PM-1 3 1/2" x 4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file - Votre référence

Our file - Notre référence

NOTICE

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

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

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

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

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

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

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

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

**THE INFLUENCE OF SHOP SUPERVISOR CHARACTERISTICS ON
EMPLOYEE-REPORTED WORK ATTITUDES
IN A PRISON INDUSTRY SETTING**

Christa A. Gillis

**A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
of Carleton University in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Psychology**

Ottawa, September, 1994

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to express my gratitude to CORCAN for their financial support. Data collection would not have been possible without their assistance. In addition, I would like to thank Operations Managers, supervisors, and offenders for their cooperation and participation.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Dr. Frank Porporino for his role in the development of the research and his advice as thesis supervisor. Thanks is due, as well, to Dr. David Robinson for his constant availability and patience as thesis co-supervisor, and to Dr. John Weekes for his suggestions throughout the development and analysis processes. Their contributions were greatly appreciated. I would also like to thank my thesis committee for their helpful suggestions and comments.

I would like to express sincere appreciation to Bart Millson, Mike Muirhead, and Travis Gee for their assistance with the analyses. Thanks also to Dr. Maury Getkate for providing useful suggestions in the development of the questionnaire.

Finally, I thank my family and Paul for their constant support and assistance.

Name Samuel J. Ellis

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

The effects of shoplifting on characteristics of shoplifters reported on the literature in a review of the literature

SUBJECT TERM

0451

SUBJECT CODE

U·M·I

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language
General 0679
Ancient 0289
Linguistics 0290
Modern 0291
Literature
General 0401
Classical 0294
Comparative 0295
Medieval 0297
Modern 0298
African 0316
American 0591
Asian 0305
Canadian (English) 0352
Canadian (French) 0355
English 0593
Germanic 0311
Latin American 0312
Middle Eastern 0315
Romance 0313
Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion
General 0318
Biblical Studies 0321
Clergy 0319
History of 0320
Philosophy of 0322
Theology 0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology
Archaeology 0324
Cultural 0326
Physical 0327
Business Administration
General 0310
Accounting 0272
Banking 0770
Management 0454
Marketing 0338
Canadian Studies 0385
Economics
General 0501
Agricultural 0503
Commerce-Business 0505
Finance 0508
History 0509
Labor 0510
Theory 0511
Folklore 0358
Geography 0366
Gerontology 0351
History
General 0578

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science
General 0615
International Law and Relations 0616
Public Administration 0617
Recreation 0814
Social Work 0452
Sociology
General 0626
Criminology and Penology 0627
Demography 0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0631
Individual and Family Studies 0628
Industrial and Labor Relations 0629
Public and Social Welfare 0630
Social Structure and Development 0700
Theory and Methods 0344
Transportation 0709
Urban and Regional Planning 0999
Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture
General 0473
Agronomy 0285
Animal Culture and Nutrition 0475
Animal Pathology 0476
Food Science and Technology 0359
Forestry and Wildlife 0478
Plant Culture 0479
Plant Pathology 0480
Plant Physiology 0817
Range Management 0777
Wood Technology 0746
Biology
General 0306
Anatomy 0287
Biostatistics 0308
Botany 0309
Cell 0379
Ecology 0329
Entomology 0353
Genetics 0369
Limnology 0793
Microbiology 0410
Molecular 0307
Neuroscience 0317
Oceanography 0416
Physiology 0433
Radiation 0321
Veterinary Science 0778
Zoology 0472
Biophysics
General 0786
Medical 0760

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Palynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences
General 0566
Audiology 0300
Chemotherapy 0992
Dentistry 0567
Education 0350
Hospital Management 0769
Human Development 0758
Immunology 0982
Medicine and Surgery 0564
Mental Health 0347
Nursing 0569
Nutrition 0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0380
Occupational Health and Therapy 0354
Ophthalmology 0381
Pathology 0571
Pharmacology 0419
Pharmacy 0572
Physical Therapy 0382
Public Health 0573
Radiology 0574
Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences
Chemistry
General 0485
Agricultural 0749
Analytical 0486
Biochemistry 0487
Inorganic 0488
Nuclear 0738
Organic 0490
Pharmaceutical 0491
Physical 0494
Polymer 0495
Radiation 0754
Mathematics 0405
Physics
General 0605
Acoustics 0986
Astronomy and Astrophysics 0606
Atmospheric Science 0608
Atomic 0748
Electronics and Electricity 0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy 0798
Fluid and Plasma 0759
Molecular 0609
Nuclear 0610
Optics 0752
Radiation 0756
Solid State 0611
Statistics 0463
Applied Sciences
Applied Mechanics 0346
Computer Science 0984

Engineering
General 0537
Aerospace 0538
Agricultural 0539
Automotive 0540
Biomedical 0541
Chemical 0542
Civil 0543
Electronics and Electrical 0544
Heat and Thermodynamics 0348
Hydraulic 0545
Industrial 0546
Marine 0547
Materials Science 0794
Mechanical 0548
Metallurgy 0743
Mining 0551
Nuclear 0552
Packaging 0549
Petroleum 0765
Sanitary and Municipal 0554
System Science 0790
Geotechnology 0428
Operations Research 0796
Plastics Technology 0795
Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

Christa Gillis
Psychology Department
Carleton University

September 11, 1995

Ms Sneja Mouelhi
Thesis Supervisor
Room 326, MacOdrum Library
Carleton University

RE. Removal of copyrighted material in M A thesis, "The influence of shop supervisor characteristics on employee-reported work attitudes in a prison industry setting"

Dear Ms Mouelhi,

Further to our recent discussion, I am writing to approve removal of the copyrighted material found in my thesis (pages 84-90 and 107-113) for purposes of translating the document to microfiche. Given the cost involved in using the questionnaire, I feel it would be easier to remove the above-listed pages rather than include them.

Please contact me if you require further information (cgillis@ccs.carleton.ca or by phone 237-1907).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'Christa Gillis', written in dark ink.

Christa Gillis

The undersigned hereby recommend to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
acceptance of the thesis submitted by
Christa Gillis
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

Chairman, Department of Psychology

Thesis Supervisors

Carleton University

September, 1994

Abstract

This study explored the role of industrial shop supervisor characteristics in promoting positive work outcomes in offenders. In the attempt to examine a variety of supervisor leadership behaviours, the study sampled supervisors and offenders from seven institutional sites under the jurisdiction of the Correctional Service of Canada. A total of 36 shop supervisors and 155 offenders participated in the study. A number of possible supervisor characteristics which may impact upon an offender were examined. These included leadership orientation, correctional orientation, credibility, and supervisor performance. Offenders completed self-report measures assessing work motivation, work involvement, and organizational outcomes. In addition, Operations Managers completed a measure designed to assess supervisor performance. Results indicated that offenders reported more positive work attitudes when they perceived their supervisors as credible and as displaying active transformational leadership behaviours. In addition, offenders working with supervisors rated positively by Operations Managers reported higher levels of work motivation. The present study extended previous research investigating staff attitudes and perceptions about working in corrections by examining the manner in which these attitudes affect offender attitudes. By assessing contributions from Managers, supervisors, and offenders, the study demonstrated that the attitudes and behaviours of shop supervisors do influence offender work attitudes.

Acknowledgements

First, I would like to express my gratitude to CORCAN for their financial support. Data collection would not have been possible without their assistance. In addition, I would like to thank Operations Managers, supervisors, and offenders for their cooperation and participation.

I would also like to express my gratitude to Dr. Frank Porporino for his role in the development of the research and his advice as thesis supervisor. Thanks is due, as well, to Dr. David Robinson for his constant availability and patience as thesis co-supervisor, and to Dr. John Weekes for his suggestions throughout the development and analysis processes. Their contributions were greatly appreciated. I would also like to thank my thesis committee for their helpful suggestions and comments.

I would like to express sincere appreciation to Bart Millson, Mike Muirhead, and Travis Gee for their assistance with the analyses. Thanks also to Dr. Maury Getkate for providing useful suggestions in the development of the questionnaire.

Finally, I thank my family and Paul for their constant support and assistance.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Tables	vi
Introduction	1
Developments in rehabilitation research	3
Social learning theory	5
Model of intervention in human service agencies	6
Supervisor characteristics	9
Independent variables	10
Dependent variables	17
Covariates	19
Present Study	20
Hypotheses	20
Methods	22
Participants	22

Table of Contents (cont'd)

Procedure	23
Measures	25
Independent variables	25
Dependent variables	32
Covariates	36
Results	45
Social desirability response bias	45
Criterion validity of the leadership measures	45
Principle analyses	47
Discussion	64
References	72
Appendices	78

List of Tables

1: Means and alphas for the leadership and credibility measures: Offenders	28
2: Means and alphas for the correctional orientation measures: Supervisors	31
3: Means for the Operations Manager ratings of the supervisor	33
4: Means and alphas for the offender work attitude outcome measures	34
5: Means and alphas for social desirability measures	38
6: CORCAN work history: Offenders	40
7: Frequency and lengths of time offenders spend with supervisors	41
8: Intercorrelations between predictor variables and covariates	42
9: Intercorrelations between offender-reported outcome variables and covariates	44
10: Intercorrelations between supervisor social desirability measures and supervisor-reported predictor variables	46
11: Intercorrelations and partial correlations between supervisor reports and offender reports on leadership dimensions	48
12: Intercorrelations and partial correlations between supervisor reports and Operations Manager reports of supervisor performance	49
13: Intercorrelations and partial correlations between offender reports and Operations Manager reports of supervisor performance	50

List of Tables (cont'd)

14: Multivariate analysis of variance of offender work attitudes by supervisor leadership variables	52
15: Multivariate analysis of variance of offender work attitudes by supervisor correctional attitudes	53
16: Multivariate analysis of variance of offender work attitudes by manager ratings	54
17: Means of dependent measures by offender work attitudes	56
18: Intercorrelations between demographic variables and supervisor-reported human service orientation	60
19: Intercorrelations between predictor variables and supervisor-reported human service orientation	61

Introduction

Work has been involved in the prison experience of many offenders and has been noted as addressing a variety of objectives. Guynes and Greiser (1986) developed a typology to describe the potential effects of inmate participation in work programs. They claimed that employment may contribute to positive consequences for offenders, the institution, and society. They suggested that work is effective not only in providing structure and reducing idleness among incarcerated offenders, but also in providing benefits associated with regular work, including the opportunity to develop responsibility and self-discipline. Institutional employment offers offenders the potential to cultivate a work ethic and marketable job skills that may improve the likelihood of obtaining legitimate post-release employment. In this respect, employment may be regarded as a step toward successful community integration and could therefore have an impact on recidivism rates (Flanagan, 1988).

Research has demonstrated that many offenders have little or no work experience external to that within institutions, as they have relied on criminal activity as a means of providing or supplementing their income (Glaser, 1964). Studies indicate that offenders, themselves, recognize that their criminality is influenced by their lack of employability skills. A full two-thirds of offenders surveyed in a study by Erez (1987) identified their needs as arising from a lack of educational and employability skills. Offenders perceive employment preparation as imperative to be

successful upon release.

Hodanish (1976) reiterates this point by indicating that offenders are required not only to manage problematic areas in their personal life, but to contend with deficits in education, employment skills, work experience, and other general circumstances. Some offenders have been incarcerated for such a long period of time they have been unable to update their skills, or have not had the opportunity to work in the community. Even among those who have a work history, it is often sporadic. Glaser (1964) postulated that one year of work in an institutional setting would be the most lengthy and continuous period of employment for a majority of offenders. He also hypothesized that the experience of steady employment in an institutional setting could be the first stage in the process of the development of good work habits and values that are necessary for successful employment in the community (Glaser, 1964). Glaser, one of the early researchers to examine the issue of offender institutional employment and recidivism, found that successful probationers were more than twice as likely to make use of the skills they had developed through institutional work programs than were probationers who were unsuccessful during their release. Soothill and Holmes (1981) provided additional evidence to support this hypothesis. They followed the progress of released offenders participating in a work placement program, and found that of all participants who remained on the job for one year or more, none were reconvicted during the ten-year follow-up period.

The perceived benefits of work have also been reported by offenders.

Gleason (1986) differentiated between the rehabilitative and custodial benefits of vocational training. Results of her study indicated that offenders regard vocational training as both rehabilitative, referring to benefits which accrue after release, and custodial, pertaining to benefits associated with the incarceration period. Flanagan and Maguire (1987) found that offenders employed with prison industries may adapt better to institutional life. Crookall (1989) reported that offenders want employment that provides the opportunity to develop job skills but, in addition, and perhaps more importantly, offenders who were interviewed in Crookall's study expressed preference for work that contributes to their personal development.

Developments in Rehabilitation Research

The issue of programming and rehabilitation, in general, has been much debated. Some researchers (e.g., Martinson, 1974) have claimed that virtually no interventions offer empirical support for the effectiveness of treatment. However, Gendreau and Ross (1979), in their review of quasi-experimental and experimental literature published between 1973 and 1978, found many examples of correctional interventions that were successful in contributing to a decrease in criminality.

More recently, researchers such as Andrews and his colleagues have made a significant contribution to the rehabilitation literature by clarifying the relationships associated with treatment outcomes for offenders. Research has evolved from recognition that certain treatment modalities are effective under particular conditions

(Hoge & Andrews, 1986), to specification of particular variables affecting treatment outcomes, including offender selection and program variables. Andrews and his colleagues, through the use of meta-analysis, have found support for improvement on some treatment outcomes (Andrews et al., 1990b). They claim that treatment will be more effective when offender needs are matched with appropriate interventions. Specifically, offenders should be evaluated for treatment based on the risk, need, and responsivity principles. These principles state that treatment will be most effective for high-risk offenders displaying a considerable number of criminogenic need factors (Andrews, Bonta, & Hoge, 1990a). In addition, treatment should be matched with the learning styles of offenders (i.e., responsivity). Andrews et al. (1990b) noted that behavioral and social learning approaches, directed toward enhancement of skills and modification of cognitions, have been noted as appropriate types of intervention. Such approaches primarily involve modelling, graduated practice, rehearsal, role playing, reinforcement, resource provision, and verbal guidance and explanations. Several methods of applying these types of interventions have been reported in the literature (see Andrews et al., 1990b), and consist of (a) use of authority applied in a fair manner, (b) modelling and reinforcement of alternatives to procriminal actions and thinking, and (c) problem solving and skills development directed toward increasing reward levels in prosocial environments.

Many of the appropriate approaches have implications for service delivery within the industrial shop setting in corrections. Following from the results outlined

in the literature, supervisors who adopt an individualized approach to working with offenders will probably promote more positive outcomes in offenders relating to rehabilitation. Also, when a supervisor models pro-social behaviour and promotes problem-solving skills in addition to the development of specific job skills, this could have further positive implications for offenders in their shops.

Social Learning Theory

Conceptualization of the supervisor as a role model borrows from the fundamental assumptions of social learning theory. Bandura (1977) claimed that the majority of human behaviour is learned through observation of models. Observation of the actions of others provides an indication of how particular behaviours should be performed; these ideas are used in the future to generate similar actions. Bandura claimed that four processes are involved in observational learning: (a) attentional processes, (b) retention processes, (c) motor reproduction processes, and (d) motivational processes. Essentially, for observational learning to occur, the relevant behaviours must be observed and adequately coded and retained in memory. In addition, the individual must be physically capable and sufficiently motivated to perform the behaviour (Bandura, 1977). For the purposes of the present study, attentional and motivational processes are most relevant. Bandura claimed that an individual will be influenced to a great extent by the people he associates with most. Essentially, if a model is perceived as attractive and his behaviour is perceived as

functional, then the individual will be more likely to attend to his or her actions and subsequently adopt the behaviours exhibited by the individual.

However, a distinction has been noted between the acquisition and performance of a behaviour. Although an individual may have been exposed to modelled activities, this condition alone does not ensure adoption of the behaviour. An important moderating variable is motivation. Bandura (1977) suggested that motivation can be aroused by describing potential benefits of the modeled behaviour to the individual.

Social learning theory suggests that there is a potential for modification of previously-formed cognitions and beliefs among offenders. Exposed to a positive model, offenders may adopt the modelled behaviours, if the conditions outlined above exist. This viewpoint is consistent with findings described by Andrews et al. (1990b) relating to appropriate delivery of intervention services and with current programming initiatives adopted by corrections researchers.

Model of Interventions in Human Service Agencies

Hoge and Andrews (1986) noted the paucity of early research examining characteristics of counsellors providing intervention services. One explanation offered by Hoge and Andrews for this neglect of counsellor characteristics was the attempt of researchers to establish direct connections between interventions and outcomes. The Hoge and Andrews (1986) model was formulated to account for the processes

involved in direct intervention models used by human service agencies.

The theoretical framework presented by Hoge and Andrews (1986) attempts to identify the variables related to outcomes, and examines proposed connections among these variables. Seven relevant factors of the intervention process, as proposed by Hoge and Andrews, are: (a) setting factors, (b) client factors, (c) worker factors, (d) programme factors, (e) counselling process factors, (f) intermediate outcomes, and (g) ultimate outcomes. Hoge and Andrews proposed that outcomes will be affected by setting, client, worker, programme, and process variables in isolation, but also that they will interact in their effects on outcome. Palmer (1983) also emphasized this concept through his claim that: "Single-modality approaches may be too narrowly focused to deal with the complex or multiple problems of most serious offenders" (p. 6) and suggested adopting an approach combining various forms of intervention. Effectiveness will not be as apparent when each aspect of programming is treated in isolation (Hoge & Andrews, 1986). Rather, the entire environment must be supportive of interventions directed at rehabilitative and reintegration efforts.

This integrated model of intervention may have utility for exploring prison industries, as it examines the interaction between the most relevant influences on offenders employed with correctional industries. In particular, the present research attempted to explore the "black box" of prison industries by examining the impact of supervisor characteristics on offenders. Although primary emphasis was directed toward the impact of supervisor characteristics on offenders in the present study, it is

noted that within such an environment, there are many influences involved. The present research attempted, as advocated by Hoge and Andrews (1986), to address intermediate offender outcomes in relation to the interaction of the various processes involved (i.e., by examining the influence of the shop supervisor). By considering various factors involved in the supervisor's influence on offenders, the outcome of the study could have implications for restructuring the instructional process and enhancing staff selection and training.

Due to the various gains that have been proposed in relation to institutional employment training and given the inconsistent findings that have been described in the literature, it was useful to examine a broader array of variables which may influence the impact of work programs on offenders. One avenue of research and theory that may be useful is the conceptualization of prison industry work supervisors as intervention agents who are actively involved in promoting positive changes among offenders (e.g., work skills, positive work attitudes, motivation, interpersonal skills). Although worker characteristics have been examined in counsellors working in therapeutic settings, there has been virtually no examination of characteristics of supervisors employed in correctional industries. The present research explored the role of industrial shop supervisor characteristics on employee outcomes in a correctional setting.

Supervisor Characteristics

It is posited that staff will be influential in the development of correctional environments that promote change in offenders. A better understanding of programs may be attained when we examine the function of staff; we need to discern whether effects are due to staff or to the programs, or both. For instance, an offender in a vocational shop may be exposed to a positive role model and therefore we might attribute gains to the staff member, and not exclusively to the program. Similarly, work skills developed in the industrial shop are important, but perhaps even more influential are the attitudes and actions of the instructor. Offenders spend a great proportion of their day in the shops, and may be positively influenced by the instructor to act or react in the work setting in a socially acceptable manner. In this location, the offender faces similar types of demands and pressures found in the community, and this may afford him the opportunity to make use of his newly-developed coping skills, such as anger management or problem-solving skills. The instructor is responsible for promoting good work habits that can be applied to the work environment upon release into the community. Thus, positive outcomes in offenders employed in correctional industrial shops could be a function of the instructor's social influence, rather than solely a function of skills promoted or imparted by the program.

Consistent with social learning theory, a number of possible supervisor characteristics which may influence offenders were examined in this study. These

included leadership, credibility, correctional orientation, and human service orientation. The rationale for selecting these particular characteristics of supervisors, and examining their influence on offender attitudes and behaviour, is presented below.

Independent Variables

The organizational literature suggests that one primary method of assessing the impact of supervisors is by examining their leadership orientation. Transformational leadership is one style of leadership which could be particularly relevant when we examine the potential influence of supervisors in a correctional setting. Bass (1985) contends that transformational leaders, whether they are aware of the fact or not, serve as important role models for their employees.

Leadership Research. Although an all-encompassing theory of leadership has not been formulated, the study of leadership traits and behaviours has led to a deeper understanding of leadership effectiveness. The construct of transformational leadership is regarded as the culmination of many of the approaches that have been researched in the past, providing an integrated approach to the leadership literature (Yukl, 1989; Yukl & Van Fleet, 1992). According to Yukl (1989), "Transformational leadership refers to the process of influencing major changes in the attitudes and assumptions of organization members and building commitment for the organization's mission, objectives, and strategies" (p. 269).

Among researchers who have studied transformational (e.g., Burns, 1978;

Bass, 1985) and charismatic leadership (e.g., Conger & Kanungo, 1987). Bass presently occupies a central position in the literature. Bass (1985) has formulated a theory of transformational leadership that builds upon the foundation provided by Burns (1978). To gain an understanding of transformational leadership, it is first necessary to describe the transactions that occur between leaders and subordinates. Bass (1990) claims that effective leadership is contingent upon an employee receiving compensation for attaining objectives determined by the manager. He relates the two factors of initiating structure and showing consideration to this interaction between manager and subordinate; first, the manager provides employees with the structure that is necessary to attain goals and secondly, he or she provides rewards to the employees when these objectives have been met. The reward is contingent upon successful attainment of the goal established by the manager. Punishment occurs if the employee does not fulfil his or her part of the agreement. This style of leadership is aptly described as "transactional leadership" (Bass, 1990).

Transformational leaders, by contrast, stimulate employees to consider needs and interests beyond the self (Bass, 1990). Bass (1985) argues that higher-order transformations, characterised by shifts in attitudes, beliefs, values, and needs, may be promoted by transformational leaders, whereas marginal changes or changes in degree only, are associated with a transactional approach to leadership. Therefore, transformational leadership extends beyond the contingency relationship upon which transactional leadership is based, to influence change in attitudes held by employees

(Bass, 1990). Although an influence process is still involved in the transformational relationship, this influence is used as a means of empowering employees (Yukl, 1989), rather than dominating them.

Bass's (1985) conception of transformational leadership includes the dimensions of charisma, individualized consideration, intellectual stimulation, and inspirational leadership. Subordinates have described charismatic leaders in terms of the enthusiasm and loyalty they are able to generate (Bass, 1990). Charismatic leaders have been characterized as possessing the rare ability of perceiving what is truly important and of arousing followers through their keen sense of mission. Followers have strong sense of trust in their leaders, believe they have the capacity to conquer any obstacle, and feel a great deal of respect for them. The resulting changes in followers can motivate them beyond their anticipations (Bass, 1985).

A transformational leader can also incite inspiration in his or her followers through intellectual stimulation, an area Bass (1985) claims clearly distinguishes the transformational from the transactional leader. Intellectually stimulating leaders promote not only the logic that is essential for solving problems, but also the creativity that allows for a more generalized approach to problem-solving. Followers who have been influenced by intellectually challenging leaders demonstrate an apparent increase in their ability to reflect, understand, and discriminate between different approaches and resolution to problems.

Another characteristic associated with transformational leadership is

individualized consideration. A leader showing individualized consideration will use examples for demonstration purposes and also functions as a role model for subordinates. In addition, the transformational leader will allocate responsibility to subordinates in a manner that impacts positively on their motivation and abilities (Bass, 1985).

Thus, transformational leadership may be regarded as a shared process among leaders and subordinates at all levels of the organization, rather than simply among top management (Burns, 1978). Studies have been conducted using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 1990) to assess transformational leadership. Transformational leaders have been found among military and industrial personnel, and not simply among high level executives (Bass, 1985, 1990; Crookall, 1989). Results have demonstrated increased subordinate satisfaction for employees supervised by transformational leaders (Seltzer & Bass, 1990; Yammarino & Bass, 1990) and increased effectiveness associated with transformational leaders (Waldman, Bass, & Yammarino, 1990). Transformational leadership has consistently demonstrated an augmenting effect beyond that of the transactional leader.

Crookall (1989) is the only researcher to examine leadership styles within the correctional environment. Crookall's study involved training supervisors in correctional industries in either situational or transformational leadership, with the intention of promoting increases in offenders' productivity, skill development and work habits, and personal growth (improved citizenship, rehabilitation). Although

results indicated statistically significant gains in offender productivity and personal growth for both experimental groups (compared to a control group), greater improvement was associated with offenders whose supervisors were trained in transformational leadership. Specifically, the transformational group underwent significant improvements in personal growth, as gauged by turnover, work habits, respect, job skills, citizenship, and progress toward rehabilitation. In addition, individual performance ratings and shop ratings increased, as did overall productivity (Crookall, 1989).

Credibility. Bass (1985) claimed that an essential component related to the success of the individualized consideration approach is that the leader is perceived as authentic in his or her concern for the employee. This demonstration of genuine concern for employees as described by Bass relates directly to credibility, which Kouzes and Posner (1987, 1993) contend is the foundation of leadership. In their research, Kouzes and Posner (1987, 1993) found that people attribute a great deal of importance to the construct of credibility; people want to feel confident in placing trust in their supervisor. For instance, Atwater (1988) found that subordinate trust in superiors was one of the strongest predictors of supportive supervisory behaviour in a sample of civilian employees employed with the United States Navy Public Works Centres. These findings are consistent with Bandura's formulations on effective modelling.

Surveys of managers assessing their superiors (Kouzes & Posner, 1987, 1993)

have consistently identified four characteristics that employees regard as essential for effective leadership; managers should be honest, forward-looking, inspiring, and competent. To categorize the three characteristics considered most essential for effective leadership, Kouzes and Posner (1987, 1993) have adopted the term "source credibility" from communications research, which represents honesty, inspiration, and competency.

Honesty, consistently rated as most important for effective leadership, is characterised by truthfulness and integrity. Managers with integrity are attributed character and conviction. Even though managers may be inspiring and competent, if they are not perceived as honest, then they will not be viewed as credible (Kouzes & Posner, 1993). Managers are inspirational if they are capable of increasing participation in subordinates through effective communication of their agenda. They are able to promote enthusiasm and generate optimism in followers. A competent leader is proficient in his or her ability to lead others; those rated as competent are considered capable, productive, and efficient. Essentially, managers characterized as leaders provide inspiration, decisiveness, and direction to followers. In addition to these specific qualities, a leader must be viewed as a person who is capable and effective in general (Kouzes & Posner, 1993).

Correctional and Human Service Orientation. Very little research has examined the role of instructors in correctional industries. There exists, however, an abundance of literature examining correctional officers' correctional attitudes (e.g.,

Cullen, Faith, Link, & Wolfe, 1989; Klofas & Toch, 1982; Philliber, 1987; Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd, 1993; Wahler & Gendreau, 1985; and Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989). Although diverse findings have been reported regarding the correctional orientation of correctional officers (e.g., see Philliber, 1987), some research suggests that treatment is supported among officers (Cullen et al., 1989). In their survey, respondents were more likely to display a custodial orientation than a rehabilitative orientation, but their focus was not purely on custody. Officers felt that their work went beyond simply supervising offenders (Cullen et al., 1989). This viewpoint is consistent with findings from Klofas and Toch (1982). In their study, officers felt that prisons could reform offenders, and viewed their role as providing a human service component to offenders.

Support for the use of rehabilitation approaches has been advocated by Palmer (1983) who stated: "Clearly, rehabilitation efforts may also produce successful or desirable outcomes with respect to attitude-change, skill development, and various aspects of community adjustment, and these as well as other outcomes often do-but often do not-relate to recidivism" (p. 3). If rehabilitation is linked with attitude change, then the supervisor's correctional and human service orientation could have a significant impact on an offender's rehabilitative process.

Whitehead and Lindquist (1989) attempted to clarify the relationship between individual characteristics and organizational conditions, and correctional officers' subsequent attitudes toward working and interacting with offenders. Specifically,

Whitehead and Lindquist (1989) examined the influence of race, education, and age of entry into the field of corrections along with several occupational conditions, to explore whether these variables had any impact on officers' professional orientation. Professional orientation is identified as officers' attitudes toward counselling and punishment. In addition, professional orientation refers to the extent to which officers prefer social distance between themselves and offenders, and related to this, the extent to which they are concerned with corruption of authority. Interestingly, results from their research indicated that neither individual characteristics nor organizational conditions were able to account for any significant portion of the variance in the counselling roles or concern with corruption scales. Only 10 percent of the variance in the social distance scale, and 4 percent of the variance in the punitive orientation scale was explained by these variables. Whitehead and Lindquist (1989) claimed that the scales are valid and reliable, and suggested exploring attitudinal and situational variables in relation to correctional officers' professional orientation. The present study examined supervisors' professional orientation in conjunction with various correctional attitudes and situationally influenced variables (e.g., leadership orientation).

Dependent Variables

Programming is viewed by offenders in various fashions. A high percentage (47%) of offenders surveyed by Gleason (1986) felt training provided the opportunity

to realise personal goals, including self-improvement, decreased recidivism rate, and interest in skill development, as opposed to purely vocational benefits (Gleason, 1986). In addition to the nature of the work and product, offenders have identified leadership style of the instructor as important in influencing their work performance and personal growth (Crookall, 1989).

Motivation. One facet of personal growth that is pertinent in the examination of outcomes associated with offenders employed in the correctional industrial setting is motivation. Bass (1985) claims that the inspiration incited by a transformational leader can motivate employees beyond their initial expectations. Such an outcome could be particularly beneficial for offenders, who typically have deficits in the area of employment (Glaser, 1964). Given the potential motivational influence of supervisors possessing a transformational leadership style, examination of the construct of motivation is warranted in the present study.

Intrinsic work motivation, according to Warr, Cooke, and Wali (1979), is gauged by the extent of extra effort one is willing to exert to achieve intrinsic satisfaction. Development of other outcomes may be linked with an offender's rehabilitative potential. Crookall (1989) reported that offenders employed with correctional industries who were provided with intellectually-stimulating and personally satisfying jobs that make a contribution felt they had more grounds for reform. These outcomes are consistent with Hackman and Oldham's (1980) conceptualization of internal work motivation. Components of their theory of internal

work motivation include degree of responsibility for outcomes and perceived meaningfulness of the task. They claim that if work is seen as trivial or lacking in meaning or importance then internal work motivation is unlikely to develop.

Involvement. A different approach to job-related motivation has been adopted by Kanungo (1979, 1982), who argued for a distinction between the constructs of job involvement and work involvement. He claimed that job involvement refers to a specific job situation, whereas work involvement describes a general work situation. Job involvement is related to satisfaction of present needs, whereas work involvement is related to past experience and to the value which one ascribes to work (Kanungo, 1982).

Covariates

Socially desirable responding. Paulhus (1984) developed a 40-item scale to measure socially desirable responding. The Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR) assesses the tendency to respond in a socially desirable manner on self-report measures. The two factor scale is comprised of Self Deceptive Enhancement (SDE), the tendency to unconsciously distort self-reports in an exaggeratedly positive manner, and Impression Management (IM), the purposeful attempt to impress others by responding in a socially desirable fashion.

Present Study

In the present study, leadership orientation of shop supervisors was examined in conjunction with measures that assess correctional orientation and credibility. This integrated approach of relevant supervisor characteristics provided a comprehensive picture of the instructor's overall style with offenders. Whereas most studies have emphasized recidivism as the primary outcome to be assessed in offenders who have participated in work programs, this study examined the relationship between supervisor characteristics and more intermediate outcomes for offenders (e.g., work attitudes and motivation). Specifically, this study explored the impact of correctional industrial supervisors on personal outcomes for offenders, including various indices of motivation and involvement. Assessment of the more intermediate outcomes is in line with Hoge and Andrews's (1986) conceptualization of the intervention process. Within such a framework, the unidimensional "black box" perception of work is replaced by an approach encompassing the entire work experience and attempting to account for how work can ultimately contribute to reintegration.

Hypotheses

In the present research, it is hypothesized that offenders in shops led by transformational and credible supervisors will have higher scores on various measures of motivation than will offenders supervised by transactional instructors or those perceived as less credible. In addition, based on Kanungo's (1979, 1982) definition

of job involvement and work involvement, higher job and work involvement is anticipated for offenders exposed to transformational supervisors.

It is hypothesized that supervisors who rate highly on human service orientation and who hold positive correctional orientations should impact positively on offender work attitudes. In particular, supervisors espousing a rehabilitative versus custodial orientation (Cullen et al., 1989) and expressing high interest in work directed toward human service, and preference for only moderate social distance from offenders (Klofas & Toch, 1982) will positively influence offender motivational outcomes (i.e., intrinsic job motivation, meaningfulness and responsibility for work outcomes).

Methods

Participants

A total of 36 shop supervisors and 155 offenders participated in the study. Twelve offenders were excluded from the analysis for the following reasons: 3 offenders were missing data from most of the measures in the questionnaire, 6 offenders misunderstood the criteria for rating the supervisor, 2 offenders had difficulty understanding the material, and 1 offender completed the questionnaire incorrectly. Only 1 supervisor was excluded from the analysis because offenders in his shop misunderstood the rating criteria for the leadership questionnaire. Offenders were tested in groups ranging in size from 2 to 12. Participants who indicated they had difficulty with reading were given assistance by the researcher, and usually tested individually. The final sample consisted of 35 supervisors and 143 offenders. The overall participation rate was 97% for shop supervisors and 60% for offenders.

Supervisors. The mean length of time supervisors were employed by the Correctional Service of Canada was 8.98 years ($SD = 7.45$). The average length of time supervisors reported working directly with offenders was 9.18 years ($SD = 7.35$), almost exactly the average length of time they reported working as a supervisor (9.19 years ($SD = 7.20$)). Supervisors reported attaining the following educational levels: 48.57% high school or less, 8.57% some community college courses, 5.71% some university courses, 20.0% community college diploma or certificate, and 5.71% Bachelor's degree or above. Missing responses were obtained for 11.43% of the

sample. In addition to academic training, 31.43% of supervisors reported receiving trades training, whereas 68.57% were missing this response.

Offenders. The average age of offenders who participated was 35.36 years ($SD = 10.50$). Ages ranged from 20.0 years to 77.0 years. Offenders reported serving an average current sentence of 3.75 years ($SD = 4.15$), with time served ranging from 2 months to greater than 20 years.

Offenders listed previous jobs they held while living in the community. 89.51 percent of the sample indicated that they had held one job prior to incarceration. 77.62 percent and 55.24 percent reported working 2 and 3 jobs in the community, respectively. The percentages were reduced quite drastically for 4 (37.06%) and 5 (17.48%) jobs. Offenders also reported previous positions they had held with CORCAN. The percentage of offenders who worked 1, 2, and 3 jobs was 19.58%, 7.69%, and 3.50%, respectively. The majority of offenders (69%) had only the current institutional job.

Procedure

In the attempt to examine a variety of supervisor leadership orientations, the study sampled supervisors and offenders from seven institutional sites under the jurisdiction of the Correctional Service of Canada. Operations Managers played an important role in recruiting participants for the study. The researcher contacted Operations Managers to explain the rationale and procedure of the study and to

address confidentiality issues and conditions of the study. After data collection dates were confirmed with the Managers, a brief memo was sent to each site detailing the study and requesting supervisors to participate. Each Operations Manager was asked to distribute this information to the institutional shop supervisors.

At the institution, the researcher discussed the study in greater detail with the Operations Manager, and responded to concerns that had arisen among staff. When all research and ethical issues had been clarified with the Manager, the researcher outlined the rationale and procedure of the study to individual supervisors. Supervisors were informed that the study was completely voluntary and that individual results were confidential. Care was taken to ensure supervisors understood the purpose of the study (i.e., that it was not a performance evaluation to be submitted to CORCAN). If the supervisor agreed to participate, he signed an informed consent form, and was given the questionnaire to complete during work hours (see Appendix A).

After the supervisor had consented to participate, he introduced the researcher to offenders in the shop. The researcher explained the rationale and procedure of the study, and requested participation from all offenders who had worked with the supervisor for a period of one month or more. Offenders who had worked with two supervisors were asked to rate the supervisor they worked with most. After the researcher explained the project and offenders had read the explanation of the study, they were given the opportunity to ask questions. Offenders who agreed to participate

were assured that their individual responses would not be given to CORCAN, or to the Correctional Service of Canada. After participants had been guaranteed of the confidential nature of their responses, they completed the informed consent forms and questionnaire (see Appendix B). Testing sessions ranged from approximately 45 minutes to 2.5 hours. After each participant had completed the questionnaire, the researcher requested the supervisor to complete punctuality information for those who had consented to release this information.

After all the shops in the institution had participated, the Operations Manager completed information concerning supervisors' influence on offenders in the shop (see Appendix C). This information was requested only for supervisors who had consented. Prior to obtaining this information, the researcher outlined the justification for obtaining this information to the Operations Manager and assured him that the information was confidential.

When testing within each institution was completed, the researcher provided debriefing information to supervisors, offenders, and Operations Managers. The researcher visited each shop to give participants the opportunity to ask additional questions. Participants were informed that a copy of the report would be provided to each shop upon completion of the project.

Measures

Independent Variables

The independent variables used in the present research were classified into 4

sets of measures: leadership orientation, credibility, correctional and human service orientation, and supervisor performance. All scales measuring these criteria were derived from self-report questionnaire items, with the exception of the credibility and job performance ratings, which were provided by offenders and Operations Managers, respectively. In addition to supervisors' self-report measure of leadership, offenders provided a rating of supervisors using the same leadership scale. Each of the independent variable scales was prorated to account for missing values. In addition, individuals missing more than 25% of the responses on a scale were deleted from the analysis of that scale.

Leadership. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X-Self) (MLQ-5X; Bass & Avolio, 1990) assesses the behaviours comprising transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and nonleadership. The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (Form 5X-Rater) consists of the same factors and items as the self-report form of the MLQ. The MLQ response options range from "Frequently, if not always" to "Not at all", scored on a 5-point Likert scale. A high score (i.e., 4) indicates high agreement with the item, whereas a low score (i.e., 0) indicates that the item does not apply to the supervisor.

Five leadership behaviours are associated with a transformational orientation: Attributed Charisma (8 items), Idealized Influence (10 items), Inspirational Leadership (10 items), Intellectual Stimulation (10 items), and Individualized Consideration (8 items). A transactional orientation to leadership is associated with three factors:

Contingent Reward (9 items), Active Management-by-Exception (7 items), and Passive Management-by-Exception (7 items). Nonleadership is measured by the 8-item Laissez-Faire scale.

Each of the leadership dimensions was collapsed across subfactors and average scores were computed for the dimensions of transformational, transactional, and nonleadership. This classification was employed for both offender ratings and supervisor self-ratings of leadership as a means of reducing the number of independent variables to be examined in the multi-variate analyses of variance (MANOVA). In addition, the leadership and credibility measures completed by offenders were averaged at the shop level, and these mean scores reassigned to each offender. These average ratings provided a less biased indication of the supervisors' credibility and leadership orientation. Table 1 indicates the mean scores and alphas obtained on the grouped leadership and credibility variables.

Credibility. The credibility rating scale, adapted from Kouzes and Posner (1987, 1992), was created for the present study to assess the degree of credibility offenders attribute to their supervisors. The scale is comprised of four subscales: the Credibility scale (1 item), the Trust scale (6 items), the Inspiration scale (4 items), and the Competence scale (4 items). Items 9 and 10 were reversed, and all items summed to yield a total score on each factor.

Since credibility is comprised of trust, inspiration, and competence (Kouzes & Posner, 1987, 1993), these factors were grouped to form a global measure of

Table 1
Means and alphas for the leadership and credibility measures: Offenders

Measure	n	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Alpha
Leadership Orientation				
Offender Reports				
Transformational	143	11.00	2.76	.97
Transactional	143	4.35	0.95	.77
Nonleadership	143	0.70	0.41	.72
Supervisor Reports				
Transformational	35	14.66	2.45	.94
Transactional	35	5.36	1.39	.82
Nonleadership	35	0.53	0.39	.59
Credibility	143	60.15	7.08	.95

credibility. This classification of the credibility factors contributes to a more efficient examination of the outcome variables by reducing the number of independent variables, and subsequently, the number of MANOVAs to be performed.

Correctional and Human Service Orientation. The extent to which supervisors endorse custodial and rehabilitative attitudes toward corrections was assessed using the **Custody** (7 items, $M = 1.71$, $SD = 0.45$, $\alpha = .69$) and **Rehabilitation** scales (9 items, $M = 2.28$, $SD = 0.49$, $\alpha = .86$) developed by Cullen et al. (1989). The response options for these measures consists of a 3-point Likert scale ranging from Agree (1) to Disagree (3). This scale was flip-scored so high numerical values represent high agreement with the items. Items 2, 8, and 15 from the rehabilitation scale were reversed so a high score indicates high support for rehabilitation. The items on each scale were then summed and an average score obtained for each supervisor.

Three scales developed by Klofas and Toch (1982) and adapted by Whitehead and Lindquist (1989), were used to examine supervisors' professional orientation. These measures include **Social Distance** (5 items, $M = 1.99$, $SD = 0.38$, $\alpha = .71$), the degree to which staff prefer working directly with offenders; **Punitive Orientation** (4 items, $M = 2.30$, $SD = 0.52$, $\alpha = .70$), the extent to which staff believe offenders should be exposed to a harsh correctional environment; and **Concern with Corruption of Authority**, (5 items, $M = 2.65$, $SD = 0.57$, $\alpha = .73$), the extent to which staff feel offenders cannot be trusted. Each of these measures was scored using

a 4-point Likert scale with response options ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree". A high numerical score on the social distance scale indicates a high desire for distance from offenders. Low scores on the punitive orientation and concern with corruption of authority scales indicate a strong orientation toward these measures.

The Human Service Orientation scale (8 items, $M = 0.71$, $SD = 0.19$, $\alpha = .46$), developed by Robinson, Porporino, and Simourd (1992), was used to measure supervisors' interest in work directed toward human service. This scale was scored using a dichotomous True/False response format. Item 18 was reversed and the scale scored by summing the items and dividing by the total number of responses. Means and alphas for the correctional and human service orientation measures are presented in Table 2.

Performance Rating. A 4-item Performance Rating scale was constructed for the study to assess Operations Managers' perceptions of the supervisors' effectiveness in developing positive work habits in offenders ($M = 3.94$, $SD = .90$), in obtaining extra effort from offenders ($M = 4.00$, $SD = .64$), and in increasing shop productivity ($M = 4.03$, $SD = .88$). Each of these measures was scored on a 5-point Likert scale with responses ranging from "Very ineffective" to "Very effective". These particular measures were compiled due to their association with effective leadership (e.g., see Bass & Avolio, 1990). In addition, Operations Managers provided a rating of the supervisor's effectiveness in working with offenders ($M =$

Table 2
Means and alphas for the correctional orientation measures: Supervisors

Measure	<u>n</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Alpha
Correctional Orientation				
Rehabilitation	35	2.28	0.49	.86
Custody	35	1.71	0.45	.69
Human Service	34	0.71	0.19	.46
Social Distance	35	1.99	0.38	.71
Punitive	33	2.30	0.52	.70
Corruption	34	2.65	0.57	.73

79.66, $SD = 14.76$), based on a scale ranging from 0 (Unacceptable) to 100 (Excellent). This measure provided an alternative source for exploring the validity of supervisor self-report leadership measures. The means for these items are presented in Table 3.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables for the present study were organized into 4 categories: motivation, involvement, organizational outcomes, and punctuality. Table 4 shows the mean scores obtained on these scales. Each of these variables, with the exception of the punctuality rating, was obtained using self-report measures completed by offenders. Punctuality ratings were completed by shop supervisors. As with the leadership measure, the organizational outcome variables were completed both by supervisors and offenders.

Motivation. Several measures of work motivation were used as dependent variables. The Intrinsic Job Motivation scale (6 items, $M = 32.96$, $SD = 6.53$, $\alpha = .82$), developed by Warr, Cook, and Wall (1979), measures the extent to which a person wants to perform well in his or her job to achieve intrinsic satisfaction. Previous testing has demonstrated good reliability (coefficient alpha = 0.82) and adequate test-retest correlation ($r = 0.65$) over 6 months (Cook, Hepworth, Wall, & Warr, 1981). Offenders rated the extent to which they agreed with the statements on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from "Strongly disagree" to "Strongly agree". A high numerical score indicates a high degree of intrinsic job motivation.

Table 3
Means for the Operations Manager ratings of the supervisor

Measure	n	Mean	<u>SD</u>
Manager Ratings			
Performance	29	79.66	14.76
Effort	33	4.00	.64
Productivity	33	4.03	.88
Habits	33	3.94	.90

Table 4
Means and alphas for the offender work attitude outcome measures

Measure	n	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Alpha
Involvement				
Job Involvement	142	33.21	7.92	.82
Work Involvement	142	20.64	5.65	.80
Motivation				
Intrinsic Job Motivation	142	32.96	6.53	.82
Meaningfulness	142	23.77	5.64	.75
Responsibility	142	24.33	5.68	.73
Organizational Outcomes				
Extra Effort	142	1.99	1.22	.84
Effectiveness	142	2.68	0.85	.86
Punctuality	116	4.54	1.03	-

Two of the 3 scales comprising Critical Psychological States, contained in the Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS; Hackman & Oldham, 1975), were used in the study to assess intrinsic work motivation. The Experienced Meaningfulness of Work (5 items, $M = 23.77$, $SD = 5.64$, $\alpha = .75$) and Experienced Responsibility for Work Outcomes (5 items, $M = 24.33$, $SD = 5.68$, $\alpha = .73$) measures refer to the degree of meaningfulness offenders attribute to their work, and the extent to which they feel they contribute to work outcomes. Response options ranged from "Disagree strongly" to "Agree strongly", rated on a 7-point Likert scale. Items 2, 4, and 5 from the meaning scale were reversed, and the items summed. A high numerical score indicates a high level of meaningfulness attributed to work by offenders. Similarly, a high level of responsibility for work outcomes corresponds to a high numerical value on the responsibility scale. Previous studies reported internal reliabilities of 0.74 and 0.72, respectively, for these measures (Cook et al., 1981).

Involvement. The constructs of job and work involvement were explored using Kanungo's (1982) Job Involvement (10 items, $M = 33.21$, $SD = 7.92$, $\alpha = .82$) and Work Involvement (6 items, $M = 20.64$, $SD = 5.65$, $\alpha = .80$) scales. Involvement is described as a generalized cognitive state of identification with work that is perceived as responding to an individual's needs and expectations (Kanungo, 1979). Response options range from "Strongly agree" to "Strongly disagree" on a 6-point Likert scale. The response options were reversed so that a high numerical value reflects strong agreement with the item. After the individual items 2 and 7 from the

job involvement scale were reversed, the items were summed. The work involvement items were also summed after reversing item 13.

Organizational Outcomes. The MLQ (Form 5X-Rater; Bass & Avolio, 1990) organizational outcome measures were examined by offenders and supervisors. These outcomes include Extra Effort exerted by followers (3 items, $M = 1.99$, $SD = 1.22$, $\alpha = .84$), and individual and group Effectiveness (4 items, $M = 2.68$, $SD = 0.85$, $\alpha = .86$). The response options for the Extra Effort scale range from "Frequently, if not always" to "Not at all", scored on a 5-point Likert scale, and Effectiveness scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from "Not effective" to "Extremely effective".

Punctuality. The offender's behaviour is a potentially important indication of motivation. Behavioral manifestations of the supervisor's influence were assessed by examining offenders' punctuality ratings. Since some of the shops did not officially record offenders' punctuality, supervisors were asked to complete the Offender Punctuality Rating Form ($M = 4.54$, $SD = 1.03$), created for the study. A low numerical value reflects offenders' early arrival (i.e., numbers 1-3). Punctuality is indicated by a numerical value of 4, and scores ranging from 5-9 indicate that the offender is usually late in arriving to work. This information was collected provided offenders agreed to release the data.

Covariates

Social Desirability. Due to the subjective nature of the measures used in the present research, an index of socially desirable responding was included in this study.

Socially desirable responding was assessed using the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (BIDR; Paulhus, 1984). The two scales in the BIDR, Self Deceptive Enhancement and Impression Management, were modified for the study by excluding the items, "I have sometime doubted my ability as a lover" and "I never read sexy books or magazines", from the Self Deceptive Enhancement and Impression Management scales, respectively. These items were dropped because they were related to sexual matters and made some staff uncomfortable. Impression Management (19 items, $M = 6.71$, $SD = 3.99$, $\alpha = .84$) measures the degree to which an individual attempts to present himself or herself in a manner consistent with situational demands and Self Deceptive Enhancement (19 items, $M = 6.77$, $SD = 3.57$, $\alpha = .65$), the extent to which an individual is overconfident to the point of lacking insight. The scales were dichotomized by assigning a value of 1 to each item that had a numerical value of 6 or 7. The same scoring process was employed for both supervisor and offender measures. The means and alphas for the social desirability covariates are presented in Table 5.

The BIDR (Paulhus, 1984) was also used to measure socially desirable responding in offenders. The two scales in the BIDR, Self Deceptive Enhancement (19 items, $M = 6.31$, $SD = 3.47$, $\alpha = .61$) and Impression Management (19 items, $M = 5.16$, $SD = 3.97$, $\alpha = .85$), were modified for the study in the same manner as the supervisor questionnaire. Although researchers have found evidence for a three factor measure of social desirability with offenders (Kroner & Weekes, 1994), the two

Table 5
Means and alphas for social desirability measures

Measure	<u>n</u>	Mean	<u>SD</u>	Alpha
Offender Reports				
Self Deceptive Enhancement	143	6.31	3.47	.61
Impression Management	143	5.16	3.97	.85
Supervisor Reports				
Self Deceptive Enhancement	35	6.77	3.57	.65
Impression Management	35	6.71	3.99	.84

factor scale was used in the present analysis for comparison purposes, since most of the published literature uses two factors.

Work Demographic Variables. Several demographic work variables were examined in the attempt to determine if they might account for the supervisors' influence on offender work attitudes. These variables were reported by offenders. Table 6 reports the length of time offenders have worked for CORCAN, length of time they have worked in the shop, and length of time they have worked with the supervisor. The average amount of time supervisors spend instructing offenders and talking with them is presented in Table 7. Table 7 also presents offenders' average amount of overall contact with the supervisor. Since many of these measures were intercorrelated, there was no need to apply each as a covariate measure. The length of time the supervisor has worked directly with offenders, length of time offenders have worked with their supervisor, and overall amount of contact with the supervisor, were selected as representative covariates to be used in the MANOVAs, due to their correlations with predictor and outcome variables. These correlations are presented in Tables 8 and 9.

Table 6
CORCAN work history: Offenders (percent)

	Time (months)			
	< 3	4-6	6-12	> 12
Working for CORCAN ^a	19.85 (<u>n</u> = 27)	18.38 (<u>n</u> = 25)	19.12 (<u>n</u> = 26)	42.65 (<u>n</u> = 58)
Working in shop ^b	27.74 (<u>n</u> = 38)	15.34 (<u>n</u> = 21)	24.09 (<u>n</u> = 33)	32.85 (<u>n</u> = 45)
Working with supervisor ^c	29.20 (<u>n</u> = 40)	18.25 (<u>n</u> = 25)	26.28 (<u>n</u> = 36)	25.55 (<u>n</u> = 35)

^a7 offenders were missing data for this item. ^b6 offenders were missing data for this item. ^c7 offenders were missing data for this item.

Table 12
Intercorrelations and partial correlations between supervisor reports and Operations
Manager reports of supervisor performance

	Supervisor Reports					
	Transformational		Transactional		Nonleadership	
Manager Reports	r	partial r	r	partial r	r	partial r
Habits	-.06	-.05	-.15	-.11	-.14	-.06
Effort	-.09	-.13	-.30	-.27	.01	.12
Productivity	.13	.08	-.18	-.15	-.09	.04
Performance	.04	-.12	-.02	.01	-.10	-.05

Note. *ns* range from 26 to 32 for correlation coefficients. *n* = 26 for partial correlation coefficients

Table 8
Intercorrelations between predictor variables and covariates

	LW ^a	WS ^b	CONTACT ^c
Offender Report			
Leadership Orientation			
Transformational	-.00	.24**	.13
Transactional	.05	.18*	-.04
Nonleadership	-.17	-.19*	-.16
Credibility	.11	.19*	.10
Manager Report			
Manager Rating	.08	-.01	-.03
Effort	.15	.10	.12
Productivity	.08	.19*	.08
Habits	.24**	.08	-.10
Supervisor Report			
Leadership Orientation			
Transformational	-.27**	-.12	.20*
Transactional	.02	-.09	.20*
Nonleadership	.19*	.04	.02

 cont'd

Table 8 (cont'd)

Correctional Orientation			
Human Service	.00	-.24**	-.19*
Custody	.40****	.01	-.08
Rehabilitation	-.32***	-.05	.17*
Punitive	.44****	.03	.03
Corruption	.21*	.02	-.19*
Social Distance	.45****	.04	-.10

Note. ns range from 111 to 143.

*LW indicates the length of time supervisors have worked with offenders. ^bWS indicates the length of time offenders have worked with the supervisor. ^cCONTACT indicates the amount of overall contact offenders have with supervisors.

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

Table 9
Intercorrelations between offender-reported outcome variables and covariates

	LW ^a	WS ^b	CONTACT ^c
Involvement			
Job Involvement	.03	.23**	.03
Work Involvement	.03	-.01	-.09
Motivation			
Intrinsic Job Motivation	.13	.14	.05
Meaningfulness	.09	.26**	.17*
Responsibility	.07	.15	.05
Organizational Outcomes			
Extra Effort	-.01	.31***	.16
Effectiveness	.02	.15	.02
Punctuality	-.07	.04	-.05

Note. *ns* range from 115 to 141.

^aLW indicates the length of time supervisors have worked with offenders. ^bWS indicates the length of time offenders have worked with the supervisor. ^cCONTACT indicates the amount of overall contact offenders have with supervisors.

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

Results

Social Desirability Response Bias

A psychometric issue of relevance was the extent to which social desirability response bias contaminated any of the supervisor self-report measures used as independent variables in the study. This possibility was explored by correlating supervisor BIDR (Paulhus, 1984) scores with leadership factors and the remaining independent variables in the study. Table 10 shows that no significant correlations were obtained for supervisor social desirability measures with supervisor-reported independent variables. However, it is important to note that many correlations were quite high, indicating that there may have been a tendency for supervisors to respond in a socially desirable manner.

Criterion Validity of the Leadership Measures

Before examining the relationship between independent and dependent variables, a number of psychometric analyses were conducted on the principle independent measure, supervisor leadership orientation. Since different sources were used to measure supervisor characteristics, it was important to examine how these different sources were intercorrelated. Accordingly, correlations between offender, supervisor, and Operations Manager ratings of leadership were examined for criterion validity. To control for a social desirability responding bias, correlations were also

Table 10

Intercorrelations between supervisor social desirability measures and supervisor-reported predictor variables

	n	SDE	IM
Leadership Orientation			
Transformational	35	.15	.30
Transactional	35	.21	-.05
Nonleadership	35	-.04	-.23
Correctional Orientation			
Human Service	34	.15	.33
Custody	35	.08	-.32
Rehabilitation	35	-.00	.30
Punitive	33	-.04	-.27
Corruption	34	.02	-.09
Social Distance	35	-.17	-.07

Note. SDE refers to self deceptive enhancement. IM refers to impression management.

conducted while partialing out effects of supervisor and offender self deceptive enhancement and impression management.

As Table 11 indicates, supervisor and offender ratings did not correlate significantly on any leadership factors. Similarly, Table 12 indicates that no correlations were obtained between supervisor self-report leadership measures and Operations Manager supervisor performance ratings. Various manager-reported supervisor performance measures were correlated with offender reports of supervisor leadership. These correlations are presented in Table 13. Again, no significant relationships were noted between the 2 sources for the leadership measures.

Principal Analyses

A series of multi-variate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were performed to explore the relationship between the independent measures and offender work attitudes. The multi-variate approach was chosen in order to reduce the number of statistical tests required to examine the dependent variables. Before conducting a series of multi-variate analyses of variance examining the effect of supervisor characteristics on work related attitudes in offenders, each independent measure (i.e., supervisor's leadership variables, credibility, and correctional orientation variables) was divided at the median to form dichotomous factors. Significant multi-variate effects were noted for the following variables: offender-reported leadership factors, credibility, supervisor-reported human service orientation, and Manager-reported

Table 11

Intercorrelations and partial correlations between supervisor reports and offender reports on leadership dimensions

	Offender Reports					
	Transformational		Transactional		Nonleadership	
	r	partial r	r	partial r	r	partial r
Supervisor reports						
Transformational	.21	.29	.17	.14	-.07	-.18
Transactional	.03	.09	.18	.17	.10	.07
Nonleadership	.09	.07	-.10	-.08	-.00	.06

Note. n s range from 35 to 36 for correlation coefficients. $n = 35$ for partial correlation coefficients.

Table 12
Intercorrelations and partial correlations between supervisor reports and Operations
Manager reports of supervisor performance

	Supervisor Reports					
	Transformational		Transactional		Nonleadership	
Manager Reports	<i>r</i>	partial <i>r</i>	<i>r</i>	partial <i>r</i>	<i>r</i>	partial <i>r</i>
Habits	-.06	-.05	-.15	-.11	-.14	-.06
Effort	-.09	-.13	-.30	-.27	.01	.12
Productivity	.13	.08	-.18	-.15	-.09	.04
Performance	.04	-.12	-.02	.01	-.10	-.05

Note. *ns* range from 26 to 32 for correlation coefficients. *n* = 26 for partial correlation coefficients

Table 13

**Intercorrelations and partial correlations between offender reports and Operations
Manager reports of supervisor performance**

	Offender Reports					
	Transformational		Transactional		Nonleadership	
Manager Reports	r	partial r	r	partial r	r	partial r
Habits	.08	.11	.09	.09	-.19	-.23
Effort	.10	.16	-.23	-.29	-.26	-.35
Productivity	.15	.19	.16	.09	-.28	-.38
Performance	-.07	-.09	.06	.04	-.02	-.05

Note. n s range from 29 to 33 for the correlation coefficients. $n = 29$ for the partial coefficients.

effort and productivity.

Table 14 displays the results obtained for offender work attitudes by supervisor self-report leadership orientation and offender-reported supervisor leadership orientation and credibility ratings. Although no significant relationships were obtained for supervisor-reported leadership variables with offender outcomes, significant relationships were noted for offender-reported credibility and transformational and nonleadership variables. Transformational and nonleadership contributed similar amounts of variance to the offender outcomes. The Lambda indicated that transformational leadership accounted for 28%, and nonleadership, 25% of the variance in this set of dependent measures. Credibility was by far the most significant finding, contributing 41% of the variance accounting for offender outcomes.

Human service orientation and concern with corruption of authority were the only correctional attitudes significantly related to offender work attitudes. These analyses indicate that the human service measure accounted for 19% of the variance in offender work attitudes, and concern with corruption of authority, 14% of the variance. Results for the correctional measures are presented in Table 15.

Most importantly, significant relationships were found for offender work attitudes with Operations Manager reports of supervisors' ability to obtain extra effort from offenders and ability to increase productivity in the shop. Table 16 displays these findings, which are particularly telling, as they correlate an independent measure

Table 14
Multivariate analysis of variance of offender work attitudes^a by supervisor leadership variables

Group	n	Lambda	E	df	p <
Leadership Orientation					
Offender Reports					
Transformational	112	.72	5.10	8,103	.0001
Transactional	112	.91	1.29	8,103	<u>ns</u>
Nonleadership	112	.75	4.40	8,103	.0001
Credibility	112	.59	9.07	8,103	.0001
Supervisor Reports					
Transformational	112	.96	.49	8,103	<u>ns</u>
Transactional	112	.96	.53	8,103	<u>ns</u>
Nonleadership	112	.91	1.29	8,103	<u>ns</u>

^aOffenders completed self-report measures assessing job involvement, work involvement, intrinsic job motivation, meaningfulness of work, responsibility for work outcomes, extra effort, and supervisor and shop effectiveness

Table 15

Multivariate analysis of variance of offender work attitudes* by supervisor correctional attitudes

Group	n	<u>Lambda</u>	F	df	p <
Correctional Orientation					
Rehabilitation	112	.92	1.17	8,103	ns
Custody	112	.93	1.02	8,103	ns
Human Service	108	.81	2.93	8, 99	.006
Social Distance	112	.92	1.08	8,103	ns
Punitive	108	.95	.70	8, 99	ns
Corruption	109	.86	2.00	8,100	.05

*Offenders completed self-report measures assessing job involvement, work involvement, intrinsic job motivation, meaningfulness of work, responsibility for work outcomes, extra effort, and supervisor and shop effectiveness

Table 16
Multivariate analysis of variance of offender work attitudes^a by manager ratings

Group	n	<u>Lambda</u>	E	df	p <
Manager Ratings					
Performance	91	.96	.40	2, 82	<u>ns</u>
Effort	106	.80	3.10	8, 97	.004
Productivity	106	.74	4.22	8, 97	.001
Habits	106	.94	.83	8, 97	<u>ns</u>

^aOffenders completed self-report measures assessing job involvement, work involvement, intrinsic job motivation, meaningfulness of work, responsibility for work outcomes, extra effort, and supervisor and shop effectiveness

of supervisor effectiveness with employee-reported work outcomes. The reported Lambda for supervisors' ability in increasing effort exerted by offenders was .80 ($F(8,97) = 3.10, p < .01$). Productivity also explained a substantial proportion of variance (26%) for offender work attitudes.

After the MANOVAs were conducted, a series of univariate analyses were used to follow up significant multivariate F tests. Results of these analyses are reported in Table 17. Differences between the means on several offender work attitudes were obtained for the dichotomized offender-rated transformational measure. Offenders who work with supervisors rated in the top 50th percentile on transformational leadership reported higher levels of job involvement, intrinsic job motivation, meaning, responsibility, extra effort, effectiveness, and better punctuality ratings.

Conversely, supervisors rated as displaying high levels of nonleadership were associated with negative offender outcomes. Offender-reported levels of job involvement, meaning, responsibility, extra effort, and shop and supervisor effectiveness were significantly lower for offenders working with supervisors who were seen as displaying high levels of nonleadership behaviours.

Offender-rated supervisor credibility was positively related to several offender work attitudes. Offenders working with supervisors who rated highly on credibility reported higher levels of job involvement, intrinsic job motivation, meaning, responsibility, extra effort, and effectiveness.

Table 17
Means of dependent measures by offender work attitudes^a

	JI ^b	WI ^c	IJM ^d	MNG ^e	RES ^f	EE ^g	EFF ^h	PUN ⁱ
Offender report								
Leadership Orientation								
Transformational								
High	35.2	<u>ns</u>	34.3	26.2	25.9	2.6	3.0	4.3
Low	31.5		31.5	21.4	22.8	1.4	2.4	4.8
Nonleadership								
High	32.6	<u>ns</u>	<u>ns</u>	21.5	22.8	1.7	2.4	<u>ns</u>
Low	35.3			26.3	25.9	2.3	3.0	
Credibility								
High	36.3	<u>ns</u>	34.6	27.1	26.2	2.6	3.1	<u>ns</u>
Low	30.3		31.2	20.3	22.4	1.4	2.3	
Correctional Orientation								
Human Service								
High	31.5	<u>ns</u>	<u>ns</u>	21.7	22.7	1.7	2.5	<u>ns</u>
Low	35.5			26.4	26.5	2.4	2.9	

cont'd

Table 17 (cont'd)

Manager Ratings									
Effort									
High	ns	ns	ns	27.7	ns	ns	ns	3.9	
Low				22.9				4.7	
Productivity									
High	35.7	ns	ns	27.3	25.9	2.4	3.1	4.1	
Low	32.2			21.9	23.4	1.8	2.5	4.8	

*Means are only shown for the sets of variables for which significant univariate F values were observed.

^b=job involvement. ^c=work involvement. ^d=intrinsic job motivation. ^e=meaningfulness of work outcomes. ^f=responsibility for work outcomes. ^g=extra effort exerted by offenders. ^h=supervisor and shop effectiveness. ⁱ=punctuality ratings.

significant multi-variate F tests with covariates removed (see Appendix E for these results).

These analyses indicated significantly lower offender-reported job involvement, meaning, responsibility, extra effort, and effectiveness associated with supervisors who reported high levels of human service orientation. Since human service orientation was the only counterintuitive finding reported in the study, it merits further examination. To explore these findings, correlations were conducted between human service and supervisor and offender demographic variables. These correlations are presented in Table 18. Significant negative correlations were obtained between human service and several offender-reported demographic variables. Specifically, the length of time offenders have served their sentence, length of time offenders have worked in the shop with the supervisor, and length of time supervisor spends explaining work were all negatively correlated with supervisor self-report human service orientation. In addition, the overall amount of contact offenders have with their supervisors was significantly negatively correlated with human service. No significant correlations were obtained for supervisor-reported demographic variables with human service orientation.

Correlations were also conducted between human service and the independent variables in the study. As Table 19 indicates, offender-reported transformational leadership was significantly negatively correlated with supervisor human service. Correlations between human service and supervisor-reported predictor variables are

significant multi-variate F tests with covariates removed (see Appendix E for these results).

These analyses indicated significantly lower offender-reported job involvement, meaning, responsibility, extra effort, and effectiveness associated with supervisors who reported high levels of human service orientation. Since human service orientation was the only counterintuitive finding reported in the study, it merits further examination. To explore these findings, correlations were conducted between human service and supervisor and offender demographic variables. These correlations are presented in Table 18. Significant negative correlations were obtained between human service and several offender-reported demographic variables. Specifically, the length of time offenders have served their sentence, length of time offenders have worked in the shop with the supervisor, and length of time supervisor spends explaining work were all negatively correlated with supervisor self-report human service orientation. In addition, the overall amount of contact offenders have with their supervisors was significantly negatively correlated with human service. No significant correlations were obtained for supervisor-reported demographic variables with human service orientation.

Correlations were also conducted between human service and the independent variables in the study. As Table 19 indicates, offender-reported transformational leadership was significantly negatively correlated with supervisor human service. Correlations between human service and supervisor-reported predictor variables are

Table 18
Intercorrelations between demographic variables and supervisor-reported human service orientation

Measure	n	Human Service
Offender Report		
Age	130	-.13
Sentence Served	132	-.24 ^b
Time working for CORCAN	132	-.15
Time working in shop	133	-.23 ^b
Time working with supervisor	132	-.24 ^b
Time talk to supervisor	133	-.10
Time supervisor explains work	133	-.19 ^a
Overall contact with supervisor	132	-.19 ^a
Supervisor Report		
Education Level	31	.11
Time working with offenders	34	.04
Time working as supervisor	32	.06
Time employed with CSC	34	-.00
Security level of institution	34	.04

^ap < .05. ^bp < .01.

Table 19
Intercorrelations between predictor variables and supervisor-reported human service orientation

	n	Human Service
Leadership Orientation		
Offender Report		
Transformational	133	-.18 ^a
Transactional	131	-.03
Nonleadership	133	.15
Credibility	132	-.14
Supervisor Report		
Leadership Orientation		
Transformational	34	.01
Transactional	34	-.04
Nonleadership	34	-.14
Correctional Orientation		
Custody	34	.14
Rehabilitation	34	-.00
Punitive	32	-.05
Corruption	33	.11
Social Distance	34	.26

cont'd

Table 19 (cont'd)

Operations Manager Report		
Habits	127	.02
Effort	127	-.00
Productivity	127	-.13
Performance Rating	111	.14

* $p < .05$.

also presented in Table 19. No significant correlations were obtained.

The relative effects should be interpreted cautiously, as many of the dependent variables were intercorrelated (see Appendix F for the correlation matrix). In addition, several independent variables used in the study were also intercorrelated (see Appendix G for the correlation matrix). Correlations were also conducted between the independent and dependent variables (see Appendix H for this matrix).

Discussion

The present study investigated an area of correctional research that has received little attention in the past. Previous research on correctional staff has focused primarily on staff perceptions and attitudes toward working in corrections and working with offenders. However, this study extended this approach by examining the manner in which staff attitudes and behaviours influence correctional clientele. Specifically, the present research explored the effects of supervisor leadership behaviours and professional orientations toward correctional work on offender work attitudes. Therefore, this study differed in its approach by obtaining input not solely from the intervention providers, but also from the people who work with them, and the individuals most likely to be influenced by them. This approach to examining the impact of correctional shop supervisors takes into account the fact that programming and intervention efforts do not occur in isolation, but are a culmination of many influences (Hoge & Andrews, 1986). This study assesses contributions from Managers, the intervention providers, and the clientele receiving the intervention, in an effort to gain a more complete assessment of the factors that contribute to positive work attitudes in offenders.

Through the use of multiple sources, the study operationalized supervisor characteristics from the perspectives of Operations Managers, supervisors, and offenders. The Manager contributions were quite helpful given the obvious halo

effects that often occur with self-report measures. Since offenders reported both independent variables and subsequent dependent variables, the Manager reports offered a more objective test of the extent to which the supervisor attitudes and behaviours influenced offender work attitudes and behaviours. In addition, the Operations Managers' ratings of the supervisor were a means of obtaining a less biased opinion of supervisors' true leadership behaviours. The inclusion of offender punctuality ratings contributed an additional unbiased behavioral indicator of motivation.

Results generally support the hypotheses that were proposed, with the exception of the findings related to human service. It was hypothesized that a transformational approach to leadership would positively influence offender motivation and involvement. Offender-rated transformational leadership was strongly related to the motivation measures: intrinsic job motivation, and meaningfulness and responsibility for work outcomes. In addition, as hypothesized, offender job involvement was related to transformational leadership. These results lend support to the existing leadership literature linking more active forms of supervisor or manager leadership (i.e., transformational leadership orientation) with increased employee motivation (e.g., Bass, 1985). The study demonstrates that transformational leaders are effective in increasing the amount of effort offenders are willing to exert and positive motivational work attitudes as reported by offenders. Most importantly, offenders working with supervisors who are seen as displaying high amounts of

transformational leadership behaviours, have better punctuality ratings. These reported findings are very strong. First, independent raters agreed on the independent variables and their effects. Secondly, the punctuality rating, a measure unaffected by the socially desirable responding that can contaminate self-report measures, provided a behavioral indicator of supervisory influence.

An important linkage was demonstrated with respect to motivation and performance. In addition to the positive outcomes associated with transformational leadership, negative offender work attitudes were related to offender reports of supervisor nonleadership orientation. Since supervisors displaying nonleadership behaviours are associated with offenders who exert less effort and are rated by Managers as running less productive shops, this finding argues for a connection between leadership behaviours, motivation and productivity. This finding constitutes an important contribution to the leadership literature.

However, counter to what was hypothesized, work involvement was unrelated to leadership orientation. This could be due to the relatively short periods of time many offenders are employed with prison industries. A more generalized involvement in work (i.e., work involvement) tends to develop over a longer period of time than the situation specific job involvement.

Additionally, it was hypothesized that "positive" correctional attitudes would relate to more positive offender work attitudes. Specifically, it was hypothesized that supervisors supporting rehabilitation and preferring less social distance between

themselves and offenders would impact positively on offender work attitudes. Essentially, the MANOVA results indicate that no correctional attitudinal variables, with the exception of human service and concern with corruption, had significant effects on offender work attitudes. These findings do not indicate that professional orientation toward correctional work be discarded as a variable in correctional research. Rather, correctional orientation variables should be explored in future research examining correctional staff attitudes and perceptions toward working with offenders. Zero-order correlations suggest trends between these measures and outcomes, even though multi-variate analyses did not indicate significant results, as they are much more stringent tests. For example, Table 1 (see Appendix H) indicates that custody is negatively correlated with job involvement ($r = -.25$), while rehabilitation is positively correlated with job involvement ($r = .20$). Additionally, Table 1 shows a negative correlation between meaningfulness of work with supervisor custodial orientation ($r = -.27$). These trends merit further exploration in similar correctional staff research.

As mentioned, the second hypothesis, the proposed positive relationship between supervisor human service orientation and meaningfulness and responsibility offenders experience in relation to work outcomes, was not supported. In fact, the relationship was opposite to that hypothesized. Results indicate that supervisors espousing a human service approach negatively influenced offender work attitudes, including job involvement, meaning, responsibility, extra effort, and effectiveness.

These findings are not easily explained, but suggestions are proposed. Supervisors espousing a human service approach are more apt to prefer interaction with others. Perhaps this style of supervision is perceived by offenders as impinging on their personal space. Previous research using the human service scale (Robinson et al., 1993) was conducted in the field of corrections, but only with correctional staff as participants. Robinson et al. (1993) found negative correlations between human service orientation and punitive correctional attitudes. Specifically, human service orientation was negatively correlated with custodial attitudes ($r = -.38$), social distance ($r = -.39$), punitiveness ($r = -.34$), and concern with corruption of authority ($r = -.34$). In addition, consistent with what one would intuitively expect, Robinson and his colleagues found human service to be positively correlated with rehabilitation ($r = .39$). However, the present research correlates staff responses on the human service scale with offender-reported outcomes. Perhaps the measure is applicable and effective only for use with non-offender populations. In addition, the alpha obtained for the measure was very low (.46), indicating that the scale was not very reliable for this sample, although other researchers (Robinson et al., 1993) reported adequate reliability for the measure ($\alpha = .73$) in a previous study conducted with Canadian correctional officers. Finally, high correlations were obtained for a human service orientation with impression management. Given these findings, the construct warrants detailed exploration, if it is to be used to effectively assess the influence of staff attitudes on offenders in future research.

Credibility was one of the strongest findings in the study. Results indicate a strong relationship between credibility and transformational leadership, lending support to Kouzes and Posner's theory of credibility as essential for effective leadership. More importantly, the association of credibility with many positive offender-reported work attitudes indicates that this may be a very important variable to examine in the future research conducted with correctional staff and offenders. This study provides support for the intuitive belief that staff providing programming and intervention for offenders should be perceived as credible.

Some caution must be used in interpreting the results due to weaknesses associated with the study, such as the low number of participants. The lack of agreement among supervisors, offenders, and Managers as to what behaviours constitute effective leadership is a source of weakness in the supervisor measures and merits further elaboration. Basically, the results of the correlations conducted on the criterion validity of the leadership measures indicate that supervisors have not presented an accurate measure of their leadership behaviours. Given that both offender- and Manager-reported independent variables effectively predicted offender outcomes, but supervisor self-report ratings were completely uncorrelated with the dependent measures, one would be justified in assuming that supervisors have not provided representative reports of their true leadership orientations. Essentially, it appears as though supervisors have responded in a manner that served to artificially inflate their leadership profiles. This inflation of positive leadership behaviours is not

of major concern, since it is not isolated to this particular sample. Bass and Avolio (1990) claim that such findings typically occur in organizational settings with individuals being assessed on the MLQ. Typically, individuals who feel they are being evaluated will attempt to present themselves in a positive manner. This is particularly the case when these assessments consist of self-report measures. In the present situation, the inflated scores may be a reflection of supervisors' inability to accurately assess their leadership behaviours, or more probably, they result from a conscious attempt of the supervisors to present themselves in a positive manner. First, although not significant, positive correlations were obtained for supervisor reports of transformational leadership with impression management ($r = .30$), and negative correlations obtained for nonleadership with impression management ($r = -.23$). This indicates that generally, supervisors made a conscious attempt to present themselves as effective leaders. Secondly, the Correctional Service of Canada is currently undergoing a reorganization initiative, and many employees feel uncertain about the security of their current position in the organization. Although the researcher assured participants that results of the study were confidential and to be used for research purposes only, it can be assumed, given the results of the correlations of supervisor predictor measures with impression management scores, that supervisors responded in a fashion that presented correctional industries in a positive manner.

Thus, these findings constituted a weakness in the study. The results would

be stronger if all rating sources were significantly positively correlated in their perceptions of leadership behaviours. However, this is not as serious a problem as one might perceive. Bass and Avolio (1990) claim that since employee leadership ratings of superiors and peers tend to be more reliable than self-reports, more credence should be given to the employee ratings.

The issue at hand is whether qualitative differences truly exist between supervisor behaviours that result in differential outcomes for offenders. Since the strongest effects were related to offender self-report predictor variables with work attitudes, one could surmise that offenders who like their supervisors rated them more positively and subsequently tend to exert more effort for them. Although weaknesses are apparent, this study indicates that certain supervisor behaviours and attitudes are effective in promoting positive work attitudes in offenders. These results have implications for future research conducted with other intervention-providers in corrections, as many correctional staff are involved in the delivery of programming directed toward modification of offender attitudes and behaviour. As the research shows that staff attitudes (i.e., credibility and leadership orientations) do influence offender attitudes and behaviours, the present findings have important implications for staff selection and training.

References

- Andrews, D.A., Bonta, J., & Hoge, R.D. (1990a). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology. Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 17, 19-52.
- Andrews, D.A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R.D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. T. (1990b). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. Criminology, 28, 369-404.
- Atwater, L.E. (1988). The relative importance of situational and individual variables in predicting leader behaviour: The surprising impact of subordinate trust. Group and Organization Studies, 13, 290-310.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Bass, B.M. (1985). Leadership: Good, Better, Best. Organizational Dynamics, 13, 26-40.
- Bass, B.M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. Organizational Dynamics, 18, 19-31.
- Bass, B.M., & Avolio, B.J. (1990). The Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Burns, J.M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.

- Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. Academy of Management Review, 12, 637-647.
- Cook, J.D., Hepworth, S.J., Wall, T.D., & Warr, P.B. (1981). The experience of work. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Crookall, P.S. (1989). Leadership in prison industry. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. School of Business Administration, The University of Western Ontario.
- Cullen, F.T., Faith, E.L., Link, B.G., & Wolfe, N.T. (1989). The correctional orientation of prison guards: Do officers support rehabilitation? Federal Probation, 53, 33-42.
- Erez, E. (1987). Rehabilitation in justice: The prisoner's perspective. Journal of Offender Counselling, Services and Rehabilitation, 11, 5-19.
- Flanagan, T. (1988). Prison labor and industry. In L. Goods, . and D. MacKenzie (Eds.), The American prison: Issues in research and policy (pp. 135-161). New York: Plenum.
- Flanagan, T., & Maguire, K. (1987). Prison labor and prisoner adjustment. Albany, NY: Hinde'ang Criminal Justice Research Centre, SUNY.
- Gendreau, P., & Ross, B. (1979). Effective correctional treatment: Bibliography for cynics. Crime and Delinquency, 25, 463-489.

- Glaser, D. (1964). The effectiveness of a prison and parole system. Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Gleason, S. (1986). Inmate attitudes toward vocational training: A case study of vocational training students in the State Prison of Southern Michigan. Journal of Offender Counselling, Services and Rehabilitation, 10, 49-60.
- Guynes, R., & Greiser, R.C. (1986). Contemporary prison industry goals. In American Correctional Association (Ed.), A study of prison industry: History, components, goals (pp. 19-29). College Park, MD: American Correctional Association.
- Hackman, J.R., & Oldham, G.R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60, 159-170.
- Hackman, J.R., & Oldham, G.R. (1980). Work redesign. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Hodanish, M. (1976). Rehabilitation through employment: Proceed with caution! Offender Rehabilitation, 1, 147-161 or 162.
- Hoge, R.D., & Andrews, D.A. (1986). A model for conceptualizing interventions in social service agencies. Canadian Psychology, 27, 332-341.
- Kanungo, R.N. (1979). The concepts of alienation and involvement revisited. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 119-138.
- Kanungo, R.N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. Journal of Applied Psychology, 67, 341-349.

- Klofas, J., & Toch, H. (1982). The guard subculture myth. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 19, 238-254.
- Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (1987). The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations. California: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.
- Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (1993). Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it. California: Jossey-Bass Inc., Publishers.
- Kroner, D.G., & Weekes, J.R. (1994). Response style measures in an inmate sample. Manuscript under review.
- Martinson, R. (1974). What works? Questions and answers about prison reform. The Public Interest, 35, 22-54.
- Palmer, T. (1983). The "effectiveness" issue today: An overview. Federal Probation, 46, 3-10.
- Paulhus, D.L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46, 598-609.
- Philliber, S. (1987). Thy brother's keeper: A review of the literature on correctional officers. Justice Quarterly, 4, 9-37.
- Robinson, D., Porporino, F. J., & Simourd, L. (1992). Staff commitment in the Correctional Service of Canada. Research Report No. R-21. Ottawa: The Correctional Service of Canada.

- 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.
- Seltzer, J., & Bass, B.M. (1990). Transformational leadership: Beyond initiation and consideration. Journal of Management, 16, 693-703.
- Soothill, K., & Holmes, J. (1981). Finding employment for ex-prisoners: A ten-year follow-up study. The Howard Journal, 20, 29-36.
- Wahler, C., & Gendreau, P. (1985). Assessing correctional officers. Federal Probation, 49, 70-74.
- Waldman, D.A., Bass, B.M., & Yammarino, F.J. (1990). Adding to contingent-reward behaviour. Group and Organization Studies, 15, 381-394.
- Warr, P.B., Cook, J., & Wall, T.D. (1979). Scales for the measurement of some work attitudes and aspects of psychological well-being. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 52, 129-148.
- Whitehead, J.T., & Lindquist, C.A. (1989). Determinants of correctional officers' professional orientation. Justice Quarterly, 6, 69-87.
- Yammarino, F.J., & Bass, B.M. (1990). Transformational leadership and multiple levels of analysis. Human Relations, 43, 975-995.
- Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. Journal of Management, 15, 251-289.

Yukl, G., & Van Fleet, D.D. (1992). Theory and research on leadership in organizations. In M.D. Dunnette and L. Hough (Eds.), Handbook of industrial & organizational psychology (Vol. 3, pp. 147-197). Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Appendix A

INFORMATION FORM

The purpose of this study is to examine relationships between supervisors and offenders in CORCAN. Specifically, I will be asking questions about your style of instruction in the shop. I will also ask offenders to rate your supervisor style. In addition, if you agree, a very short performance questionnaire will be completed by the Operations Manager to gain further information about your relationship with offenders in CORCAN. This information will help give more understanding of the impact supervisors have on their employees.

This study is being carried out by Christa Gillis, as part of a requirement for her Master's thesis at Carleton University.

Each supervisor who takes part in the study will be asked to fill out a questionnaire, which should take approximately 1-1.5 hours to complete. Most of the questions deal with the supervisor's style of instruction in the shop. It is important to note that there are no right or wrong answers, and that there is no one "correct" style. Also, this questionnaire is not a performance evaluation. We are interested in your perceptions of the most effective way to run the shop. The questionnaire also includes some standard questions that have been used in a variety of studies of the workplace and some questions about your background. We ask that you please answer all of these questions.

There is no reward for participating, and no penalty for not participating in the study. Participation by both supervisors and offenders is completely voluntary. All answers are strictly confidential. However, if you wish, you may receive feedback on how you rated your supervisory style on this questionnaire. This information will be provided to you only. Please be assured that individual instructors will not be identified in any reports, or to CORCAN staff.

If you have any questions about the study, please ask them. If you have any questions about the study later, you may contact Dr. David Robinson, Senior Research Manager, Research and Statistics Branch, at (613) 996-5222.

QUESTIONNAIRE CONSENT FORM

I _____, hereby consent to participate as a volunteer in this study. I understand the purpose of the study is to examine relationships between supervisors and offenders in CORCAN industries. If I agree, a short questionnaire will be given to the Operations Manager within the institution, to gain more information about my relationship with offenders.

The purpose and method of the study have been explained to me and I understood the explanation. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the study, and I am satisfied with the responses I was given.

I understand that this questionnaire will take about 1-1.5 hours to complete and that I may withdraw at anytime from this study. This means I may refuse to participate or answer any of the questions.

There is no reward for participating, and no penalty for not participating in the study. My participation is completely voluntary. Information gathered in the study will be used for research purposes only and will be kept confidential. I understand that this means my individual responses to each question will not be released to CORCAN or CSC.

I understand that this is not a performance evaluation. I also understand that individual instructors will not be identified in any reports on this study.

If I want more information about this study, I can contact Dr. David Robinson, Senior Research Manager, Research and Statistics Branch, at (613) 996-5222.

I hereby grant permission to the researcher to make use of the information gathered in this questionnaire.

Yes ____ No ____

I hereby grant permission to the researcher to ask the Operations Manager about general performance information concerning my shop.

Yes ____ No ____

Signature of participant

Date

I, the undersigned, have defined and fully explained the above to the participant in detail, and to the best of my knowledge, it was understood.

Signature of Researcher

Date

QUESTIONNAIRE

Background Information

Indicate your highest level of education

- 1 grade 11 or below
- 2 secondary or high school diploma
- 3 some college courses
- 4 some university courses
- 5 community college diploma or certificate
- 6 Bachelor's degree
- 7 Master's degree
- 8 Doctoral degree
- 9 Other - please describe (e.g., trade certificate)

How long have you been working directly with offenders?

_____ years, _____ months

How long have you been a shop supervisor?

How many years have you been employed with C.S.C.?

What is the security classification of the institution?

If you had the opportunity to do things over again, would you re-enter the field of corrections?

- ☐ **Definitely yes**
- ☐ **Probably yes**
- ☐ **Unsure**
- ☐ **Probably not**
- ☐ **Definitely not**

Please think back to when you applied for your first job with C.S.C. We would like you to indicate how important each of these factors was in influencing your decision to work for C.S.C.

	Not at all Important	Not very Important	Somewhat Important	Very Important
Good pay	1	2	3	4
Good benefits	1	2	3	4
Job security	1	2	3	4
Promotional opportunities	1	2	3	4
Step up from previous employment	1	2	3	4
Interest in helping people	1	2	3	4
Lack of employment opportunities elsewhere	1	2	3	4
It fit my educational background	1	2	3	4
Interest in doing security work	1	2	3	4
Interest in working with inmates	1	2	3	4
Any other reason that we might have missed (specify and then rank on this scale)				
_____	1	2	3	4

THE FOLLOWING MATERIAL HAS BEEN REMOVED DUE TO COPYRIGHT
RESTRICTIONS.

PLEASE CONTACT THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.

LE MATERIEL SUIVANT A ETE ENLEVE DUE AU DROIT D'AUTEUR.

S.V.P.CONTACTER LA BIBLIOTHEQUE DE L'UNIVERSITE.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA
CANADIAN THESES SERVICE

BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA
LE SERVICE DES THESES CANADIENNES

pp. 84 - 90, (c) Bass & Avolio, 1991

Using the scale below as a guide, circle the number after each statement to indicate how much you agree with it.

1. My first impressions about people usually turn out to be right.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I don't care to know what other people really think of me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I have not always been honest with myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I always know why I like things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Once I've made up my mind, other people can seldom change my opinion.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I am not a safe driver when I exceed the speed limit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I am fully in control of my own fate.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. It's hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. I never regret my decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I sometimes lose out on things because I can't make up my mind soon enough.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2 of/de 2

PM-1 3 1/2"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

14. My parents were not always fair when they punished me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. I am a completely rational person.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. I rarely appreciate criticism.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. I am very confident of my judgments.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. It's all right with me if some people happen to dislike me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. I don't always know the reasons why I do the things I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. I never cover up my mistakes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. I never swear.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. I have said something bad about a friend behind his or her back.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Not true			Somewhat			Very true
28. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. I always declare everything at customs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. When I was young, I sometimes stole things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. I have never dropped litter on the street.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. I have done things that I don't tell other people about.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. I never take things that don't belong to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. I have taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. I have some pretty awful habits.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38. I don't gossip about other people's business.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

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

		False	True
1.	I prefer a job that gives me the opportunity to help people solve their problems.	0	1
2.	One of the most rewarding elements of correctional work is that it is challenging.	0	1
3.	There is only one way to work with offenders, and new ideas will not make any difference in this line of work.	0	1
4.	If I had the choice, I'd much prefer to work with non-offenders than with offenders.	0	1
5.	I know what works and what doesn't work with my job so trying different ways is a waste of time.	0	1
6.	I can get a lot of satisfaction from working with people who are less fortunate than I am.	0	1
7.	For good reasons, the type of work we do in corrections has a bad image with the public.	0	1
8.	You often hear managers talking about new approaches to working with offenders, but most of these things are too idealistic to work.	0	1
9.	If it wasn't for the good pay, I would probably not choose a career in the field of corrections.	0	1
10.	Changing the way we do things around here would cost a lot of money but it would be worth it.	0	1

		False	True
11.	While every job has its rewards, offenders are the most interesting and challenging type of people to work with.	0	1
12.	For me, a job that involves talking to other people about their problems is more meaningful than a job that involves only casual contact with other people.	0	1
13.	In general, there are more good things than bad things about having a career in corrections	0	1
14.	Most of the ideas you hear about correctional work come from naive professionals who really don't know what makes offenders "tick".	0	1
15.	Work that allows me to help other people makes me feel like I am really making a difference.	0	1
16.	Working in corrections would be O.K. as long as you didn't have to deal with offenders directly.	0	1
17.	If there was a better way of dealing with offenders we would have discovered it by now.	0	1
18.	I don't necessarily have to work with people in order to feel like I'm making a contribution to society.	0	1
19.	Being involved in the field of corrections gives me a personal sense of pride and accomplishment.	0	1

		False	True
20.	What we really need around here are people with innovative ideas about how to change things.	0	1
21.	If I was to start looking for a new career tomorrow, I'd probably look for work in one of the helping professions.	0	1
22.	Usually, I am not very proud to tell people that I earn my living working with criminals.	0	1
23.	Administrative work is O.K., as long as it contributes to solving the major problems in society.	0	1
24.	Generally, I would prefer to have a job in a different field than corrections.	0	1
25.	I could be much more innovative in approaching my work if I had more support from my supervisors.	0	1
26.	Generally, I tend to get more satisfaction from working with people than from other parts of my job.	0	1
27.	What most attracts me to corrections is the type of work I do, and not the pay, fringe benefits, or working conditions.	0	1
28.	I find that I get very little encouragement to use initiative in solving work problems.	0	1
29.	I would have to agree that work in corrections is not a very respectable kind of job to have.	0	1
30.	New and better ways of doing things around here are usually blocked by people who are higher up in the organization.	0	1
31.	There is not enough flexibility to try new ways of doing things around here.	0	1

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

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	Staff should work hard to earn trust from offenders.	1	2	3	4
2.	It's important for staff to have compassion.	1	2	3	4
3.	The way to get respect from offenders is to take an interest in them.	1	2	3	4
4.	You get to like the offenders you work with.	1	2	3	4
5.	Sometimes staff should advocate for an offender.	1	2	3	4
6.	Rehabilitation programs should be left to mental health professionals.	1	2	3	4
7.	Counselling is a job for counsellors, not for correctional officers or other line staff.	1	2	3	4
8.	If staff (other than counsellors) want to do counselling, they should change jobs.	1	2	3	4
9.	There would be much less crime if prisons were more uncomfortable.	1	2	3	4
10.	Improving prisons for inmates makes them worse for staff.	1	2	3	4

		Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
11.	A military regime is the best way of running a prison.	1	2	3	4
12.	Rehabilitation programs are a waste of time and money.	1	2	3	4
13.	You can't ever completely trust an offender.	1	2	3	4
14.	A good principle is not to get "close" to offenders.	1	2	3	4
15.	A personal relationship with an offender invites corruption.	1	2	3	4
16.	You must keep conversations with offenders short and businesslike.	1	2	3	4
17.	If staff are lenient with offenders, they will take advantage of them.	1	2	3	4

Instructions: You will now note that the response options have changed. Please indicate that extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement below.

	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree
18. Keeping the offenders from causing trouble should be the major concern of correctional officers.	1	2	3
19. All rehabilitation programs have done is to allow criminals who deserve to be punished to get off easily.	1	2	3
20. Many people don't realize it, but prisons are too soft on the inmates.	1	2	3
21. Rehabilitating a criminal is just as important as making a criminal pay for his or her crime.	1	2	3
22. An inmate will go straight only when he finds that prison life is too hard.	1	2	3
23. The only effective and humane cure for the crime problem in Canada is to make a strong effort to rehabilitate offenders.	1	2	3
24. Sleep 'em, feed 'em, and work 'em is the only way to handle inmates.	1	2	3
25. The only way to reduce crime in our society is to punish criminals, not to try to rehabilitate them.	1	2	3
26. We would be successful even if all we taught inmates was a little respect for authority.	1	2	3

		Agree	Uncertain	Disagree
27.	We should stop viewing criminals as victims of society who deserve to be rehabilitated and start paying more attention to the victims of these criminals.	1	2	3
28.	As long as inmates stay quiet and don't cause any trouble I really don't care if they are getting rehabilitated or cured while in prison.	1	2	3
29.	I would support expanding the rehabilitation programs with criminals that are now being undertaken in our prisons.	1	2	3
30.	An officer's job isn't to help rehabilitate inmates; it's only to keep them orderly so that they don't hurt anyone in there or tear the prison apart.	1	2	3
31.	One of the reasons why rehabilitation programs often fail with prisoners is because they are under-funded; if enough money were available, these programs would work.	1	2	3
32.	The rehabilitation of adult criminals just does not work.	1	2	3
33.	The rehabilitation of prisoners has proven to be a failure.	1	2	3

Appendix B

INFORMATION FORM

The purpose of this study is to examine relationships between supervisors and offenders in CORCAN. Specifically, I will be asking questions about your supervisor's style of instruction in the shop. This information will help give more understanding of the impact supervisors have on their employees.

This study is being carried out by Christa Gillis, as part of a requirement for her Master's thesis at Carleton University.

Each person who participates will be asked to complete a questionnaire. Each questionnaire should take about 1-1.5 hours to complete. Some of the questions deal with your perceptions of the supervisor's style of instruction in the shop, and others include different ways you may think about work. There are also some standard questions that have been used in a variety of studies of the workplace and some questions about your background. We ask that you please answer all of these questions. Remember that there are no right or wrong answers. We are simply interested in your opinion of your relationship with your supervisor. In addition, if you agree, I would like to look at your work performance ratings completed by your supervisor. This will be done to obtain some additional information not available from the questionnaire responses.

All answers are strictly confidential. Individual offenders will not be identified in any reports, and your supervisor will receive information based on the average responses of all participants.

If you have any questions about the study, please ask them. If you have any questions about the study later, you may contact Dr. David Robinson, Senior Research Manager, Research and Statistics Branch, at (613) 996-5222.

QUESTIONNAIRE CONSENT FORM

I _____, hereby consent to participate as a volunteer in this study. I understand the purpose of the study is to examine the relationship between supervisors and offenders in CORCAN industries.

The purpose and method of the study have been explained to me and I understood the explanation. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the study, and I am satisfied with the responses I was given.

I understand that this questionnaire will take about 1-1.5 hours to complete and that I may withdraw at anytime from this study. This means I may refuse to participate or answer any of the questions.

I understand that there is no reward for participating, and no penalty for not participating in the study. I understand that my participation is completely voluntary and that information gathered in the study will be kept confidential.

I also understand that individual offenders and instructors will not be identified in any reports on this study.

If I want more information about this study, I can contact Dr. David Robinson, Senior Research Manager, Research and Statistics Branch, at (613) 996-5222.

I hereby grant permission to the researcher to make use of the information gathered in the study
for research purposes only.

Yes ____ No ____

I hereby grant permission to the researcher to use information obtained from my work performance ratings.

Yes ____ No ____

Signature of participant

Date

I, the undersigned, have defined and fully explained the above to the participant in detail, and to the best of my knowledge, it was understood.

Signature of Researcher

Date

QUESTIONNAIRE

Background Information

How old are you?

How long have you been serving your sentence?

_____ years, _____ months

How long have you been working for CORCAN?

- ___ less than 3 months
- ___ 4-6 months
- ___ 7-12 months
- ___ 12 months
- ___ 2 years or more

How long have you worked in this shop?

- ___ less than 3 months
- ___ 4-6 months
- ___ 7-12 months
- ___ greater than 12 months

How long have you worked with this supervisor?

- ___ less than 3 months
- ___ 4-6 months
- ___ 7-12 months
- ___ greater than 12 months

What is your job title?

Indicate any other jobs you have held while you were on the street

Indicate any other jobs you have held with CORCAN

Instructions: Please place a check mark beside the response that applies to you.

How much time do you spend talking with your supervisor on an average day?

- ☐ 15 minutes or less
- ☐ 30 minutes
- ☐ 45 minutes
- ☐ 1 hour
- ☐ 2 hours or more

How much time does your supervisor spend with you explaining how to do your work?

- ☐ 15 minutes or less
- ☐ 30 minutes
- ☐ 45 minutes
- ☐ 1 hour
- ☐ 2 hours or more

How much contact do you have overall with your supervisor on an average day?

- ☐ 15 minutes or less
- ☐ 30 minutes
- ☐ 45 minutes
- ☐ 1 hour
- ☐ 2 hours or more

THE FOLLOWING MATERIAL HAS BEEN REMOVED DUE TO COPYRIGHT
RESTRICTIONS.

PLEASE CONTACT THE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY.

LE MATERIEL SUIVANT A ETE ENLEVE DUE AU DROIT D'AUTEUR.

S.V.P. CONTACTER LA BIBLIOTHEQUE DE L'UNIVERSITE.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA
CANADIAN THESES SERVICE

BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA
LE SERVICE DES THESES CANADIENNES

Using the scale below as a guide, circle the number after each statement to indicate how much you agree with it.

1. My first impressions about people usually turn out to be right.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I don't care to know what other people really think of me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I have not always been honest with myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I always know why I like things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Once I've made up my mind, other people can seldom change my opinion.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. I am not a safe driver when I exceed the speed limit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I am fully in control of my own fate.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. It's hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. I never regret my decisions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I sometimes lose out on things because I can't make up my mind soon enough.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

14. My parents were not always fair when they punished me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. I am a completely rational person.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. I rarely appreciate criticism.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. I am very confident of my judgments.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. It's all right with me if some people happen to dislike me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. I don't always know the reasons why I do the things I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. I sometimes tell lies if I have to.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. I never cover up my mistakes.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. I never swear.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. I have said something bad about a friend behind his or her back.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Not true			Somewhat			Very true
28. I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. I always declare everything at customs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. When I was young, I sometimes stole things.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31. I have never dropped litter on the street.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32. I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33. I have done things that I don't tell other people about.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34. I never take things that don't belong to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35. I have taken sick-leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36. I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37. I have some pretty awful habits.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38. I don't gossip about other people's business.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Instructions: This is not a test and there are no "right" or "wrong" answers.
Following are some statements with which you may agree or disagree. Circle the
answer which best represents your general feeling or the way you usually feel.

If you STRONGLY AGREE	circle SA
If you AGREE	circle A
If you're not sure or UNDECIDED	circle U
If you DISAGREE	circle D
If you STRONGLY DISAGREE	circle SD

Please indicate your feelings about every statement by circling one of the five (5)
answers; that is, please answer every question by circling one of the five responses.

		SA-----A-----U-----D-----SD				
		Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	Laws are so often made for the benefit of small selfish groups that a person cannot respect the law.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2.	Clearly all laws deserve our respect.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3.	It is our duty to obey all laws.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4.	Laws are usually bad.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5.	The law is rotten to the core.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6.	Almost any jury can be fixed.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7.	You can't get justice in court.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8.	On the whole, lawyers are honest.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9.	Fake witnesses are often produced by the prosecution.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10.	On the whole, policemen are honest.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11.	A cop is a friend to people in need.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12.	Life is better with fewer policemen.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13.	Policemen should be paid more for their work.	SA	A	U	D	SD
14.	Policemen are just as crooked as the people they arrest.	SA	A	U	D	SD
15.	All laws should be strictly obeyed because they are laws.	SA	A	U	D	SD

		SA-----A-----U-----D-----SD					
		Strongly	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly	
		Agree				Disagree	
16.	The law does not benefit the common person.	SA	A	U	D	SD	
17.	The law as a whole is sound.	SA	A	U	D	SD	
18.	In the long run law and justice are the same.	SA	A	U	D	SD	
19.	The law enslaves the majority of people for the benefit of a few.	SA	A	U	D	SD	
20.	On the whole judges are honest and kindhearted.	SA	A	U	D	SD	
21.	Court decisions are almost always just.	SA	A	U	D	SD	
22.	Almost anything can be fixed in the courts if you have enough money.	SA	A	U	D	SD	
23.	A judge is a good person.	SA	A	U	D	SD	
24.	Our society would be better off if there were more policemen.	SA	A	U	D	SD	
25.	Police rarely try to help people.	SA	A	U	D	SD	
26.	Sometimes a guy like me has to break the law in order to get ahead.	SA	A	U	D	SD	
27.	Most successful people used illegal means to become successful.	SA	A	U	D	SD	
28.	People who have been in trouble with the law have the same sort of ideas about life as I have.	SA	A	U	D	SD	

	SA-----A-----U-----D-----SD					
	Strongly	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly	
	Agree				Disagree	
29.	A person should always obey the law no matter how much it interferes with his personal ambition.					
	SA	A	U	D	SD	
30.	I would rather associate with people that obey the law than those that don't.					
	SA	A	U	D	SD	
31.	It's alright for a person to break the law if he doesn't get caught.					
	SA	A	U	D	SD	
32.	I'm more like the people who can make a living outside the law than I am like those who only break the law occasionally.					
	SA	A	U	D	SD	
33.	Most people would commit crimes if they know they wouldn't get caught.					
	SA	A	U	D	SD	
34.	People who have been in trouble with the law are more like me than people who don't have trouble with the law.					
	SA	A	U	D	SD	
35.	There is never good cause for breaking the law.					
	SA	A	U	D	SD	
36.	I don't have much in common with people who never break the law.					
	SA	A	U	D	SD	
37.	A hungry person has the right to steal.					
	SA	A	U	D	SD	

SA-----A-----U-----D-----SD
 Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

38.	It's alright to evade the law if you don't actually violate it.	SA	A	U	D	SD
39.	No person can violate the law and be my friend.	SA	A	U	D	SD
40.	A person should obey only those laws which seem reasonable.	SA	A	U	D	SD
41.	A person is a fool to work for a living if he can get by some easier way; even if it means violating the law.	SA	A	U	D	SD

Instructions: Please read the following items carefully. Circle the answer that best indicates how you feel about each item.

	1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----
	Strongly	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly
	Agree				Disagree
1. My shop supervisor is credible.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. My shop supervisor is honest.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. My shop supervisor is competent.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. My shop supervisor is inspiring.	SA	A	U	D	SD
5. I trust my supervisor.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. My supervisor is as good as his word.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. My supervisor does what he says he will.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. I can rely on my shop supervisor to keep his promises.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. I can not trust that my shop supervisor will be honest with me.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. My supervisor does not know his trade well.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11. My supervisor really knows how to get things done around the shop.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. My shop supervisor is good at what he does in his job.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. My supervisor inspires me to do my best at my work.	SA	A	U	D	SD

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
 Strongly Agree Undecided Disagree Strongly Disagree

14. My supervisor is usually enthusiastic about the work done in the shop.	SA	A	U	D	SD
15. My supervisor knows how to communicate his ideas well.	SA	A	U	D	SD

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree with these statements, based on the following rating scheme. Note that the response options have changed.

1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----
Strongly Agree	Agree	Mildly Agree	Mildly Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

1. The most important things that happen to me involve my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. To me, my job is only a small part of who I am.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I am very much involved personally in my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I live, eat, and breathe my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Most of my interests are centred around my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I have very strong ties with my present job which would be very difficult to break.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Usually I feel detached from the job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Most of my personal life goals are job-oriented.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I consider my job to be very central to my existence.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. The most important things that happen in life involve work.	1	2	3	4	5	6

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6
 Strongly Agree Agree Mildly Agree Mildly Disagree Disagree Strongly Disagree

12. Work is something people should get involved in most of the time.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Work should be only a small part of one's life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Work should be considered central to life.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. In my view, an individual's personal life goals should be work-oriented.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Life is worth living only when people get absorbed in work.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree with these statements, based on the following rating scheme. Note that the response options have changed.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7
 I strongly I disagree I disagree I'm not sure I agree I agree I strongly
 disagree quite a lot just a little about this just a little quite a lot agree

1. I feel a sense of personal satisfaction when I do this job well.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. My opinion of myself goes down when I do this job badly.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. I take pride in doing my job as well as I can.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I feel unhappy when my work is not up to my usual standard.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I like to look back on the day's work with a sense of a job well done.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I try to think of ways of doing my job effectively.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Instructions: Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements by using the scale provided below. Note that the response options have changed.

	1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----	5-----	6-----	7
	Disagree	Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Agree	Agree
	strongly		slightly		slightly		strongly
1. The work I do on this job is very meaningful to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Most of the things I have to do on this job seem useless or trivial.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Most people on this job find the work very meaningful.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Most people on this job feel that the work is useless or trivial.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. It's hard, on this job, for me to care very much about whether or not the work gets done right.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. I feel a very high degree of personal responsibility for the work I do on this job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I feel I should personally take the credit or blame for the results of my work on this job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Whether or not this job gets done is clearly my responsibility.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Most people on this job feel a great deal of personal responsibility for the work they do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Most people on this job feel that whether or not the job gets done right is clearly their own responsibility.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Instructions: Please rate your performance on these areas involved in your work, based on the following rating scale.

If you think your performance is very ineffective	circle 1
If you think your performance is ineffective	circle 2
If you think your performance is neither effective nor ineffective	circle 3
If you think your performance is effective	circle 4
If you think your performance is very effective	circle 5

Please indicate how effective you feel you are in each area by circling one of the five (5) options; that is, please answer every question by circling one of the five numbers.

1. Being able to cooperate with other workers in the shop.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Being able to cooperate with your supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Being able to solve problems.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Demonstrating initiative at work.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Being able to work independently.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Dealing with authority.	1	2	3	4	5

On a scale of 0 to 100, where 0=Unacceptable and 100=Excellent, I would consider my performance to be _____.

Appendix C**INFORMATION FORM**

The purpose of this study is to examine relationships between supervisors and offenders in CORCAN. Specifically, I will be asking you to complete a short questionnaire rating various aspects of the supervisor's leadership style. This information will help give more understanding of the impact supervisors may have on their employees.

The study is being carried out by Christa Gillis, as part of a requirement for her Master's thesis at Carleton University.

All answers are strictly confidential. Individual Operations managers, supervisors, and offenders will not be identified in any reports.

If you have any questions about the study, please ask them. If you have any questions about the study later, you may contact Dr. David Robinson, Senior Research Manager, Research and Statistics Branch, at (613) 996-5222.

QUESTIONNAIRE CONSENT FORM

I _____, hereby consent to participate as a volunteer in this study. I understand the purpose of the study is to examine relationships between supervisors and offenders in CORCAN industries.

The purpose and method of the study have been explained to me and I understood the explanation. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the study, and I am satisfied with the responses I was given.

I understand that this questionnaire will take about 10 minutes to complete and that I may refuse to participate or answer any of the questions.

I understand that there is no reward for participating, and no penalty for not participating in the study. I understand that my participation is completely voluntary and that information gathered in the study will be kept confidential.

I also understand that individual responses from Operations Managers, supervisors, and offenders will not be identified in any reports on this study.

If I want more information about this study, I can contact Dr. David Robinson, Senior Research Manager, Research and Statistics Branch, at (613) 996-5222.

I hereby grant permission to the researcher to make use of the information gathered in the study.

Yes ____ No ____

Signature of Participant

Date

I, the undersigned, have defined and fully explained the above to the participant in detail, and to the best of my knowledge, it was understood.

Signature of Researcher

Date

SUPERVISOR PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE

Supervisor: _____

Shop: _____

Instructions: Please rate the supervisor on the dimensions below using the rating scale provided.

If you think his performance is very ineffective	circle 1
If you think his performance is ineffective	circle 2
If you think his performance is neither effective nor ineffective	circle 3
If you think his performance is effective	circle 4
If you think his performance is very effective	circle 5

1. How effective is the supervisor in developing positive work habits in offenders?	1	2	3	4	5
2. How effective is the supervisor in obtaining extra effort from offenders?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How effective is the supervisor in increasing shop productivity?	1	2	3	4	5

On a scale of 0 to 100, where 0=Unacceptable and 100=Excellent, how would you rate the overall ability of the shop supervisor in working with offenders?

Overall performance rating: _____

Appendix D

Table 1
Multivariate analysis of variance of offender work attitudes^a by supervisor leadership variables with covariates removed

Group	<u>n</u>	<u>Lambda</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p <</u>
Leadership Orientation					
Offender Reports					
Transformational	111	.77	3.53	8, 95	.001
Transactional	111	.89	1.44	8, 95	<u>ns</u>
Nonleadership	111	.79	3.11	8, 95	.004
Credibility	111	.68	5.58	8, 95	.0001
Supervisor Reports					
Transformational	111	.96	.52	8, 95	<u>ns</u>
Transactional	111	.93	.91	8, 95	<u>ns</u>
Nonleadership	111	.92	1.09	8, 95	<u>ns</u>

^aOffenders completed self-report measures assessing job involvement, work involvement, intrinsic job motivation, meaningfulness of work, responsibility for work outcomes, extra effort, and supervisor and shop effectiveness

Table 2

Multivariate analysis of variance of offender work attitudes* by supervisor correctional attitudes with covariates removed

Group	n	<u>Lambda</u>	F	df	p <
Correctional Orientation					
Rehabilitation	111	.92	1.01	8, 95	<u>ns</u>
Custody	111	.93	.84	8, 95	<u>ns</u>
Human Service	107	.82	2.58	8, 91	.01
Social Distance	111	.91	1.14	8, 95	<u>ns</u>
Punitive	107	.95	.54	8, 91	<u>ns</u>
Corruption	108	.87	1.75	8, 92	<u>ns</u>

*Offenders completed self-report measures assessing job involvement, work involvement, intrinsic job motivation, meaningfulness of work, responsibility for work outcomes, extra effort, and supervisor and shop effectiveness

Table 3

Multivariate analysis of variance of offender work attitudes* by manager and offender supervisor ratings with covariates removed

<u>Group</u>	<u>n</u>	<u>Lambda</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>p <</u>
Manager Ratings					
Performance	90	.96	.37	8, 74	<u>ns</u>
Effort	105	.81	2.56	8, 89	.01
Productivity	105	.78	3.10	8, 89	.004
Habits	105	.90	1.25	8, 89	<u>ns</u>

*Offenders completed self-report measures assessing job involvement, work involvement, intrinsic job motivation, meaningfulness of work, responsibility for work outcomes, extra effort, and supervisor and shop effectiveness

Appendix E

Table 1
Means of dependent measures by offender work attitudes^a

	JI	WI	IJM	MNG	RES	EE	EFF	PUN
Offender report								
Leadership Orientation								
Transformational								
High	35.0	<u>ns</u>	34.2	26.3	26.1	2.6	3.0	4.3
Low	31.6		31.5	21.4	22.8	1.4	2.4	4.8
Nonleadership								
High	31.6	<u>ns</u>	<u>ns</u>	21.5	22.8	1.7	2.4	<u>ns</u>
Low	35.1			26.3	26.1	2.4	3.0	
Credibility								
High	36.2	<u>ns</u>	34.5	27.2	26.3	2.6	3.1	<u>ns</u>
Low	30.3		31.2	20.3	22.4	1.4	2.3	
Correctional Orientation								
Human Service								
High	31.5	<u>ns</u>	<u>ns</u>	21.7	22.7	1.7	2.5	<u>ns</u>
Low	35.3			26.5	26.7	2.4	2.9	

cont'd

Table 1 (cont'd)

Manager Ratings									
Effort									
High	36.2	<u>ns</u>	<u>ns</u>	27.7	<u>ns</u>	<u>ns</u>	<u>ns</u>		3.9
Low	32.6			22.9					4.7
Productivity									
High	35.5	<u>ns</u>	<u>ns</u>	27.4	26.1	2.4	3.0		4.1
Low	32.2			21.9	23.4	1.8	2.5		4.8

*Means are only shown for the sets of variables for which significant multivariate F values were observed.

Appendix F

Table 1
Intercorrelations among dependent variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 Job Involvement	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2 Work Involvement	.62 ^d	-	-	-	-	-	-
3 Intrinsic Job	.34 ^d	.17 ^a	-	-	-	-	-
4 Meaningfulness	.50 ^d	.19 ^a	.42 ^d	-	-	-	-
5 Responsibility	.37 ^d	.08	.43 ^d	.59 ^d	-	-	-
6 Extra Effort	.33 ^d	.07	.30 ^c	.49 ^d	.42 ^d	-	-
7 Effectiveness	.27 ^c	.07	.28 ^c	.44 ^d	.37 ^d	.57 ^d	-
8 Punctuality	-.24 ^a	-.25 ^a	-.04	-.23 ^a	-.19	-.11	-.13

Note. ns range from 101 to 151.

^a $p < .05$. ^b $p < .01$. ^c $p < .001$. ^d $p < .0001$.

Appendix G

Table 1
Intercorrelations among independent variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1 Trsform																
2 Trsact	.34 ^d															
3 Nonlead	-.20 ^a	.42 ^d														
4 Human	.02	-.04	-.18 ^a													
5 Custody	-.38 ^d	.32 ^d	.28 ^c	.18 ^a												
6 Rehab	.37 ^d	-.05	-.15	.02	-.66 ^d											
7 Punitive	-.42 ^d	.21 ^a	.30 ^c	-.04	.67 ^d	-.39 ^d										
8 Corrupt	-.39 ^d	-.16	-.07	.10	.48 ^d	-.72 ^d	.42 ^d									
9 Social	-.30 ^c	-.23 ^b	-.15	.24 ^b	.14	-.15	.13	.54 ^d								
10 Trsform	.22 ^a	-.00	-.02	-.28 ^b	-.32 ^d	-.00	-.36 ^d	.00	.08							
11 Trsact	.16	.28 ^c	-.00	-.04	-.03	.01	-.22 ^a	-.15	-.25 ^b	.26 ^b						
12 Non	-.09	.10	.11	.24 ^b	.12	.19 ^a	.03	-.19 ^a	-.28 ^c	-.65 ^d	.18 ^a					
13 Credible	-.04	-.19 ^a	-.15	-.19 ^a	-.29 ^c	-.05	-.17	.16	.31 ^c	.83 ^d	-.01	-.81 ^d				
14 Performance	-.10	.06	-.11	.14	-.04	.19 ^a	.11	-.12	.40 ^d	.06	.08	-.07	.04			
15 Effort	-.17	-.26 ^b	.03	-.00	-.02	.07	.13	.05	.38 ^d	.16	-.24 ^b	-.32 ^c	.31 ^c	.57 ^d		
16 Habits	-.16	-.09	-.10	.02	.09	-.29 ^c	.07	.15	.41 ^d	.12	.10	-.19 ^a	.20 ^a	.66 ^d	.55 ^d	
17 Product	.07	-.13	-.06	-.13	-.16	-.05	-.02	.09	.18 ^a	.27 ^b	.15	-.35 ^d	.28 ^b	.59 ^d	.58 ^d	.65 ^d

Note. 1-3 are supervisor self-report leadership factors. 10-12 are offender self-report leadership factors.

^a $p < .05$. ^b $p < .01$. ^c $p < .001$. ^d $p < .0001$.

Appendix H

Table 1
Correlations between independent and dependent variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 Transformational	.07	.01	.01	.09	.05	.11	.08	.01
2 Transactional	-.06	-.04	.00	-.10	-.01	.03	-.01	.16
3 Nonleadership	-.08	-.09	-.00	.07	-.01	-.01	-.00	-.07
4 Human Service	-.15	.01	-.14	-.32 ^c	-.24 ^b	-.25 ^b	-.20 ^a	-.10
5 Custody	-.25 ^b	-.15	-.07	-.27 ^b	-.14	-.22 ^a	-.12	.20 ^a
6 Rehabilitation	.20 ^a	.10	.01	.16	.06	.02	-.13	-.19 ^a
7 Punitive	-.13	-.04	-.00	-.05	-.01	-.18	-.08	-.02
8 Corrupt	-.21 ^a	-.07	-.10	-.18 ^a	-.08	.01	.09	.10
9 Social Distance	-.08	-.09	.08	-.07	-.01	.06	.10	.14
10 Transformational	.33 ^d	.11	.29 ^c	.43 ^d	.32 ^d	.51 ^d	.54 ^d	-.16
11 Transactional	.17 ^a	.24 ^b	-.01	.11	.09	.16	.05	.02
12 Nonlead	-.21 ^a	.00	-.22 ^b	-.29 ^c	-.19 ^a	-.32 ^d	.50 ^d	.03
13 Credibility	.29 ^c	.08	.28 ^c	.41 ^d	.30 ^c	.42 ^d	.55 ^d	-.20 ^a
14 Performance	.16	.08	.15	.17	.16	.10	.10	.06
15 Effort	.12	-.07	.12	.27 ^b	.14	.11	.21 ^a	-.14
16 Habits	.05	.00	.08	.20 ^a	.19 ^a	.14	.21 ^a	.15
17 Productivity	.12	.03	.07	.36 ^d	.17	.24 ^b	.24 ^b	-.07

Note. 1-3 are supervisor self-report leadership factors. 10-12 are offender self-report leadership factors.

^a $p < .05$. ^b $p < .01$. ^c $p < .001$. ^d $p < .0001$.

1 = job involvement. 2 = work involvement. 3 = intrinsic job motivation. 4 = meaningfulness of work outcomes. 5 = responsibility for work outcomes. 6 = extra effort. 7 = supervisor and shop effectiveness. 8 = punctuality.

END

1 4 - 1 1 - 9 5

FIN