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This study analyzed the congruence of attitudes, interests, and job performance of correctional officer employees in a coercive organization. Of the 240 correctional officer staff at the Georgia Diagnostic and Classification Center, a maximum security institution in the Georgia State Penal System housing approximately 1500 inmates, 80 were tested. This study utilized the Correctional Officer Interest Blank (COIB) and the Correctional Officer Job Performance Rating Scale (COJPRS) in determining the relationship of job interest and job performance. Additionally, the variables of age, race, education, and prior employment were examined for each subject. Results indicated that a positive correlation existed between expressed Correctional Officer Interest Blank scores and the Correctional Officer Job Performance Rating Scale scores given by correctional supervisors. This study took approximately two weeks from its beginning to completion. A Pearson Product R correlational coefficient was used to analyze produced data. A partial correlation tested the relationship between the COIB and the COJPRS by controlling for the effects of the following variables: age, race, education, and prior employment. Results indicated that a positive significant relationship continued to exist between correlational
officer job attitude and performance even when certain selected background factors were introduced. In order to understand whether this relationship was due to background factors, a one-way ANOVA was computed. The F ratio was not found to be statistically significant at the .05 level on any of the study's variables. As a result, further inquiry was initiated by analyzing the subgroupings of each of the study's selected background factors to the COIB and the COJPRS. Anova findings failed to support significance at the .05 level on any of the study's variable subgroupings except for age on the COJPRS. This finding indicated that possibly job supervisors perceive performance as diminishing with age.
CHAPTER 1

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The research addressed the problem of congruence between expressed beliefs and action. Specifically, the study is designed to determine the extent to which the espoused theory concerning prison work and the theory-in-use concerning prison work are compatible with correctional officers.

Theoretical Framework

This study is a comparative analysis of the espoused theories and the theories-in-use of employees in coercive organizations to determine if there exists a congruence between the two. The literature indicates that employees of productive, healthy organizations exhibit in general a congruence between espoused theories and actual behavior. Contrastingly, entropic organizations have employees whose theories (espoused and applied) are incompatible.¹

What is an espoused theory? An espoused theory in this study is an expressed philosophical based value system of an individual employee. Essentially, an espoused theory represents how one thinks and not necessarily how one behaves.

Significant research on the integration of thought and

action has been conducted by Harvard University Professor Chris Argyris, a noted organizational behaviorist.\(^1\) His research indicates that there is a need for all professional practitioners to become "competent in taking action and simultaneously reflecting on this action to learn from it."\(^2\)

Conceptually, the study assumes the following relationship among the variables being examined:

The study was approached by examining the concepts of "espoused theory" and "theory-in-use." Accordingly, espoused theory was determined by the total score received by correctional


officers on the Correctional Officers Interest Blank (COIB). Use of an interest inventory like the COIB would allow correctional employees to indicate their expressed/espoused belief systems toward correctional type work. Theory-in-use, on the other hand, was determined by actual behavior. Therefore, in this study the behavior/performance of selected correctional officer subjects was evaluated via a rating scale. This instrument, the Correctional Officer Job Performance Rating Scale, was completed on each officer subject by their respective supervisor. By using two standardized instruments, the study was able to operationalize the concepts of theory-in-use and espoused theory in order to conduct a tangible analysis of a theoretical concept.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested by the study. The theoretical and empirical literature suggests that certain variables may significantly impact the relationship being studied. Accordingly, the five hypotheses allow for the testing of these relationships.

Hypothesis 1. There is a statistically significant relationship between expressed job interest and job performance of correctional officers.

Hypothesis 2. The relationship between expressed job interest and job performance among correctional officers will not be modified when controlled for the factors of age, race, education, and prior employment/military experience.
Hypothesis 3. There is no statistically significant relationship between job interest and job performance of correctional officers based on educational level.

Hypothesis 4. There is no statistically significant relationship between job interest and job performance of correctional officers based on prior military experiences.

Hypothesis 5. There is no statistically significant relationship between job interest and job performance of correctional officers based on age.

Hypothesis 6. There is no statistically significant relationship between job interest and job performance of correctional officers based on race.

Evolution of the Problem

The observed reality of the prison system is that it is one of the most important social institutions in the United States. Available theories such as the one proposed by Katz & Kahn in 1978 indicate that prisons are maintenance organizations that are expected to socialize their clients by teaching them appropriate values and behavioral norms.1 These clients are vulnerable to possible exploitation by organizational staff and are dependent on the integrity of its professionals.2 In 1964 Carlson


perceived prisons as organizations where neither the client nor the organization has a choice about participation.¹

When we compare prisons with other institutions, we quickly recognize that they have an organization structure similar to the paramilitary and military organization.² The theory that best explains the conceptual underpinning of research prisons is the Compliance Theory proposed by Etzioni. Although there are three types of compliance and goals discussed in Etzioni's theory only one category, that of goals and coercive compliance, is related to prisons.³

Accordingly, prisons are classified as coercive organizations because the relationship between the type of control over members available to an organization and the attitudinal responses of lower participants (e.g.; prisoners, correctional officers) to that control. An organization in this arrangement is considered coercive because it can use the application or threat of application of physical sanctions such as infliction of pain, restriction of movement, and controlling through force of the satisfactors of sex, food, and comfort. Client's responses


are alienative, expressing hostility to the coercive organization's rules and regulations.¹

A coercive organization pursues order goals which represent the organization's attempts to control the actions of its clients by segregating them to prevent deviant activities. Order centered organizations differ in their methods of accomplishing their goals. As Etzioni points out, some merely segregate deviants, others segregate and punish, and still others eliminate deviants altogether.² Force is the major means of control applied by the organization to assure that the organizational goal of keeping inmates inside is fulfilled. The accomplishment of all tasks depend on the effective performance of the correctional officer who performs this custodial role.

One way officer attitudes toward prison are shaped are by their experiences with peers. Officers who do not fit traditional standards set by the officer subculture are inclined to drop out while those who are similar in their belief system about inmates, despite differences in race and background, usually stay.³


²Ibid.

Recent research findings indicate that successful officers tend to have characteristics that are compatible with the organization. This indicates that certain correctional officers may be better suited than others for this type work. If, however, these characteristics could be identified at the time of recruitment then maybe the recruit best suited for prison work could be selected. Prior research dealing with officer interest has not been representative of today's correctional officer.¹

Because the turnover of correctional officers has been reported in some state prison systems as high as fifty to sixty percent, recruitment criteria is necessary if these organizations are to survive. A major difficulty in establishing selection criteria is that actual recruitment reflects not only the preferences of this type of organization but also those of society and economic conditions.²

Since prisons follow a strict chain of command, officer recruits are expected to comply with the rigid creed and philosophy and conform to norms. The organization's recruitment policy as it relates to compliance is complex. Socialization for non-conforming staff in this type of arrangement is not considered desirable because it diverts the organization's resources from its priorities. Socialization and selectivity can, however,

¹Jacobs and Greer, "Drop-outs and Rejects," p. 61.
compliment each other. If the organization can identify the characteristics it requires in its recruits and select them accordingly, it will not have to spend its resources unnecessarily on training and education. If, however, the system accepts every applicant who desires to join its organization it will have to rely on socialization to accomplish its goals.\(^1\)

This study therefore examined the interactive relationship of two variables: officers' interest of the job and their superiors' evaluation of their performance. The study poses the question, Can successful job performance of a correctional officer as it relates to job interest be predicted?

**Significance of the Problem**

The significance of this study stems from a number of issues previously presented regarding staff recruitment. First, with the increased complexity and change in the role of the prison correctional officers, it is critical that adequate selection be developed to identify those candidates who have the potential (in terms of knowledge, skills, and personal characteristics) for good job performance. Secondly, the antiquated selection and promotion systems in the correctional field are coming under considerable scrutiny from a variety of sources. Thus there is an increasing effort to identify better, more efficient job related procedures for use in the decision-making area. The selected background factors of age, race, education, and prior

\(^1\)Etzioni, *Analysis of Complex Organizations*, p. 80.
employment as they relate to the variables of this study might be of value to future recruiters. These criteria used in conjunction with an interest instrument such as the Correctional Officer Interest Blank could possibly prove to be beneficial in establishing rational procedures for selecting staff who are suitable for correctional work. A third issue concerns the importance of examining performance alternative procedures with possible potential to improve the correctional officer and his appraisal system. Examination of job interest and motivation of correctional officers as well as a comparison to performance might suggest some guidelines for use in the selection process of staff. Adequate selection procedures for correctional officers are critical due to the control and influence these staff exercise over all aspects of prison life including inmate movement, prison work, and academic programs. This study was unique for several reasons:

1. It made the first known inquiry into one of the state of Georgia's penal institutions to examine the relationship between correctional officer's expressed interest toward the job and actual job performance as assessed by their supervisors.

2. It was original in its examination of selected background factors of correctional officers, determining if a relationship exists between officer interest and job performance.

3. It, for the first time, provided information on the job interests and performance of correctional officers in one Georgia penal institution.
In this study, two instruments, the Correctional Officer Interest Blank (COIB) and the Correctional Officer Job Performance Rating Scale (COJPRS) were selected because they have exhibited varying degrees of validity in a number of correctional institutional settings. Comparison of these instruments' findings allowed for validities to be examined and recommendations for use in this study to be made. The study should not only contribute to the existing literature regarding correctional officers, their performance, possible suitability for correctional work, and interests, but also provide information and recommendations to the specific correctional institution used as a data base for this research.

Limitations of the Study

The study was limited to one random sample group of correctional officers at the Georgia Diagnostic and Classification Center. The size of the subject population was a limiting factor because the study was confined to only one of the State of Georgia's penal institutions. This institution's special purpose and/or mission of being a diagnostic center additionally limited the study.

The sex ratio of men to women in the officer ranks at the Georgia Diagnostic and Classification Center was a limitation due to the women being outnumbered by their male counterparts forty (40) to one (1), as compared to four (4) to one (1) for the
national ratio. This being the case, sex was discarded as a variable. Additionally, the study will be limited by race since only two races (black and white) were represented.

**Definition of Terms**

The following definitions are given to provide an understanding of terms used in the study.

**Georgia Diagnostic and Classification Center (GDCC)** - a maximum security male adult correctional facility under the Department of Offender Rehabilitation.

**Correctional Officer** - one who performs duties of moderate difficulty in the detention, security, and control of inmates.

**Supervisory Staff** - personnel who provide direct or indirect supervision of staff and are responsible for the operation of a unit or department at the Georgia Diagnostic and Classification Center.

**Recruitment** - the act of enlisting new personnel for the organization.

**Job Aptitude** - the degree of ability that a correctional officer exercises in the performance of his job.

**Selected Background Factors** - the factors of age, race, education, and prior employment used in recruitment that are believed to be predictors of performance.

**Theory-in-Use** - theory that is measured and/or evaluated by way of observation.

**Espoused Theory** - an expressed philosophical base or value system that is representative of how one thinks, but not behaves.

**Congruence** - one's espoused theory matches his theory-in-use, that is, one's behavior fits his espoused theory of action.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Upon determining the focus of the study, this author reviewed the literature and divided it into five specific sections. Each section will deal with certain concepts that have impacted on the interactive relationship between espoused theories and theories-in-use of correctional officers in coercive organizations. These five specific sections are espoused theory vs. theory-in-use, correctional officer characteristics, correctional administrator attitudes, correctional organization attitudes, and selection procedures. The first section, espoused theory vs. theory-in-use, will provide an understanding of the theoretical underpinning importance of this concept to this study. Available literature dealing with espoused theory and theory-in-use was limited and had to be drawn from fields other than corrections.

Espoused Theory vs. Theory-in-Use

According to Argyris and Schon in 1974, espoused theory is an expressed philosophical base or value system.\(^1\) This base, or value system, is representative of how one thinks but does not necessarily reflect how one behaves. Theory-in-use on the other hand does reflect how one behaves and is determined through

\(^1\)Argyris and Schon, *Theory in Practice*, p. 8.
observation. The degree of agreement between espoused theory and theory-in-use determines congruence.

Some researchers have attempted to make the theoretical relationship between espoused theory and theory-in-use explicit. In 1969 Scott, in his research of workers in agencies for the blind, found that the concepts of espoused theory and theory-in-use to be inconsistent.1 The agency's espoused theory was that blind clients should be independent and reach their potential. However, the theory-in-use position assumed that blind clients are dependent on the agency by way of being, instead of a recipient of services. Clients, as a result, were expected to adapt to the setting of the agency.

In a similar but organizationally different study, researchers found that student learning did not take place when teachers failed to fully understand the concepts they were attempting to teach. Because of these teachers' lack of learned knowledge about their technical theories-in-use, they tended to become incongruent with their espoused theories.2

The literature confirms the writer's position that productive and healthy organizations have employees with congruence between espoused theories and actual behavior. Conversely,

---


organizations that are non-productive and unhealthy are incongruent in espoused theory and actual behavior. Since theory-in-use is determined by way of observation, it is considered behavioral. This view is supported by Von Wright in 1972 who proposed that an individual's inaction may be due to external reasons. Additionally, unconscious wishes or fears may also cause internal stress resulting in conflicting theories-in-use.¹

Argyris and Schon supported these findings and proposed additionally that most people are unaware of how their attitudes affect their behavior and influence others negatively.² These individuals remain unaware of their ineptness. Incongruent unawareness between espoused theory and theory-in-use may be culturally or individually created.

Research into the integration of thought and action has been conducted by Argyris, a noted organizational behaviorist. An understanding derived from a relationship between thought and action could reverse certain moves toward entropy and increase their forces toward health and learning.³ Insight into experiences and rationale for behavior is critical if thought and action are to be congruently integrated.

Penal literature was not discovered that studied this important concept. However, the relationship of espoused theory

and theory-in-use has relevance for study in any organization, even ones that are coercive in nature—such as prisons. In order to relate this theoretical concept to prisons one must first discuss certain categories that are relevant to the penal organization. The first step in this process will be to receive an understanding of certain correctional officer characteristics.

**Correctional Officer Characteristics**

According to Jacobs and Greer in 1978, correctional officer attitudes and performance vary according to penal goals and types of prison organizations.\(^1\) Correctional officer attitudes, behavior, and performance are better explained by background characteristics such as age, sex, education, and race. Additionally, occupational variables such as time on the job, prior employment experience, and rank in the organization influence officer attitudes and performance.

**Age**

Correctional officers are entering all areas of correctional work at a younger age than during previous decades, particularly in adult institutions. Forty percent of America's correctional officers are under 35 years of age and 25 percent are between 35 and 44 years of age. Only 35 percent of correctional officers were found to be over 45 years of age. Projections indicate that by 1985 significant increases in the age groups of under 35 and 35 to 44 will be found in adult institutions. The projected

\(^1\)Jacobs and Greer, "Drop-outs and Rejects," pp. 57-70.
staff increases will be due to career opportunities created as a result of increases in the under 35 adult offender populations. Trends suggest that those under 21 and over 45 will be excluded from employment as prison officers as well as a mandatory retirement age of 55 to be used for federal officers and 62 for state agencies.¹

One important change that can be expected in the entry into correction's work is more young and socially conscious people. They will temper, if not replace, the old guard views of prison which are slowly passing from the prison scene. These new officers are more politically aware and better educated. They offer more potential to be developed and can relate more to offenders but demand more in return.²

Sex

In the prison system there are twice as many women correctional officers as there are female offenders. Women account for about 29 percent of the total correctional work force with their largest concentrations in lower-paid white collar and routine service type occupations. Since 1960 their numbers in the correctional officer ranks has risen from 5 to 14 percent of the


total officer percentage. Advances in the administrative positions of adult corrections for women rose to 12 percent.\(^1\) Women, like other minorities, are well represented in the correctional officer ranks. Although perhaps overrepresented they are utilized in working with both male and female offenders.\(^2\) They not only perform their jobs as well as men but even have a quieting effect on inmate aggressiveness. Perhaps the most desirable characteristic of women correctional officers, however, is their low attrition rate of 13.8\% as compared to 22.5\% for their male counterparts.\(^3\)

**Education**

Due to prisons being traditionally isolated work settings, correctional positions discouraged educated persons from seeking employment. Poor pay, long hours, limited promotional opportunities, depressing work conditions, and a reputation for political interference served to keep professionals from seeking correctional employment. A recent trend in corrections has been to upgrade the educational level of its personnel. Emphasis in education was not previously stressed because custody was considered as the single function of the penal system. Custody


personnel were recruited from the less educated segments of the population. Also, practices of promoting from within served to perpetuate a low level of education throughout the organization. In the last years an effort has been made to change the image of penal employees by increasing educational requirements for initial employment and promotions. Another provision has been to encourage current personnel to upgrade their educational levels. These efforts suggest that system executives and policy makers perceive a relationship exists between higher levels of education and staff performance.¹

A popular trend has been to expand the correctional officers' roles through training to include treatment, as well as custody concerns. As a result of this shift, correctional officers are required to develop skills in counseling, crisis intervention, and communication. This trend to expand correctional officer roles would require personnel recruiters to upgrade the officer ranks by recruiting from colleges and universities or offer in-service training/education for current existing correctional employees. For the largest number of tasks, research indicated that either formalized training or tutoring by an experienced co-worker or superior was the best

method of attaining these additional skills.¹

Age is also a predictor of officer educational attainment. The average age of officers working in adult correctional institutions is estimated to be about 39. The average educational level is 12 years. Generally, younger officers or supervisors tend to be better educated than their older counterparts. After age 20, the proportion of officers and supervisors with less than a high school education steadily increases as the age of the officers increases. Correctional supervisors' educational attainment in 1978 was over 12 years. Less than 13 percent failed to meet the minimum requirements of a high school education. Thirty-eight percent had gone beyond the minimum requirements and 49 percent had achieved the minimum itself. More than twice the number of supervisors as compared to line correctional officers had received a graduate degree.²

Correctional officers appear to come from the middle educational range of the general population. Only 7 percent of correctional officers reported educational attainment levels of the eighth grade and below as compared to 30 percent of the general population's education range. Only 19 percent of officers' educational levels was between 9 and 12 years of education. Approximately 82 percent of adult corrections


²National Manpower Survey, Corrections, p. 29.
officers have 12 years or more of education; however, only 5 percent of adult correctional officers as compared to 13 percent of the general adult male population had attained this level. Generally, correctional officers appear to be slightly better educated than the general adult male population. Officers with higher educational levels described themselves as being more liberal. Projections for the future indicate that the trend toward better educated officers will continue with a number of officers receiving educational degrees. Prior to 1960 only about 9,250 of adult correctional officers were college educated. By 1974, 28.1 newly hired officers were college educated. If present economic conditions continue, by 1985 the number of new correctional officers with some college may approach 40-50%. Currently 34.5% of adult correctional officers have some college. Although recommended, it is unlikely that graduation from a two or four-year college would be a realistic standard unless the line officer's role changes sufficiently to merit it.

Race

Minorities are entering the correctional work force in increasing numbers. Proportionally there were approximately three times as many blacks in correctional work in 1978 as there were in 1960. In 1978, minorities accounted for 20.6% of the correctional work force with 16.2% being black, 3.3 hispanic, and

---

1Jacobs and Greer, "Drop-outs and Rejects," pp. 57-70.
1.1 classified as other minorities. Of the total minority work force, 21.7% are correctional officers, 11.6% management, 15.2% professional, 16.4% clerical, and 10.3% skilled laborers. The number of black minority correctional officers has risen from 6.6 in 1960 to 21.7 in 1978.\(^1\) Minority group numbers will continue to increase in the correctional officer ranks in order to keep up with the large number of minority inmates being sentenced. Available statistics suggest that affirmative action programs and labor market conditions account for the increases in employment of minorities and women. This increase, however, in all 41 state systems has not achieved parity between the racial composition of correctional officers and inmates. The most frequently cited obstacle is the locations of the state institutions.\(^2\)

In contrast to white officers who appeared to have entered the correctional officer ranks due to unemployment, black officers selected and sought out careers in penal work. Black commitment to this type of career is evidenced by their low attrition rate and stated desire of over 50% to remain with the organization past five years. As a result of lower attrition rates among blacks and women, these groups will experience a


continued growth in the correctional work force.\textsuperscript{1} The demands of the officers' roles in the penal organization, rather than race factors, accounted for tension and conflict. Black officers were found to differ very little from their white counterparts in their attitudes toward prison, inmates, and the administration. Perhaps one reason for this consistent perception of inmates by both black and white officers is the type of offender being sent to adult correctional institutions. These offenders tend to be black, younger, and more violent. As a result of their involvement with prison gang violence, this inmate type is negatively impacting penal policies and procedures. As a result, other inmates will be exposed to these violent groups and become increasingly unwilling to accept the definitions of the prison experience. The authors concluded that officer attitudes and behavior will only change when the organizational structure of prison changes.\textsuperscript{2}


Prior Employment

The majority of correctional officers (57 percent) chose this occupation for reasons unrelated to desiring this type of work. Primarily they were out of work and thought correctional work would be interesting. Other reasons prompting officers to seek correctional work were job security, fringe benefits—such as insurance, vacations, influence of a relative, upward mobility, and proximity to the prison.

A small number of officers sought out prison work because it offered an opportunity to have power and authority over inmates.\(^1\) However, retired military personnel who compose 20 to 25 percent of the correctional officer work force may seek employment in the criminal justice system because of its similarities to the military.\(^2\) Officers having prior penal job experience, such as military prison work, may find correctional civilian employment very similar, bringing them subsequent success. The age and maturity these prior job experiences brings, concludes Sandhu in 1972, are important attributes of the

---


successful officer.\(^1\) According to Hardesty in 1970, good and poor correctional officers can be identified prior to their appointment. Hardesty's Correctional Officer Testing Selection Battery and Procedure combined objectivity with supervisory appraisal measures.\(^2\) These measures identified definite differences between the two groups which could be used in the selection process. This approach demonstrated that effective and objective selection procedures for correctional officers are feasible.

**Turnover**

The annual turnover rate for correctional officers in some state prisons is 50 to 60 percent. In some states, such as Texas, 44 percent leave prison work after the first month of training.\(^3\) According to Hill in 1979, the state of Georgia, which has a turnover rate of 33%, reported its chief factor for turnover was due to low pay, long hours, and a stressful work environment.\(^4\) The state's chief recruitment problems were due

---


to isolation of facilities, low pay, risk, and stress factors. Nationally officer resigeees stated their primary reason for leaving correctional work was due to fear for their safety, with white officers expressing safety issues more often than their black peers. This was probably due to white officers' lack of experience in dealing with urban black inmates.\(^1\) Other reasons for leaving correctional work were role strain, working conditions, and relationships with inmates. The most serious problem experienced by new correctional officers was adjusting to strict demands of the paramilitary organization. Fifty-four percent of blacks who exited the organization cited problems with superiors as their reason for leaving.\(^2\)

Officers may be attracted to prison work with expectations that are incompatible with their actual roles. When they realize their aspirations are not being met, they may as a result leave the organization.\(^3\)

**Correctional Officer Attitudes/Performance**

Corrections in the United States is big business. Annual budgets are expanding at the rate of approximately 20% a year, most of which is due to expanding manpower costs; expenditure

\(^1\)Jacobs, "Street Gangs," p. 155.


increases of 54% by state agencies, 41.5% by local and county, and 4.5% by federal government were reported. By 1985 state and local correctional employees are expected to increase by 60%.

Personnel costs are the major expenditure for the correctional system because of the high turnover rate. Nationwide, adult correctional officers account for the largest single group from 32.2% to 62.5% depending on the type and mission of the institution. The average experience for correctional officers in state penal systems is 65 months. Sixteen percent of correctional officers have 2 years of experience or less with 23 percent having had 10 years. One common reason correctional officers cited for leaving the organization was dissatisfaction with administrative behavior in supporting them on the job.¹

Correctional officers work in a para-military organization which passes information upward while initiative and decisions flow in the opposite direction. Officers, like inmates, are under surveillance; they are subject to being inspected and searched if suspect. Correctional superiors and inmates file reports on officers as well as officers on officers. These contradictory organizational goals have caused conflict among correctional officers. This conflict occurs as a result of confusion about whether or not to help inmates. Cynicism can and often does

occur among correctional officers who do not feel supported by superiors. This feeling usually grows with experience on the job.¹

Although expressing positive attitudes toward the job, over 70 percent of officers criticized the promotional systems in prison organizations as being influenced by nepotism and arbitrariness. Officers who were ambitious sought out relationships with influential superiors. Promotions appeared to be based on how well officers' job performance conformed to the expectations of their superiors. Correctional officers criticized superior's evaluations as being political and subjective.²

Role of the Correctional Officer

Correctional officers in penal institutions comprise the largest group of officials in corrections and clearly have the greatest impact on incarcerated offenders. Only in recent years have they been recognized as providing the critical link between the prison administration and the inmate. As a result of this prior neglect, we know relatively little about them—particularly


their attitudes.\textsuperscript{1} Often overlooked in studies concerning correctional institutions, correctional officers have not been viewed as being professionals. Officers instead have been conservative in their opinion and in their contempt of inmates.\textsuperscript{2}

The more favorable studies cite officers' work as difficult and low paying and recommend that final judgement be withheld due to the circumstances.\textsuperscript{3} Nationwide, correctional officers are marked by problems of disparities from training to paychecks, from officer inmate ratios to uniforms and equipment. These disparities might account for officers' experiencing low morale, high turnover, and absenteeism.\textsuperscript{4} The greatest problem, however, for the modern correctional officer has been change.


His role has changed from a keeper of bodies to a doctor, counselor, confidante, supervisor—all combined into one package. The officer in this role is expected to make legal decisions at a moment's notice and must be infallible in those decisions since he can be sued.¹

The role taught by the organization is not always clear. Except for the period between 1830-1850, correctional officers have received double-level messages from the organization.²

Perhaps the reason for this role confusion is because of the organization's changing expectations. Correctional officers are many times perceived as being counselors to whom inmates can turn to in times of need. At the same time, officers must be a firm symbol of authority who will encourage by example, by punitive action, and by appropriate societal behaviors.³

These role expectations, according to Simmel in 1968, are further complicated by the status barrier that exists between superior staff and their inmate clients. Persons in authority are always the


objects of ambivalent tendencies: "One admires their rank and moves toward them; one fears their control and moves away from them."¹ This ambivalence, according to researchers, has been shown to reduce the accuracy of the message perceptions resulting in correctional officers limiting their contact with inmates.² This is indeed unfortunate since correctional officers compose approximately 65.2% of the full-time personnel in correctional institutions and clearly have more frequent contacts with inmates than any other staff group.

The critical need for officer/inmate contact is emphasized by researchers who indentified correctional employees as a key influential force in inmate rehabilitation.³ Officers, therefore, are staff who are caught between two subcultures, one administrative and one inmate. Although having to deal with both, the officer identifies with neither. Organizationally the traditional hierarchy marked by guard loyalty to wardens is giving way to a kind of triangular configuration with each point


representing a component of the system: the correctional officer, the administration, and the inmate. Correctional officers have found themselves alone with changes they are unprepared to deal with; changes which come from above and/or below them in the system.¹

Because of the rapidly changing system, in the future it will become increasingly more important that officers have a clearly defined set of roles, priorities, and expectations in dealing with inmates.² Two research instruments which have shown merit in identifying progress in this area of officer attitudes and job performance potential are the Correctional Officer Interest Blank³ and the Correctional Officer Job


Performance Rating Scales.¹

**Correctional Administrator Attitudes**

Supervisor's perceptions and assumptions about subordinates determine how they deal with them in the organization. If supervisors perceive subordinates as fortune-seekers with no concern for the organization, only themselves, they will deal with them harshly. In this perception, subordinates are expected to follow orders without question or explanation. They are expected to obey in a ritualistic manner and not exhibit any independent thinking. This philosophy appears to have been successful in stable organizations; however, others have been influenced by society and have had to develop a different management philosophy in dealing with subordinates.²

Subordinates by nature of their position in the organization do not have the same opportunity as supervisors do in meeting their perceived needs resulting in their demanding higher wages.


titles, fringe benefits, and breaks. If the work environment is viewed as being too hostile or stressful, as is the case frequently in correctional institutions, correctional officers may react by absenteeism and/or leaving the organization. Correctional employees who perceived their job as expanding, offering greater freedom, expressed greater satisfaction and job involvement. Supervisors, therefore, need to correctly assess the values of their subordinates and provide outlets for these values to be expressed. Perceived-meaningful responsibilities was cited by researchers as being more important to subordinates than money. Correctional administrators have a responsibility to maintain a stable, healthy, and productive work force. Standards of physical fitness, intelligence, character, and emotional stability have been set as necessary requirements for


candidates who seek employment in correctional organizations. Having established these standards, it follows that they should be maintained throughout an employee's career. Employers should offer the employee compensation by providing psychological services in order to protect their investment.¹

According to Duffee in 1980, correctional managers lag far behind their counterparts in business and industry in terms of knowledge of the role of the manager.² The result is that correctional organizations tend to be run by hunch or whim. Correctional managers in the past, according to researchers, have failed to set goals and objectives to help their subordinates understand what they are supposed to do. They have instead


allowed them an unbridled amount of discretion which has led to even less accountability. Although a certain amount of discretion is necessary within any criminal justice role, excessive discretion has led to the judicial system's reversing its hands-off policy. The objectives of corrections, as a result of court intervention, will inch forward, not by the leadership of correctional administrators, but by court order. Recent researchers point out that administrators in the organization have little or no impact and feel just as victimized by the system as other employees do. Supervisors do appear to influence the performance of their staff either positively or negatively, depending on their leadership style.

According to Crozier and Thoenig in 1978, the proper course of strategy for administrators to take is to create a healthy organizational climate. This climate has to rest on the extent to which policy and style are formulated at the top and

---


communicated throughout the organization. According to Duffee in 1975, each administrator's style will be reflected by his perception of subordinates, self, and the organization. The literature emphasizes that new systems will need to be created to reduce the work environment's complex and unfamiliar problems. These changes are on the threshold of happening and will have to be tested by scientific methods.

Attitudes of the Correctional Organization

In the last several years the correctional organization has been criticized by a variety of sources. While the sources of criticism have been disparate, the conclusions have been quite similar: prisons fail to manage, they do not rehabilitate offenders, and they should be used as little as possible as correctional measures. Perhaps one major reason for the failure of the correctional system has been due to the system's

---


ignorance of the needs of its staff and inmates. Prior to the 1960s, courts were not concerned with individuals who were convicted and sentenced to serve time. Courts instead practiced a hands-off doctrine, leaving inmates to the dictates of prison authorities.¹ During the 1960s, courts reassessed their hands-off tradition and began to address inmate petitions.² This change, according to Singer and Keating, marked a trend toward judicial review that would establish four general categories of prisoner rights.³ The first category granted inmates the right to challenge their conviction. The second category, which related to the Eighth Amendment, protected them from cruel punishment including torture, overcrowding, and isolation. The third category insured procedural protection for inmates when correctional policy influenced their liberty. This category specified that decisions involving discipline, transfer, and eligibility for parole must involve a hearing and in some cases a right to counsel. The final group granted inmates freedom of religion, speech, assembly, and freedoms from racial discrimination and segregation. As a result of these rights, inmates (known as jailhouse lawyers) and organizations (such as the


American Civil Liberties Union) turned attention to the conditions and officials under which inmates live.\textsuperscript{1} Bureaucracies, such as correctional organizations, were organized so that top management supposedly handled all the difficult decisions. The fallacy to this logic is that line personnel rather than the administrator are placed in the role of making decisions.\textsuperscript{2} The officer who demonstrates leadership potential in this arrangement, unless provided a flexible climate to operate in; however, becomes discouraged and regresses to narrow traditional roles of his job. Prison administrators can contribute both to correctional officer job enrichment and to inmate welfare by locating correctional officer innovators and recognizing them as self-motivated pioneers rather than forcing them to fight the system that we verbally endorse but sabotage in practice.\textsuperscript{3}

According to researchers, the penal system is a coercive organization whose subjects, the inmates, are negatively involved. As a result of the inmates' subordinate position,


staff are elevated to a position of power, thus establishing a
military type chain of command. Orders are issued from the top
and passed down for subordinates to implement. Staff who have a
high level of charisma and loyalty to the organization are
accelerated in rank. Ex-military personnel are accustomed to
this type of operation, and, as a result, are socialized to this
type of organizational philosophy. ¹ Although possessing some
of the characteristics of a military organization, penal
institutions do not have the latitude of operation granted
military agencies; moreover, the penal system has not received
the attention and training of the military. Recent research
indicates that law enforcement agencies are the only institutions
in our society that have not benefited from the advances in the
management sciences. ² However, during the 1970s, these
agencies, as a result of federal programs and institutes such as
the American Correctional Association and the Police Executive
Institute, have enabled law enforcement executives to apply
management concepts to their departments, resulting in organiza-
tional change. This change has stressed the importance of staff

¹E. Gross, "Primary Functions of the Small Group," Ameri-
can Journal of Sociology 60 (1954), pp. 24-9; K. D. Schwartz,
"Functional Alternatives to Inequality," American Sociological
Review 20 (1955), pp. 424-30; Ronald Waldron, Systems Approach to
Correctional Institutions, Federal Probation Bureau of Prisons
(Washington, D.C., March 1974), pp. 51-4; Peter P. Schoderbek,

²Egon Bittner, "The Functions of the Police in Modern
Society Crime and Delinquency Issues," Monograph Series
(Rockville, Maryland: National Institute of Mental Health, 1970),
p. 54.
training, upgrading prison conditions, and changing the image of the police officer on the streets and his counterpart in prison to that of a professional.¹

Despite the growth of criminal justice training centers throughout the United States, there has not been a report published indicating the effectiveness of these centers. All systems agree that correctional officers need training, but they disagree on what type. Officer training, although deemed as being important, has amounted to little more than simple lecturing. Programs have fallen short of their designed objectives, leaving trainers frustrated. The breakdown has probably been due to a neglect in trainers' education and partially because of officer values, attitudes, and preferences. If methods of training could be used that incorporated these variables, then many believed that programs would be more meaningful.²

Selection Procedures

While selection procedures vary greatly from department to department, a pervasive thread in the law enforcement system is


noted by O'Leary.\textsuperscript{1} He identified two types of procedures: one for entry level positions and one for promotional decisions. While the procedures may differ somewhat methodologically, the overriding problem in both types centers on implementation and the uncertainty of interviewers and test developers as to what exactly they are looking for in candidates. These problems stem from the problem of identifying what the job is and what knowledge, skills, abilities, and personal characteristics, referred to as KSAPC's by O'Leary, are desired for the entry level or promotion position. Identification of characteristics (broadly defined as skills, abilities, knowledge, demographic or biographical information, personality characteristics and psychological attributes to include motivations and value structures) which are typical of those officers who properly perform the varied functions of the officer role is of critical importance in the selection and promotion area of officer human resource management. A variety of tests (broadly defined to include any type of instrumentation utilized to assess or measure characteristics) have been applied in the law enforcement department situation in an effort to identify these characteristics.\textsuperscript{2}

Seven general types of tests in common use in the public service include (1) written tests, (2) evaluations of training


\textsuperscript{2}Ibid.
and experience, (3) performance test, (4) interview—individual and group, (5) physical condition tests, (6) medical examination, and (7) personal investigation. In addition, psychological and psychiatric assessment devices have more recently come into use in the law enforcement field due to the often sensitive nature of situations in which officers find themselves involved. The validation documentation of these various tests is rather inconsistent, reflecting the historical approach of using the information that test developers "believe" to be job related. O'Leary suggests seven critical problems of the general selection system in the law enforcement field.

1. Poorly defined KSAPC's for the position under consideration.
2. Poorly trained and poorly informed interviewers.
3. A misdirected confidence in the effective selection capabilities of such paper and pencil tests as IQ tests.
4. The "crush of bodies" problem.
5. Adverse impact.
6. Local control of selection systems.
7. Lack of job relatedness of the selection systems components.

While lack of knowledge, skills, ability, and personal characteristics has been discussed, it should be reemphasized

---


2 O'Leary, *Selection and Promotion*, pp. 68-70.
that some type of systematic analysis of the job is a necessary prerequisite for a successful selection procedure. The lack of knowledge as to what information is needed to adequately evaluate a candidate's potential makes some interviews merely an exercise. No relevant or usable information is obtained due to the lack of guidelines for securing this information. In addition, typical problems of untrained interviewers have the potential of distorting what information is obtained. The misdirected confidence in paper and pencil tests and the use of pre-established cutoff scores may lead to deselection of qualified persons. This problem is another symptom of the lack of systematic analysis of the job as well as the lack of internal validation studies of the tests.

The adverse impact issue has been a great impetus to improvement of selection and promotional system in the law enforcement field. Adverse impact is defined by the Federal Executive Agency guidelines as occurring when "a selection rate for any racial, ethnic, or sex group becomes less than four-fifths (4/5) or 80 percent of the rate for the group with the highest rate."¹ In other words, adverse impact occurs when a greater percentage of minorities are rejected by a selection system than are non-minorities. If adverse impact exists, law enforcement departments are required to demonstrate the validity

of the selection system in use - either content, construct, or criterion related validity.

The "crush of bodies" problem is the result of law enforcement departments receiving a large volume of applications for a limited number of positions. With limited funds devoted to the selection system and efforts aimed at providing every applicant with a fair chance, less expensive procedures may be utilized. The tests (or predictors) with greater validity are usually more expensive; thus, they may not be considered for use.

Due to the fact that a great many law enforcement departments come under the auspices of civil service commission, we find a reluctance of these authorities to deviate from more traditional methods of selection (paper and pencil tests) or promotion (evaluations, seniority). Despite the fact that these departments, internally, may desire to implement a more comprehensive selection and promotion system, this lack of autonomy to initiate such a procedure leaves the department with an antiquated system.

Job relatedness of a selection or promotion system is important for two reasons: "1) it is more likely to be valid (measure and predict success) and 2) it is more likely to generate some type of legal action if it doesn't relate to the job in question."\(^1\)

Finally, validity of tests used by the system is the most important problem area faced by law enforcement departments.

\(^{10}\)O'Leary, Selection and Promotion, p. 7.
"Any selection system will deselect or eliminate a substantial number of people";\textsuperscript{1} otherwise, the system is not performing effectively. Thus, those who are not selected may voice their reservations concerning appropriateness and accuracy of the system. Naturally, no system can be perfect and errors will always draw the attention of those people who are critical of the system in part or whole. "The basic point underlying all these considerations is the importance of the selection system being related to the job, and therefore, being valid."\textsuperscript{2}

**Summary**

In summary, the literature has been examined in several areas. The first area examined and defined espoused theory and theory-in-use, the theoretical concepts that underpin this study. The significant point of this section was the degree of agreement that exists between espoused theory and theory-in-use. Agreement between these two theories indicates a congruent relationship while the lack of agreement points toward an incongruent negative relationship of job interest and job performance. The section on correctional officer characteristics emphasized that officer interests and performance are better explained by the background characteristics of age, race, education, and prior employment experiences. Conclusions were that correctional officers are

\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., p. 9. \\
\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., P. 8.
coming from an increasingly younger and better educated minority group.

The primary studies relating to correctional officer attitudes and leadership potential were found to have been conducted by Gough in 1982 and Peterson in 1977. The development of the Correctional Officer Interest Blank (COIB) and the Correctional Officer Job Performance Rating Scales (COJPRS) came out of these studies. Their purposes were to investigate officer interests and performance.

Literature on correctional administrator attitudes indicated that correctional superiors were out of touch with the needs of correctional officers. Primarily this lack-of-needs' awareness was due to ignorance of the correctional system's management sciences. This ignorance has resulted in an emergence of legal intervention by the states and federal courts demanding inmate rights. Future studies that addressed office interests and job performance were recommended as having merit.

---

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Design

In order to investigate the relationship between correctional officers espoused theory as evidenced by expressed job interests and job theory-in-use as evidenced by performance an ex post facto research design was used.

Kerlinger (1964) defines an ex post facto study as:

An investigation in which the experimenter does not manipulate the independent variable but presumably measures its effects after it has occurred. As a result, should the different values of the independent variable be systematically associated with different values of the dependent variable, it is impossible to unequivocally attribute that association solely to the effects of the independent variable. The association could be attributed to another variable that the experimenter could not control.¹

This research design was considered most appropriate for the study because it met the necessary requisites and represented the best method for addressing the research questions. This design required the completion of three instruments. The first and second instruments were completed by the subjects of the study. The third instrument was completed by shift supervisors of each subject. The selected background factors of age, race, education, and prior military employment were controlled.

Selection of Population and Sample

The subjects consisted of eighty correctional officers employed in one penal institute of the Department of Offender Rehabilitation. The cross-section of officers that comprised the sample allowed for 33%, or one out of three, to be represented. Sampled subjects were selected at random from the Center's 240 officer staff via a random number table. See Appendix D. The selected background factors of age, race, education, and prior military employment for each subject were assigned a score. The total score for each factor was analyzed via a partial correlation and compared to the study's primary instruments, the COIB and the COJPRS. Each variable was then broken down into their various subgroupings and analyzed via a one-way anova.

The principal investigator and the correctional supervisor for each evaluated shift explained the purpose of the study to the respective officers. The three shifts of 6:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M., 2:00 P.M. to 10:00 P.M., and 10:00 P.M. to 6:00 A.M. were examined. Each officer in the sample was required to complete an attitude and demographic instrument. A third instrument for measuring performance was then completed on each subject by their respective supervisors.

Instruments

The data were collected via the following instruments:

(1) the Correctional Officer Interest Blank, (2) the Correctional Officer Job Performance Rating Scale, and (3) the Demographic Information Sheet.
Description of the Instruments

Correctional Officer Interest Blank (COIB)

The instrument utilized in assessing responses of subjects was the Correctional Officer Interest Blank (COIB). The COIB was developed in 1951 by Harrison G. Gough as a result of a research project suggested by Richard A. McGee, then Director of the California Department of Corrections.¹ The goals of the project were to identify some of the attitudinal and personality factors related to successful performance as a correctional officer and to develop a reliable and practical means of assessing these factors at the time of application or early employment. After undergoing several revisions, the COIB was published in 1965 in its current 40-item version. The 1965 version of the test contains 18 triads on which total scores can vary from 0 to 24 (because of scoring for both "like most" and "like least" responses), and 22 true/false items on which scores can vary from 0 to 22. The total possible range of scores on the test is, therefore, from 0 to 46. These 40 items were scored and correlated with the overall criteria of performance. The results of the analysis are given in Table 8. However, two of the coefficients in Table 8 represent true cross validational findings—that of .37 for the 75 California applicants and that of .31 for the 694 Federal correctional officers. Both of these coefficients are statistically significant beyond the .05 level.

of probability. The odd/even reliability coefficient computed on the 40-item test, as applied to the California applicants, was .70. Since its creation in 1951, there have been several validational studies conducted. In the United States, each study conducted approximated the findings presented in Table 8. All of the study's subjects were exclusively male and all were prison personnel.

Perhaps the most recent validational studies were carried out in the late 1970's by Norman Peterson and Janis Houston (1980) of the Personnel Decisions and Research Institute of Minneapolis, Minnesota. In this study, Peterson and Houston attempted to develop methods of selection that would identify candidates having a positive service orientation to their jobs, who would be relatively free of hostile, authoritarian, racist, or sadistic feelings toward inmates. This comprehensive job analysis was given to approximately 400 subjects, about 8 percent of which were females. Among those tested on the COIB, job ratings were available for 252. For the total sample, mean age was 38.2, standard deviation 11.2, and mean years of experience as a correctional officer was 4.2, standard deviation 3.6.

From all the evidence reviewed, appearances indicate that scores on the COIB are moderately predictive of performance as a correction officer, the median co-efficient in cross-validating samples being .31, and are also moderately predictive of job

---

1Peterson, Houston, Bosshardt, and Dunnette, Correctional Officer Job, p. 66.
stability with correlations of .30 and .17 with persistence in employment. The median correlation of .31, with ratings of performance, if corrected for an estimated general reliability of those ratings of .75, rises to .36. This co-efficient of .36 may be taken as the best current estimate of validity of the test as a predictor of performance.

Correctional Officer Job Performance Rating Scales (COJPRS)

The supervisory rating scales were developed through heavy utilization of the job analysis results from the Marion, Ohio study. The Marion study primarily screened the correctional officer applicants on personality or temperament dimensions such as "self control," "tolerance," and "emotional stability." These dimensions comprised a set of predictors that appeared to cover as many as possible of the worker characteristics necessary to perform as a correctional officer. Additionally, the instrument could be completed in a fairly reasonable amount of time and did not require elaborate testing procedures.\(^1\) Three primary sources were used: (1) the job performance rating scales developed via the Critical Incidents - Retranslation Technique, (2) the factor analysis of the time spent and importance ratings of correctional officer job tasks, and (3) the 18 worker correctional officer job in both studies.

Critical Incidents Scales

These scales were constructed in Marion, Ohio by selecting correctional officers and inmates who composed 177 critical

\(^1\)Ibid., p. 74.
incidents, (e.g., short descriptions of excellent, average, and poor job performance of correctional officers). These incidents were sorted into categories according to common job behaviors. Nine categories of job performance were identified and definitions were written for each. Then 31 staff and inmates were independently requested to assign each incident to one of the nine categories and rate it according to job performance affectiveness. Data were analyzed and incidents that were placed into a category by at least 51 percent of the items were used for the nine categories or dimensions. Thus, nine rating scales were constructed; these nine categories composed the nine behavioral categories or dimensions with definitions and anchors for each scale. Each were composed of incidents rated at various points along the nine-point effectiveness scale. Twenty factors were then extracted and rotated. Out of these twenty, thirteen factors were selected to comprise the Correctional Officer Job Performance Rating Scales. This scale was developed directly from three different modes of analysis of the correctional officers' job: critical incidents task, activity analysis, and analysis of relevant knowledges, skills, and abilities. The scales incorporated the relevant job performance dimensions and are content valid and comprehensive. These scales were neither

---

overly lenient nor stringent on the average. Standard deviations indicated a satisfactory amount of variance in the ratings. The odd/even reliability coefficient on the COJPRS twelve (12) scales was .75. The inter-rater reliabilities range from .57 to .75 with a mean of .65, which indicates that the COJPRS has a more than satisfactory agreement level. In summary, the rating scales appear to be satisfactory with respect to psychometric properties such as leniency or stringency, sufficient variance, content validity, and adequate levels of inter-rater reliability.

A total of 37 correctional institutional staff members participated in these review sessions. Nine of these persons were captains with an average of 22 years of job experience, 12 were lieutenants with an average of 15 years of job experience, and 8 were sergeants with an average of 7 years. The other 8 reviewers were correctional officer training officers. These 37 reviewers qualified as expert reviewers of the rating scales because of their extensive knowledge of the correctional officer job gained through years of experience and the fact that they were members of the population who would be called upon to use the rating scales, namely, correctional officer supervisors.

Demographic Information Sheet

The Demographic Information Sheet accompanied the COIB and the COJPRS, the data gathering instruments used in this study. Variables elicited in this personal data questionnaire were: name, age, sex, race, educational level, and prior military experience.
Data Collection Procedures

Permission was requested of and granted on December 20, 1982, by the superintendent of the Diagnostic Center and the Department of Offender Rehabilitation Research Review Committee. The research site is a correctional facility of the Georgia Department of Offender Rehabilitation. The writer identified the Center's correctional officers. A letter was sent to each of the Center's evaluative correctional supervisors explaining the study, soliciting their help, and asking their permission for their staff to participate in the study. The shift supervisors were then requested to rate their assigned correctional officers on the Correctional Office Job Performance Rating Scales. The writer prepared and sent packets to the Center's supervisors for distribution to the correctional officers involved in the study. Enclosed in the packet were:

1. A cover letter asking the correctional officer to support and participate in the study.

2. The three research instruments:
   a. Correctional Officer Interest Blank
   b. Correctional Officer Job Performance Rating Scales
   c. Demographic Information Sheet

3. Directions and an explanation of procedures for completing the questionnaires.

Analysis of the Data

Treatment of the COIB:

The responses to the COIB was treated as follows:

1. Correctional officers completing the COIB were treated as a separate group.

2. Each respondent's scores were totaled.
3. For each respondent, a total score was computed.

4. The total score for each Correctional Officer was computed on the COIB and the COJPRS.

The correctional officer's COIB responses reflected the officer's interest and preference score. This inquiry attempted to determine if a relationship existed between expressed officer attitude scores and supervisor rating of correctional officer performance.

Treatment of COJPRS:

The response to the COJPRS was treated as follows:

1. Each Correctional Officer completing the COIB was then rated by their supervisors on the COJPRS.

2. Each respondent's scores were totaled.

3. For each respondent, a score on each of the 13 subscales was computed.

4. The total scores for the COJPRS were averaged and then analyzed to determine how correctional officers' job performance was appraised by correctional shift supervisors.

Treatment of the Demographic Information Sheet:

The response to the Demographic Information Sheet was treated as follows:

1. Each correctional officer participating in the study completed the Demographic Data Sheet.

2. The selected background factors of age, race, education, and military experience were given by each respondent.

3. For each background factor, a score was given.

4. The total score for each factor was analyzed via a partial correlation compared to the COIB and the COJPRS.

5. Each factor was then divided into their various subgroupings and analyzed via a one-way anova.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS, PRESENTATION, AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This chapter contains the presentation and discussion of the research findings and is divided into two sections:

1. Analysis of findings from the Correctional Officer Interest Blank and Correctional Officer Job Performance Rating Scales.

2. Analysis of findings from the Demographic Information Sheet concerning the selected background factors of age, race, education, and prior military employment.

Correctional Officer Interest Blank
Correctional Officer Job Performance Rating Scales

Eighty correctional officers were subjects in a study of one penal institution of the Department of Offender Rehabilitation. The data of this study consist of the correlational scores between the Correctional Officer Interest Blank (COIB) and the Correctional Officer Job Performance Rating Scales (COJPRS). A Pearson R correlational coefficient analyzed produced data. The COIB score and the overall score of the COJPRS were correlated to question whether a relationship exists between job interest (espoused theory) of a correctional officer and job performance (theory-in-use) in the correctional organization. Correlated results for the two instruments are located in Table 1.

Findings From the Testing of the Hypotheses

In order to determine whether a relationship existed between expressed job interests (espoused theory) and performance (theory-in-use), six hypotheses were tested.
Hypothesis 1 states that there is no statistically significant relationship between job interest and job performance of correctional officers. Upon examination of the data it is quite evident that a significance existed between the COIB and COJPRS. In order to test Hypothesis 1, which states that there is no significant relationship between expressed job interest and job performance of correctional officers, the Pearson Product R correlational coefficient was employed. The means, standard deviations, and correlated results are displayed in Table 1. These results show a Pearson R correlational coefficient of .22 which was statistically significant at the .05 level. Hypothesis 1 is rejected. These findings are consistent with the literature of previous studies involving the predictability of the COIB and the COJPRS.

### TABLE 1

**Pearson Product R Correlational Coefficient Between the COIB and the COJPRS of G.D.C.C. Correctional Officers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>CASES</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COIB</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30.94</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COJPRS</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73.25</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p > .05

**Demographic Information Sheet**

Background information of age, race, education and prior employment were gathered via the Demographic Information Sheet.
An examination indicates subjects were homogenous with respect to sex, length of employment, and position in the correctional organization. Some background differences, however, among group members were noted in the areas of age, race, education, and prior employment/military experience.

Hypothesis 2 states the relationship between expressed job interest and job performance among correctional officers will not be modified when controlled for the factors of age, race, education, and prior employment/military experience. A partial correlation and a one way analysis of variance were employed to examine relationships. The partial correlation was selected in order to determine if a relationship existed between the results of the two instruments (COIB and the COJPRS).

This relationship was then analyzed to determine if it extended to include certain selected background factors. A partial correlation allowed for each factor to be controlled for in order to determine which ones were significant. This was important because a partial correlation may have been stronger in one case but unable to support this relationship in another group. Correlated results for the four variables are located in Table 2.

On all four variables in Table 2, statistically significant findings exceeding the .05 level were found. The results of the partial correlations are as indicated, age .223, race .217, prior employment/military experience .216, and education .219. These findings indicate that positive correlations continue to exist between correctional officer job attitude and performance even when certain selected background factors are introduced.
TABLE 2
Partial Correlations Among Selected Background Factors of G.D.C.C. Correctional Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>EDUCATION</th>
<th>PRIOR EMPLOYMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Employment</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p > .05

In order to determine whether or not these background factors would modify the relationship between job interest and job performance among correctional officers a one-way anova test was computed. Anova results are located in Table 3. The F-score was not found to be statistically significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 3
Anova Summary of Means, Standard Deviations, and F-Scores of Selected Background Factors of Age, Race, Prior Employment, and Education of the COIB and COJPRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COJPRS</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COIB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>41.97</td>
<td>11.4000</td>
<td>.4986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.4446</td>
<td>.6840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Employment</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.4628</td>
<td>.5234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>1.0094</td>
<td>.4310</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .05
for the variables of age, race, prior employment/military experience, and education. Hypothesis 2 is accepted.

As a result of those findings further inquiry was initiated. This was necessary in order to determine if separate background factors (subgroupings) yielded a relationship between expressed job interests (espoused theory) and performance (theory-in-use).

Hypothesis 3 states there is no statistically significant relationship between job interest and job performance of correctional officers based on educational level. The variable of education was divided into its sub-areas in Table 4 and evaluated according to eleventh grade or less, twelfth, or over twelfth

TABLE 4

Anova Summary of the COIB and COJPRS Means, Standard Deviations, and F-Scores by the Selected Background Factor of Education (Subgrouping)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COIB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th grade or less</td>
<td>28.88</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th grade</td>
<td>31.15</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 12th grade</td>
<td>31.27</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.94</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.4618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COJPRS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th grade or less</td>
<td>73.63</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th grade</td>
<td>72.77</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 12th grade</td>
<td>75.64</td>
<td>17.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.25</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>.8541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .05
grade. These subgroupings were analyzed according to job interest and job performance via a one-way anova.

Computed results indicated that the F-score was not found to be significant at the .05 level on the COIB or the COJPRS. Hypothesis 3 is accepted.

Hypothesis 4 states there is no statistically significant relationship between job interest and job performance of correctional officers based on prior employment/military experience. The variable of prior employment was divided into its sub-areas in Table 5 and evaluated according to whether or not officers possessed prior military experience. These subgroups were

### TABLE 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anova Summary of the COIB and COJPRS Means, Standard Deviations, and F-Scores by the Selected Background Factor of Prior Employment (Subgrouping)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COIB</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Employment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-retired Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COJPRS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Employment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-retired Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(\bar{X})</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retired Military</td>
<td>31.71</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-retired Military</td>
<td>30.61</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.94</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.3621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Military</td>
<td>73.71</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-retired Military</td>
<td>73.05</td>
<td>16.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.25</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>.8640</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .05
analyzed according to job interest and job performance via a one-way analysis of variance.

Computed results indicated that the F-score was not found to be significant at the .05 level on the COIB or the COJPRS. Hypothesis 4 is accepted.

Hypothesis 5 states there is no statistically significant relationship between job interest and job performance of correctional officers based on age. The variable of age was divided into its subgroups in Table 6 and evaluated according to its three sub-areas of 29 or less, 30-39, and over 39. These

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COIB</th>
<th></th>
<th>COJPRS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X}$</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>$*$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 or less</td>
<td>32.81</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>81.44</td>
<td>16.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>69.21</td>
<td>16.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 39</td>
<td>30.67</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>72.04</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.97</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>73.25</td>
<td>15.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 6

Anova Summary of the COIB and COJPRS Means, Standard Deviations, and F-Scores by the Selected Background Factor of Age (Subgrouping)
subgroups were analyzed according to job interest and job performance via a one-way analysis of variance.

Computed results indicated that the F-score was not significant on the COIB but was statistically significant at the .05 level on the COJPRS. Consequently one can infer that job supervisors perceive job performance (theory-in-use) among subordinates as decreasing with age. Hypothesis 5 rejects the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 6 states there is no statistically significant relationship between job interest and job performance of correctional officers based on race. In Table 7 the variable of race

TABLE 7
Anova Summary of the COIB and COJPRS Means, Standard Deviations, and F-Scores by the Selected Background Factor of Race (Subgrouping)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COIB</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>30.86</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30.97</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30.94</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>.9348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>COJPRS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>72.82</td>
<td>13.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>73.41</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.25</td>
<td>15.52</td>
<td>.8794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .05
was divided into its sub-areas and evaluated according to its two subgroups of black and white. These subgroups were analyzed according to job interest and job performance via a one-way analysis of variance.

Computed results indicated that the F-score was not found to be significant at the .05 level on the COIB or the COJPRS. Hypothesis 6 is accepted.

Consensus of test developers is that an officer who receives high scores on both the COIB and the COJPRS is inclined to perform well in correctional type work.

The following procedural steps were employed in executing this study:

1. Permission and authorization to conduct the study were secured from the appropriate source.

2. The related literature and research findings pertinent to the study were reviewed and incorporated into this report.

3. The correctional officers and their supervisors were selected and a schedule for administering the instruments was established.

4. The instruments were administered.

5. The data were collected, analyzed, and interpreted.

6. The summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations derived from the study were incorporated in the final dissertation report.

Data collected from the instruments were analyzed statistically through correlation, partial correlation, and analysis of variance. In the study, a Pearson R was used to determine if a correlation existed between the COIB and the COJPRS. A partial correlation analyzed the degree of correlational agreement among
the selected background factors of age, education, race, and prior military experience. An analysis of variance was used to determine the significance of mean differences among the study's instruments and variables. This research drew certain conclusions about the mean differences and F-scores through these analysis.

The participants in the study consisted of eighty (80) correctional officers and three (3) correctional supervisors (evaluators) from one penal institution of the Georgia Department of Offender Rehabilitation. A total of approximately one out of every three correctional officers at the penal institution were randomly selected to participate in the study. Out of the selected participants all returned usable questionaires.

Other Findings

The normative COIB mean, standard deviation, and job rating scores are illustrated in Table 8. Subjects of this study compared to the normative sample. Upon comparison, the mean and standard deviation scores of the study's subjects showed no significant difference to the normative sample. This correlational score of the COIB to the COJPRS of .22, however, was interestingly lower than those of the normative sample.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Correctional Officers, 1952</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>30.38</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Correctional Officers, 1953</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>29.65</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Applicants, 1954</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31.45</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Correctional Officers, 1955</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>31.02</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other State Correctional Officers, 1965</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>31.04</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Diagnostic Center Correctional Officers, 1984</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30.94</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1 illustrates the racial characteristics of correctional officers, their COIB (attitude) and COJPRS (performance) mean scores. On both the COIB and the COJPRS racial subgroups, mean scores were approximately the same, with black officers scoring only slightly higher than their white peers.

**FIGURE 1**

Graph of the Racial Characteristics of Correctional Officers, Their COIB (Attitude) and COJPRS (Performance) Mean Scores
Figure 2 graphically illustrates the age characteristics of correctional officers analyzed via their COIB and COJPRS mean scores. The COIB and COJPRS age mean score subgroupings were slightly higher on the COIB and significantly higher on the COJPRS for the 29 or less age group. The other two groups of 30-39 and over 39 on both instruments were approximately the same with the over 39 age group being slightly higher.

FIGURE 2
Graph of the Age Characteristics of Correctional Officers, Their COIB (Attitude) and COJPRS (Performance) Mean Scores
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Figure 3 demonstrates the educational subgrouping characteristics of correctional officers' COIB and COJPRS mean scores. The educational subgrouping mean scores on both instruments were approximately the same with the more than twelfth grade level group being slightly higher than the other two groups.

FIGURE 3

Graph of the Educational Characteristics of Correctional Officers COIB (Attitude) and COJPRS (Performance) Mean Scores
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Figure 4 graph illustrates the subgrouping categories of the prior employment variable. On both instruments retired military correctional officers received slightly higher mean scores than their non-retired peers.

FIGURE 4
Graph of the Prior Employment Characteristics of Correctional Officers COIB (Attitude) and COJPRS (Performance) Mean Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retired Military</th>
<th>Non-retired Military</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COIB Scores</td>
<td>COJPRS Scores</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Summary

Hypothesis 1 was tested by way of a Pearson R correlational coefficient. Findings suggested that a correlation existed between the study's variables of attitude toward the job and performance on the job. These findings resulted in the rejection of null Hypothesis 1.

The inquiry was further tested by way of a partial correlation to determine if the relationship continued to exist despite the introduction of certain selected background factors. These factors being race, age, education, and prior employment. The procedure controlled for each factor in order to determine the impact of each variable's relationship to job attitude and job performance. For Hypothesis 2, results of background factors analyzed via partial correlation continued to support this established correlation between job attitude and job performance. Results indicated on all four variables a continued stable correlation of attitude and performance existed. Upon establishing that this correlation continued to exist even when selected background factors were introduced, additional inquiry was made via an anova analysis. This analysis along with the partial correlational results indicated that all of the selected background factors when controlled for failed to modify the previously established correlation of job attitude and job performance. These findings resulted in the acceptance of null Hypothesis 2.
Further inquiry of the selected background factors reduced each variable to its subgroupings. In anova analysis of every subgrouping, no significant at the .05 level except for one, that of age, on the COJPRS was found. This finding suggests that job supervisors maybe perceive performance as decreasing with age.

Selected background factors, when divided into their subgroupings and compared on both instruments to their subgroupings' mean scores, yielded slightly higher—but not significant—scores as originally hypothesized. Consequently, except for the subgrouping factor of age, significance at the .05 level was not established. These findings resulted in the acceptance of null Hypotheses 2, 3, 4, and 6 and the rejection of null Hypothesis 5.

In comparing the study's findings to the normative COIB sample, no significant differences in means and standard deviations were noted. The correlational score for the study's sample interestingly, however, was lower than for the normative sample.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter will present a summary of the study. Conclusions based on the findings of the study will be drawn. Implications will be made from conclusions. The chapter will conclude with recommendations for further research.

Summary

The purpose of the study was to analyze correctional officers' expressed job interest (espoused theory) relationship to job performance (theory-in-use) in a coercive organization. The instruments utilized for this purpose were the Correctional Officer Interest Blank with Demographic Information Sheet and the Correctional Officer Job Performance Rating Scale. The researcher anticipated that the study would: (1) Examine the theoretical relationship of espoused theory and theory-in-use by comparing expressed job interests and job performance among correctional officers in a coercive organization, (2) provide personnel managers with selection criteria that could be utilized in the recruitment process, (3) provide data regarding supervisors' perceptions of appropriate correctional officer performance, and (4) provide data regarding selected background factors and their relationship to job interest (espoused theory) and job performance (theory-in-use).
The study utilizes the forty (40) items from the Correctional Officer Interest Blank (COIB), the four (4) background factors of age, race, education, and prior military experience from the Demographic Information Sheet, and the overall averaged score of the twelve scales of the Correctional Officer Job Performance Rating Scale.

Selected correctional officers were requested to state their interests toward the job by completing the correctional Officer Interest Blank. Additionally, they were requested to complete the Demographic Information Sheet by stating their race, prior military experience, educational achievement level, and age.

The twelve (12) scales of the Correctional officer Job Performance Rating Scale were then completed on each subject of the study by their respective job supervisor. A nine (9) point scale of high, moderate, and low range served the supervisors as degrees of performance. A high range score indicates superior performance on the scale being evaluated, whereas a low range score would indicate a poor rating. An overall score was derived by averaging the other eleven (11) scales.

**Implications**

The following implications stem from the study:

1. If specific background factors utilized in this study are not predictive of correctional office performance, are there personal factors needing consideration?

2. Are there some staff personnel more suitable than others for correctional type work?
3. Can high staff turnover be explained by incongruence between an employee's espoused theory of job interest and theory-in-use as evidenced by their supervisors' evaluation of job performance?

4. Can this incongruence explain why some staff excel in this type of work while others do poorly?

5. Did the small sample for subgroupings within the correctional institution and overall sample size constrain comparisons that might have been made between selected background factors and their various subgroupings?

6. What impact did the attitude of the participants have in terms of veracity of responses?

7. Does job performance diminish with age or are correctional supervisors' perceptions of correctional officers performance youth oriented?

Recommendations

The following areas of research are recommended based on the limitations of the current study being one sample group in one correctional institution and the research questions which have come to light as possible explanations of findings or voids in existing literature.

1. The relationship of attitude and performance should be investigated between superior, peer, and subordinate. A thorough examination of the different types of ratings and their relationships in various situational settings should be conducted.

2. The research design utilized in the present research should be used for further research in the same or a similar setting with other criteria. The new criteria should include other background factors and alternative organizational measures of performance.

3. Additional validation studies involving the COIB and the COJPRS should be conducted in various correctional institutions, ranging from county jails to large institutions with greater numbers available for subgroupings. This type of research effort would establish the applicability of the instrument in the particular type of research setting.
4. Research into the question of professional orientation of correctional officers should be carried out. This would establish the nature of the the correctional organizational context and open up new paths of investigation for instruments predictive of job performance.

5. Research aimed at additional comparisons of correctional officers, police officers, public school teachers, military personnel, and employees in other organizationally similar institutions is called for. These fields are in need of new innovative selection, and performance appraisal systems and a thorough examination of these techniques could provide information relevant to the improvement of these systems.

Summary of Findings

1. A significant relationship was found to exist in correctional officers in this study between job interest (espoused theory) and performance (theory-in-use).

2. The selected background factors in correctional officers of race, age, education, and prior employment/military experience did not modify a relationship that already existed between job interest (espoused theory) and performance (theory-in-use).

3. Twenty-eight (28) percent of correctional officers in this study were racially identified as black and seventy-two percent as white.

4. Correctional officer subjects comprised three age groups. The over 39 group were fifty-seven (57) percent, the 30-39 group twenty-four (24) percent, and the 29 or less age group twenty percent (20).

5. Seventy-six (76) percent of correctional officers reported having earned their high school diploma, fourteen (14) percent claimed some college credits, and ten (10) percent stated that they possess eleven years or less of education.

6. Thirty (30) percent of correctional officer's prior employment was identified as being ex-military while the remaining seventy (70) percent reported coming from other occupations.

7. Correctional officer findings in this study concerning the correctional officer interest blank are consistent with the findings of this instrument's normative sample.
Conclusions

Analysis of the participants' responses to the experiment yielded the following conclusions:

1. The study's two instruments, the COIB and the COJPRS were significantly correlated at the .05 level.

2. This correlation continued to exist virtually unchanged even when the selected background factors of age, race, education and prior employment were introduced. These factors were then controlled for, alone and in combinations, to determine if this relationship could be modified. The results indicated that possibly background factors alone could not modify this correlation.

3. This coercive organization was found to exhibit healthy organizational behavior as congruence was found to exist between job interest and job performance. This relationship exists and is not influenced by any of the background factors utilized in this study except for age.

4. As a result, background factors were evaluated by their subgroupings. Findings indicated that possibly only age subgrouping on the COJPRS was significant. This finding could indicate that job supervisors perceive performance as diminishing with age.

5. The use of certain background factors in the personnel selection process should be cautioned, as statistical significance was not established in this study.

It is concluded from the literature and the findings of this study that any validity the COIB possesses should be that of a personnel screening instrument. This instrument might be particularly useful in identifying applicants who are homogeneous in job attitude and whose philosophy is compatible with the organization. The COIB could be particularly useful in economic times of high unemployment. However, in periods of low unemployment it might prove to be counter productive to utilize a screening device due to the restricted range of available personnel.
It is concluded from this study's findings that the COIB might also be used as a screening instrument by vocational or school guidance counselors in filtering out potential applicants who could not adapt to the routine of the prison environment. This procedure could ferret out the recruit who would lose interest after a short period of time and leave the organization.

It is concluded from the findings that certain second career groups score slightly higher but not significantly on the variables of performance and attitude toward the job. The primary reason for their selection of this career cites retired military correctional officers is its similarities to the military. This factor could explain why findings of retired military subjects in this study scored slightly higher on performance scores for this type of work than their non-retired military peers.

It is concluded from this study's findings that the COJPRS, the second instrument utilized in this study, could possibly be used as a promotion predictor. This could be possible if the criteria used to evaluate job performance is the same for promotions. Promotions in this arrangement may not be based on employee attitude but on the preferences of the job supervisor. Supervisors may only consider their perception of appropriate job performances as promotable qualities disregarding job attitude. Therefore, job supervisors perceptions of what successful performance is should be evaluated. This inquiry could help determine whether performance among staff is based on adherence to instructions from superiors or in their implementation of organizational goals and policies.
The proposed end product of this inquiry was the relationship of results to theory. The interpretative findings determined if a relationship existed between correctional officers espoused theory as evidenced by their expressed job interests and theory-in-use as evidenced by their supervisors evaluation of their job performance.

This inquiry proposes that espoused theory and theory-in-use possess the potential to solve problems and answer questions about staff recruitment, suitability for correctional type work, and supervisory appraisal of employee performance in the correctional organization. Positive findings held out the potential to solving problems and answering questions in the field of correctional personnel. The lack of such a relationship, however,
indicated a negative correlation existed between espoused theory and theory-in-use. Results indicated that a correlation does exist between espoused theory and theory-in-use but that it is not due to selected background factors of age, race, education, and prior military experience. A negative correlational findings resulted in the rejection of a relationship between espoused theory and theory-in-use. This indicated that the calculated value was less than the critical value resulting in the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Findings provided grounds for further research inquiry.
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APPENDIX A

CORRECTIONAL OFFICER INTEREST BLANK
AND SUB-SCALE DESCRIPTIONS
Correctional Officers' Interest Blank

by
Harrison G. Gough, Ph.D.

and
F. L. Aumack, Ph.D.

Name: ............................................. Date: ..............

Please print

Age:................. Sex:...................... Marital status: ..........

Highest school grade completed:...........................................

Present occupation:...........................................................

Former or usual occupation:...............................................

Place of testing:...............................................................

Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.
577 College Avenue, Palo Alto, CA 94306

Copyright 1953, 1980 by Harrison G. Gough and F. L. Aumack. All rights reserved. No portion of this form may be reproduced by any process without the Publisher's written authorization.
Part I. Personal Preferences

Directions: This part contains 18 items, each one listing three different activities and preferences. In each set of three choose the one you would like the best and mark an X for it in the first column. Then select the one you would like the least and mark an X for it in the second column. For each item you should have one X in the “like most” column and a second X in the “like least” column. Be sure to answer every item.

EXAMPLES:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Like most</th>
<th>Like least</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Travel by car.</td>
<td>2. Travel by train.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Travel by air.</td>
<td>4. 1. Supervise juvenile offenders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervise adult offenders.</td>
<td>3. Supervise other correctional officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Help in training an inmate.</td>
<td>7. Talk about baseball.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Travel by car.</td>
<td>9. Talk about politics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Talk about recent movies.</td>
<td>11. See a boxing match.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. See a wrestling match.</td>
<td>13. See a horse race.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Stand guard in a prison tower.</td>
<td>17. Be tricked by an inmate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Watch a football game.</td>
<td>21. Watch a speedboat race.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Watch a prize fight.</td>
<td>23. Own a cattle ranch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Own a fruit orchard.</td>
<td>25. Own a skiing resort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Be a clerk in a grocery store.</td>
<td>27. Be a clerk in a liquor store.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Be a clerk in a sporting goods store.</td>
<td>29. Be told what to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Be left alone.</td>
<td>31. Tell others what to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Make billfolds out of leather.</td>
<td>33. Read newspaper editorials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Carve toy boats out of wood.</td>
<td>35. Read the sports page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Read newspaper reports about crime.</td>
<td>37. Read a book to a sick person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ ☒</td>
<td>☒ ☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part I. Logical Thinking

15. a. Be criticized by another correctional officer.
   b. Be criticized by an inmate.
   c. Be criticized by a supervisor.

16. a. Interview inmates about their future plans.
   b. Supervise inmates during their recreational periods.
   c. Lead an inmate discussion group on "the causes of crime."

17. a. Improve the standard of cleanliness in a prison.
   b. Improve the morale of the inmates.
   c. Improve the methods of discipline.

18. a. Have more education.
   b. Have more experience.
   c. Have more understanding of human nature.

Part II. Personal Attitudes

Directions: This part contains 22 statements. If you agree with a statement, or feel that it is true about you, put an X in the box under “true.” If you disagree with a statement, or feel that it is not true about you, put an X in the box under “false.” Be sure to answer either “true” or “false” for every item.

True False

19. I would like to hear a great singer in an opera.
20. I am fascinated by fire.
21. I get nervous when I have to ask someone for a job.
22. As a youngster in school I used to give the teachers lots of trouble.
23. My home as a child was less peaceful and quiet than those of most other people.
24. Before I do something I try to consider how my friends will react to it.
25. I seem to do things that I regret more often than other people do.
26. If I were a reporter I would like very much to report news of the theater.
27. I am usually in good health and physical condition.
28. If the pay was right I would like to travel with a circus or carnival.
29. I have had more than my share of things to worry about.
30. I enjoy watching outdoor games like football and baseball.
31. In school I was sometimes sent to the principal for cutting up.
32. I’m pretty sure I know how we can settle the international problems we face today.
33. I dislike to have to talk in front of a group of people.
34. I feel that I have often been punished without cause.
35. Sometimes I feel that I am about to go to pieces.
36. My parents have generally let me make my own decisions.
37. When I was going to school I played hooky quite often.
38. A man should always stand by a friend, even if he has done something wrong.
39. With things going as they are, it’s pretty hard to keep up hope of amounting to something.
40. If I had the money I think I would enjoy taking a trip around the world.
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER INTEREST BLANK
SUB-SCALE DESCRIPTIONS

Correctional Officer's Interest Blank - a 40-item interest and attitude scale that has shown considerable promise in identifying applicants and officers of both sexes who possess the temperament and personal qualities required for superior performance in correctional work.

Expressed Interest - that set of attitudes toward work that are measured by the Correctional Officer Interest Blank (COIB).

Personal Preferences - the sub-scale score of the Correctional Officer Interest Blank that identifies individuals with strong internal values who can be counted on the behaved in a dependable and rule-observing way.

Personal Attitudes - the sub-scale score of the Correctional Officer Interest Blank that identifies persons who impress others as being fair-minded, dependable, responsible, and reliable.
APPENDIX B

CORRECTIONAL OFFICER JOB PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE
AND SUB-SCALE DESCRIPTIONS
INSTRUCTIONS FOR
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER JOB PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE

This booklet contains rating scales for twelve areas that are important for effective job performance as a Correctional Officer. These twelve categories are:

Job Knowledge
Supervising Inmates
Working with Fellow Officers
Searching and Securing
Dealing with Inmates
Enforcing Rules and Regulations
Use of Force
Supervising Inmate Movement
Dealing with Intimidation, Harrassment and Other Stress
Record Keeping and Administrative Duties
Handling of Unusual Situations and Crises
Overall Job Success

We ask you to rate one of your officers on each of these categories. The scales for rating the officer on these categories appear in the next few pages. Please notice that each category is named and defined at the top of the page. Running down the left side of the page is a 9-point scale showing different levels of officer effectiveness. The scale is divided into three general levels or ranges: high, moderate and low. Next to the high and low ranges on the scale are some examples of what officers who are at the high and low ranges might do. These examples are not the only possible ones; they are meant to give you a "feel" for the level of performance at the high and low levels.

Please go through the following steps for each rating scale.

1. First, read over the definition of the category and the examples at the high and low ranges of the scale.

2. Decide whether the officer you are rating is in the high, moderate or low range in comparison to all other Correctional Officers you know. Use the examples of the high and low performance as guides in making this decision.

3. Then decide where the officer stands within the broad range you have decided on. Within the "high range," for instance, a rating of "9" is higher than "8" or "7"; within the "moderate range," "6" is higher than "5" or "4"; and within the "low range," "3" is higher than "2" or "1." Circle the number that best shows where the officer stands on the scale.

4. If you absolutely cannot make a rating for an officer on a particular scale, circle "CR" for "Cannot Rate."

Go through these steps for each of the twelve rating scales.
Job Knowledge: Knows institutional rules, procedures, schedules, forms, resources and other basic "job routine" knowledges; is familiar with the institution's physical layout and security system; is knowledgeable in contraband detection, shakedown methods and ticketing procedures; knows firearms, self-defense, crowd control techniques and ways to handle violent inmates; is able to administer first aid.

- 9
  Can explain institutional rules and procedures to others, especially inmates, in an accurate manner; is able to tell others the location of institutional areas or services, correctly identifies different types of contraband; knows the appropriate method of inmate control to use in a given situation.

- 8 High Range
- 7
- 6
- 5 Moderate Range
- 4
- 3 Is unable to give adequate explanations to inmate questions about institutional procedures; asks others for directions to find distant areas of the institution; is unable to correctly identify many types of contraband.
- 2 Low Range
- 1

CR Cannot Rate
Supervising Inmates (except for inmate movement): Patrols lock, work, school, dining room, visiting room or other institutional areas to guard against possible thefts, property damage, personal injury, etc.; conducts periodic and irregular inmate counts; maintains discipline; gives orders and gains inmate cooperation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9</th>
<th>Never leaves designated area except for emergencies or when authorized; has very little theft, fighting, property damage, etc., in his/her area; conducts extra counts at irregular times; breaks up horse-play before problems occur; has no trouble getting unwilling residents to get up and prepare for work or perform unpleasant jobs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>High Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Moderate Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leaves one's designated area unattended to visit with other CO's outside the lock or down the hall; observes an inmate in the wrong cell and fails to take any action; makes counts only at designated and predictable times; gives conflicting orders to inmates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CR Cannot Rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Working with Fellow Officers:** Gets along with co-workers and superiors; communicates effectively with other officers; stays informed of relevant developments and keeps others informed; carries out instructions from superiors; responds quickly to calls for assistance from other officers; supports other officers; trains, advises, and helps new CO's; maintains rapport with other officers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>High Range</td>
<td>Works smoothly with other officers; goes quickly to the aid of other officers needing help; coaches and encourages new or other CO's having difficulties; informs incoming shift officers of problems faced that day; promptly carries out instructions from supervisors as ordered.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moderate Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
<td>Is reluctant or fails to help fellow officers engaged in fights with inmates; argues loudly with other CO's around inmates; fails to support other officers requesting help; does not inform supervisor or incoming shift officer of important developments; carries out instructions from supervisors in a slow manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Cannot Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Searching and Securing: Watches inmates and others for unauthorized weapons, drugs, and money and uses effective shakedown procedures for those suspected of having contraband; searches cells, dorms, halls, yard and other institutional areas for contraband; inspects food packages and vehicles; watches for missing supplies; takes appropriate action when contraband is found.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>High Range</th>
<th>Moderate Range</th>
<th>Low Range</th>
<th>CR Cannot Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Upon discovering an inmate with contraband, confiscates it immediately and tickets the inmate; notices unusual marks in an inmate cell and checks it out when the inmate is gone; re-searches an area where a serious incident occurred to look for objects used in the incident.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Observes an inmate with contraband and fails to confiscate it immediately; notices inmates passing contraband and lets them sidetrack him/her and eliminate the evidence; checks cells when inmates aren't around but doesn't replace articles exactly; as they were (allowing the inmate to guess the CO has been checking).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Cannot Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dealing with Inmates: Displays a concern for inmates and inmate property; shows respect for inmate's rights and privileges; treats all inmates fairly and equally, regardless of race or national origin; communicates in an effective manner with inmates about matters of inmate concern; listens to inmate explanations; helps inmates work out problems; does not show excessively authoritarian attitudes or actions in dealing with inmates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Is courteous to and talks with inmates when appropriate; carefully handles inmate belongings; listens to inmate reasons for questioning an order; talks to inmates headed for trouble and warns them before writing tickets; takes inmates having problems at ease and talks to them individually to find out the problem and work out a solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>High Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Moderate Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Uses abusive language and makes treats to inmates; carelessly handles inmate property (e.g., photos, important papers) during cell shakedowns; does not listen to inmate explanations for being out of place or for other rule violations; immediately tickets residents questioning an order for disrespect; refuses to help inmates having problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CR Cannot Rate
Enforcing Rules and Regulations: Enforces rules and regulations in a fair, consistent manner; is not overly lenient or harsh in enforcement; makes rules work to maintain order rather than creating unnecessary tension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Informs inmates they will be ticketed for doing certain things and follows through on it when violations occur; treats all inmates violating a rule in a similar manner; writes up the same kinds of violations from day to day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>High Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moderate Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>May fail to enforce rules when a violation occurs; writes up some inmates for violating a regulation but not others who are favorites; may ticket an inmate for doing something on one occasion but let it go on another occasion; writes tickets on such minor infractions that inmates become even more aroused and uncontrollable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Cannot Rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use of Force: Skillfully uses inmate/crowd control and self-defense techniques; recognizes when force is required; uses physical force, firearms, weapons, cuffs, mace, chains, etc., to subdue inmates when necessary; uses proper amounts of force for the situation (is especially careful not to use excessive force when it is inappropriate).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>High Range</td>
<td>Tackles inmates fleeing other officers and holds inmate until help arrives; chases inmates avoiding a shakedown, catches the inmate and uses an armlock or headlock to control the inmate; uses chemical mace to subdue inmates attacking with sharp objects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moderate Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
<td>Has difficulty recognizing when force is required; either never uses force, even when needed, or uses force in situations where it is not needed; sometimes uses excessive force to subdue inmates; reluctant to become involved in fights between inmates or between inmates and officers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Cannot Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supervising Inmate Movement: Supervises inmate movement through the halls, yard, and in other areas of the institution; issues passes to inmates; checks passes of inmates entering or leaving the lock, work, school, or other areas; supervises transportation of inmates outside the institution; supervises inmate transfers into and out of the lock.

- **9** High Range
  - Observes inmates attempting to enter unauthorized areas and returns inmate to own lock or dorm; warns inmates loitering in the halls to move on; supervises the transport of new inmates within the institution in an efficient manner.

- **8**

- **7**

- **6**

- **5** Moderate Range

- **4**

- **3**

- **2** Low Range
  - Fails to check passes of inmate entering or leaving work, school or other institutional areas; does not warn loitering inmates in halls to move on; leaves hallway unattended to visit with other CO's.

- **1**

**CR** Cannot Rate
Dealing with Intimidation, Harassment and Other Stress: Able to work under constant pressure, stress, and in frustrating circumstances; keeps self-control despite verbal, mental, and physical harassment from inmates; responds well to criticism from superiors; takes effective actions under stress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Range</strong></td>
<td>Gets very upset when teased or called names by inmates; may get into a heated argument when inmates challenge his/her authority; becomes defensive when criticized by superiors and refuses to change; may react to stress or psychologically brutal manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moderate Range</strong></td>
<td>Ignores name calling by inmates and continues to carry out duties; remains calm when physical objects are thrown by inmates and issues a ticket if appropriate; reacts calmly to inmate threats; listens to criticisms from supervisor and works to improve self.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Range</strong></td>
<td>CR Cannot Rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Record Keeping and Administrative Duties: Keeps records of those entering or leaving the lock, work, school, or other areas within the institution, logs persons entering or leaving the institution; inventories and orders supplies and laundry; fills out inspection slips, security check slips and use of force reports; completes paperwork for inmate transfers; keeps inmate mail secure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>High Range</td>
<td>Keeps neat, accurate, and up-to-date records of inmates entering or leaving institutional areas; properly logs in visitors; fills out security check slips, tickets, and use of force reports in a clear, detailed and accurate manner; determines necessary supplies to prevent shortages; keeps inmate mail secure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>High Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Moderate Range</td>
<td>May fail to keep records of inmates leaving the lock, work, or other area, allowing inmates to go unaccounted for; orders the wrong amounts of supplies; fills out inspection slips in a sloppy manner; fails to keep inmate mail secure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Moderate Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moderate Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Cannot Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Handling of Unusual Situations and Crises:** Perceives suspicious persons and activities; recognizes potential crisis situations; investigates suspicious activities; remains calm and takes appropriate action in unusual or emergency situations (e.g., sick or injured officers or inmates, confrontations with inmates, escapes); adapts to new or unfamiliar situations (e.g., special assignments, inmate or coworker changes); reports actions to supervisor or other appropriate persons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Reports suspicious persons outside the institution to control; refuses to give in to unexpected inmate demands, remaining calm even though threatened; warms fighting inmates to stop and calls control for help in breaking up violent fights; upon finding an injured inmate, immediately calls control and then goes to the aid of the inmate; quiets drunken or rowdy inmates without yelling or using force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>High Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Moderate Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Observes inmates fighting and makes no attempt to break it up or call control; delays release of very sick inmates causing them to become even sicker; fails to assist injured inmates; unwilling or unable to perform new duties, work with new and difficult inmates or new co-workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CR Cannot Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Overall Job Success:** Taking all aspects of a Correctional Officer job into account, how successfully does this person perform. (Consider promotability or likelihood of success on higher level jobs, consider the officer's present job performance as a line correctional officer).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>High Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Moderate Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CR** Cannot Rate
CORRECTIONAL OFFICER JOB PERFORMANCE RATING SCALE
SUB-SCALE DESCRIPTIONS

Job Performance - that rating given by supervisors on the Correctional Officer Job Performance Rating Scale (COJPRS).

Correctional Officer Job Performance Rating Scale - rating scales for 13 areas that are important for evaluating effective job performance for correctional officers.

Job Knowledge - knows institutional rules, procedures, schedules, forms, resources and other basic "job routine" knowledges; is familiar with the institution's physical layout and security system; is knowledgeable in contraband detection, shakedown methods and ticketing procedures; knows firearms, self-defense, crowd control techniques and ways to handle violent inmates; is able to administer first aid.

Supervising Inmates (except for inmate movement) - patrols lock, work, school, dining room, visiting room or other institutional areas to guard against possible thefts, property damage, personal injury, etc.; conducts periodic and irregular inmate counts; maintains discipline; gives orders and gains inmate cooperation.

Working with Fellow Officers - gets along with co-workers and superiors; communicates effectively with other officers; stays informed of relevant developments and keeps others informed; carries out instruction from superiors; supports other officers; trains, advises, and helps new CO's; maintains rapport with other officers.

Searching and Securing - watches inmates and others for unauthorized weapons, drugs, and money and uses effective shakedown procedures for those suspected of having contraband; searches cells, dorms, halls, yard and other institutional areas for contraband; inspects food packages and vehicles; watches for missing supplies; takes appropriate action when contraband is found.

Dealing with Inmates - displays a concern for inmates and inmate property; shows respect for inmates' rights and privileges; treats all inmates fairly and equally, regardless of race or national origin; communicates in an effective manner with inmates about matters of inmate concern; listens to inmate explanations; helps inmates work out problems; does not show excessively authoritarian attitudes or actions in dealing with inmates.

Enforcing Rules and Regulations - enforces rules and regulations in a fair, consistent manner; is not overly lenient or harsh in enforcement; makes rules work to maintain order rather than creating unnecessary tension.
Use of Force - skillfully uses inmate/crowd control and self-defense techniques; recognizes when force is required; uses physical force, firearms, weapons, cuffs, mace, chains, etc., to subdue inmates when necessary; uses proper amounts of force for the situation (is especially careful not to use excessive force when it is inappropriate).

Supervising Inmate Movement - supervises inmate movement through the halls, yard, and in other areas of the institution; issues passes to inmates; checks passes of inmates entering or leaving the lock, work, school, or other areas; supervises transportation of inmates outside the institution; supervises inmate transfers into and out of the lock.

Dealing with Intimidation, Harassment and Other Stress - able to work under constant pressure, stress, and in frustrating circumstances; keeps self-control despite verbal, mental, and physical harassment from inmates; responds well to criticism from superiors; takes effective actions under stress.

Record Keeping and Administrative Duties - keeps records of those entering or leaving the lock, work, school, or other areas within the institution; inventories and orders supplies and laundry; logs persons entering or leaving the institution; fills out inspection slips, security check slips, and "Use of Force" reports; completes paperwork for inmate transfers; keeps inmate mail secure.

Handling of Unusual Situations and Crises - perceives suspicious persons and activities; recognizes potential crisis situations; investigates suspicious activities; remains calm and takes appropriate action in unusual or emergency situations (e.g., sick or injured officers or inmates, confrontations with inmates, escapes); adapts to new or unfamiliar situations (e.g., special assignments, inmate or co-worker changes); reports actions to supervisor or other appropriate persons.

Overall Job Success - taking all aspects of a correctional officer job into account (evaluates how successfully the officer performs, considers promotability or likelihood of success on higher level jobs, considers present job performance as a line correctional officer).
APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SHEET
# DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SHEET

Please fill out all requested information completely. Do not check or mark but one category in each section.

Name

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education Level Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 29 or less</td>
<td>1. 11 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 30-39</td>
<td>2. 12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Prior Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Black</td>
<td>1. Retired Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. White</td>
<td>2. Non-retired Military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

RANDOMIZATION
RANDOMIZATION

In order that conclusions of sampling theory be statistically valid, samples must be chosen so as to be representative of a population. In this study the representative sample was obtained by random sampling. This method allowed each member of the Georgia Diagnostic Centers' Correctional Officer Staff an equal chance of being included in the study. Accordingly, each of the Centers' correctional officer staff were assigned a number in order to determine these numbers' pattern of selection of the utilized random number table. The second column and the third row was selected as a starting point. The order in which the numbers 1 to 240 were encountered determined the sequence in which they were arranged. Numbers that were duplicated or non-applicable were discarded. This procedure continued until all remaining numbers were numerically assigned. A total of 80 subjects were then chosen by selecting every third number from the 240 correctional officer subject pool. This sample allowed for a representation of approximately 33\%, or 1/3, of the total Diagnostic Centers' correctional officer work force.\(^1\)

---

APPENDIX E

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH
AARON W. ROQUEMORE
Route 1, Jackson Road
Barnesville, Georgia 30204
(404)358-4461

EDUCATION:

Field work: Department of Offender Rehabilitation, Jackson, Georgia.

West Georgia College School of Education Guidance and Counseling Department Ed.S. (1978)
Field work: Department of Offender Rehabilitation, Jackson, Georgia.

West Georgia College School of Education Guidance and Counseling Department M.Ed. (1974)
Field work: Department of Offender Rehabilitation, Jackson, Georgia.

West Georgia College School of Social Sciences History Department B.A. (1972)
Field work: Lamar County School System, Barnesville, Georgia.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

1979 to Present: Department of Offender Rehabilitation
Jackson, Georgia.

Title: Counselor Supervisor

Responsibilities: Classification Committee Chairman for facility of approximately 116 permanent under death sentence inmates. Committee makes all delegated management, classification, treatment, and administrative decisions for superintendent. Approximately forty staff personnel are assigned to this area.
Professional Experience (continued):

1978 to 1979: Department of Offender Rehabilitation
Milledgeville, Georgia
Title: Chief Counselor
Responsibilities: Management and supervision of counseling program in a state penal institution for 500 geriatric and handicapped male offenders, served as classification chairman responsible for all inmate assignments and classification, overall supervision of ten employees.

1974 to 1979: Department of Offender Rehabilitation
Jackson, Georgia
Title: Senior Counselor
Responsibilities: Management and supervision of counseling program in a state penal institution (in director's absence), serve as in-service training coordinator and responsible for all training needs of counselors and administrative staff, overall supervision of four employees.

1973 to 1974: West Georgia College
Carrollton, Georgia
Title: Full time Graduate Student

1972 to 1973: Department of Offender Rehabilitation
Jackson, Georgia
Title: Correctional Officer
Responsibilities: Supervised activities of approximately 100 inmates, submitted reports to superiors upon request.

1972 to 1972: Lamar County Board of Education
Barnesville, Georgia
Title: Fifth Grade Teacher
Responsibilities: Instructed students in the areas of history, spelling, and physical education.
PRE-PROFESSIONAL AND VOLUNTEER EXPERIENCE:

1978 to 1979  Butts County Mental Health Center
             Jackson, Georgia

MEMBERSHIP IN PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Georgia State Employees Association
American Correctional Association
Georgia Correctional Officers Association
Georgia Peace Officers Association

PERSONAL INFORMATION:

Born:        February 18, 1950
Height:      6' 1"
Weight:      175 lbs.
Health:      Excellent
Marital Status: Married, one child

Special Interests: hiking, fishing, hunting, camping
Activities: Local civic and community affairs