. (1988). Stress, health and the working environment of Swedish prison staff. Work & Stress, 2(4), 281-290.
- Harris, J.R. (1991). The utility of the transaction approach for occupational stress research. Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality, 6(7), 21-29.
- Hepburn, J.R., & Albonetti, C. (1980). Role conflict in correctional institutions: An empirical examination of the treatment-custody dilemma among correctional staff.
- Hepburn, J.R., & Knepper, P.E. (1993). Correctional officers as human service workers: The effect on job satisfaction. Justice Quarterly, 10(2), 315-335.
- House, J.S. (1981). Work Stress and Social Support. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Hurst, T.E., & Hurst, M.M. (1997). Gender differences in mediation of severe occupational stress among correctional officers. American Journal of Criminal Justice, 22(1), 121-137.
- Jacobs, J.K. (1978). What prison guards think: A profile of the Illinois force. Crime and Delinquency, 24, 185-196.
- Johnson, R. (1978). Ameliorating prison stress: Some helping roles for custodial personnel. International Journal of Criminology and Penology, 34, 73-84.
- Jurik, N.C., & Musheno, M.C. (1985). The Professionalization of Corrections: Diffusing Organizational Reforms. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Sociological Association.
- Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, R.P., Snoek, J.D., & Rosenthal, R.A. (1964). Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. New York: Wiley.
- Kanungo, R.N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 341-349.
- Karasek, R.A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 285-308.
- Karasek, R.A., & Theorell, T. (1990). Healthy work: Stress, productivity and the reconstruction of working life. New York: Basic Books.

- Kauffman, K. (1988). Prison officers and their world. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kiely, J., & Hodgson, G. (1990). Stress in the prison service: The benefits of exercise programs. Human Relations, 43(6), 551-572.
- Klofas, J., & Toch, H. (1982). The guard subculture myth. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 19, 238-254.
- Lariviere, M., & Robinson, D. (1996). Attitudes of CSC correctional officers towards offenders. Ottawa: Correctional Service Canada.
- Lasky, G.L., Gordon, B.C., & Srebalus, D.J. (1986). Occupational stressors among federal correctional officers working in different security levels. Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 13(3), 317-327.
- Launey, G., & Fielding, P.J. (1989). Stress among prison officers: Some empirical evidence based on self report. The Howard Journal, 28(2), 138-148.
- Lazarus, R.S., (1966). Psychological stress and the coping process. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lazarus, R.S., (1991). Psychological stress in the workplace. Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality, 6(7), 1-13.
- Light, S.C. (1991). Assaults on prison officers: Interactional themes. Justice Quarterly, 8(2), 141-156.
- Lindquist, C.A., & Whitehead, J.T. (1986). Burnout, job stress, and job satisfaction among southern correctional officers: Perceptions and causal factors. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services & Rehabilitation, 10(4), 5-26.
- Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), The Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Lombardo, L.X. (1981). Occupational stress in correction officers: Sources, coping strategies, and implications. In Zimmerman, S.E., & Miller, H.D. (Eds.), Corrections at the crossroads. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Long, N.R., Shouksmith, G., Voges, K.E., & Roache, S. (1986). Stress in prison staff: An occupational study. Criminology, 24, 331-345.
- Martson, J.L. (1993). Stress and stressors: Inmate and staff perceptions. American Jails, 7(4), 21-30.

- Matthieu, J.E., & Zajac, D.M. (1990). A review and meta-analysis of the antecedents, correlates, and consequences of organizational commitment. Psychological Bulletin, 108, 171-194.
- McCall, J., (1979). The problems of stress in correctional institutions. In J.J. Dahl and E.A. Anderson (Eds.), Management of stress in corrections. Washington: University Research Corp.
- McCorkle, R.C., Miethe, T.D., & Drass, K.A. (1995). The roots of prison violence: A test of the deprivation, management, and 'not-so-total' institution models. Crime and Delinquency, 41(3), 121-157.
- McGrath, J. (1970). A conceptual formulation for research on stress. In J. McGrath (Ed.), Social and psychological factors in stress. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.
- Menard, J.M. (1978). Preparing correctional officers and inmates for their interaction. In S. Moore-Jochums (Ed.), Tools for trainers. Illinois: Southern Illinois University.
- Morrison, D.L., Dunne, M.P., Fitzgerald, R., & Cloghan, D. (1992). Job design and levels of physical and mental strain among Australian prison officers. Work & Stress, 6(1), 13-31.
- Murphy, J.R., & Hurrell, J.J. (1987). Stress measurement and management in organizations: Development and current status. In A.W. Riley & S.J. Zaccharo (Eds.), Occupational Stress and Organizational Effectiveness. New York: Praeger.
- Ouimet, M. (1999). Remarkable rarity of violence toward staff in prisons. Forum on Corrections Research, 17(1), 29-35.
- Patterson, B.L. (1992). Job experience and perceived job stress among police, correctional, and probation/parole officers. Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 19(3), 260-285.
- Pedhauzer, E.J. (1982). Multiple Regression in Behavioural Research: Explanation and Prediction. Holt, Rinehart & Winston: Forth Worth, Texas.
- Philliber, S. (1987). Thy brother's keeper: A review of the literature on correctional officers. Justice Quarterly, 4(1), 9-37. .
- Pogrebin, M. (1977). Role conflict among correctional officers in treatment oriented correctional institutions. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 21, 168-179.
- Pollack, C., & Sigler, R. (1998). Low levels of stress among Canadian correctional officers in the northern region of Ontario. Journal of Criminal Justice, 26(2), 117-128.

- Poole, E.D., & Pogrebin, M.R. (1988). Deputy sheriffs as jail guards: A study of correctional policy orientations and career phases. Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 15(2), 190-209.
- Poole, E.D., & Regoli, R.M. (1980). Role stress, custody orientation, and disciplinary actions: A study of prison guards. Criminology, 7, 303-314.
- Porter, L.W., Steers, R.M., Mowday, R.T., & Boulian, P.V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover among psychiatric technicians. Journal of Applied Psychology, 59, 603-609.
- Robinson, D., Lefaive, P., & Muirhead, M. (1997). Results of the 1996 CSC Staff Survey: A Synopsis. Correctional Research and Development Branch. CSC: Ottawa.
- Robinson, D., & Mirabelli, L. (1996). Summary of Findings of the 1995 CSC National Inmate Survey. Correctional Research and Development Branch. CSC: Ottawa.
- Robinson, D., Porporino, F.J., & Simourd, L. (1997). The influence of educational attainment on the attitudes and job performance of correctional officers. Crime and Delinquency, 43(1), 60-77.
- Robinson, D., Porporino, F.J., & Simourd, L. (1993). The influence of career orientation on support for rehabilitation among correctional staff. The Prison Journal, 73, 162-177.
- Robinson, D., Porporino, F.J., & Simourd, L. (1996). Do different occupational groups vary on attitudes and work adjustment in corrections?. Federal Probation, 60(3), 45-53.
- Robinson, D., & Stevenson, J. (1995). Results of the 1994 CSC All-Staff Survey: A Synopsis. Correctional Research and Development Branch, CSC: Ottawa.
- Rutter, D.R., & Fielding, P.J. (1988). Sources of occupational stress: An examination of British prison officers. Work & Stress, 2(4), 291-300.
- Sauter, S.L., & Hurrell, J.J. (1989). Introduction. In S.L. Sauter, J.J. Hurrell, & C.L. Cooper (Eds.), Job Control and Worker Health. Chichester, England: Wiley.
- Saylor, W.G. (1983). Surveying Prison Environments. Unpublished manuscript, Office of Research, Federal Bureau of Prison. Washington, D.C.
- Saylor, W.G., & Wright, K.N. (1992). Status, longevity, and perceptions of the work environment among federal prison employees. Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 17(3/4), 133-160.

- Schlenker, B.R. (1987). Threats to identity: Self-identification and social stress. In C.R. Snyder & C.E. Ford (Eds.), Coping with Negative Life Events: Clinical and Social Psychological Perspectives. New York: Plenum.
- Shamir, B., & Drory, A. (1982). Occupational tedium among prison officers. Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 9(1), 79-99.
- 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.
- Stalgaitis, S.J., Meyers, A.W., & Krisak, J. (1982). A social learning theory model for reduction of correctional officer stress. Federal Probation, 46, 33-41.
- 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, 22(4), 313-327.
- Sykes, G.M. (1958). The Society of Captives: A Study of a Maximum Security Prison. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tellier, C., & Robinson, D. (1995). Correlates of Job Stress among Front-line Correctional Staff. Paper presented at the 42nd Annual Conference of the Canadian Psychological Association. Charlottetown, PEI.
- Theorell, T., & Karasek, R.A. (1996). Current issues relating to psychosocial job strain and cardiovascular disease research. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 1, 9-26.
- Thoits, P.A. (1991). On merging identity theory and stress research. Social Psychology Quarterly, 54, 101-102.
- Vagg, P.R., & Spielberger, C.D. (1998). Occupational stress: Measuring job pressure and organizational support in the workplace. Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 3(4), 294-305.
- Van Fleet, F. (1992). Correctional officers and their families: Dealing with stress. In American Correctional Association, The effective correctional officer. Laurel, MD.
- Van Harrison, R. (1978). Person-environment fit. In C.L. Cooper and R. Payne (Eds.), Stress at work. New York: Wiley.

- Van Voorhis, P., Cullen, F.T., Link, B.G., & Wolfe, N.T. (1991). The impact of race and gender on correctional officer's orientation to the integrated environment. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 28(4), 472-500.
- Whitehead, J.T., & Lindquist, C.A. (1986). Correctional officer job burnout – A path model. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 23(1), 23-42.
- Whitehead, J.T., & Lindquist, C.A. (1989). Determinants of correctional officers' professional orientation. Justice Quarterly, 6, 69-87.

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 worksites, 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 worksite 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 X 3 4

Correctional Service Canada Staff Survey

1996

**Coopers
& Lybrand
Consulting**

**Solutions
for Business™**

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
☐ Some High School
☐ High School Graduate
☐ Some College | ☐ College Graduate
☐ Some University
☐ University Graduate
☐ 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				
<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td style="width: 30px; height: 30px;"></td><td style="width: 30px; height: 30px;"></td></tr></table>			+	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td style="width: 30px; height: 30px;"></td><td style="width: 30px; height: 30px;"></td></tr></table>		
8. How long have you been working at your present work site?
Years		Months				
<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td style="width: 30px; height: 30px;"></td><td style="width: 30px; height: 30px;"></td></tr></table>			+	<table border="1" style="display: inline-table; vertical-align: middle;"><tr><td style="width: 30px; height: 30px;"></td><td style="width: 30px; height: 30px;"></td></tr></table>		
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

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

--	--	--

	RHQ
	Staff College
	Clustered Services
	William Head Inst.
	Matsqui Inst.
	RHC
	Mountain Inst.
	Kent Inst.
	Elbow Lake Inst.
	Ferndale Inst.
	Mission Inst.
	Vancouver DPO*
	Vancouver Island DPO*
	Fraser Valley DPO*
	Northern Interior DPO*
	Other

	RHQ
	Staff College
	RPC
	Clustered Services
	Stony Mountain Inst.
	Rockwood Inst.
	Saskatchewan Pen.
	Riverbend Inst.
	Special Handling Unit
	Okimaw OHCI Healing Lodge
	Drumheller Inst.
	Grande Cache Institution
	Bowden Inst.
	Edmonton Institution for Women
	Edmonton Inst.
	Manitoba - NW Ont. DPO
	Saskatchewan DPO*
	Edmonton DPO
	Calgary DPO
	Other

	RHQ
	Staff College
	Clustered Services
	Mont. St-Fran. Inst.
	Fed. Training Cent.
	Donnacona Inst.
	Joliette Institution
	Leclerc Inst.
	Archambault Inst.
	Ste-A.-des-P. Inst.
	Reg. Recept. Cent.
	Drummond Inst.
	Cowansville Inst.
	La Macaza Inst.
	Port-Cartier Inst.
	Montréal Metro DPO*
	Ruraux PO (Rimouski,
	Chicoutimi, Rouyn-Noranda)
	Moyens PO (Trois-Rivières,
	Hull, Lanaudière)
	Urbain (Laurentides, Laval,
	Québec, Bureau du district)
	Other

	RHQ
	Staff College
	Clustered Services
	Reg. Treatment Centre
	Kingston Pen.
	Millhaven Inst.
	Bath Inst.
	Prison For Women
	Collins Bay Instit.
	Frontenac Inst.
	Beaver Creek Inst.
	Joyceville Inst.
	Pittsburgh Inst.
	Warkworth Inst.
	Grand Valley Inst. for Women
	Eastern/Northern DPO*
	Ottawa District Parole Office
	Central Ontario DPO*
	Hamilton District Parole Office
	Western DPO*
	Other

	RHQ
	Learning Centre
	Clustered Services
	Springhill Inst.
	Dorchester Inst.
	Westmorland Inst.
	Atlantic Inst.
	Nova Institution for Women
	Halifax/Dartmouth DPO*
	Truro/Kentville/Sydney P.O.
	Nfld & Labrador DPO*
	N.-B. East / P.E.I. DPO*
	N.B. West DPO*
	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

--	--

Administrative support*
Administrative Officer / Supervisor / Manager (Finance, Personnel, Administration, Information Technology, etc.)
Correctional Officer I
Correctional Officer II
Correctional Supervisor / Coordinator
Unit Manager
Case Management Officer / Coordinator
Correctional Programs / Chaplaincy (program delivery officers, shop supervisors, instructors, teachers, social development, recreation, etc.)
Technical / Institutional Services
Health Care / Psychology
Other

Administrative Support
Administrative Officer (Finance, Personnel, Planning, Accountability, Administration, Information Technology, etc)
Clustered Services - Administrative Support
Clustered Services - Administrative Officer/ Supervisor/ Manager (Finance, Personnel, etc.)
Clustered Services - Correctional Programs /Chaplaincy (program delivery officers, shop supervisors, instructors, teachers, social development, recreation, etc.)
Clustered Services - Technical / Institutional Services (Food Services, Stores, Works, Plant Maint., Material Mgmt., etc.)
Other

Administrative support *
Administrative Officer / Supervisor / Manager (Finance, Personnel, etc.)
Correctional Officer II
Case Management Officer
Other

Administrative Support
Administrative Officer (Finance, Personnel, Planning, Accountability, Administration, Information Technology, etc.)
Other

* Clerical, Secretarial, etc.

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.*

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
----------------------	----------	---------	-------	-------------------

1. Unit Management contributes to good interaction between staff and inmates.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Unit Management facilitates interaction among staff at all levels of authority.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Unit Management works well in my institution.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. The Unit Management model is a good one.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Unit Management promotes team spirit.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Unit Management effectively integrates the security, case management and program functions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Unit Management ensures the effective overall control of the inmate population.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Unit Management adversely affects security in my institution.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Unit Management contributes to decision making at the lowest possible level.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

* **Questions #10 through #13 apply to institutional staff who work in or oversee unit management operations: all Correctional Officers and Supervisors/Coordinators, Case Management Officers/Coordinators, Unit Managers, Deputy Wardens and Wardens.**

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

10. My input into the case management process is hindered by:

a) post rotation or shift schedules

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

b) unavailability of post relief

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

c) inadequate facilities or lack of private space

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

d) time

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

11. Unit Management offers opportunities for interesting work.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

12. Unit Management facilitates employee career development.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

13. Unit Management provides opportunities for my professional development.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

SECTION #3 CASE MANAGEMENT

Do Not
Use

*** This section is to be completed by all community staff (Parole Offices, District offices, CCCs) and all institutional staff who have significant or frequent contact with offenders.**

*** If you do not fall within these groups, proceed directly to Section # 4 on page 7.**

Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
----------------------	----------	---------	----------------------	-------------------	-------	-------------------

1. The case management decision-making process leads to sound decisions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Case management decisions are based on complete and accurate information.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. CSC case management practices effectively contribute to protecting the public.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. CSC case management practices are effective in helping offenders become law-abiding citizens.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. CSC has the program and supervision tools necessary for effective case management in the community.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. CSC has enough programs in the community to address the needs of offenders on conditional release.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Our current resources allow us to devote the necessary time with offenders to deliver quality supervision programs in the community.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Motivating offenders to participate in programs is a problem currently facing community corrections.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. CSC community staff maintain good relationships with non-government partners who deliver service to offenders (e.g., halfway houses, substance abuse programs, etc.).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. CSC does not give enough attention to the community side of corrections.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Our community corrections side is increasing its effectiveness in supervising offenders.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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.

1. Staff should work hard to earn trust from offenders.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. It's important for staff to have empathy for offenders.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. The way to get respect from offenders is to take an interest in them.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Sometimes staff should play an advocacy role for an offender.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. There would be much less crime if prisons were more uncomfortable.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Improving prisons for inmates makes things worse for staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. A military regime is the best way of running a prison.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Rehabilitation programs are a waste of time and money.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. You can't ever completely trust an offender.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. A good principle is to not get "close" to offenders.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. If staff are lenient, offenders will take advantage of them.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Rehabilitating an offender is just as important as making an offender pay for his or her crime.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. We should stop viewing offenders as victims of society.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs which are presently being offered in our institutions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION #5 OFFENDERS PROGRAMS

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

The following section seeks your opinion on various aspects of offender programs (e.g. education, substance abuse, living skills, family violence, vocational training, CORCAN)

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.

Programs	Results/Benefits of Programs							
	I am not at all familiar with this Program	Keeps inmates busy	Helps prevent returns to prison	Makes inmates easier to work with	Gives offenders more positive attitudes	Helps reduce drug use in the institution	Helps reduce violence in the institution	Helps meet the operational needs of the institution
a) Adult Basic Education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Jobs in Institutional Services (e.g., kitchen)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Offender Substance Abuse Pre-Release Program	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Aboriginal Liaison Program	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Cognitive Skills Training	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) Vocational Training	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g) Jobs in CORCAN	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h) Private Family Visits	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i) Sex Offender Programs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j) Family Violence Program	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

If you work at National or Regional Headquarters, skip questions 3 & 4 and proceed directly to Section #6, page 11.

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.

ROLE

a) The waiting lists for programs are too long.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Many offenders receive programs which they do not need, just so that they appear to be better candidates for release.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) More resources are needed to support rehabilitation programs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Offenders take programs in order to manipulate the system rather than to improve themselves.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) All staff should be involved in supporting the roles of program staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) Programs are a low priority at this institution/community site.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g) Institutional programming should be conducted as close as possible to release eligibility.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
h) Programs can be as effective in the community as in the institution.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
i) The entrance requirements for programs (e.g., Cognitive Skills, Family Violence, Substance Abuse) are too rigid.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
j) Our programs are effective in reducing recidivism.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
k) Offenders who are not motivated to participate should not be admitted into programs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
l) Offenders can often fool parole board members into granting early release by participating in programs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
m) Our programs are effective in rehabilitating offenders.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
n) All programs should be linked to risk/need assessment.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
o) If necessary, offenders should be required to continue their involvement in programming while under conditional release.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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 behaviour?

ROLE

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Disagree	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
a) I should deliver some of these programs myself.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) I should refer offenders to programs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) I should monitor/observe the progress of the offenders I work with.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) I should support or reinforce the progress offenders make in programs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) I should stay informed about programs being offered.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION #6 WORK ENVIRONMENT

Do Not
Use

To be completed by all CSC staff.

Questions in this section ask you to think about communications within CSC, quality of work life, and how satisfied you are with your present job. For each item, please darken the response circle that best describes your feelings.

1. The information I get through formal communication channels helps me perform my job effectively.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. In CSC, it is often unclear who has the formal authority to make a decision.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. It's really not possible to change things in my worksite.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. I am told promptly when there is a change in policy, rules, or regulations that affects me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. I have the authority I need to accomplish my work objectives.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Employees do not have much opportunity to influence what goes on in CSC.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. From what I have seen, promotions in CSC are seldom related to employee performance.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Management at my worksite is flexible enough to make changes when necessary.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. In CSC, authority is clearly delegated.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. My supervisor involves me in the planning process, such as developing work methods and procedures for my job.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. My supervisor gives me adequate information on how well I am performing.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. My supervisor asks for my opinion when a work-related problem arises.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. I have a great deal of say over what has to be done on my job.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. On my job I know exactly what my supervisor expects of me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in my job.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. The opportunity to supplement my income by working overtime is one of the most attractive aspects of my job.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

15241

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

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

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

- [illegible]

Do Not
Use

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

26. In my work unit, being male hinders one's ability to perform day to day functions. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
27. In my work unit, being female hinders one's ability to perform day to day functions. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
28. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my job. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
29. From what I have seen, discipline is fairly applied at my worksite. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
30. When I'm at work, I often feel tense or uptight. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
31. A lot of times, my job makes me very frustrated or angry. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
32. Most of the time when I am at work, I don't feel that I have much to worry about. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
33. I am usually calm and at ease when I am working. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
34. I usually feel that I am under a lot of pressure when I am at work. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
35. There are a lot of aspects about my job that can make me pretty upset about things. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
36. I often worry about work-related problems after work hours. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
37. Lack of employment security is one of the major personnel issues facing CSC today. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
38. I have fears about my own employment security in CSC. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
39. CSC is doing as much as it can to maintain employment security of all staff. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
40. I am familiar with the Employee Assistance Program (EAP). ☐ Yes ☐ No => IF NO, SKIP TO SECTION 7

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

41. I feel that EAP provides a confidential service. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
42. If I need help in the future, I would contact the EAP. ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

SECTION #7 CASUAL EMPLOYMENT

Do Not
Use

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 Partially Disagree Undecided Partially Agree Agree Strongly Agree N/A

1. The employment of casuals has enhanced CSC's flexibility

a) to meet unforeseen needs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) to respond to emergencies	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) to conduct short term projects	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) to replace staff for short absences	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Casual employees are committed to performing more than the minimum requirements of their work duties.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

3. Casual employment increases the chances of becoming an indeterminate employee.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

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

☐ Yes

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

Strongly Disagree Partially Disagree Undecided Partially Agree Agree Strongly Agree N/A

5. Casual employees receive adequate training to perform the duties of positions in my classification

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

Do Not
Use

Strongly Disagree Disagree Agree Strongly Agree

6. The employment of casuals has:

a) allowed me to take more vacation time/annual leave when I want it.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) allowed me to undertake more training opportunities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) enabled me to have a more acceptable shift rotation.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) reduced the acting assignments available to me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) reduced the promotion opportunities available to me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
f) prevented me from taking on developmental assignments.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
g) has resulted in a reduction in the overtime I work.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

If you work at National or Regional Headquarters, skip questions 7 & 8 and proceed directly to Section 8, page 16.

7. The employment of casuals has resulted in a lower level of safety.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Lack of orientation of casual employees to the special safety concerns in a correctional environment places them at risk.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. How would you rate the adequacy of your *training* for the following policies, rules and regulations that *apply to your day to day job*?

	Not at all	Not enough	Enough	Too much	Not necessary
--	------------	------------	--------	----------	---------------

a) CCRA & CCRR	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Commissioner's Directives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Regional Instructions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Standing Orders	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Post Orders	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

4. When you need information regarding the following policies, rules and regulations that *apply to your day to day job* (e.g. details, interpretations, applications), how accessible is that information?

	Not at all	Not enough	Enough	Too much	Not necessary
--	------------	------------	--------	----------	---------------

a) CCRA & CCRR	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Commissioner's Directives	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Regional Instructions	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Standing Orders	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Post Orders	☐	☐	☐	☐

5. When required, how often do you apply the following policies, rules and regulations in order to carry out the duties of your job?

	Not at all	Not enough	Enough	Too much	Not necessary
--	------------	------------	--------	----------	---------------

a) CCRA & CCRR	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
b) Commissioner's Directives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
c) Regional Instructions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
d) Standing Orders	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
e) Post Orders	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Do Not
Use

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

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	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:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
(i) The <u>availability</u> of support to help you resolve any problems that you encounter in the area of <i>Financial Services</i> ?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(ii) The <u>quality</u> of support to help you resolve any problems that you encounter in the area of <i>Financial Services</i> .	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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

Financial Management Services

Customer Service

Facilities

Staff

Documentation

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*.

☐

☐

☐

☐

☐

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 hours
- 3a. Including today, have you worked the same shift for the last four work days? ☐ Yes => **IF YES, GO TO QUESTION 4**
☐ No
- 3b. Why not? ☐ I had a shift change in the preceeding 4 days => **GO TO QUESTION 5**
☐ I had day(s) off (sick leave, annual leave, etc.) in the preceeding 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."
- ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
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 | Slightly
Negative | None | Positive |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| a) Relations with family | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| b) Relations with friends | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| c) Other non-working activities | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

SECTION #10 HARASSEMENT

*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 or discriminated against?	How 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?	☐	☐

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

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Partially Disagree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Partially Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
5. If I were harassed, I would complain to authorities.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. If I complained about harassment, I feel that there would be retaliation by management towards me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. If I complained about harassment, I feel that there would be retaliation by my colleagues towards me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. I feel that my supervisor is committed to eliminating harassment in the workplace.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. I feel the level of harassment has diminished in the past two years.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION #11 CAREER DEVELOPMENT*To be completed by all CSC staff.*

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

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
1. The information that I require to manage my career is available to me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
2. My current Personal Development Plan addresses my training and development needs and outlines a realistic plan to meet these objectives.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐ I do not have one
3. My supervisor plays an active role in my career planning and development.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
4. I feel I need new ideas to help me become more effective at my job.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
5. Staff development within CSC is promoted by management.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
6. I feel that CSC provides a work environment that facilitates my learning as an employee.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
7. I am interested in developing additional skills which would make me a more effective employee.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
8. The responsibility to manage one's career rests primarily with the employee.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
9. Career Planning is irrelevant in the Public Service at this time.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
10. Developmental activities, once identified in a Personal Development Plan, occur as planned.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
11. Supervisors provide sufficient input in the selection process for competitions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	

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 | | | | | | | | |

SECTION #12 ATTITUDES TOWARDS CSC

To be completed by all CSC staff.

Questions in this section ask you to think about your attitudes toward 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
----------------------	----------	-----------------------	-----------	--------------------	-------	-------------------

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 CSC.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
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 CSC.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Staff can play an important role in fostering a positive image of the Service.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. CSC's Corporate Objectives accurately describe what our priorities <u>should</u> be.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. I support CSC's mission.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. I believe that CSC is treated unfairly in the media.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. The public should demand greater accountability from CSC regarding issues of the safe reintegration of offenders.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. CSC should consult more with the public on issues that concern the management of offenders.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Do Not
Use

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Partially Disagree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Partially Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
12. CSC responds adequately to the findings of the Correctional Investigator.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. CSC should be more pro-active in educating the public about corrections.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Federal corrections will never be viewed in a positive way by the public.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. Most of our successes in safely reintegrating offenders go without notice in the media.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Inquiries and other forms of investigation have greatly assisted us to learn from our mistakes.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. CSC can greatly improve its effectiveness in protecting the public.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. I believe that the Service has a significant role to play in the area of crime prevention.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. CSC needs to develop stronger working relationships with other sectors of the criminal justice system.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. The public has unrealistic expectations about our ability to change the behaviour of offenders.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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.

<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Partially Disagree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Partially Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
------------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------	--------------	---------------------------

1. My workplace environment is satisfactory with respect to:

(a) air quality	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(b) heating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(c) lighting	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
(d) ergonomic factors (properly designed chairs and work stations)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

2. Management at my worksite takes appropriate action on infractions of safety and health regulations.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

3. My supervisor is committed to the promotion of occupational safety and health.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

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

<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Partially Disagree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Partially Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
------------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------	--------------	---------------------------

4. CSC policies and procedures are adequate to minimize the risk of injury posed by offenders at my worksite.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

5. The risk to my personal safety posed by offenders is the source of significant stress in my life.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

6. I am satisfied with the measures taken at my worksite to manage the risk of harm presented to staff by offenders.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

7. In my opinion, the risk to me of physical assault by offenders has increased significantly over the past two years.

☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------

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

8. I have received sufficient education/training on how to prevent the transmission of HIV/AIDS.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. I have received sufficient education/training on how to prevent the transmission of infectious diseases (other than HIV/AIDS), such as tuberculosis and hepatitis B.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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

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

10. I feel that CSC should revise its draft non-smoking policy to restrict smoking even further in any indoor or enclosed space within the institution.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. I feel that smoking should be eliminated entirely from any indoor or enclosed space within the institution.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. I believe the elimination of smoking by staff, inmates and the public, in any indoor or enclosed space within the institution will be successfully implemented.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. When the policy is implemented, inmates will come to accept the restriction on smoking in any indoor or enclosed space within the institution.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. In the long run, the draft non-smoking policy will have benefits for everyone.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. I believe that most inmates are opposed to the draft non-smoking policy.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Inmates will take advantage of programs that will help them quit smoking if they are made available.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. I support the CSC non-smoking policy.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION #14 OFFENDER DRUG STRATEGY

*** 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.

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Partially Disagree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Partially Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
1. Urinalysis has resulted in a decrease in drug use in institutions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Offenders have found ways of sabotaging our ability to detect illegal drug use through urinalysis.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Substance Abuse Treatment Programs have helped decrease the use of drugs in institutions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Inmates have resisted our efforts to mount a successful drug strategy.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. The drug strategy has resulted in CSC having more control over the problem of drugs coming into institutions through visitors.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. The implementation of the Drug Strategy, including the use of urinalysis and other technologies has reduced the level of job stress I experience.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Urinalysis greatly contributes to our ability to effectively manage risk in the community.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. A program of random urinalysis should be implemented in the community setting.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. The implementation of the Drug Strategy, including the use of urinalysis and other technologies has increased my ability to assess offender risk/needs.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION #15 VOLUNTEERS

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

Questions in this section ask you to think about volunteers working for CSC. For each item, please darken the response circle that best describes your feelings.

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Partially Disagree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Partially Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
1. Volunteers help institutions run more smoothly.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Volunteers help parole offices run more smoothly.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. The use of volunteers is essential to maintaining offender links to the community.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. The use of volunteers threatens my job security.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Volunteers only get in the way of running this operational unit successfully.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Volunteers pose a major threat to the security of operational units.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. This operational unit makes good use of volunteers.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. We need to do a better job of selecting, training and screening volunteers.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Volunteers help the general public to know more about Correctional Service Canada.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Volunteers only create more work for me.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. We need more volunteers to assist us in working with offenders in the community.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

SECTION #16 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CSC AND NPB*To be completed by all CSC staff.*

Questions in this section ask you to think about the relationship between CSC and National Parole Board. For each item, please darken the response circle that best describes your feelings.

	<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Partially Disagree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Partially Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
1. Generally, NPB members have a good understanding of what we do to prepare offenders for release.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. NPB members make good use of case management assessment reports that are provided to them.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. We need to have a better relationship with the NPB.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. CSC must do a better job of communicating with the NPB.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. NPB members have the knowledge they need to successfully work with our community supervision staff.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. The NPB utilizes special conditions in a manner that assists CSC to effectively manage risk in the community.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. CSC and NPB are effective partners in the criminal justice system.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. CSC and NPB work well together in the task of protecting society.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. CSC and NPB should engage in more developmental activities together (e.g. training, information systems, research, staff exchange).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. CSC and NPB provide each other with mutual support in pursuing their mandates.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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	

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

☐ Everyday

☐ 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?

- a) Painkillers (e.g., Tylenol, Aspirin)
- b) Antacids (e.g., Tums, Rolaids, Maalox)
- c) Antihistamines (e.g., Seldane, Hismanal)

Almost every day	About once a week	About once a month	Rarely or Never
---------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------

☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐

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	46kg	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

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.

<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	<i>Disagree</i>	<i>Partially Disagree</i>	<i>Undecided</i>	<i>Partially Agree</i>	<i>Agree</i>	<i>Strongly Agree</i>
------------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------------	------------------	----------------------------	--------------	---------------------------

Ⓐ Ⓑ Ⓒ Ⓓ Ⓔ Ⓕ Ⓖ

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

<i>Much Too Fast</i>	<i>Too Fast</i>	<i>About Right</i>	<i>Too Slow</i>	<i>Much Too Slow</i>
--------------------------	-----------------	------------------------	-----------------	--------------------------

Ⓐ Ⓑ Ⓒ Ⓓ Ⓔ

3. Do you have a need for remote access to the network (e.g. IN 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?

<i>Every Day</i>	<i>At Least Once/A Week</i>	<i>Less Than Once/a Week</i>	<i>Never</i>
----------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	--------------

Ⓐ Ⓑ Ⓒ Ⓓ

*** 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?

<i>Very Poor</i>	<i>Unsatisfactory</i>	<i>Satisfactory</i>	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Do Not Use</i>
----------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	------------------	-----------------------

- a. WORD for word processing
b. EXCEL for spreadsheets
c. Powerpoint for presentations
d. Teamlinks/Al 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 computer

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

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?

Very Poor Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Excellent Not Applicable

① ② ③ ④ ⑤

① ② ③ ④ ⑤

① ② ③ ④ ⑤

① ② ③ ④ ⑤

① ② ③ ④ ⑤

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 10

Very Poor Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Excellent

a. 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 (accurate/up-to-date) of the information in ARMS?

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

Disagree Agree The Same No Opinion

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

① ② ③ ④

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

- 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 (accurate/up-to-date) of the information in CAMS?

Very Poor Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Excellent

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

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

- 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 (accurate/up-to-date) of the information in EIS?

Very Poor Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Excellent

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

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

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

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

☐ Yes

☐ No => IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 13

Very Poor	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
-----------	----------------	--------------	-----------

- 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?

☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐

Disagree	Agree	The Same	No Opinion
----------	-------	----------	------------

- 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

Very Poor	Unsatisfactory	Satisfactory	Excellent
-----------	----------------	--------------	-----------

- 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?

☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐

Disagree	Agree	The Same	No Opinion
----------	-------	----------	------------

- 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

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

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

Disagree Agree The Same No Opinion

① ② ③ ④

- 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

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

Disagree Agree The Same No Opinion

① ② ③ ④

- 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

15241

Do Not
Use

16. Do you use Offender Management System (OMS)?

☐ Yes

☐ No => IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 17

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

Very Poor Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Excellent

○ ○ ○ ○

○ ○ ○ ○

○ ○ ○ ○

○ ○ ○ ○

○ ○ ○ ○

○ ○ ○ ○

Disagree Agree The Same No Opinion

○ ○ ○ ○

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

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

☐ Yes

☐ No

17. Do you use Salary Information Management System (SIMS)?

☐ Yes

☐ No => IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 18

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

Very Poor Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Excellent

○ ○ ○ ○

○ ○ ○ ○

○ ○ ○ ○

○ ○ ○ ○

○ ○ ○ ○

○ ○ ○ ○

Disagree Agree The Same No Opinion

○ ○ ○ ○

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

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

☐ Yes

☐ No

15241

Do Not
Use

18. Do you use Office Automation Tools and Applications (Word, Excel, Powerpoint, OntTime, Government and CSC Phonebook, CD Finder, Hotel Directory, Teamlinks/AiMail 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 (accurate/up-to-date) of the information in OA?

Very Poor Unsatisfactory Satisfactory Excellent

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

① ② ③ ④

Disagree Agree The Same No Opinion

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

① ② ③ ④

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

☐ 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

Correctional Service Canada

CSC Staff Survey Scoring Guide for Composite Scales
1996 Staff Survey Version

Organizational Communication (ORGCOM)

6.1

6.2 -reversed

6.4

6.9

(Sum of items)/4 % Favorable = > 4

1. The information I get through formal communication channels helps me perform my job effectively.
2. In CSC, it is often unclear who has the formal authority to make a decision.
4. I am told promptly when there is a change in policy, rules, or regulations that affects me.
9. In CSC, authority is clearly delegated.

Staff Empowerment (EMPOWER)

6.3 - reversed

6.5

6.6 - reversed

6.8

(Sum of items)/4 % Favorable = > 4

3. It's really not possible to change things in my worksite.
5. I have the authority I need to accomplish my work objectives.
6. Employees do not have much opportunity to influence what goes on in CSC.
8. Management at my worksite is flexible enough to make changes when necessary.

Quality of Supervision (SUPERV)

6.10

6.11

6.12

6.13

6.14

6.19

(Sum of items)/6 % Favorable = > 4

10. My supervisor engages me in the planning process, such as developing work methods and procedures for my job.
11. My supervisor gives me adequate information on how well I am performing.
12. My supervisor asks my opinion when a work-related problem arises.
13. I have a great deal of say over what has to be done on my job.
14. On my job I know exactly what my supervisor expects of me.
19. My supervisor demonstrates sensitivity to such personal needs as shift or leave requests by fairly balancing them against operational requirements.

Staff Recognition (SRECOG)

6.20

6.21

6.22

(Sum of items)/3 % Favorable = > 4

- 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.

Provision of Staff Services (PROSERV)

6.40

6.23a

6.23b

(Sum of items)/3 % Favorable = > 4

- 40. I am familiar with the Employee Assistance Program (EAP).
- 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/ fitness program activities that meet my needs. (e.g. smoke cessation, weight management, health education).

Fair Treatment of Employees (FAIR)

6.24a-e

6.25

6.29

(Sum of items)/7 % Favorable = > 4

- 24. I feel that employees in CSC are treated fairly, regardless of:
 - a. race
 - b. national or ethnic origin
 - c. gender
 - d. physical disability
 - e. language
- 25. I feel that CSC is committed to ensuring equal opportunities for all employees.
- 29. From what I have seen, discipline is fairly applied at my worksite.

Job Satisfaction (JOBSAT)

6.15

6.28

(Sum of items)/2 % favorable = > 4

15. I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in my job.

28. Generally speaking, I am very satisfied with my job.

Frequency of Harassment (FHARASS)

10.2a-d

% Often = Any item = 3

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

a) Personal

b) Sexual

c) Abuse of Authority

d) Discrimination in Employment

Adequacy of CSC Response to Harassment (HRESPOND)

10.6 - reversed

10.7 - reversed

10.8

(Sum of items)/3 % Favorable = >4

6. If I complained about harassment, I feel that there would be retaliation by management towards me.

7. If I complained about harassment, I feel that there would be retaliation by my colleagues towards me.

8. I feel that my supervisor is committed to eliminating harassment in the workplace.

Willingness to Report Harassment (HWILLING)

10.1

10.3

10.5

(Sum of items)/3 % Willing = > 4

1. I am aware of CSC's harassment complaint process.

3. If I observed an incident of harassment, I would agree to be a witness.

5. If I were harassed, I would complain.

Seriousness of Personal Harassment (HSERIOUS)

10.4a-d

% Experiencing Very Serious Harassment = Any item = 2.

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

TYPE

- a) Personal
- b) Sexual
- c) Abuse of Authority
- d) Discrimination in Employment

Performance Appraisal (PERFORM)

11.16

11.17

11.18

(Sum of items)/3 % Favorable = > 4

- 16. The Performance Evaluation/ Appraisal process provides me with enough feedback on my performance to manage my career.
- 17. The standards used to evaluate my performance have been fair and objective.
- 18. My last annual performance rating presented a fair and accurate picture of my actual job performance.

Job Stress (JSTRESS)

6.30

6.31

6.32 - reversed

6.33 - reversed

6.34

6.35

6.36

(Sum of items)/7 % Experiencing Stress = > 4

- 30. When I'm at work, I often feel tense or uptight.
- 31. A lot of times, my job makes me very frustrated or angry.
- 32. Most of the time when I am at work, I don't feel that I have much to worry about.
- 33. I am usually calm and at ease when I am working.
- 34. I usually feel that I am under a lot of pressure when I am at work.
- 35. There are a lot of aspects about my job that can make me pretty upset about things.
- 36. I often worry about work-related problems after work hours.

Career Management (CAREER)

11.1

11.2

11.3

9.9***(Sum of items)/4 % Favorable = > 4***

1. The information that I require to manage my career is available to me.
2. My current Personal Development Plan addresses my training and development needs and outlines a realistic plan to meet these objectives.
3. My supervisor plays an active role in my career planning and development
9. I am usually able to find the time during normal working hours to complete the training which is necessary to do my job.

Commitment to CSC (COMMIT)

12.1

12.2 - reversed

12.3

12.4

12.5 - reversed

(Sum of items)/5 % Favorable = > 4

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 CSC.
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 CSC.
5. I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar.

Support for CSC Objectives (CSCOBJ)

12.7

12.8

(Sum of items)/2 % Favorable = > 4

7. CSC's Corporate Objectives accurately describes what our priorities should be.
8. I support CSC's mission.

CSC's Promotion of Occupational Health and Safety (OHANDS)

13.2

13.3

(Sum of items)/2 % Favorable = > 4

2. Management at my worksite takes appropriate action on infractions of safety and health regulations.
3. My supervisor is committed to the promotion of occupational safety and health.

Satisfaction with Physical Environment (ENVIRON)

13.1 a-d

(Sum of items)/4 % Favorable = > 4

1. My workplace environment is satisfactory with respect to:
 - (a) air quality
 - (b) heating
 - (c) lighting
 - (d) ergonomic factors (properly designed chairs and work stations)

Perceptions of Personal Security (SECURE)

13.5 - reversed

13.6

13.7 - reversed

13.4

(Sum of items)/4 % Favorable = > 4 Note: National and Regional Headquarters staff are excluded from the scoring of this scale.

5. The risk to my personal safety posed by offenders is the source of significant stress in my life.
6. I am satisfied with the measures taken at my worksite to manage the risk of harm presented to staff by offenders.
7. In my opinion, the risk to me of physical assault by offenders has increased significantly over the past two years.
4. CSC policies and procedures are adequate to minimize the risk of injury posed by offenders at my worksite.

Rehabilitation (REHAB)

4.8 - reversed

4.12

4.14

(Sum of items)/ 3 % Favorable = > 4

- 8. Rehabilitation programs are a waste of time and money.
- 12. Rehabilitating an offender is just as important as making an offender pay for his or her crime.
- 14. I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs which are presently being offered in our institutions.

Empathy Toward Offenders (EMPATHY)

4.1

4.2

4.3

4.4

4.9 - reversed

4.10 - reversed

4.11 - reversed

(Sum of Items)/7 % Favorable = > 4

- 1. Staff should work hard to earn trust from offenders.
- 2. It's important for staff to have compassion for offenders.
- 3. The way to get respect from offenders is to take an interest in them.
- 4. Sometimes staff should advocate for an offender.
- 9. You can't ever completely trust an offender.
- 10. A good principle is to not get "close" to offenders.
- 11. If staff are lenient with offenders, they will take advantage of them.

Punittivenesss (PUNITIVE)

4.5

4.6

4.7

4.13

(Sum of items)/4 % Punitive = > 4

- 5. There would be much less crime if prisons were more uncomfortable.
- 6. Improving prisons for inmates makes them worse for staff.
- 7. A military regime is the best way of running a prison.
- 13. We should stop viewing offenders as victims of society.

Interest in Participating in Offender Programming (OFFPROG)

5.4 a-e

(Sum of items)/5 % Favorable = > 4 Note: National and Regional Headquarters staff are excluded from the scoring of this scale.

4.

- a) I should deliver some of these programs myself.
- b) I should refer offenders to programs.
- c) I should monitor/observe the progress of the offenders I work with.
- d) I should support or reinforce the progress offenders make in programs.
- e) I should stay informed about programs being offered.

Unit Management Effectiveness (UNITME)

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

2.5

2.6

2.7

(Sum of items)/7 % Favorable = > 4 Note: Community and National and Regional Headquarters staff are excluded from the scoring of this scale.

- 1. Unit Management contributes to better interaction between staff and inmates.
- 2. Unit Management facilitates interaction among staff at all levels of authority.
- 3. Unit Management works well in my institution.
- 4. The Unit Management model is a good one.
- 5. Unit Management promotes team spirit.
- 6. Unit Management has effectively integrated the security, case management and program functions.
- 7. Unit Management ensures the effective overall control of the inmate population.

Unit Management Career Benefits (UNITMC)

2.11

2.12

2.13

(Sum of items)/3 % Favorable = > 4 Note: To be scored only for staff with occupational codes of 03,04,05,06,07.

- 11. Unit Management offers opportunities for more interesting work.
- 12. Unit Management facilitates employee career development.
- 13. Unit Management has improved my opportunities for my professional development.

Case Management Effectiveness (CASEMAN)

3.1

3.2

3.3

3.4

(Sum of items)/4 % Favorable = > 4 Note: To be scored only for staff with occupational codes of 03,04,05,06,07.

1. The case management decision-making process leads to sound decisions.
2. Case management decisions are based on complete and accurate information.
3. CSC case management practices effectively contribute to protecting the public.
4. CSC case management practices are effective in helping offenders become law-abiding citizens.

Institutional Smoking Policy (SMOKING)

13.10

13.11

(Sum of items)/2 % Favorable = > 4 Note: To be scored only for institutional staff.

10. I feel that CSC should revise its draft non-smoking policy to restrict smoking even further in any indoor or enclosed space within the institution.
11. I feel that smoking should be eliminated entirely from any indoor or enclosed space within the institution.

Equitable Promotions (EQUIT)

6.7 - reversed

% Favorable = > 4

7. From what I have seen, promotions in CSC are seldom related to employee performance.

New Composite Scales - 1996

Employment Security (EMPSEC)

6.37 - reversed

6.38 - reversed

6.39

(Sum of Items)/3 % Favorable = > 4

37. Lack of employment security is one of the major personnel issues facing CSC today.
38. I have fears about my own employment security in CSC.
39. CSC is doing as much as it can to maintain *employment security of all staff*.

Use of Casuals (CASUALS)

7.1a-d

7.2

(Sum of Items)/5 % Favorable = > 4

1. The employment of casuals has enhanced CSC's flexibility:
 - a) to meet unforeseen needs
 - b) to respond to emergencies
 - c) to conduct short term projects
 - d) to replace staff for short absences
2. Casual employees are committed to performing more than the minimum requirements of their *work* duties.

Application of Policies Section

CCRA (CCRA)

8.1a

8.2a

8.3a

8.4a

8.5a

(Sum of Items)/5 % Favorable = > 2

1. Generally, how would you rate your *understanding* of the following policies, rules and regulations "*that apply to your day to day job*"?
 - a) CCRA & CCRR
2. How would you rate your *knowledge of the specific details* of the following policies, rules and regulations that apply to your job?
 - a) CCRA & CCRR

3. How would you rate the adequacy of your *training* for the following policies, rules and regulations that apply to your job?
 - a) CCRA & CCRR
4. When you need information regarding the following policies, rules and regulations that apply to your job(e.g. details, interpretations, applications), how accessible is that information?
 - a) CCRA & CCRR
5. When required, how often do you apply the following policies, rules and regulations in order to carry out the duties of your job?
 - a) CCRA & CCRR

Commissioners Directives (CDS)

8.1b
8.2b
8.3b
8.4b
8.5b

(Sum of Items)/5 % Favorable = >2

1. Generally, how would you rate your *understanding* of the following policies, rules and regulations "*that apply to your day to day job*"?
 - b) Commissioner's Directives
2. How would you rate your *knowledge of the specific details* of the following policies, rules and regulations that apply to your job?
 - b) Commissioner's Directives
3. How would you rate the adequacy of your *training* for the following policies, rules and regulations that apply to your job?
 - b) Commissioner's Directives
4. When you need information regarding the following policies, rules and regulations that apply to your job(e.g. details, interpretations, applications), how accessible is that information?
 - b) Commissioner's Directives
5. When required, how often do you apply the following policies, rules and regulations in order to carry out the duties of your job?
 - b) Commissioner's Directives

Regional Instructions (RINST)

8.1c

8.2c

8.3c

8.4c

8.5c

(Sum of Items)/5 % Favorable = >2

1. Generally, how would you rate your *understanding* of the following policies, rules and regulations "*that apply to your day to day job*"?
c) Regional Instructions
2. How would you rate your *knowledge of the specific details* of the following policies, rules and regulations that apply to your job?
c) Regional Instructions
3. How would you rate the adequacy of your *training* for the following policies, rules and regulations that apply to your job?
c) Regional Instructions
4. When you need information regarding the following policies, rules and regulations that apply to your job(e.g. details, interpretations, applications), how accessible is that information?
c) Regional Instructions
5. When required, how often do you apply the following policies, rules and regulations in order to carry out the duties of your job?
c) Regional Instructions

Standing Orders (SORDERS)

8.1d

8.2d

8.3d

8.4d

8.5d

(Sum of Items)/5 % Favorable = >2

1. Generally, how would you rate your *understanding* of the following policies, rules and regulations "*that apply to your day to day job*"?
d) Standing Orders
2. How would you rate your *knowledge of the specific details* of the following policies, rules and regulations that apply to your job?
d) Standing Orders

3. How would you rate the adequacy of your *training* for the following policies, rules and regulations that apply to your job?
d) Standing Orders
4. When your need information regarding the following policies, rules and regulations that apply to your job(e.g. details, interpretations, applications), how accessible is that information?
d) Standing Orders
5. When required, how often do you apply the following policies, rules and regulations in order to carry out the duties of your job?
d) Standing Orders

Post Orders (PORDERS)

8.1e

8.2e

8.3e

8.4e

8.5e

(Sum of Items)/5 % Favorable = >2

1. Generally, how would you rate your *understanding* of the following policies, rules and regulations "*that apply to your day to day job*"?
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 job?
e) Post Orders
3. How would you rate the adequacy of your *training* for the following policies, rules and regulations that apply to your job?
e) Post Orders
4. When your need information regarding the following policies, rules and regulations that apply to your job(e.g. details, interpretations, applications), how accessible is that information?
e) Post Orders
5. When required, how often do you apply the following policies, rules and regulations in order to carry out the duties of your job?
e) Post Orders

CSC Policy Orientation (POLICY)

8.6

8.7

8.8

8.9

8.10

(Sum of Items)/5 % Favorable = > 4

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 *immediate* 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.

Openness to Personal Development on the Job (OPEN)

11.4

11.5

11.6

11.7

(Sum of Items)/4 % Favorable = > 4

4. I feel I need new ideas to help me become more effective at my job.
5. Staff development within CSC is promoted by management.
6. I feel that CSC provides a work environment that facilitates my learning as an employee.
7. I am interested in developing additional skills which would make me a more effective employee.

Satisfaction with Employment Competition Process (COMPETE)

11.11

11.12

11.14

11.15

(Sum of Items)/4 % Favorable = > 4

- 11. Supervisors provide sufficient input in the selection process for competitions.
- 12. There is adequate information at the end of the selection process to understand how merit was determined.
- 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.

CSC Accountability to the Public (ACCOUNT)

12.10 - reversed

12.11 - reversed

12.12

12.13 - reversed

12.17 - reversed

(Sum of Items)/5 % Favorable = > 4

- 10. The public should demand greater accountability from CSC regarding issues of the safe reintegration of offenders.
- 11. CSC should consult more with the public on issues that concern the management of offenders.
- 12. CSC responds adequately to the findings of the Correctional Investigator.
- 13. CSC should be more pro-active in educating the public about corrections.
- 17. CSC can greatly improve its effectiveness in protecting the public.

Public Image of CSC (IMAGE)

12.9 -reversed

12.14 reversed

12.20 reversed

(Sum of Items)/3 % Poor Public Image = > 4

- 9. I believe that CSC is treated unfairly in the media.
- 14. Federal corrections will never be viewed in a positive way by the public.
- 20. The public has unrealistic expectations about our ability to change the behaviour of offenders.

Success of the Offender Drug Strategy (DRUGS)

14.1

14.2 -reversed

14.3

14.4 -reversed

14.5

14.6

14.9

(Sum of Items)/7 % Favorable = > 4 *Note: National and Regional Headquarters staff are excluded from the scoring of this scale.*

1. Urinalysis has resulted in a decrease in drug use in institutions.
2. Offenders have found ways of sabotaging our ability to detect illegal drug use through urinalysis.
3. Substance Abuse Treatment Programs have helped decrease the use of drugs in institutions.
4. Inmates have resisted our efforts to mount a successful drug strategy.
5. The drug strategy has resulted in CSC having more control over the problem of drugs coming into institutions through visitors.
6. The implementation of the Drug Strategy, including the use of urinalysis and other technologies has reduced the level of job stress I experience.
9. The implementation of the Drug Strategy, including the use of urinalysis and other technologies has increased my ability to assess offender risk/needs.

Use of Volunteers (VOLENTER)

15.1

15.2

15.3

15.4 -reversed

15.5 -reversed

15.6 -reversed

15.9

15.10 -reversed

(Sum of Items)/8 % Favorable = > 4 *Note: National and Regional Headquarters staff are excluded from the scoring of this scale.*

1. Volunteers help institutions run more smoothly.
2. Volunteers help parole offices run more smoothly.
3. The use of volunteers is essential to maintaining offender links to the community.
4. The use of volunteers threatens my job security.
5. Volunteers only get in the way of running this operational unit successfully.
6. Volunteers pose a major threat to the security of operational units.
9. Volunteers help the general public to know more about Correctional Service Canada.
10. Volunteers only create more work for me.

Quality of Relationship with NPB (NPB)

16.1

16.2

16.3 -reversed

16.4 -reversed

16.7

16.8

16.10

(Sum of Items)/7 % Favorable = > 4

1. Generally, NPB members have a good understanding of what we do to prepare offenders for release.
2. NPB members make good use of case management assessment reports that are provided to them.
3. We need to have a better relationship with the NPB.
4. CSC must do a better job of communicating with the NPB.
7. CSC and NPB are effective partners in the criminal justice system.
8. CSC and NPB work well together in the task of protecting society.
10. CSC and NPB provide each other with mutual support in pursuing their mandates.

Quality of Information Technology Support (ITSUP)

18.6a-b

18.7a-b

18.8

(Sum of Items)/5 % Satisfactory = > 2

6. How would you rate the following:
 - a) the availability of support to help you resolve any problems that you encounter with the personal computer.
 - b) the quality of support to help you resolve any problems that you encounter with the personal computer.
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?