

AN EXAMINATION OF SCALES TO UNDERSTAND CORRECTIONAL OFFICER
EXPERIENCES

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department Criminal Justice and Criminology
Sam Houston State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

by

Channing R. Carpenter

December, 2018

AN EXAMINATION OF SCALES TO UNDERSTAND CORRECTIONAL OFFICER
EXPERIENCES

by

Channing R. Carpenter

APPROVED:

H. Daniel Butler, PhD
Thesis Director

Melinda Tasca, PhD
Committee Member

Elisa L. Toman, PhD
Committee Member

Phillip Lyons, PhD
Dean, College of Criminal Justice

ABSTRACT

Carpenter, Channing R., *An examination of scales to understand correctional officer experiences*. Master of Arts (Criminal Justice and Criminology), December, 2018, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas.

The experiences of correctional officers have historically been overshadowed by inmates' experiences while incarcerated. However, there has been an increase in research examining the experiences of correctional officers. A systematic review of 71 studies examining correctional officer experiences revealed that job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment are the most common experiences. To date, few studies have investigated the differences across measures used to predict various correctional officer experiences. In this exploratory study, I examined whether the most frequently used scales and items measuring correctional officer job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment are related to the outcomes of interest (e.g., adverse work experiences, commitment and retention, punitive orientation). The scales examined in this study have been deemed valid and reliable, nevertheless former research has not examined whether certain scales are related to certain effects. Despite considerable changes in the prison environment over time, questions remain whether scales developed in the 1980s and 1990s are associated with the outcomes of interest. This review established that the most commonly used scales include Cullen and colleagues' (1983) job stress scale, Brayfield & Rothe's (1951) job satisfaction scale, and Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment scale to measure the predictors of interest as these experiences relate to the outcomes of interest. Limitations, policy implications, and future research will be discussed.

KEYWORDS: Correctional officer experiences, Job stress, Job satisfaction, Organizational commitment, Systematic review

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my chair, Dr. H. Daniel Butler for the countless hours guiding me throughout the process of successfully completing my thesis. I cannot thank you enough for the support and encouragement as a mentor throughout my graduate degree at Sam Houston State University. I am extremely lucky to have had the opportunity to learn from you and work with you for the past 2 years.

I would also like to thank my committee members, Drs. Melinda Tasca and Elisa Toman for their consistent encouragement and academic input throughout this process. You both have provided me with the knowledge to obtain a finished product to extend correctional officer literature. I am especially grateful to have had the opportunity to work with you both.

I cannot begin to express how much support and love my family and friends have given me throughout my graduate degree, such as the continuous “I can do it” speeches. Vinny Gonzales and Amber Griffin, I thank you both for the constant support you have given me throughout my graduate school experience. Amber, I could not have made it this far without your friendship and guidance throughout my graduate degree, and I thank you for always instilling the confidence in me that I could do this.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
Measurements Developed to Examine Correctional Officer Experiences	3
Plan of Study.....	4
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW	7
Job Stress	7
Correctional Officer Job Stress.....	8
Measures of Job Stress.....	9
Job Stress as a Predictor	14
Job Satisfaction.....	15
Correctional Officer Job Satisfaction	16
Measures of Job Satisfaction	16
Job Satisfaction as a Predictor	22
Organizational Commitment	25
Correctional Officer Organizational Commitment.....	25
Measures of Organizational Commitment.....	26
Organizational Commitment as a Predictor.....	31
Change in the Prison Environment Over Time.....	33

CHAPTER III: METHOD.....	36
Data.....	39
Outcomes	49
Scale Effects Over Time.....	50
Analytic Plan	51
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS	53
Job Stress	53
Job Satisfaction.....	55
Organizational Commitment	58
Scale Effects Over Time.....	60
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	64
Job Stress	65
Job Satisfaction.....	68
Organizational Commitment	71
Scale Effects Over Time.....	74
Limitations.....	76
Policy Implications	77
Future Research	79
REFERENCES	83
VITA.....	97

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Most Frequently Used Scales and Items to Measure Job Stress.....	10
2 Outcomes Examined When Job Stress is a Predictor	14
3 Most Frequently Used Scales and Items to Measure Job Satisfaction.....	18
4 Outcomes Examined When Job Satisfaction is a Predictor	22
5 Most Frequently Used Scales to Measure Organizational Commitment.....	27
6 Outcomes Examined When Organizational Commitment is a Predictor.....	31
7 Ten High-Impact Journals.....	38
8 Number of Studies and Models Examining Job Stress, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment as Dependent and Independent Variables	40
9 Number of Studies and Models of Scales and Items Used to Examine Job Stress as an Independent Variable	42
10 Number of Studies and Models of Scales and Items Used to Examine Job Satisfaction as an Independent Variable	45
11 Number of Studies and Models of Scales Used to Examine Organizational Commitment as an Independent Variable.....	48
12 Number of Studies and Models Examining the Combined Outcome Categories	49
13 Job Stress as an Independent Variable to Predict Adverse Work Experiences	54
14 Job Stress as an Independent Variable to Predict Commitment and Retention	54
15 Job Stress as an Independent Variable to Predict Punitive Orientation.....	55

16 Job Satisfaction as an Independent Variable to Predict Adverse Work Experiences	56
17 Job Satisfaction as an Independent Variable to Predict Commitment and Retention	57
18 Job Satisfaction as an Independent Variable to Predict Punitive Orientation	58
19 Organizational Commitment as an Independent Variable to Predict Adverse Work Experiences	59
20 Organizational Commitment as an Independent Variable to Commitment and Retention	59
21 Organizational Commitment as an Independent Variable to Punitive Orientation	60
22 Scales Used to Measure Job Stress as an Independent Variable Throughout the Decades	61
23 Scales Used to Measure Job Satisfaction as an Independent Variable Throughout the Decades	62
24 Scales Used to Measure Organizational Commitment as an Independent Variable Throughout the Decades	63
25 Most Common Scale Used to Measure Job Stress as a Predictor Across the Combined Outcome Categories	68
26 Most Common Scale Used to Measure Job Satisfaction as a Predictor Across the Combined Outcome Categories	71
27 Most Common Scale Used to Measure Organizational Commitment as a Predictor Across the Combined Outcome Categories	74

CHAPTER I

Introduction

“The role of the prison officer is one that is hard to identify with, to see as an extension of one’s self, because it can be demeaning, dangerous, and lonely” (Johnson, 2002, p. 208).

In 2016, the United States incarcerated 1,505,400 offenders in state and federal correctional facilities (Carson, 2016). A statistic that comes second to the amount of prisoners housed in facilities is the number of individuals paid to secure the prison regime across the United States - correctional officers. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2011), 434,870 correctional officers supervise prisons across the United States. Correctional officers are responsible for supervising and managing incarcerated offenders’ behaviors (Moon & Maxwell, 2004). Examples of these job responsibilities include frequent checks on offender wellbeing, preventing escapes, and ensuring adherence to departmental policy and regulations (e.g., limit availability of contraband) (Johnson, 2002). These job responsibilities require correctional officers to work in environments considered dangerous (e.g., higher likelihood of violence) (Harrell, 2011).

Historically, interest in prisons has focused on the adjustment and wellbeing of inmates rather than experiences of correctional officers (DiIulio, 1987; Sykes, 1956). However, a growing body of research has examined the experiences of correctional officers (Lambert, Hogan, & Barton, 2002; Triplett, Mullings, & Scarborough, 1999). For instance, researchers have examined a variety of adverse effects that correctional officers may experience (e.g., job stress) (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Brough & Williams, 2007; Cullen, Link, Cullen, & Wolfe, 1990; Cullen, Link, Wolfe, & Frank, 1985; Grossi &

Berg, 1991). The daily routine of correctional officers is comprised of stressful encounters and uncomfortable situations, such as separating fights or performing searches of persons (Huckabee, 1992; Lambert, Hogan, & Allen 2006). The stressful aspects of the job can be derived from several sources. For example, the unpredictable nature of the job (e.g., “thinking on your feet”) requires constant alert and readiness from officers.

Correctional officer job stress is an outcome that is considered to be an adverse work experience as a result of job stress constituting as a negative employee behavior. For instance, officers working in a maximum-security prison experience higher levels of job stress compared to officers working in less high security prisons (Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link, & Wolfe, 1991). An adverse work experience is characterized as an undesirable or harmful behavior. However, stress is just one outcome, of many, that officers may experience on the job (e.g. job satisfaction, organizational commitment). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment are considered to be positive behaviors that correctional officers may experience on the job.

Based on some of the reasons presented above, one can expect to be uneasy choosing such a profession. Approximately two-thirds of correctional officers have second thoughts about being a correctional officer and would rather have a different job (Johnson, 2002; Toch & Grant, 1982). The rate of divorce and stress related illnesses are also abnormally high in addition to the average life span of a correctional officer being sixteen years less than the national average (Dowden & Tellier, 2004). Based on these findings, it is important to examine whether measures designed to capture correctional officer experiences actually achieve this goal.

Measurements Developed to Examine Correctional Officer Experiences

In regards to research on correctional officers, scholars have validated and deemed reliable a variety of scales used to measure correctional officer experiences (e.g., job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment) (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951, Cullen et al., 1985, Mowday, Porter, & Steers, 1982). Scales allow researchers to capture complex behaviors or attitudes, such as those related to the experiences of job stress. One concern, however, is whether scales developed in the 1980s and 1990s are associated with outcomes of interest despite considerable changes in the prison environment. Although not all research examining correctional officer outcomes use scales (e.g., some studies use single item measures), most measures attempt to capture complex attitudes through the use of scales. For instance, one frequently used scale that measures work stress includes 6 items and is considered an ideal measure of correctional officer stress (Cullen et al., 1985; Grossi & Berg, 1991; Hartley, Davila, Marquart, & Mullings, 2013; Tewksbury & Higgins, 2006). Although a scale is generally deemed valid and reliable, few studies have examined whether scales (e.g., scales associated with job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment) are associated with outcomes of interest. An examination of measurements used to examine job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as each relates to outcomes of interest can provide evidence to either continue using the scales and items used throughout the literature, or construct new measurements to understand the correctional officer experiences of interest in today's prison setting.

To date, few studies have investigated the differences across measures used to predict various correctional officer experiences (e.g., job stress, job satisfaction,

organizational commitment). Although there are several measures that have examined correctional officer stress, few studies have attempted to discern whether one operationalization of job stress is tailored more towards capturing the stressful experiences of correctional officers. The purpose of this study is to examine the most commonly used measures in correctional officer research and determine whether these measures are associated with the outcomes of interest. A systematic review is important for future research as a result of what little is known about scales used to understand correctional officer experiences. Furthermore, consideration of scales used can display which avenues are worth pursuing and which need to be further examined. As a result, I will examine how researchers operationalize attitudes and behaviors associated with job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Scholars target these specific attitudes and behaviors as important concepts to understanding the experiences of correctional officers. Furthermore, my review of correctional officer research (described in Chapter 3) reveals that these attitudes and behaviors are frequently examined across studies of correctional officers.

Plan of Study

The objective of this study is to systematically examine empirical peer-reviewed publications from several high impact or specialty corrections journals published between 1980-2016 that include measures of job stress, job satisfaction, or organizational commitment. For example, a systematic review can reveal that particular scales related to job satisfaction are more likely to predict work-related stressors than other scales. This involves providing frequency distributions of the scales and items used to measure job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. The use of frequency

distributions will simplify the presentation of findings, such as whether certain measures are more likely to predict particular outcomes. For instance, one measure of job stress may not be related to organizational commitment compared to other measures of job stress. It is imperative to understand that this study is not empirically testing the items and scales used, rather exploring what has been studied when evaluating correctional officer experiences. If the examination displays that the scales used to measure correctional officer experiences lack validity, there is evidence to support a new construction of items and scales to measure correctional officer experiences.

The following section, Chapter 2 will describe how job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment relate to the experiences of correctional officers. In addition, discussion of how researchers have measured these complex attitudes and behaviors will be examined. Several tables displaying the items or scales used to measure each correctional officer experience (e.g., job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment) will be shown. The purpose is to recognize how researchers construct items or scales to measure a variety of correctional officer attitudes and behaviors. Chapter 3, Method will explain how the current study is laid out in terms of the construction of the sample, research questions, data, outcomes being examined, how the scale effects are being examined over time, and the analytic plan. Chapter 4, Results contains the findings from the current study. A variety of tables will display the number of studies and models when using a particular scale, the direction of the relationship between a measure (% positive or % inverse), and whether the examined measure was significantly related to an outcome (% nonsignificant). Finally, Chapter 5, Discussion and Conclusion are

comprised of the application of the findings, policy implications, and how this study provides strength to correctional officer literature.

CHAPTER II

Literature Review

Research examining the experiences of correctional officers has traditionally incorporated theories derived from the organizational psychology literature (Beehr & Newman, 1978; Udechukwu, 2009). Organizational psychology is a field of study pertaining to the relationship between occupations and human behavior, which includes the study of job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment (the areas of focus for the current study) (Rothmann & Cooper, 2015). The purpose of this section is to provide a brief background of the relevance of job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as they relate to the experiences of correctional officers. After discussing the background of these experiences, I will provide an overview of how researchers measured these complex attitudes and behaviors. This overview will include several tables that provide the items or scales used to measure each correctional officer experience (e.g., job stress). The goal is to understand how researchers develop scales or items to measure complex correctional officer attitudes and behaviors.

Job Stress

Stress is described as the psychological strain surrounding unfavorable circumstances that prevent individuals from achieving desired goals (Levi, 1987). Applied to an understanding of the workplace, job stress occurs when there is a lack of demands to meet an individual's needs (Caplan, Cobb, & French, 1975). Job stress is further conceptualized as the imbalance between demands (e.g., job expectations) and supplies (e.g., ability to meet demands) (Beehr & Newman, 1978; McMichael, 1978). For instance, job stress may occur when employees work longer hours with little

compensation for the hours worked. Job stress may also cause psychological anxiety and/or discomfort (Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker-Gail, & Baker, 2010). The imbalance between a task and the resources needed to complete a task may lead to emotional distress. Some individuals may experience frustration or anger when given tasks with few resources. Others, however, may experience symptoms associated with depression (e.g., lack of motivation) (Tsutsumi, Kayaba, Theorell & Siegrist, 2001). Furthermore, job stress differs from other sources or types of stress, such as life stress (e.g., finances, relationships), although the experiences outside of work can influence how individuals cope with stressors on the job (Cullen et al., 1985; Van Voorhis et al., 1991).

The relationship between job stress and various organizational workplace behaviors or attitudes is complex (Rothmann & Cooper, 2015). This complexity is exemplified by the studies that include job stress as a predictor and an outcome. For instance, job stress has predicted job satisfaction and organizational commitment while also being predicted by these measures in other studies. For instance, prior research on job stress has found a relationship between job stress and increased health risks (i.e., negative physiological and mental health outcomes).

Correctional Officer Job Stress

National life expectancy statistics find that stress is the leading cause of a shortened lifespan for correctional officers (Lambert & Hogan, 2010). Correctional officers who experience job stress report having an increased uneasiness psychologically as a result of the exposure of various work-related stressors (e.g., inability to meet job demands) (Cullen et al., 1985). For instance, correctional officers may feel unsafe

working in close proximity to inmates (Crawley, 2013). Despite the complexities associated with research on job stress, a growing body of research has examined the factors that influence correctional officer job stress (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987). Correctional officers may also experience stress when attempting to meet job demands, such as supervising inmates while providing treatment related services (Bergh, 1997). Correctional officers may experience stress due to a lack of resources, such as not being able to participate in decision-making or not receiving gratitude for completing work successfully (Botha & Pienaar, 2006). These examples reveal that several factors influence job stress in addition to job stress having an effect on a variety of adverse outcomes (e.g., health and psychological wellbeing).

Measures of Job Stress

In this section, I will describe how researchers measure correctional officer job stress. Table 1 illustrates the most frequently used scales and items that capture correctional officer job stress in alphabetical order. A preliminary review of studies found that the most frequently used measures come from the work of Cullen, Link, Wolfe and Frank (1985), Smith and Ward (1983), and Crank, Regoli, Hewitt, and Culbertson (1995). Generally, job stress scales aim to measure how concerned and/or worried correctional officers are during their time working in a facility. For instance, “Most of the time when I am at work, I don’t feel that I have much to worry about” (Cullen et al., 1985) or “During the past 6 months, how often have you experienced a feeling of worry that the job is hardening you emotionally” (Saylor & Wright, 1992)? Job stress scales also measure how calm correctional officers are during a workday. For example, “I am usually calm and at ease when I am working” (Cullen, Link, Travis III, & Lemming, 1983).

Table 1

Most Frequently Used Scales and Items to Measure Job Stress

Author(s)	Item(s) and/or Scale
Armstrong and Griffin (2004) – based on Crank, Regoli, Hewitt, and Culbertson (1995)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My job makes me frustrated or angry. 2. My job places me under a lot of pressure.
Crank, Regoli, Hewitt, and Culbertson (1995)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When I'm at work, I often feel tense or uptight. 2. A lot of times my job makes me very frustrated or angry. 3. Most of the time when I'm at work, I don't feel that I have much to worry about. 4. I am usually calm and at ease when I'm working. 5. I am usually under a lot of pressure when I am at work. 6. There are a lot of aspects of my job that makes me upset.
Cullen, Link, Travis III, & Lemming (1983)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When I'm at work, I often feel tense or uptight. 2. A lot of times, my job makes me very frustrated or angry. 3. Most of the time when I am at work, I don't feel that I have much to worry about. 4. I am usually calm and at ease when I am working. 5. I usually feel that I am under a lot of pressure when I am at work. 6. There are a lot of aspects about my job that can make me pretty upset about things.
Cullen, Link, Wolfe and Frank (1985)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When I'm at work, I often feel tense or uptight. 2. A lot of times, my job makes me very frustrated or angry. 3. Most of the time when I am at work, I don't feel that I have much to worry about. 4. I am usually calm and at ease when I am working. 5. I usually feel that I am under a lot of pressure when I am at work. 6. There are a lot of aspects about my job that can make me pretty upset about things.

(continued)

Author(s)	Item(s) and/or Scale
Cullen, Link, Wolfe and Frank (1985) and Lambert and Paoline (2005)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I often feel tense or anxious on my shift. 2. My job frequently makes me very frustrated. 3. I usually don't have much to worry about on my shift (reverse coded). 4. I am generally pretty calm on my shift (reverse coded). 5. I usually feel under a lot of pressure on my shift. 6. Many aspects of my job can make me upset at times.
Cullen, Link, Wolfe, and Frank (1985) and Lindquist and Whitehead (1986)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When I'm at work, I often feel tense or uptight. 2. A lot of times, my job makes me very frustrated or angry. 3. I frequently feel stressed out on the job. 4. I usually feel that I am under a lot of pressure when I am at work. 5. There are a lot of aspects about my job that can make me pretty upset about things. 6. Most of the time when I am at work, I don't feel that I have much to worry about.
Cullen, Link, Wolfe and Frank (1985) and Triplett, Mullings, and Scarborough (1996)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When I'm at work, I often feel tense or uptight. 2. A lot of times, my job makes me very frustrated or angry. 3. There are a lot of aspects about my job that can make me pretty upset about things. 4. I am usually calm and at ease when I am working. 5. I don't consider this a very stressful job.
Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker-Gail, and Baker (2010)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A lot of the time my job makes me very frustrated or angry. 2. I am usually under a lot of pressure when I am at work. 3. When I'm at work I often feel tense or uptight. 4. I am usually calm and at ease when I'm working (reverse coded for index). 5. There are a lot of aspects of my job that make me upset.

(continued)

Author(s)	Item(s) and/or Scale
Saylor and Wright (1992)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. During the past 6 months, how often have you experienced a feeling that you have become harsh toward people since you took this job? 2. During the past 6 months, how often have you experienced a feeling of worry that this job is hardening you emotionally? 3. During the past 6 months, how often have you experienced a feeling of being emotionally drained at the end of the workday? 4. During the past 6 months, how often have you experienced a feeling that you treat inmates as if they were impersonal objects? 5. During the past 6 months, how often have you experienced a feeling that working with people all day is really a strain for you? 6. During the past 6 months, how often have you experienced a feeling of being fatigued w/ up in the morning and have to face another day on the job?
Smith and Ward (1983)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How stressful do you consider this job to be?
Triplett, Mullings, and Scarborough (1996) – based on Whitehead and Lindquist (1986)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I don't consider this a very stressful job. 2. I frequently feel stressed out on the job.
Wright and Saylor (1992): Prison Social Climate Survey of the Federal Bureau of Prisons	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A feeling that you have become harsh toward people since you took this job? 2. A feeling of worry that the job is hardening you emotionally? 3. A feeling of being emotionally drained at the end of the day? 4. A feeling that you treat inmates as if they were impersonal objects? 5. A feeling that working with people all day is really a strain for you? 6. A feeling of being fatigued when you get up from sleep and have to face another day on the job?

The earlier construction of items became the foundation for more recent items used to assess correctional officer experiences. For example, the job stress scale by Crank and colleagues (1995) is based on Cullen and colleagues (1985) job stress measures. In addition, Smith and Ward's (1983) single item measuring job stress was originally used on a sample of military police officers and a southeastern city of police officers, then used within correctional officer literature. Cullen and colleagues (1985) scale is the most reported scale to measure correctional officer job stress.

Job stress scales and items display consistent terminology, which provides transparency into how researchers create measurements of job stress. "Frustrated" was included in 67% ($n = 8$) of the 12 measures used to examine job stress. Frustration in the workplace can occur as a result of the high expectations that employees cannot meet within the workplace (Colligan & Higgins, 2006). Another term, "pressure" was included in 58% ($n = 7$) of the 12 measures used to examine job stress. Similarly, employee pressure can arise as a result of multiple demands not being met (Colligan & Higgins, 2006). In addition, "tense" was included in 58% ($n = 7$) of the 12 measures used to examine job stress. Einarsen and colleagues (2005) state that workplace stress can make an employee feel tense because of the possible confrontations with supervisors and coworkers. Finally, "worry" was included in 58% ($n = 7$) of the 12 measures used to examine job stress. According to Colligan and Higgins (2006), worry is shown within the workplace based on the pressing and impractical requests throughout the job. Over the past 25 years, collective terminology in scales and items measuring job stress identifies how researchers attempt to analyze and understand correctional officer job stress.

Job Stress as a Predictor

Table 2

Outcomes Examined When Job Stress is a Predictor

Outcomes
Job Satisfaction
Organizational Commitment
Burnout
Intent to Leave

Table 2 displays the outcomes examined when job stress is a predictor. Job stress may decrease an officer's satisfaction and commitment to the job. Prior research has found that job stress decreases job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Lambert, 2004; Lambert et al., 2013, Lambert, Hogan & Griffin, 2007). Job satisfaction may be adversely affected by job stress because workplace factors may contribute to stressors and decrease satisfaction. Similarly, job stress decreases the levels of commitment to an agency or organization. For example, lower levels of commitment can occur resulting in correctional officers viewing their work in a negative light and blaming the organization for a stressful environment (Hogan et al., 2009). As expected, correctional officers are not as likely to form a positive relationship or be satisfied with an organization that increases uneasiness and worry (Hogan et al., 2009; Hogan et al., 2013).

Job stress has also been associated with adverse working conditions (e.g., burnout, intent to leave). Burnout is defined as "a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among individuals who do 'people work' of some kind" (Maslach & Jackson, 1981, p. 99). Burnout is a multidimensional concept comprised of

three components – emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and low levels of personal accomplishment (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). Emotional exhaustion is described as a “feeling of being emotionally drained, fatigued, overextended, and used up from the job” (Griffin et al., 2010. p. 240). Depersonalization is defined as treating individuals as objects or coldly (Griffin et al., 2010). A low level of personal accomplishment is characterized as the lack of feeling successful while working (Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000). Job stress is positively associated with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization, unlike decreased levels of personal accomplishment. As expected, an individual’s job stress influences an individual’s emotional exhaustion as a result of stress breaking down the individual (Griffin et al., 2010). Furthermore, job stress can be the result of an employee’s detachment towards inmates and coworkers.

An examination of how correctional officer job stress is measured may reveal certain measures are better at explaining specific outcomes in comparison to other outcomes. Although researchers are using consistent terminology, questions remain whether a certain job stress scale is better at predicting a variety of outcomes compared to other measurements of job stress. Additionally, measures of job stress can provide ways to understand and advance correctional officer job stress in the workplace.

Job Satisfaction

Scholarship suggests that employee behaviors are best understood by an individual’s job satisfaction (Locke, 1976). Job satisfaction is defined as the feeling an individual has towards their job and the diverse components of the job (Spector, 1997). Job satisfaction is exhibited through an optimistic emotional judgment of an individual’s occupational involvement (Locke, 1976), a job fulfillment towards an

individual's needs (Hopkins, 1983), and an affective reaction toward an individual's job (Cranny, Smith, & Stone, 1992; Lambert, 2001). Job satisfaction is a personal feeling, that reveals if an individual's needs are being met or unmet by current occupation (Lambert, Barton, & Hogan, 1999; Udechukwu, 2009).

Correctional Officer Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction has received the most attention in correctional literature examining behaviors and attitudes of correctional officers (Lambert et al., 2002). This is not surprising given the positive and negative consequences surrounding correctional officer outcomes associated with job satisfaction. For example, decreased job satisfaction is influenced by absenteeism (Lambert, 2001). A positive behavior associated with job satisfaction is employee performance. According to Lambert and colleagues (2002), growing demands and budget cuts within correctional institutions can decrease a correctional officer's job satisfaction.

Measures of Job Satisfaction

In this section, I will describe how researchers measure correctional officer job satisfaction. Table 3 illustrates the most frequently used items and scales to measure job satisfaction in alphabetical order. A preliminary review of studies found that the most frequently used measurements come from the work of Quinn and Staines (1979), Quinn and Shepard (1974), Brayfield and Rothe (1951), and Saylor and Wright (1992). Quinn and Staine's (1979) job satisfaction item aims to measure satisfaction with one's job, while other scales items are situational (e.g., Quinn & Shepard 1974; Saylor & Wright, 1992). For example, "Before we talk about your present job. I'd like to get some idea of the kind of job you'd most like to have. If you were free to go into any type of job you

wanted, what would your choice be?” (Quinn and Shepard, 1974) or “If I have a chance, I will change to some other job at the same rate of pay at this facility” (Saylor & Wright, 1992).

Table 3

Most Frequently Used Scales and Items to Measure Job Satisfaction

Author(s)	Item(s) and/or Scale
Brayfield and Rothe (1951)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I like my job better than the average worker does. 2. Most days I am enthusiastic about my job. 3. I definitely dislike my job (reverse coded). 4. I find real enjoyment in my job. 5. I am fairly well satisfied with my job.
Broome, Knight, Edwards, and Flynn (2009) and Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker-Gail, and Baker (2010)*	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I like my job better than the average worker does. 2. I find real enjoyment in my job. 3. I am satisfied with my job. 4. You like the people you work with. 5. You feel appreciated for the job you do. 6. I definitely dislike my job (reverse coded). 7. Most days I am enthusiastic about my job. 8. I feel fairly well satisfied with my job.
Cullen, Link, Wolfe and Frank (1985) – consistent with Quinn and Shepard (1974) and Quinn and Staines (1979): Quality of Employment Survey	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job? 2. Before we talk about your present job. I'd like to get some idea of the kind of job you'd most like to have. If you were free to go into any type of job you wanted, what would your choice be? 3. Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide? 4. In general, how well would you say that your job measures up to the sort of job you wanted when you took it? 5. If a good friend of yours told he (or she) was interested in working in a job like yours for your employer, what would you tell him (or her)?

(continued)

Author(s)	Item(s) and/or Scale
Hepburn (1985)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I like the duties I perform in my job. 2. I am satisfied with my present job assignment. 3. At the end of the day, I usually feel that I have done something especially well. 4. I enjoy most of the work I do here. 5. If I had to do it all over again, knowing what I know now, I would take the same job again.
Hepburn and Albonetti (1980)*	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I like the duties I perform on my job. 2. If I had a chance, I would get a job in something other than what I am doing. 3. I am satisfied with my present job assignment.
Quinn and Shepard (1974)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job? 2. Before we talk about your present job. I'd like to get some idea of the kind of job you'd most like to have. If you were free to go into any type of job you wanted, what would your choice be? 3. Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide? 4. In general, how well would you say that your job measures up to the sort of job you wanted when you took it? 5. If a good friend of yours told he (or she) was interested in working in a job like yours for your employer, what would you tell him (or her)?
Quinn and Staines (1979)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?

(continued)

Author(s)	Item(s) and/or Scale
Saylor and Wright (1992)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I would be more satisfied with some other job at this facility than I am with my present job. 2. My BOP job is usually interesting to me. 3. My BOP job suits me very well. 4. My BOP job is usually worthwhile. 5. If I have a chance, I will change to some other job at the same rate of pay at this facility. 6. I am currently looking for or considering another job outside the BOP.
Warr, Cook, and Wall (1979)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The amount of variety in your job. 2. The physical work conditions. 3. The freedom to choose your own method of working. 4. Your fellow workers. 5. The recognition you get for good work. 6. Your immediate boss. 7. The amount of responsibility you are given. 8. Your rate of pay. 9. Your opportunity to use your abilities. 10. Industrial relations between management and workers in your firm. 11. Your chance of promotion. 12. The way your firm is managed. 13. The attention paid to suggestions you make. 14. Your hours of work. 15. Your job security.

Note: *Missing items

The measurement of job satisfaction consists of specific-faceted and global measures (Cook, Hepworth, Wall, & Warr, 1981; Cranny et al., 1992). A specific-faceted measure is described as a narrow viewpoint of tasks throughout the job (e.g., relationships with employees) (Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969). For instance, “you like the people you work with” (Broome et al., 2009; Griffin et al., 2010). An issue with a specific-faceted measure is the lack of examining all workers’ view of satisfaction (Lambert et al., 1999). A global or overall measure of job satisfaction is giving the employee the opportunity to choose what is considered their level of satisfaction (Camp, 1994). For example, “I like my job better than the average worker does” or “I find real enjoyment in my job” (Brayfield & Rothe, 1951). According to Lambert and colleagues (1999), a majority of job satisfaction scales are using global measures (e.g., Brayfield & Rothe, 1951; Quinn & Shepard, 1974).

Consistent language displayed across job satisfaction scales and items provides insight into how researchers measure job satisfaction. Most commonly used term, “satisfied” was included in 89% ($n = 8$) of the nine different measures used to examine job satisfaction. Satisfied is shown throughout the workplace as a result of positive feelings exhibited throughout the work environment. For instance, a satisfied employee can be described as cheerful and successful within the workplace (Aziri, 2011). The second term, “like” was included in 67% ($n = 6$) of the nine different measures used to examine job satisfaction. For instance, “I like my job better than the average worker does” or “You like the people you work with” (Broome et al., 2009; Griffin et al., 2010). Likeness for the job compared to other jobs and the fondness of coworkers are two components of the workplace. Staw and colleagues (1994) express liking the job as a

positive emotion within the workplace that can influence positive results. In addition, “enjoyment” was included in 22% ($n = 2$) of the nine different measures used to examine job satisfaction. According to Saleh and Hosek (1976), employee enjoyment is shown in the workplace due to the connectedness to job involvement. For example, “I find real enjoyment in my job” can be shown through supporting coworkers or being heavily involved in the workplace (Brayfield and Rothe, 1951). Lastly, “enthusiastic” was included in 22% ($n = 2$) of the nine different measures used to examine job satisfaction. Watson (2002) discusses affective dispositions, which are personality qualities described as temperaments. A positive temperament, such as enthusiastic is shown among employees within the workplace that are experiencing satisfaction with the job (Brief & Weiss, 2002).

Job Satisfaction as a Predictor

Table 4

Outcomes Examined When Job Satisfaction is a Predictor

Outcomes
Job Stress
Organizational Commitment
Leaving the Job
Concerns with Corruption of Authority
Correctional Orientation
Female Correctional Officer Acceptance
Work Experience

Table 4 displays the outcomes examined when job satisfaction is a predictor. Job satisfaction is used to predict a variety of experiences pertaining to correctional officers,

such as job stress (Cheeseman & Downey, 2012), organizational commitment (Hogan et al., 2013; Lambert, 2004; Lambert et al., 2007; Law & Guo, 2016), leaving the job (Whitehead et al., 1987; Griffin et al., 2010), concerns with authority corruption (Whitehead & Lindquist, 1989), correctional orientation (Moon & Maxwell, 2004), female correctional officer acceptance (Walters, 1993), and work experience (Clemente et al., 2015). Correctional officer job satisfaction has gained the most attention in correctional literature as a predictor of job stress (Lambert et al., 2002). Cheeseman and Downey (2012) find that job satisfaction among female correctional officers has a negative effect on job stress. This relationship can occur as a result of women struggling to work in an organization predominately operated by men (Acker, 1992).

An employee who is satisfied with their work will have a higher chance of having a positive perception of the institution, which leads to a greater bond to the organization (Lambert, 2001). Job satisfaction is consistently shown to have a positive influence on organizational commitment, specifically as job satisfaction increases, commitment to the organization increases (Lambert, 2004; Lambert et al., 2007; Law & Guo, 2016). This relationship can be expected as a result of job satisfaction as a precursor of organizational commitment (Lambert et al., 1999; Lambert & Hogan, 2010; Lambert & Paoline, 2008; Law & Guo, 2016). Furthermore, distinct bond components of organizational commitment (e.g., normative commitment, affective commitment) are positively associated with job satisfaction (Hogan et al., 2013). Job satisfaction is a significant predictor of normative commitment, which suggests that when an individual is satisfied with their job this can foster and continue an individual's duty to the organization (Hogan et al., 2013). Correctional officer job satisfaction, however, is one of the strongest

predictors of affective commitment (Lambert, 2004). For instance, an employee's satisfaction with their job influences their loyalty to the institution. Job satisfaction is heightened based on an officer's loyalty to the prison, which can reinforce positive behavior.

According to Cherniss (1980), job satisfaction is a striking predictor of burnout. Job satisfaction is influenced by two components of burnout - emotional exhaustion and lack of personal accomplishment (Griffin et al., 2015; Whitehead et al., 1987). Griffin and colleagues (2010) find that increased levels of job satisfaction are related to a decreased likelihood of an employee reporting emotional exhaustion and lower levels of personal accomplishment. Job satisfaction suggests that an employee's needs are successfully met due to the decreased possibility of experiencing burnout.

Job satisfaction is also shown to be associated with correctional orientation (e.g., rehabilitation orientation, punitive orientation) (Moon & Maxwell, 2004). Consistent findings suggest that higher levels of job satisfaction are related to correctional officer's supporting an emphasis on rehabilitation orientation and less supportive of punitive orientation (Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd, 1997; Moon & Maxwell, 2004). As expected, a correctional officer with higher levels of satisfaction will more likely take the time to assist inmates in making constructive change by using rehabilitative techniques while incarcerated. Higher levels of satisfaction create positive behavior for correctional officers, which feed into positive behavior shown by the treatment of inmates.

An analysis of how correctional officer job satisfaction is measured can reveal how specific measures enhance an explanation of certain outcomes compared to others. While scholars are using alike terminology, questions remain whether a certain job

satisfaction scale is better at predicting a variety of outcomes compared to other measurements of job satisfaction. Still, measurement of job satisfaction can provide ways to improve correctional officer job satisfaction in the workplace.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment is characterized as the degree of an employee's association and participation in a certain organization (Lambert, 2001; Mowday et al., 1982; Steers, 1977). Beehr and Newman (1978) suggest that employee withdrawal is associated with a loss of identification with the organization. Organizational commitment is a complex behavior comprised of two principles: (1) the formation of attachment to the organization and (2) how this attachment is observed (Lambert et al., 1999). The attachment to the organization and view of the attachment is shown through behavioral-attitudinal indicators (Mowday et al., 1982).

Correctional Officer Organizational Commitment

The attitudes of staff are a vital component within correctional organizations (Lambert et al., 1999). More specific, the examination of correctional officer's commitment to an organization is essential to understanding officer's negative and positive behaviors (Lambert et al., 1999). A study conducted by Robinson (1992) discovered that correctional officers have the lowest levels of commitment to the organization compared to other correctional employees (e.g., nonsupervisory staff). Low levels of commitment can occur due to a lack of providing correctional staff with the goals and objectives of the institution. Comparatively, positive behaviors (e.g., increase in job performance, citizenship behavior) can influence high levels of commitment to an organization (Meyer & Allen, 1997).

Measures of Organizational Commitment

In this section, I will describe how researchers measure correctional officer commitment to an organization. Table 5 illustrates the most frequently used items and scales to measure organizational commitment in alphabetical order. A preliminary review of studies found that the most frequently used scales derive from the work of Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982), Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979), Saylor, Gilman and Camp (1996), and Saylor and Wright (1992). Mowday and colleague's (1982) Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ) is the most common approach to measuring organizational commitment.

Table 5

Most Frequently Used Scales to Measure Organizational Commitment

Author(s)	Item(s) and/or Scale
Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982): Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I tell my friends that this is a great organization to work for. 2. I feel very little loyalty to this prison (reverse coded). 3. I find that my values and the prison's values are very similar. 4. I am proud to tell people that I work at this prison. 5. This prison really inspires the best in me in the way of job performance. 6. I really care about the fate of this prison.
Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979): Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful. 2. I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for. 3. I feel very little loyalty to this organization. 4. I would accept almost any type job assignment in order to keep working for this organization. 5. I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar. 6. I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization. 7. I could just as well be working for a different organization so long as the type of work were similar. 8. This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance. 9. It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization. 10. I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for, over others I was considering at the time I joined. 11. There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely. 12. Often, I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees.

(continued)

Author(s)	Items(s) and/or Scale
Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulina (1974)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 13. I really care about the fate of this organization. 14. For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work. 15. Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part. 1. I am proud to tell people that I work at this prison. 2. This prison really inspires the best in me in the way of job performance. 3. I find that my values and the prison's values are very similar. 4. I tell my friends that this is a great organization to work for. 5. Often I disagree with the DOC on important matters. 6. I really care about the fate of this prison. 7. Deciding to work for this prison was a definite mistake on my part. 8. I am willing to put forth a great deal of effort beyond what is normally expected to ensure that the prison is successful. 9. I feel little loyalty to this prison. 10. When a problem comes up here, the people I work with seldom agree on how it should be handled.
Saylor, Gilman, and Camp (1996): Prison Social Climate Survey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This facility is the best in the whole BOP. 2. I would rather be stationed at this facility than any other I know about. 3. I would like to continue to work at this facility.
Saylor and Wright (1992)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This institution is the best in the whole BOP. 2. I would rather be stationed at this institution than any other I know about. 3. I would like to continue working in this institution.

The OCQ is an attitudinal measure assessing the amount of commitment an employee develops to a particular organization (Lambert et al., 1999). An attitudinal measure, or more commonly known as affective commitment is the emotional or cognitive bond to an organization. Attitudinal measures consist of “I tell my friends that this is a great organization to work for” and “I really care about the fate of this prison” (Mowday et al., 1982). A calculative measure, more commonly known as continuance commitment determines the costs and benefits of working for the organization. An example of a calculative measure would be “I am willing to put forth a great deal of effort beyond what is normally expected to ensure that the prison is successful” (Porter et al., 1974). Attitudinal measures transpire larger and greater effects, compared to calculative measures (Lambert et al., 1999).

There is considerable variability in the amount of items that are used to measure each scale. For example, Saylor and colleagues (1996), Saylor and Wright (1992), and Mowday and colleagues’ (1982) scales range from three to six items measuring organizational commitment. Saylor, Gilman, and Camp (1996) and Saylor and Wright’s (1992) three item scales focus on an individual’s likelihood of leaving the institution and view of the organization. Rather, Mowday and colleagues’ (1982) scale captures more specific measures of organizational commitment. For example, Mowday and colleagues (1982) measure the occurrence of the employee telling their friends about the organization, loyalty to the institution, similarity in objectives, and increase in job performance by working for the organization. Comparatively, Mowday and colleagues (1979) and Porter and colleagues’ (1974) range of scale items is from 10 to 15 items. Mowday and colleagues (1979) and Porter and colleagues’ (1974) scales include items as

shown above, but additional items are examined. Mowday and colleagues (1979) and Porter and colleagues' (1974) scales involve items that discuss an individual's reason for leaving, how much will the individual gain while working in the organization, and comparing current job assignment to other occupations.

The terminology used across organizational commitment scales provides transparency into how researchers recognize measurements of organizational commitment. The first term, "loyalty" was included in 60% ($n = 3$) of the five different measures used to examine organizational commitment. Mowday and colleagues (1979) express that loyalty is a socially acceptable employee behavior. Within the workplace, an individual's commitment is illustrated by the loyalty that individual has towards an organization, specifically by the "time, energy, talent, judgment, ideas, and moral courage" exhibited (Stewart, 1961, p. 19). Furthermore, loyalty within the workplace is illustrated through the pride an individual can have towards an institution (Cook & Wall, 1980). Another term, "proud" was included in 60% ($n = 3$) of the five different measures used to examine organizational commitment. For example, "I am proud to tell people that I work at this prison" measures the obligation and belonging to an organization (Mowday et al., 1982). An employee's devotion to work additional hours unexpectedly or be an advocate for the organization when needed characterizes how being proud can be applied throughout the workplace. Finally, "fate" was included in 60% ($n = 3$) of the five different measures used to examine organizational commitment. For instance, "I really care about the fate of this prison" is characterized as an employee having compassion for an organization's future (Mowday et al., 1982; Porter et al., 1974). Likewise, an

employee's allegiance to an organization illustrates the care surrounding the organization's forefront.

Organizational Commitment as a Predictor

Table 6

Outcomes Examined When Organizational Commitment is a Predictor

Outcomes
Organizational Citizenship
Intent to Leave
Treatment Views

Table 6 displays the outcomes examined when organizational commitment is a predictor. Organizational commitment is shown to predict a variety of experiences involving correctional officers, such as organizational citizenship (Lambert et al., 2008), intent to leave (Griffin et al., 2014), and treatment views (Lambert & Hogan, 2009). Organizational commitment is shown to be positively associated with organizational citizenship as a result of an employee who is loyal to the organization will exhibit positive behavior (Lambert et al., 2008). Conversely, correctional officers who have a strong bond with the organization will ensure positive support for the organization to flourish (Lambert et al., 2008).

Organizational commitment contains an inverse relationship to the intent to leave the organization (Camp, 1994; Lambert & Hogan, 2009; Robinson et al., 1997). Griffin and colleagues (2014) found that organizational commitment was the strongest predictor for correctional officers leaving the institution. As expected, a strong relationship occurs

among organizational commitment and intent to leave because heightened loyalty and bond to the organization would impact an individual's desire to stay (Griffin et al., 2014).

The last experience that organizational commitment influences is the support of treatment. Research finds that organizational commitment is positively associated with the support of treatment (Lambert & Hogan, 2009; Lambert, Hogan, Barton, Jiang, & Baker, 2008). An institution that provides staff with the values, goals, and objectives can increase commitment to the institution. For instance, Lambert and Hogan's (2009) study emphasizes a treatment approach to supervising inmates. By correctional officers embracing the goals of the institution, built commitment to the organization's objectives are visible to employees.

In summary, researchers use a variety of scales to measure these complex attitudes and behaviors in the correctional environment. An examination is necessary to explore whether particular scales are more closely associated with certain outcomes than others. For example, one measure of job stress may not be related to job satisfaction compared to other measures of job stress. Additionally, a certain measure of job satisfaction may not be related to job stress compared to other measures of job satisfaction. An analysis of which scales are related to particular outcomes can provide insight into the measurement of correctional officer experiences. In addition, an examination of which scales are consistently being used throughout studies over time can determine if the scales used, despite the change in the prison environment are capturing job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among correctional officers.

Change in the Prison Environment Over Time

The purpose for examining the scale effects throughout the decades is due to the changes in the prison environment over time. Beginning of the 1970s, the era of mass incarceration was transpiring as a result of the increase in crime rates in the United States (Clear & Austin, 2009). Most of the measurements developed to understand the correctional officer experiences of interest were created in the mid 1970s and beginning of the 1980s (e.g., Cullen et al. 1983, Mowday et al. 1982, Quinn & Shepard 1974). According to Clear (2009), the rate of incarcerated persons has grown since 1973. Furthermore, changes in penal policy in the 1980s were also responsible for the growth in the prison population (Clear, 2009; Clear & Austin, 2009). For instance, restrictions in sentencing policies (i.e., lower rate of receiving probation compared to prison) in the 1980s and early 1990s amplified the prison population.

According to Coyle (2002), prison administration is responsible for managing the rise in the prison population between 1980 and 2000. Arguments, however can be made that not only correctional administration need to cope with the rise in the prison population, but correctional officers supervising prisoners can have a difficult time managing the growing population of inmates being supervised. For example, with the growing rate of prisoners being supervised, there may be a possibility of correctional officers working longer hours or not having the resources to successfully manage prisoners. Due to the increase in the prison population over time, little is known about how this can affect a correctional officer's job stress, job satisfaction, and commitment to an organization as these experiences relate to correctional officer outcomes (e.g., adverse work experiences, commitment and retention, punitive orientation).

Historically, the prison environment has constituted as a static organization, but similar to other organizations, change is inevitable (Coyle, 2002). As a result of the changes within the prison environment, this can also affect an officer's job stress, job satisfaction, and commitment to an organization. Change in the prison environment can impact the approach correctional officer's use throughout daily activities revolving around the supervision of inmates (Coyle, 2002). Furthermore, the change in structure and function of the prison may influence the correctional officer experiences of interest (e.g., job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment) as these experiences relate to correctional officer outcomes (e.g., adverse work experiences, commitment and retention, punitive orientation).

According to Van Voorhis and colleagues (1991), the 1967 Task Force on Corrections and the 1973 National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standard and Goals made efforts to improve the correctional environment. Progressive prison reform encouraged rehabilitation and reentry programs (Clear, 2009; Gottschalk, 2006). Although, rehabilitation and reentry programs have been unsuccessful to decreasing the prison populations in the United States, researchers' interest in the examination of how a rehabilitative environment can affect correctional officer experiences of interest (e.g., job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment) grew. Beginning in the 2000s, studies were examining the effects of job satisfaction to predict correctional orientation (Moon & Maxwell, 2004). In addition, Lambert and Hogan's (2009) study was interested in the effects of organizational commitment to predict treatment views.

Throughout time, the consistent rise of inmates housed in prisons and the varying enforcement goals (i.e., punitive and rehabilitative intentions) of institutions makes

researchers question how correctional officers' job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment change over time. The current study will provide insight into which scales used to examine these correctional officer experiences of interest were consistently used in studies despite the change in the prison environment over time. This study informs research of how the operationalization of the scales used to measure the correctional officer experiences of interest may be influenced by the way prisons were functioning at the time (mass incarceration versus rehabilitative orientation). Furthermore, this study can present to researchers if the scale effects over time are static or dynamic. How correctional officers' experience job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as these experiences relate to correctional officer outcomes (e.g., adverse work experiences, commitment and retention, punitive orientation) can be influenced by the shift in enforcement, specifically illustrating how the development of scales over time may need to be reevaluated.

CHAPTER III

Method

In this study, I performed a systematic review of 71 peer-reviewed publications that include samples of correctional officers in state and federal prisons. A systematic review is defined as an “attempt to collate all relevant evidences that fits pre-specified eligibility criteria to answer a specific research question” (Moher et al., 2015, p. 3). The purpose of the systematic review is to examine whether the measurement of scales influences associations between a predictor (e.g., job stress) and an outcome (e.g., organizational commitment).¹ For instance, several studies may include different measures of job stress in addition to examining distinct outcomes, such as job satisfaction or organizational commitment. Therefore, a systematic review may reveal that certain scales associated with job stress are more likely to predict organizational commitment than other scales without concerns pertaining to number of examined studies (e.g., calculating a reliable effect size).

A preliminary review of the selected studies revealed that job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment are the most frequently examined experiences of correctional officers (N = 40). These experiences will be the focus of this study due to the frequency in which they are included in studies in addition to having enough cases to examine variation in scales, etc. that are used in studies of correctional officers. However, other experiences that could be explained include role conflict (Lambert et al., 2002; Lambert, Kelly, & Hogan, 2013; Triplett et al., 1999) or participation in decision making (Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986; Whitehead & Lindquist,

¹ A meta-analysis will not be performed due to the small number of studies that include relevant predictor variables in addition to differences in the outcomes that are examined.

1989; Wright, Saylor, Gilman, & Camp, 1997), but job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment were chosen to be the predictors of interest due to these experiences most commonly examined in correctional officer experience literature. The following research questions will be answered:

- 1) What measures of job stress are associated (e.g., direction and significance of predictor) with correctional officer outcomes?
- 2) What measures of job satisfaction are associated (e.g., direction and significance of predictor) with correctional officer outcomes?
- 3) What measures of organizational commitment are associated (e.g., direction and significance of predictor) with correctional officer outcomes?
- 4) Are there changes in scale effects over time?

I examined multivariate peer-reviewed publications from several high impact or specialty corrections journals between 1980-2016. These journals include the following: *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *The British Journal of Criminology*, *Justice Quarterly*, *Journal of Offender Counseling Services Rehabilitation*, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency*, *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, *Criminology*, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, *The Prison Journal*, *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *Law and Human Behavior*, *Law and Society Review*, *Crime and Delinquency*, *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, *Punishment and Society*, and *Criminology and Public Policy*.² First, the high-impact journals (n = 10) were examined,

² Efforts were made to examine articles published in Psychology journals, but researchers discovered that minimal multivariate studies are published in high tier Psychology journals. The Psychology journals consist of *International Journal of Stress Management* and *Journal of Organizational Behavior*. Also, efforts were made to investigate articles published in Sociology journals, alike from Psychology journals,

following the specialty corrections journals ($n = 8$). Table 7 shows ten journals with high-impact factors under review in this study.

Table 7

Ten High-Impact Journals

Journal Name	Impact Factor
<i>Journal of Quantitative Criminology</i>	4.316
<i>Criminology</i>	3.796
<i>Journal of Criminal Justice</i>	3.139
<i>Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency</i>	2.899
<i>Law and Human Behavior</i>	2.867
<i>The British Journal of Criminology</i>	2.464
<i>Justice Quarterly</i>	2.456
<i>Criminology and Public Policy</i>	2.216
<i>Criminal Justice and Behavior</i>	2.168
<i>Crime and Delinquency</i>	1.941

The studies chosen include samples of line officers, all correctional officers, all staff and correctional officer positions, treatment staff, and nonsupervisory staff. The review excludes studies that contain samples of correctional officers in a jail setting, probation officers in community corrections, and juvenile correctional officers in juvenile facilities. Officers from these settings were excluded due to unmeasured structural and managerial practices that may influence job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational

few multivariate studies are published in high tier Sociology journals. The Sociology journals examined include *American Journal of Sociology*, *American Sociological Review*, *Social Forces*, and *Social Problems*.

commitment (e.g., officers in prison may encounter different stressors than officers in jails).

Data

The review established 40 multivariate studies examining job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as either a predictor and/or outcome.³ Analyses were restricted to studies that included job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as predictors. Overall, the 40 studies contain 156 final models examining the correctional experiences of interest as either an independent or dependent variable. A variety of studies showed additional analyses (e.g., correlations), but the current study specifically focuses on “final” models. A final model includes the regression model that best addresses the research questions posed in the articles. For instance, models showing the effects of only demographic characteristics were not included in the analyses, but the model showing the demographic characteristics and the independent variables of interest (e.g., final model) were included in the analyses. Table 8 illustrates the number of studies and models examining job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as dependent and independent variables.

³ Walters (1993) and Eigenberg (2000) were removed from the analyses as a result of the outcomes not fitting within the broader measures.

Table 8

Number of Studies and Models Examining Job Stress, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment as Dependent and Independent Variables

	Studies	Models
Job Stress		
<i>Dependent Variable</i>	21	31
<i>Independent Variable</i>	14	43
Job Satisfaction		
<i>Dependent Variable</i>	20	33
<i>Independent Variable</i>	12	35
Organizational Commitment		
<i>Dependent Variable</i>	8	22
<i>Independent Variable</i>	5	10
Total	40	156

Note: Rogers (1991) was removed from the analyses due to the effects not being reported in the final models.

Job stress as a dependent variable was used in 21 studies, containing 31 models. In contrast, job satisfaction was used as a dependent variable in 20 studies, containing 33 models. Organizational commitment is used as a dependent variable in eight studies, containing 22 models. Job stress and job satisfaction was examined most often compared to organizational commitment. This suggests that job stress and job satisfaction are more common experiences analyzed by scholars compared to organizational commitment.

Job stress is used as an independent variable in 14 studies. Within the 14 studies, job stress is used as an independent variable in 43 models. Compared to the high amount of times job satisfaction was used as a dependent variable, job satisfaction is used as an independent variable in only 12 studies. Within the 12 studies, job satisfaction is an independent variable in 35 models. Lastly, organizational commitment was used as an independent variable in five studies. Within the five studies, organizational commitment

is used in 10 models. This is not surprising given the lack of literature examining organizational commitment compared to literature examining job stress and job satisfaction.

The examination of the 156 final models determined that a variety of scales and/or items are used to measure correctional officer experiences of interest (e.g., job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment). As shown in table 9, the most frequently used scale to measure job stress as an independent variable comes from the work of Crank, Regoli, Hewitt, and Culbertson (1995). Crank and colleagues' (1995) job stress scale was used in six studies and 15 models. Next, Smith and Ward's (1983) single item measure of job stress (e.g., "How stressful do you consider this job to be?") was used in two studies and 15 models. The last scale used most often derives from the work of Cullen, Link, Wolfe, and Frank (1985). Cullen and colleagues' (1985) scale measuring job stress was used in two studies and four models.

Table 9

Number of Studies and Models of Scales and Items Used to Examine Job Stress as an Independent Variable

Author(s) and Item(s)	Studies	Models
Crank, Regoli, Hewitt, and Culbertson (1995)	6	15
1. When I'm at work, I often feel tense or uptight.		
2. A lot of times my job makes me very frustrated or angry.		
3. Most of the time when I'm at work, I don't feel that I have much to worry about.		
4. I am usually calm and at ease when I'm working.		
5. I am usually under a lot of pressure when I am at work.		
6. There are a lot of aspects of my job that makes me upset.		
Single Item Measure	2	15
1. How stressful do you consider this job to be?		
Cullen, Link, Wolfe and Frank (1985)	2	4
1. When I'm at work, I often feel tense or uptight.		
2. A lot of times, my job makes me very frustrated or angry.		
3. Most of the time when I am at work, I don't feel that I have much to worry about.		
4. I am usually calm and at ease when I am working.		
5. I usually feel that I am under a lot of pressure when I am at work.		
6. There are a lot of aspects about my job that can make me pretty upset about things.		
Wright and Saylor (1992)	1	6
1. A feeling that you have become harsh toward people since you took this job?		
2. A feeling of worry that the job is hardening you emotionally?		
3. A feeling of being emotionally drained at the end of the day?		
4. A feeling that you treat inmates as if they were impersonal objects?		
5. A feeling that working with people all day is really a strain for you?		

(continued)

Author(s) and Item(s)	Studies	Models
6. A feeling of being fatigued when you get up from sleep and have to face another day on the job?		
Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker-Gail, and Baker (2010)	1	1
1. A lot of the time my job makes me very frustrated or angry.		
2. I am usually under a lot of pressure when I am at work.		
3. When I'm at work I often feel tense or uptight.		
4. I am usually calm and at ease when I'm working (reverse coded for index).		
5. There are a lot of aspects of my job that make me upset.		
Cullen, Link, Wolfe and Frank (1985) and Triplett, Mullings, and Scarborough (1996)	1	1
1. When I'm at work, I often feel tense or uptight.		
2. A lot of times, my job makes me very frustrated or angry.		
3. There are a lot of aspects about my job that can make me pretty upset about things.		
4. I am usually calm and at ease when I am working.		
5. I don't consider this a very stressful job.		
Total	13	42

Note: Osipow & Spokane's (1983) measure of job stress is not included due to lack of relevant information pertaining to the items included in the scale.

Table 10 displays the number of studies and models of scales used when examining job satisfaction as an independent variable. As shown in table 6, the most frequently used scale to measure job satisfaction as an independent variable comes from the work of Brayfield and Rothe (1951). Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) job satisfaction scale was used in five studies and 11 models. The next measurement used most often derives from Quinn and Staine's (1979) single-item measure (e.g., "All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?"), which was used in two studies and 15 models. The last scale used most frequently to measure job satisfaction as an independent variable comes from the work of Quinn and Shepard (1974). Quinn and Shepard's (1974) job satisfaction scale was used in two studies and three models.

Table 10

Number of Studies and Models of Scales and Items Used to Examine Job Satisfaction as an Independent Variable

Author(s) and Item(s)	Studies	Models
Brayfield and Rothe (1951)	5	11
1. I like my job better than the average worker does.		
2. Most days I am enthusiastic about my job.		
3. I definitely dislike my job (reverse coded).		
4. I find real enjoyment in my job.		
5. I am fairly well satisfied with my job.		
Single Item Measure	2	15
1. All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?		
Quinn and Shepard (1974)	2	3
1. All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?		
2. Before we talk about your present job. I'd like to get some idea of the kind of job you'd most like to have. If you were free to go in to any type of job you wanted, what would your choice be?		
3. Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide?		
4. In general, how well would you say that your job measures up to the sort of job you wanted when you took it?		
5. If a good friend of yours told he (or she) was interested in working in a job like yours for your employer, what would you tell him (or her)?		
Hepburn (1985)	1	4
1. I like the duties I perform in my job.		
2. I am satisfied with my present job assignment.		
3. At the end of the day, I usually feel that I have done something especially well.		

(continued)

Author(s) and Item(s)	Studies	Models
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4. I enjoy most of the work I do here. 5. If I had to do it all over again, knowing what I know now, I would take the same job again. 		
Broome, Knight, Edwards, and Flynn (2009) and Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker-Gail, and Baker (2010)* <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I like my job better than the average worker does. 2. I find real enjoyment in my job. 3. I am satisfied with my job. 4. You like the people you work with. 5. You feel appreciated for the job you do. 6. I definitely dislike my job (reverse coded). 7. Most days I am enthusiastic about my job 8. I feel fairly well satisfied with my job. 	1	1
Total	11	34

Note: * Missing items

Melia, Nogareda, Lahera, Duro, Peiró, Salanova, and Gracia's (2006) measure of job satisfaction is not included due to lack of relevant information pertaining to the items included in the scale.

Table 11 shows the number of studies and models of scales used when examining organizational commitment as an independent variable. The most frequently used scale to measure organizational commitment as an independent variable originates from the work of Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982). Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment scale was used in four studies and nine models. The next and final scale used to measure organizational commitment as an independent variable comes from the work of Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulina (1974). Porter and colleagues' (1974) scale measuring organizational commitment was used in one study and one model.

Table 11

Number of Studies and Models of Scales Used to Examine Organizational Commitment as an Independent Variable

Author(s) and Item(s)	Studies	Models
Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982): Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ)	4	9
1. I tell my friends that this is a great organization to work for.		
2. I feel very little loyalty to this prison (reverse coded).		
3. I find that my values and the prison's values are very similar.		
4. I am proud to tell people that I work at this prison.		
5. This prison really inspires the best in me in the way of job performance.		
6. I really care about the fate of this prison.		
Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulina (1974)	1	1
1. I am proud to tell people that I work at this prison.		
2. This prison really inspires the best in me in the way of job performance.		
3. I find that my values and the prison's values are very similar.		
4. I tell my friends that this is a great organization to work for.		
5. Often I disagree with the DOC on important matters.		
6. I really care about the fate of this prison.		
7. Deciding to work for this prison was a definite mistake on my part.		
8. I am willing to put forth a great deal of effort beyond what is normally expected to ensure that the prison is successful.		
9. I feel little loyalty to this prison.		
10. When a problem comes up here, the people I work with seldom agree on how it should be handled.		
Total	5	10

Outcomes

Due to the limited number of models included for each measure of job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment, there may be limited variability across individual outcomes of correctional officer experiences. For instance, emotional exhaustion is included as an outcome in two models, which would make it difficult to determine whether the measurement of a variable is associated with a specific outcome due to chance alone (e.g., examined in few studies). This is one reason why a meta-analysis is not conducive to addressing the research questions posed in this study – small sample size of included studies. Therefore, I will combine outcomes to examine broader correctional officer experiences. Table 12 displays the number of studies and models examining the combined outcome categories.

Table 12

Number of Studies and Models Examining the Combined Outcome Categories

Combined Outcome Categories	Studies	Models
Adverse Work Experiences	24	58
Commitment and Retention	28	79
Punitive Orientation	4	19
Total	40	156

Note: Studies do not total to 40 as a result of the outcome categories being used in two or more studies.

First, I will combine the following into a measure of “Adverse Work Experiences”: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, ineffectiveness, social distance, corruption of authority, health problems, job stress, and burnout (24 studies; 58 models). These measures capture hardship, strain, and stress that correctional officers may

experience on the job. Although there are differences across the factors that influence job stress compared to depersonalization, both measures worsen the work-related experiences for correctional officers. Next, I will combine the following outcomes to create a measure of “Commitment and Retention”: organizational commitment, job satisfaction, organizational citizenship, turnover intent (reverse coded), continuance commitment, normative commitment, affective commitment, work experience (reverse coded), job demands, and job resources (28 studies; 79 models). Similar to the strategy of measuring adverse work experiences, commitment and retention captures experiences that influence officers’ willingness to stay on the job and also their level of commitment. Again, one limitation of this measure is that lower levels of job satisfaction and higher levels of job demands could feasibly be considered adverse work experiences. However, these experiences appear to be more closely aligned with behaviors associated with commitment and retention. Finally, a measure capturing “Punitive Orientation” will be captured using the following variables: counseling roles, punitive orientation, punishment orientation, rehabilitation orientation (reverse coded), and treatment views (reverse coded). The rationale behind this measure is to capture more inclusive attitudes and behaviors of officers who view their role as treatment or punishment oriented (4 studies; 19 models). Positive associations for this measure indicate an officer has more punitive attitudes than treatment attitudes.

Scale Effects Over Time

The scale effects over time will be displayed by using 10-year increments⁴ across four decades. The four decades are as illustrated: 1980 – 1989, 1990 – 1999, 2000 –

⁴ The reason a 10-year increment was chosen for this study rather than a 5-year increment is due to not having enough cases.

2009, and 2010 – 2016. The decade in which a scale was used will be displayed along with the amount of studies and models involved a particular scale. Since the beginning of mass incarceration, this type of research provides insight into which scales are most often used dependent on the four decades of interest, despite considerable change in the prison setting.

Analytic Plan

The analysis for the current study involved examining the correctional experiences of interest (e.g., job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment) as predictor variables according to the scales used to predict a variety of outcomes. For example, a certain scale for one predictor (e.g., job satisfaction) may be more likely to predict a certain outcome (e.g., adverse work experiences). The analyses will proceed as follows. First, I will examine whether measures of job stress are positively or inversely related to one of the three outcomes described above by use of frequency distributions. For instance, Cullen and colleagues' (1985) job stress scale may be positively related to adverse work experiences in 5 studies that comprise 20 models. The frequency distribution will reflect the exact percentage of the relationship that this particular scale is related to adverse work experiences. In other words, if hypothetically, Cullen and colleagues' (1985) job stress scale is related to adverse work experiences in a positive direction for 20 models out of 40, then it would be reported as being associated with adverse work experiences in 50% of the models. The same process was used to examine the other two outcomes (e.g., commitment and retention and punitive orientation). Finally, this strategy was used to examine whether certain measures of job satisfaction and organizational commitment are similarly related to the outcomes of interest.

Therefore, the tables will illustrate the direction of the relationship between a measure (% positive or % inverse) in addition to whether the examined measure was significantly related to an outcome (% nonsignificant).

CHAPTER IV

Results

In this chapter, I will present the results of the systematic review of 40 studies containing 156 final models that include predictors of job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as they relate to adverse work experiences, commitment and retention, and punitive orientation. Frequency tables will illustrate the presentation of findings by presenting the number of studies and models when using a particular scale or item, the direction of the relationship between a measure (% positive or % inverse), and whether the examined measure was significantly related to an outcome (% nonsignificant). Additionally, frequency distributions will show whether the publication date of scales examined in this study are concentrated within a certain decade. Such an examination is important, as the prison environment has changed drastically since the onset of mass incarceration.

Job Stress

Table 13 displays job stress as an independent variable that predicts adverse work experiences. Very few studies that include predictors of job stress examine adverse work experiences (3 studies of 24). As a result of the limited variability across scales, scales with similar items were combined to increase the sample size of the models.⁵ Therefore, it is difficult to draw conclusions as to whether one measure of job stress better predicts adverse work experiences. The scale developed by Cullen and colleagues (1983) was

⁵ Cullen and colleagues' (1983) job stress scale was the first scale developed and used to examine correctional officer job stress. Similar items developed from Cullen and colleagues' (1983) scale include Cullen and colleagues (1985), collaborative measures from Cullen and colleagues (1985) and Lindquist and Whitehead (1986), collaborative measures from Cullen and colleagues (1985) and Triplett and colleagues (1996), Crank and colleagues (1995), Armstrong and Griffin (2004), collaborative measures from Cullen and colleagues (1985) and Lambert and Paoline (2005), and Griffin and colleagues (2010).

used in one study that contains three models, and two of the models found a positive association between job stress and adverse work experiences. In addition, a single item measure of job stress (i.e., “How stressful do you consider this job to be?”) was used in two studies comprised of nine models (Smith & Ward, 1983). Approximately 89 percent of the 9 models were not associated with adverse work experiences.

Table 13

Job Stress as an Independent Variable to Predict Adverse Work Experiences

Author(s)	Studies	Models	% Positive	% Inverse	% Nonsignificant
Cullen, Link, Travis III, & Lemming (1983)	1	3	67	0	33
Single Item Measure	2	9	11	0	89

Table 14 shows job stress as an independent variable to predict commitment and retention. Less than half of the studies use job stress as a predictor to examine commitment and retention (9 studies of 28). Cullen and colleagues’ (1983) job stress scale was used in eight studies comprised of 15 models. Of the 15 models, 27 percent were positively associated, 40 percent of the models were inversely related, and 33 percent of the models were not related to commitment and retention.

Table 14

Job Stress as an Independent Variable to Predict Commitment and Retention

Author(s)	Studies	Models	% Positive	% Inverse	% Nonsignificant
Cullen, Link, Travis III, & Lemming (1983)	8	15	27	40	33
Saylor (1983)	1	6	17	67	17

Table 15 presents job stress as an independent variable to predict punitive orientation. Three of the four studies use job stress as a predictor to examine punitive orientation. Cullen and colleagues' (1983) job stress scale was used in two studies comprised of three models. Of the three models, 33 percent were positively associated, 33 percent were inversely related, and 33 percent of the models were not associated to punitive orientation. In addition, a single item measure of job stress (i.e., "How stressful do you consider this job to be?") was used in one study comprised of six models (Smith & Ward, 1983). Of the six models, 100 percent were not associated with punitive orientation.

Table 15

Job Stress as an Independent Variable to Predict Punitive Orientation

Author(s)	Studies	Models	% Positive	% Inverse	% Nonsignificant
Cullen, Link, Travis III, & Lemming (1983)	2	3	33	33	33
Saylor (1983)	1	6	0	0	100

Job Satisfaction

Table 16 presents job satisfaction as an independent variable to predict adverse work experiences. Very few studies include job satisfaction as a predictor to examine adverse work experiences (4 studies of 24). Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) job satisfaction scale was used in one study comprised of three models. Of the three models, 67 percent of the models were inversely related to adverse work experiences and 33 percent of the models were not associated with adverse work experiences. Consistent with job stress, due to the limited variability across measures, scales with similar items were combined to

increase the sample size of the models.⁶ Thus, drawing conclusions as to whether one measure of job satisfaction better predicts adverse work experiences would not be appropriate.

Quinn and Shepard's (1974) job satisfaction scale was used in one study with one model. The single model was shown to be 100 percent inversely related to adverse work experiences. In addition, a single item measure of job satisfaction (i.e., "All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?") was used in two studies comprised of nine models (Quinn & Staines, 1979). Of the nine models, 33 percent were positively associated with adverse work experiences, whereas 67 percent of the models were not related to adverse work experiences.

Table 16

Job Satisfaction as an Independent Variable to Predict Adverse Work Experiences

Author(s)	Studies	Models	% Positive	% Inverse	% Nonsignificant
Brayfield and Rothe (1951)	1	3	0	67	33
Quinn and Shepard (1974)	1	1	0	100	0
Single Item Measure	2	9	33	0	67

Table 17 shows job satisfaction as an independent variable to predict commitment and retention. Very few studies include job satisfaction as a predictor to examine commitment and retention (5 studies of 28). Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) job satisfaction scale was used in three studies comprised of seven models. Of the seven models, 86 percent were positively associated to commitment and retention, while 14 percent of the 7 models were not related to commitment and retention. A 10-item collaborative job

⁶ Quinn and Shepard's (1974) items are similar to the job satisfaction scale by Cullen and colleagues (1985) and a single item measure from Quinn and Staines (1979).

satisfaction scale of five items from Broome and colleagues (2009) and five items from Griffin and colleagues (2010) was used in one study with one model. The one model was shown to be positively associated to commitment and retention. Lastly, Hepburn and Albonetti (1980) and Hepburn's (1985) scale (e.g., "I like the duties I perform here") was used in one study with four models. Of the four models, 100 percent was not associated with commitment retention.

Table 17

Job Satisfaction as an Independent Variable to Predict Commitment and Retention

Author(s)	Studies	Models	% Positive	% Inverse	% Nonsignificant
Brayfield and Rothe (1951)	3	7	86	0	14
Broome, Knight, Edwards, and Flynn (2009) and Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker-Gail, and Baker (2010)	1	1	100	0	0
Hepburn and Albonetti (1980) and Hepburn (1985)	1	4	0	0	100

Table 18 displays job satisfaction as an independent variable to predict punitive orientation. Three of the four studies include job satisfaction as a predictor to examine punitive orientation. Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) job satisfaction scale was used in one study with one model. The model was shown to not be associated with punitive orientation. Quinn and Shepard's (1974) job satisfaction scale was used in one study comprised of two models. Both models were inversely related to punitive orientation. Lastly, a single item measure of job satisfaction (i.e., "All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?") was used in one study with six models (Quinn & Staines, 1979). The six models were not related to punitive orientation.

Table 18

Job Satisfaction as an Independent Variable to Predict Punitive Orientation

Author(s)	Studies	Models	% Positive	% Inverse	% Nonsignificant
Brayfield and Rothe (1951)	1	1	0	0	100
Quinn and Shepard (1974)	1	2	0	100	0
Single Item Measure	1	6	0	0	100

Organizational Commitment

In alphabetical order, table 19 presents organizational commitment as an independent variable to predict adverse work experiences. Very few studies include organizational commitment as a predictor to examine adverse work experiences (2 studies of 24). Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment scale (e.g., "I really care about the fate of this prison") was used in one study comprised of three models. The three models were not related to adverse work experiences. In addition, Porter and colleagues' (1974) organizational commitment scale (e.g., "I am proud to tell people that I work at this prison") was used in one study with one model. The model demonstrates that this particular scale was not related to adverse work experiences.

Table 19

Organizational Commitment as an Independent Variable to Predict Adverse Work Experiences

Author(s)	Studies	Models	% Positive	% Inverse	% Nonsignificant
Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982)	1	3	0	0	100
Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulina (1974)	1	1	0	0	100

Table 20 shows organizational commitment as an independent variable to predict commitment and retention. Very few studies include organizational commitment as a predictor to examine commitment and retention (2 studies of 28). Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment scale was the only scale shown to predict commitment and retention. As shown, Mowday and colleague's (1982) scale was used in two studies with five models. Organizational commitment is positively associated to commitment and retention.

Table 20

Organizational Commitment as an Independent Variable to Commitment and Retention

Author(s)	Studies	Models	% Positive	% Inverse	% Nonsignificant
Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982)	2	5	100	0	0

Table 21 displays organizational commitment as an independent variable to predict punitive orientation. Only one of the four studies includes organizational commitment as a predictor to examine punitive orientation. Similar to table 19, Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment scale was the only measurement used

to predict punitive orientation. This particular scale was used in one study with one model. The model is inversely associated to punitive orientation.

Table 21

Organizational Commitment as an Independent Variable to Punitive Orientation

Author(s)	Studies	Models	% Positive	% Inverse	% Nonsignificant
Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982)	1	1	0	100	0

Scale Effects Over Time

Ranging across four decades (e.g., 1980 – 1989, 1990 – 1999, 2000 – 2009, and 2010 – 2016), frequency distributions will illustrate the scales used to measure job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as predictors in studies depending on the year the study using the scale was published. The findings will demonstrate the changes, if any in the scales used to measure job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among correctional officers since the beginning of mass incarceration. Table 22 displays the scales used to measure job stress as an independent variable throughout the decades. Comprised of nine models, five studies published between 2000 and 2009 used Cullen and colleagues' (1983) job stress scale. In addition, between 2010 and 2016 Cullen and colleagues' (1983) scale was used in five studies including 12 models. In addition, 15 models using a single item measure of job stress (i.e., "How stressful do you consider this job to be?") was used in two studies published between 1980 and 1989 (Smith & Ward, 1983). Lastly, Saylor's (1983) job stress scale was used in one study with six models published between 2000 and 2009.

Table 22

Scales Used to Measure Job Stress as an Independent Variable Throughout the Decades

	1980 – 1989		1990 – 1999		2000 – 2009		2010 – 2016	
Author(s)	Studies	Models	Studies	Models	Studies	Models	Studies	Models
Cullen, Link, Travis III, & Lemming (1983)	-	-	-	-	5	9	5	12
Single Item Measure	2	15	-	-	-	-	-	-
Saylor (1983)	-	-	-	-	1	6	-	-

Note: - Was not used during particular decade or used as a dependent variable

Table 23 shows the scales used to measure job satisfaction as an independent variable throughout the decades. Comprised of five models, Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) job satisfaction scale was used in three studies published between 2000 and 2009. Moreover, between 2010 and 2016 Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) measurement of job satisfaction was used in two studies containing six models. In one study published between 2010 and 2016, one model used a 10-item collaborative job satisfaction scale of five items from Broome and colleagues (2009) and five items from Griffin and colleagues (2010).

One study published between 2010 and 2016 used Hepburn and Albonetti (1980) and Hepburn's (1985) job satisfaction scale in four models. Quinn and Shepard's (1974) job satisfaction scale was used in one study comprised of two models between 2000 and 2009. Likewise, one study published between 2010 and 2016 used Quinn and Shepard's (1974) scale in one model. Finally, 15 models used a single item measure of job

satisfaction (i.e., “All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?”) in two studies published between 1980 and 1989 (Quinn & Staines, 1979).

Table 23

Scales Used to Measure Job Satisfaction as an Independent Variable Throughout the Decades

	1980 – 1989		1990 – 1999		2000 – 2009		2010 – 2016	
Author(s)	Studies	Models	Studies	Models	Studies	Models	Studies	Models
Brayfield and Rothe (1951)	-	-	-	-	3	5	2	6
Broome, Knight, Edwards, and Flynn (2009) and Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker-Gail, and Baker (2010)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Hepburn and Albonetti (1980) and Hepburn (1985)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4
Quinn and Shepard (1974)	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	1
Single Item Measure	2	15	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: - Was not used during particular decade or used as a dependent variable

Finally, table 24 shows the scales used to measure organizational commitment as an independent variable throughout the decades. Comprised of two models, Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment scale was used in two studies published between 2000 and 2009. In addition, seven models contain Mowday and colleagues' (1982) measures in two studies published between 2010 and 2016. Lastly, Porter and

colleagues' (1974) organizational commitment scale was used between 2000 and 2009 in one study and one model.

Table 24

Scales Used to Measure Organizational Commitment as an Independent Variable Throughout the Decades

	1980 – 1989		1990 – 1999		2000 – 2009		2010 – 2016	
Author(s)	Studies	Models	Studies	Models	Studies	Models	Studies	Models
Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982)	-	-	-	-	2	2	2	7
Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Boulina (1974)	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-

Note: - Was not used during particular decade or used as a dependent variable

The purpose of this chapter is to display a review of the scales used to examine the correctional officer experiences of interest as predictors (e.g., job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment) as these experiences relate to adverse work experiences, commitment and retention, and punitive orientation. Furthermore, an examination of the scales used to measure job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment were shown to capture the points in time (e.g., 1980 – 2016) each scale was commonly used throughout the literature. The final chapter, Discussion and Conclusion (Chapter 5) will provide an understanding of the findings. Additionally, policy implications will be discussed to show how this study informs research on whether the most frequently used scales still apply in today's prison setting. Lastly, limitations of this study will be discussed and future research will be considered.

CHAPTER V

Discussion and Conclusion

Efforts to understand the attitudes and behaviors of correctional officers have traditionally relied on scales to capture complex emotions (e.g., job stress). In this exploratory study, I examined whether the most commonly used scales and items measuring job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment are related to adverse work experiences, commitment and retention, and punitive orientation among correctional officers. Although the scales examined in this study have been deemed valid and reliable, past research has not examined whether certain scales are better at explaining officer attitudes and behaviors.

This study revealed that scales are not used as frequently as anticipated due to the limited amount of studies and models that examine job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as these experiences relate to adverse work experiences, commitment and retention, and punitive orientation. This can suggest that scales used to understand the correctional officer experiences of interest as predictors is understudied, compared to the increased amount of literature examining the correctional officer experiences of interest as dependent variables. Likewise, limited number of studies and models examining job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment demonstrates how past scholars put more emphasis into examining other experiences in relation to job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment than to investigating how job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment can affect a variety of outcomes. Greater use of scales can provide additional insight in the

relationships between the correctional officer experiences of interest as they relate to the outcome categories of interest.

Overall, the findings consistently show that particular scales (e.g., Brayfield & Rothe 1951; Cullen et al. 1983; Mowday et al. 1982) are used most often when examining correctional officer experiences. The most common scales used to examine the relationship between job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment and adverse work experiences, commitment and retention, and punitive orientation, includes at least five items in each scale. In addition, scales measuring the correctional officer experiences of interest as predictors were not used until the 2000s, despite these scales having been developed years earlier.

Job Stress

Researchers have described job stress as the imbalance between the ability to meet demands and an individual's needs in the workplace (Beehr & Newman, 1978; Caplan et al., 1975; McMichael, 1978). For example, an employee can experience psychological discomfort and/or anxiety in the workplace as a result of the imbalance of the task and the means to complete the task (Griffin et al., 2010). Applied to correctional officers, this review reveals that job stress can influence a variety of outcomes in the workplace, such as adverse work experiences, commitment and retention, and punitive orientation. Prior literature finds that as job stress increases, there is higher likelihood of correctional officer's having adverse work experiences. There is an inverse relationship between job stress and commitment and retention. For instance, the less job stress a correctional officer experiences, the more likely the officer will be committed to the prison. This also reduces his or her chances of leaving the job. Lastly, findings uncover

inconsistencies in the relationship between job stress and punitive orientation. These inconsistencies are shown by the use of measurement (e.g., a scale and a single item measure) to show the relationship between job stress and punitive orientation.

The review identifies the most common scales and items used to present the effects as shown above. Overall, the findings from this review indicate that few studies ($n = 3$) examine adverse work experiences using job stress as a predictor. One scale (i.e., Cullen et al. 1983) and a single item measure (i.e., Smith & Ward 1983) are the only two sources of measurement used to examine job stress as it relates to adverse work experiences. In relation to my study, this finding suggests that these two measures are what researchers found to best measure job stress in relation to adverse work experiences.

Job stress predicting commitment and retention is the most common outcome category examined in this review (9 studies). The reoccurring theme in the literature examining job stress as it relates to commitment and retention is a major finding, because this suggests that job stress is highly associated with positive emotions (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational commitment). Although job stress as it relates to commitment and retention is commonly examined, only two scales (e.g., Cullen et al. 1983; Saylor 1983) have been used to capture such a relationship between job stress and commitment and retention. Cullen and colleagues' (1983) job stress scale was used most frequently to predict commitment and retention. Researchers may have found Cullen and colleagues' (1983) scale to be better suited to measuring commitment and retention among correctional officers based on the finding that the Cullen and colleagues' (1983) scale is used far more often than Saylor's (1983) scale.

Similar to the measurements used to examine adverse work experiences, prior studies ($n = 3$) only use Cullen and colleagues' (1983) job stress scale and Smith and Ward's (1983) single item measure to predict punitive orientation among correctional officers. The findings reveal that Cullen and colleagues' (1983) scale captured inconsistencies in the relationship between job stress and punitive orientation, whereas Smith and Ward's (1983) single item measure found clear evidence to not be associated to punitive orientation. For instance, each of the three models examining the relationship between job stress and punitive orientation using Cullen and colleagues' (1983) scale found different results. In this case, Cullen and colleagues' (1983) job stress scale needs additional review in future study to provide more understanding into the use of this measurement examining the association between job stress and punitive orientation among correctional officers.

A major finding pertaining to job stress scales used in relation to the outcome categories of interest is the consistent use of Cullen and colleagues' (1983) job stress scale. Additional research is needed, but Cullen and colleagues' (1983) scale measuring job stress appears to be the measurement most frequently used to examine job stress. Table 25 presents Cullen and colleagues' (1983) job stress scale containing six items.

Table 25

Most Common Scale Used to Measure Job Stress as a Predictor Across the Combined Outcome Categories

Author(s)	Scale
Cullen, Link, Travis III, & Lemming (1983)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When I'm at work, I often feel tense or uptight. 2. A lot of times, my job makes me very frustrated or angry. 3. Most of the time when I am at work, I don't feel that I have much to worry about. 4. I am usually calm and at ease when I am working. 5. I usually feel that I am under a lot of pressure when I am at work. 6. There are a lot of aspects about my job that can make me pretty upset about things.

Researchers have used other job stress measures (e.g., Saylor 1983; Smith & Ward 1983) to examine the outcomes of interest that find similar results to Cullen and colleagues' (1983) job stress scale, but there is limited variation in other scales. Therefore, it is impossible to state that these scales are also equipped to measure such complex attitudes and behaviors among correctional officers. Cullen and colleagues' (1983) job stress scale, however, has provided scholars with the knowledge that this scale can be used to understand how job stress can predict positive emotions (e.g., job satisfaction, organizational commitment) among correctional officers in the workplace. As Cullen and colleagues' (1983) job stress scale has shown, this particular scale may continue to be an influential measurement in future study of correctional officer experiences, specifically examining the association between job stress and outcomes involving commitment and retention.

Job Satisfaction

According to Locke (1976), job satisfaction is a feeling an individual develops toward an occupation and the components of the occupation. For example, individuals'

personal feelings pertaining to their job can be negatively influenced if their needs go unmet (Lambert et al., 1999; Udechukwu, 2009). Applied to correctional officers, researchers have found that job satisfaction can influence adverse work experiences, commitment and retention, and punitive orientation. For example, as an officer's job satisfaction increases, the officer is less likely to have adverse work experiences. Additionally, as job satisfaction increases, there is a higher likelihood of an officer having commitment and retention to the organization. Lastly, research finds inconsistencies in the association between job satisfaction and punitive orientation. These inconsistencies are illustrated by the measurements used (e.g., scales and a single item measure) to show the relationship between job satisfaction and punitive orientation. Additional research can provide insight into the reconstruction of items for use in updated scales examining job satisfaction as it relates to punitive orientation.

The review recognizes the most frequently used measures to examine job satisfaction in relation to adverse work experiences, commitment and retention, and punitive orientation. Overall, it appears that relatively few studies examine adverse work experiences using job satisfaction as a predictor (4 studies). Two scales (e.g., Brayfield & Rothe 1951; Quinn & Shepard 1974) and one single item measure (i.e., Quinn & Staines 1979) are the only measures used to examine job satisfaction as it relates to adverse work experiences. This suggests that these three measures are what researchers found best when measuring job stress as it relates to adverse work experiences.

Similar to job stress, job satisfaction as it relates to commitment and retention was the most common outcome examined (5 studies). This suggests that job satisfaction is highly associated with positive behaviors. Three scales (e.g., Brayfield & Rothe 1951;

Broome et al. 2009 and Griffin et al. 2010; Hepburn 1985 and Hepburn & Albonetti 1980) have been the only sources of measurement to examine job satisfaction as it relates to commitment and retention. Interestingly, Hepburn (1985) and Hepburn and Albonetti (1980) fail to identify the relationship that Brayfield and Rothe (1951) and the collaborative measures from Broome and colleagues (2009) and Griffin and colleagues (2010) find. Questioning the use of the collaborative scale from Hepburn (1985) and Hepburn and Albonetti (1980) is suggested as a result of this scale only being used in one study.

Similar to the measurements used to examine adverse work experiences, prior studies ($n = 3$) only use the scales from Brayfield and Rothe's (1951), Quinn and Shepard (1974), and a single item measure from Quinn and Staines (1979) to predict punitive orientation among correctional officers. Interestingly, Quinn and Shepard's (1974) job satisfaction scale results find an inverse relationship to punitive orientation, whereas Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) scale and Quinn and Staine's (1979) single item measure found job satisfaction to not be associated with punitive orientation. Questioning further use of Quinn and Shepard's (1974) job satisfaction scale to understand punitive orientation is suggested. However, questioning the use of Quinn and Shepard's (1974) job satisfaction scale to predict punitive orientation can be problematic as a result of this scale only being used in a single study. Furthermore, continued questions arise due to Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) finding that the job satisfaction scale is not associated with punitive orientation. Such findings can suggest that the measures used in past studies examining job satisfaction and punitive orientation may not be designed to measure such experiences.

A noteworthy finding is the consistent use of Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) job satisfaction scale in all outcome categories. Future research is needed, but Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) scale was used most often when examining job satisfaction as it relates to commitment and retention. Table 26 shows Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) job satisfaction scale displaying the five items.

Table 26

Most Common Scale Used to Measure Job Satisfaction as a Predictor Across the Combined Outcome Categories

Author(s)	Scale
Brayfield and Rothe (1951)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I like my job better than the average worker does. 2. Most days I am enthusiastic about my job. 3. I definitely dislike my job (reverse coded). 4. I find real enjoyment in my job. 5. I am fairly well satisfied with my job.

This study adds insight into the historical use of Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) job satisfaction scale. Yet, Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) scale provides strength to understanding the association between job satisfaction and positive attitudes and behaviors (e.g., organizational commitment) and adverse work experiences (e.g., job stress). However, caution to using these measures is advised since relatively few studies use job satisfaction as a predictor to examine the outcomes of interest.

Organizational Commitment

An employee's association and participation in a certain organization is characterized as organizational commitment (Lambert, 2001; Mowday et al., 1982; Steers, 1977). Lambert and colleagues (1999) demonstrate that organizational commitment is formed through the attachment officers have to the organization and how officers observe this attachment. Applied to correctional officers, researchers have

established that organizational commitment is associated with commitment and retention and punitive orientation. Prior research has found that heightened commitment to an organization increases an officer's commitment and retention. In addition, as organizational commitment increases, punitive orientation decreases. In this case, officers' commitment to the organization is heavily influenced by how inmates are treated while incarcerated.

Overall, it appears relatively few studies examine adverse work experiences using organizational commitment as a predictor. Two scales (e.g., Mowday et al. 1982; Porter et al. 1974) were the only two sources of measurements used to examine organizational commitment as it relates to adverse work experiences. Interestingly, Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment scale did not find any type of association between organizational commitment and adverse work experiences. Surprisingly, as a correctional officer's organizational commitment increases, adverse work experiences (e.g., burnout, job stress, health problems, etc.) were not associated with this attitude. Additional research is needed to validate if the scales used to predict adverse work experiences are not finding an association because there is no actual relationship, or if the scale items are not suited to predict this relationship.

Organizational commitment as it relates to commitment and retention was examined most often amongst all outcomes categories, which is consistent with other predictors (e.g., job stress, job satisfaction). Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment scale was the only measurement used to examine the relationship between organizational commitment and commitment and retention. Results reveal that organizational commitment is highly associated to commitment and retention,

which may suggest that the measures used in past studies examining this relationship are representing a promising representation. Although, Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment scale items conclude that organizational commitment is highly associated to commitment and retention, further research is necessary due to the limited number of studies and models examining such relationship.

Organizational commitment as it relates to punitive orientation comprises the smallest sample size of all predictors in relation to the combined outcome categories under investigation. Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment scale is the only scale that has been used to examine organizational commitment as it relates to punitive orientation. The use of one scale in one study limits the significance of the findings that state that organizational commitment is inversely associated with punitive orientation. This suggests that future research is needed to understand if Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment scale finds similar results in future studies. Future study examining such relationship can serve as a device to validate whether Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment scale is the best source of measurement to display the association between organizational commitment and punitive orientation.

Although, organizational commitment contains the smallest sample size of studies and models compared to job stress and job satisfaction, the consistent use of Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment scale is a major finding. Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment scale appears to be the measurement most commonly used to examine all outcomes under investigation, but further research is needed. Mowday and colleagues' (1982) scale measuring organizational commitment

was used to measure all outcomes, but the most frequently examined outcome is commitment and retention. Table 27 shows Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment scale.

Table 27

Most Common Scale Used to Measure Organizational Commitment as a Predictor Across the Combined Outcome Categories

Author(s)	Scale
Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I tell my friends that this is a great organization to work for. 2. I feel very little loyalty to this prison (reverse coded). 3. I find that my values and the prison's values are very similar. 4. I am proud to tell people that I work at this prison. 5. This prison really inspires the best in me in the way of job performance. 6. I really care about the fate of this prison.

In comparison to my other outcomes of interest, organizational commitment needs additional attention due to few studies examining this complex correctional officer experience. This review finds clear associations between organizational commitment and the outcomes of interest, but very few measurements have been used in past literature to understand organizational commitment as it relates to adverse work experiences, commitment and retention, and punitive orientation. Further study is advised to compare results of studies using similar scales, such as Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment scale.

Scale Effects Over Time

Overall, scales measuring the correctional officer experiences of interest, as predictors were not used until studies published in the 2000s. However, studies published between 1980 and 1989 were only using single item measures to capture the relationship that job stress and job satisfaction have in relation to adverse work experiences,

commitment and retention, and punitive orientation. Overall, studies published in the 1980s reveal that single item measures of job stress and job satisfaction do not find the same relationships that scales measuring these constructs found. For example, Smith and Ward's (1983) single item measure found no association between job stress and adverse work experiences, whereas Cullen and colleagues (1983) found a positive relationship. In addition, Quinn and Staine's (1979) single item measure of job satisfaction found no association to adverse work experiences, whereas Quinn and Shepard (1974) and found an inverse relationship. This is a notable finding as a result of all four measurements shown above were developed during the onset of mass incarceration, but scales used in studies published in the 2000s found associations when single item measures did not. This can suggest that the use of scales is the researcher's attempt to address the complex components of job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment in its entirety.

Organizational commitment as a predictor, however, has only been measured using scales. Despite the early construction of organizational commitment scales (e.g., Mowday et al. 1982; Porter et al. 1974), the first studies to examine organizational commitment as a predictor among correctional officers was in the 2000s. Consistent with the development of most scales used to measure job stress and job satisfaction, besides Brayfield and Rothe (1951), organizational commitment scales were created during the onset of mass incarceration. Unlike job stress and job satisfaction, organizational commitment is a new experience of interest among researchers, meaning a comparison of single item measures versus scales cannot be interpreted.

Interestingly, findings reveal that the developments of the most common scales (e.g., Brayfield & Rothe 1951; Cullen et al. 1983; Mowday et al. 1982) to measure the

correctional officer experiences of interest were created in the early 1950s (i.e., job satisfaction) and 1980s (i.e., job stress, organizational commitment). This means the correctional officer experiences of interest (e.g., job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment) were first used as outcomes variables, rather than predictor variables. This suggests that additional research examining the correctional officer experiences of interest as predictors needs to take place to further understand the relationships between job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as these experiences relate to adverse work experiences, commitment and retention, and punitive orientation.

Limitations

Although this is one of the few studies to examine the measurements commonly used to examine correctional officer experiences, this study is not without limitations. First, interpretation of the findings can be problematic due to the limited number of studies and models. For instance, there is a lack of variation when a scale is only used in one study and one model. For example, the collaborative job satisfaction scale developed by Broome and colleagues (2009) and Griffin and colleagues (2010) examining commitment and retention and Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment used to predict punitive orientation were only used in one study and in one model. While, Broome and colleagues (2009) and Griffin and colleagues' (2010) job satisfaction scale is positively associated with commitment and retention, a sample of one study and one model does not explain much. As a result of the small sample of the models presented in this study, I suggest that researchers should explore this further. Additionally, differences across studies may be influenced by the geographical locations

of correctional officers. For instance, officers in the northeast might have different stressors or levels of satisfaction on the job compared to officers in the southeast.

Finally, researchers did not expect less than half of the models (68 models out of 156) examining job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment to be used as dependent variables. Simply, this decreased the number of models examined in the current study. Furthermore, this can suggest that scales and items developed to measure job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment were originally designed to be used in studies where these experiences are dependent variables, possibly affecting the ways in which these experiences are portrayed as predicting diverse outcomes. For example, Mowday and colleagues' (1979) organizational commitment scale was only used to measure organizational commitment as a dependent variable.

Policy Implications

Over the past 25 years, approximately 70 studies have been published attempting to examine a variety of correctional officer experiences. To date, few studies have specified what measurements are best to continue the knowledge pertaining to correctional officers experiencing job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment and how these experiences influence outcomes in federal and state prisons. This study informs research on measurements that have steadily been used throughout correctional officer literature examining the correctional officer experiences of interest as predictors. Additionally, this study attempts to provide research with scales that may be best to use in future studies examining job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as these experiences relate to adverse work experiences, commitment and retention, and punitive orientation.

The findings reveal that particular scales are shown to provide a promising representation of how job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment relate to the combined outcome categories. This study discovered that Cullen and colleagues' (1983) job stress scale and Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) job satisfaction scale are the best scales used to examine the relationship with job stress and job satisfaction as these experiences relate to adverse work experiences and commitment and retention among correctional officers. By Cullen and colleagues' (1983) job stress scale and Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) job satisfaction scale showing to be the best sources of measurement suggests that the Department of Corrections (DOC) can benefit by the knowledge accumulated in this study, specifically how particular outcomes may be associated with their employees' stress and satisfaction on the job. Researchers can inform the DOC that Cullen and colleagues' (1983) job stress scale accurately displays how job stress is associated to adverse work experiences and commitment and retention. By informing the DOC of such findings, this can encourage training to correctional administration and correctional officers by informing and identifying how certain aspects (e.g., frustration, pressure, worry, etc.) used in scales to measure job stress can influence outcomes. Similarly, a training to identify the components associated with job satisfaction (e.g., satisfied, like, enthusiastic, etc.) can assist correctional staff with being able to identify if one is feeling satisfied on the job. By informing the DOC of certain outcomes associated to job satisfaction can make correctional administration and correctional officers aware of how an organization can help to deter negative outcomes such as adverse work experiences (e.g., job stress, burnout, corruption of authority, etc.) among correctional officers.

Finally, the organizational commitment scale established by Mowday and colleagues (1982) is considered to be the best scale used to examine the relationship among organizational commitment as it relates to commitment and retention and punitive orientation. Yet, additional research is needed as a result of the limited amount of study on this complex correctional officer experience. A training to inform correctional administration and correctional officers of the terminology associated to feeling commitment to an organization (e.g., loyalty, proud, fate) can provide correctional officers with knowledge pertaining to such feelings can be associated to negative or positive outcomes.

Future Research

Five avenues for future research will be discussed. Similar to the current study, future study can examine the scales for outcomes. For instance, assess the different measurements of job stress as an outcome and understand how these measurements of job stress as an outcome influences correlates. In this study, review of the articles found that the most frequently used scales (e.g., Brayfield & Rothe 1951; Cullen et al. 1983; Mowday et al. 1982) have been used to examine job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as outcomes. This invites future research to examine if certain items and scales are better at examining job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as predictor or outcome variables.

Although, various outcomes were examined in the current study, other outcomes that the predictors of interest (e.g., job stress, job satisfaction, organizational commitment) may explain include level of acceptance of women correctional officers (Walters, 1993), definition of rape (Eigenberg, 2000), and absenteeism. The level of

acceptance of women correctional officers and definition of rape, however was not included in this review due to the outcomes not aligning with the broader measures of outcomes. To date, few studies have examined the association between job satisfaction and absenteeism among correctional officers. Lambert (2001) finds that lower level of job satisfaction is associated to higher levels of being absent on the job, but the effect is shown to be small. Additionally, there is a lack of literature that has examined the relationship between correctional officer job stress and being absent from the job. Future study can identify if there is a relationship between job satisfaction and job stress as these experiences relate to absenteeism through the scales that have been used to measure such experiences.

Another avenue for future research involves examining the scales used to examine correctional officers' job stress, job satisfaction and organizational commitment in relation to the differences in state and federal prisons' geographic location. Such examination may provide researchers with knowledge surrounding the differences across correctional officers, depending on location of occupation. This type of study may find that correctional officers in different locations in state and federal prisons may cope with certain stressors differently. Additionally, such analysis can conclude which scales are better equipped to measure job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment generally across correctional officers working in the United States despite the differences across states.

Future research can offer additional understanding of scales commonly used to understand job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among correctional officers working in institutions with different security levels (e.g., low,

medium, maximum). Although, Dowden and Tellier (2004) state that security levels are not particularly important for correctional officers experiencing stress on the job, an individual's job satisfaction and organizational commitment may be affected by security level of the prison. Future research can disentangle the differences in measurements used depending on the security level of the federal or state prison.

The last and final avenue for future research includes the application of findings may be relevant to other areas in criminal justice (i.e., policing) along with fields outside of criminal justice (e.g., social work). Commitment to an organization can be an important component in policing agencies (e.g., a police officer's loyalty to department) and social work agencies (e.g., a social worker's loyalty to fulfilling agency goals and practices). Mowday and colleagues' (1982) organizational commitment scale may find consistent results pertaining to police officers' organizational commitment in relation to commitment and retention and punitive orientation. In addition, Cullen and colleagues' (1983) job stress scale may display how a police officer's stress on the job can influence outcomes such as adverse work experiences and commitment and retention. Applied to social work, commitment to an agency may influence adverse work experiences and commitment and retention similar to correctional officers working for the DOC. Social work agencies may contain diverse therapies and procedures that each social worker uses to fulfill the needs of the client, but if a social worker is unable to perform such therapies and practices, negative outcomes may occur. Similarly, the stress surrounding fulfilling the goals of the social work agency and the client along with the obtaining satisfaction from the job can affect a variety of outcomes as shown with correctional officers.

In summary, scales and items are important tools used to understand particular experiences, which findings reveal how few scales are actually used to examine the correctional officer experiences of interest. Since the onset of mass incarceration, researchers have used three consistent measurements (e.g., Brayfield & Rothe 1951; Cullen et al. 1983; Mowday et al. 1982) that attempt to capture correctional officers' attitudes and behaviors in the prison environment, but have failed to examine if the scales and items used to measure the correctional officer experiences of interest relate to certain effects. Providing research with a presentation of the scale effects in relation to how scale effects change over time can aid in future research. This will aid in our understanding of which scales and items accurately measure the experiences of correctional officers in state and federal prisons. In a difficult and challenging profession, correctional officers' experiences are critical to evaluate, because of the risk this work force experiences daily. Such analysis invites researchers to continue to improve our understanding of correctional officer experiences.

REFERENCES

*Included in systematic review

- Acker, J. (1992). *Gendered organizational analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- *Armstrong, G. S., Atkin-Plunk, C. A., & Wells, J. (2015). The relationship between work–family conflict, correctional officer job stress, and job satisfaction. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 42(10), 1066-1082.
- *Armstrong, G. S. & Griffin, M. L. (2004). Does the job matter? Comparing correlates of stress among treatment and correctional staff in prisons. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32(6), 577-592.
- Aziri, B. (2011). Job satisfaction: A literature review. *Management Research & Practice*, 3(4).
- Beehr, T. A., & Newman, J. E. (1978). Job stress, employee health, and organizational effectiveness: A facet analysis, model, and literature review. *Personnel Psychology*, 31(4), 665-699.
- Bergh, L. (1997). Trauma and stress: The incidence of trauma and stress amongst correctional officers and offenders in the Department of Correctional Services.
- *Botha, C., & Pienaar, J. (2006). South African correctional official occupational stress: The role of psychological strengths. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(1), 73-84.
- Brayfield, A. H., & Rothe, H. F. (1951). An index of job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 35(5), 307.
- Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1), 279-307.

- *Britton, D. M. (1997). Perceptions of the work environment among correctional officers: Do race and sex matter?. *Criminology*, 35(1), 85-106.
- Broome, K. M., Knight, D. K., Edwards, J. R., & Flynn, P. M. (2009). Leadership, burnout, and job satisfaction in outpatient drug-free treatment programs. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 37(2), 160-170.
- *Brough, P., & Williams, J. (2007). Managing occupational stress in a high-risk industry: Measuring the job demands of correctional officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(4), 555-567.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor. (2011) Retrieved from <https://www.correctionalofficeredu.org/salaries/>
- Camp, S. D. (1994). Assessing the effects of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on turnover: An event history approach. *The Prison Journal*, 74(3), 279-305.
- *Camp, S. D., Saylor, W. G., & Wright, K. N. (2001). Racial diversity of correctional workers and inmates: Organizational commitment, teamwork, and workers' efficacy in prisons. *Justice Quarterly*, 18(2), 411-427.
- Caplan, R. D., Cobb, S., & French, J. R. (1975). Job demands and worker health; main effects and occupational differences. In *Hew Publication (NIOSH)* (Vol. 75). DHEW.
- Carson, A. E. Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2016). *Prisoners in 2016*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=6187>

- *Cheeseman, K. A. & Downey, R. A. (2012). Talking 'bout my generation: The effect of "generation" on correctional employee perceptions of work stress and job satisfaction. *The Prison Journal*, 92(1), 24-44.
- Cherniss, C. (1980). *Staff burnout: Job stress in the human services* (p. 21). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Clear, T. R. (2009). *Imprisoning communities: How mass incarceration makes disadvantaged neighborhoods worse*. Oxford University Press.
- Clear, T. R., & Austin, J. (2009). Reducing mass incarceration: Implications of the iron law of prison populations. *Harv. L. & Pol'y Rev.*, 3, 307.
- *Clemente, J. C., Pehrsson, E. C., Blaser, M. J., Sandhu, K., Gao, Z., Wang, B., ... & Lander, O. (2015). The microbiome of uncontacted Amerindians. *Science Advances*, 1(3), e1500183.
- Colligan, T. W., & Higgins, E. M. (2006). Workplace stress: Etiology and consequences. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 21(2), 89-97.
- Cook, J. D., Hepworth, S. J., Wall, T. D., & Warr, P. B. (1981). *The experience of work: A comparison and review of 249 measures and their use*. New York: Academic Press.
- Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfilment. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 53(1), 39-52.
- Coyle, A., & University of London. International Centre for Prison Studies. (2002). *Managing prisons in a time of change* (p. 36). London: International Centre for Prison Studies.

- Crank, J. P., Regoli, R., Hewitt, J. D., & Culbertson, R. G. (1995). Institutional and organizational antecedents of role stress, work alienation, and anomie among police executives. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 22(2), 152-171.
- Cranny, C. J., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (Eds.). (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. Lexington Books.
- Crawley, E. (2013). *Doing prison work*. Willan.
- *Cullen, F. T., Link, B. G., Cullen, J. B., & Wolfe, N. T. (1990). How satisfying is prison work? A comparative occupational approach. *Journal of Offender Counseling Services Rehabilitation*, 14(2), 89-108.
- Cullen, F. T., Link, B. G., Travis, L. F., & Lemming, T. (1983). Paradox in policing: A note on perceptions of danger. *Journal of Police Science & Administration*.
- *Cullen, F. T., Link, B. G., Wolfe, N. T., & Frank, J. (1985). The social dimensions of correctional officer stress. *Justice Quarterly*, 2(4), 505-533.
- *Dial, K. C., Downey, R. A., & Goodlin, W. E. (2010). The job in the joint: The impact of generation and gender on work stress in prison. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(4), 609-615.
- DiIulio, J.J. (1987) *Governing Prisons: A Comparative Study of Correctional Management*. New York: Free Press.
- Dowden, C., & Tellier, C. (2004). Predicting work-related stress in correctional officers: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32(1), 31-47.
- Eigenberg, H. M. (2000). Correctional officers' definitions of rape in male prisons. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28(5), 435-449.

- Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., Zapf, D., & Cooper, C. L. (2005). Workplace bullying: Individual pathology or organizational culture. *Workplace Violence*, 229-247.
- *Griffin, M. L., Hogan, N. L., & Lambert, E. G. (2014). Career stage theory and turnover intent among correctional officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41(1), 4-19.
- *Griffin, M. L., Hogan, N. L., Lambert, E. G., Tucker-Gail, K. A., & Baker, D. N. (2010). Job involvement, job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment and the burnout of correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37(2), 239-255.
- Gottschalk, M. (2006). *The prison and the gallows: The politics of mass incarceration in America*. Cambridge University Press.
- *Grossi, E. L. & Berg, B. L. (1991). Stress and job dissatisfaction among correctional officers: An unexpected finding. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 35(1), 73-81.
- Harrell, E. (2011). Workplace violence, 1993-2009. National Crime Victimization Survey and the Census of Fatal Occupational Injuries Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics. [Online].
- *Hartley, D. J., Davila, M. A., Marquart, J. W., & Mullings, J. L. (2013). Fear is a disease: The impact of fear and exposure to infectious disease on correctional officer job stress and satisfaction. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(2), 323-340.
- Hepburn, J. R. (1985). The exercise of power in coercive organizations: A study of prison guards. *Criminology*, 23(1), 145-164.

- *Hepburn, J. R. (1987). The prison control structure and its effects on work attitudes: The perceptions and attitudes of prison guards. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 15(1), 49-64.
- Hepburn, J. R., & Albonetti, C. (1980). Role conflict in correctional institutions. *Criminology*, 17(4), 445-460.
- *Hepburn, J. R., & Knepper, P. E. (1993). Correctional officers as human services workers: The effect on job satisfaction. *Justice Quarterly*, 10(2), 315-337.
- *Hogan, N. L., Lambert, E. G., & Griffin, M. L. (2013). Loyalty, love, and investments: The impact of job outcomes on the organizational commitment of correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 40(4), 355-375.
- *Hogan, N. L., Lambert, E. G., Jenkins, M., & Hall, D. E. (2009). The impact of job characterizes on private prison staff: Why management should care. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(3), 151-165.
- Hopkins, A. H. (1983). *Work and job satisfaction in the public sector*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.
- Huckabee, R. G. (1992). Stress in corrections: An overview of the issues. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20(5), 479-486.
- Johnson, R. (2002). *Hard time: Understanding and reforming the prison*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Lambert, E. G. (2001). To stay or quit: A review of the literature on correctional staff turnover. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 26(1), 61.
- *Lambert, E. G. (2004). The impact of job characteristics on correctional staff members. *The Prison Journal*, 84(2), 208-227.

- Lambert, E. G., Barton, S. M., & Hogan, N. L. (1999). The missing link between job satisfaction and correctional staff behavior: The issue of organizational commitment. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24(1), 95-116.
- *Lambert, E. G., & Hogan, N. L. (2009). Exploring the predictors of treatment views of private correctional staff: A test of an integrated work model. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 48(6), 504-528.
- Lambert, E. G., & Hogan, N. L. (2010). Wanting change: the relationship of perceptions of organizational innovation with correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 21(2), 160-184.
- *Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Allen, R. I. (2006). Correlates of correctional officer job stress: The impact of organizational structure. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30(2), 227-246.
- *Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Barton, S. M. (2002). The impact of work-family conflict on correctional staff job satisfaction: An exploratory study. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(1), 35-52.
- Lambert, E., Hogan, N., Barton, S. M., Jiang, S., & Baker, D. N. (2008). The impact of punishment and rehabilitation views on organizational commitment among correctional staff: A preliminary study. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33(1), 85-98.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Cheeseman, K., & Barton-Bellessa, S. M. (2013). The relationship between job stressors and job involvement among correctional staff: A test of the job strain model. *The Howard Journal of Crime and Justice*, 52(1), 19-38.

- *Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Griffin, M. L. (2007). The impact of distributive and procedural justice on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35(6), 644-656.
- *Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Griffin, M. L. (2008). Being the good soldier: Organizational citizenship behavior and commitment among correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(1), 56-68.
- *Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Moore, B., Tucker, K., Jenkins, M., Stevenson, M., Jiang, S. (2009). The impact of the work environment on prison staff: The issue of consideration, structure, job variety, and training. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(3), 166-180.
- Lambert, E. G., Kelley, T., & Hogan, N. L. (2013). The association of occupational stressors with different forms of organizational commitment among correctional staff. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(3), 480-501.
- Lambert, E. G., & Paoline, E. A. (2008). The influence of individual, job, and organizational characteristics on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Criminal Justice Review*, 33(4), 541-564.
- Lambert, E. G., & Paoline III, E. A. (2005). The impact of medical issues on the job stress and job satisfaction of jail staff. *Punishment & Society*, 7(3), 259-275.
- *Law, F. M., & Guo, G. J. (2016). Correlation of hope and self-efficacy with job satisfaction, job stress, and organizational commitment for correctional officers in the Taiwan prison system. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 60(11), 1257-1277.

- Levi, L. (1987). Definitions and the conceptual aspects of health in relation to work. *Psychosocial factors at work and their relation to health*. Geneva: World Health Organization, 9-14.
- *Lindquist, C. A. & Whitehead, J. T. (1986). Burnout, job stress and job satisfaction among southern correctional officers. *Journal of Offender Counseling Services Rehabilitation*, 10(4), 5-26.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology. *The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction: Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2(2), 99-113.
- Matteson, M. T., & Ivancevich, J. M. (1987). *Controlling work stress: Effective human resource and management strategies*. San Francisco, CA, US: Jossey-Bass.
- McMichael, A. J. (1978). Personality, behavioural, and situational modifiers of work stressors. In C. Cooper & R. Payne (Eds.), *Stress at work*. New York, Wiley, pp. 127-147.
- Meliá, J. L., Nogareda, C., Lahera, M., Duro, A., Peiró, J. M., Salanova, M., & Gracia, D. (2006). Principios comunes para la evaluación de los riesgos psicosociales en la empresa [Common principles for the assessment of psychosocial risks at work]. In J. L. Meliá et al. (Eds.), *Perspectivas de Intervención en Riesgos Psicosociales. Evaluación de Riesgos* [Perspectives for Intervention in Psychosocial Risks. Risk assessment] (pp. 13-36). Barcelona, Spain: Foment del Treball Nacional.

- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace*. Sage Publications.
- Moher, D., Shamseer, L., Clarke, M., Ghersi, D., Liberati, A., Petticrew, M., ... & Stewart, L. A. (2015). Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews*, 4(1), 1.
- *Moon, B., & Maxwell, S. R. (2004). Assessing the correctional orientation of corrections officers in South Korea. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 48(6), 729-743.
- *Moon, B., & Maxwell, S. R. (2004). The sources and consequences of corrections officers' stress: A South Korean example. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32(4), 359-370.
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee organization linkage: The psychology of commitment, absenteeism and reparation*. New York: Academic Press.
- Mowday, R. T., Steers, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14(2), 224-247.
- Osipow, S. H., & Spokane, A. R. (1983). *A manual for measures of occupational stress, strain, and coping: (Form E-2)*. Marathon Consulting and Press.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Boulian, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59(5), 603.

- Quinn, R. P., & Shepard, L. J. (1974). The 1972-73 Quality of Employment Survey. Descriptive Statistics, with Comparison Data from the 1969-70 Survey of Working Conditions.
- Quinn, R. P., & Staines, G. L. (1979). The 1977 quality of employment survey: Descriptive statistics, with comparison data from the 1969-70 and the 1972-73 surveys.
- Robinson, D. (1992). Commitment, attitudes, career aspirations and work stress: The experiences of correctional staff. In *Forum on Corrections Research* (Vol. 4, pp. 16-40).
- Robinson, D., Porporino, F. J., & Simourd, L. (1997). The influence of educational attainment on the attitudes and job performance of correctional officers. *Crime & Delinquency*, 43(1), 60-77.
- Rogers, R. (1991). The effects of educational level on correctional officer job satisfaction. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 19(2), 123-137.
- Rothmann, I., & Cooper, C. L. (2015). *Work and organizational psychology*. Routledge.
- Saleh, S. D., & Hosek, J. (1976). Job involvement: Concepts and measurements. *Academy of Management Journal*, 19(2), 213-224.
- *Savicki, V., Cooley, E., & Gjesvold, J. (2003). Harassment as a predictor of job burnout in correctional officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 30(5), 602-619.
- Saylor, W. G. (1983). Surveying prison environments. Unpublished manuscript. Washing, D.C.: Federal Bureau of Prisons, Office of Research.

- Saylor, W. G., Gilman, E., & Camp, S. D. (1996). Prison Social Climate Survey Reliability and Validity Analyses of the Work Environment Constructs. *Office of Research and Evaluation Federal Bureau of Prisons*, 1-47.
- Saylor, W. G., & Wright, K. N. (1992). Status, longevity, and perceptions of the work environment among federal prison employees. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 17(3-4), 133-160.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Peeters, M. C. (2000). Job stress and burnout among correctional officers: A literature review. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 7(1), 19-48.
- *Slate, R. N., & Vogel, R. E. (1997). Participative management and correctional personnel: A study of the perceived atmosphere for participation in correctional decision making and its impact on employee stress and thoughts about quitting. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25(5), 397-408.
- Smith, P. C., & Kendall, L. M. (8). Hulin. CL (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. *Chicago: Rand McNally*.
- Smith, B. L., & Ward, R. M. (1983). Stress on military and civilian personnel: A comparative analysis. *American Journal of Police*, 3, 111.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences* (Vol. 3). Sage publications.
- Staw, B. M., Sutton, R. I., & Pelled, L. H. (1994). Employee positive emotion and favorable outcomes at the workplace. *Organization Science*, 5(1), 51-71.
- Steers, R. M. (1977). Antecedents and outcomes of organizational commitment. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 46-56.

- *Steiner, B., & Wooldredge, J. (2015). Individual and environmental sources of work stress among prison officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 42(8), 800-818.
- Stewart, A. (1961). A realistic look at organizational loyalty. *Management Review*, 19(1), 100-105.
- Sykes, G. M. (1956). The corruption of authority and rehabilitation. *Social Forces*, 257-262.
- Toch, H., & Grant, J. D. (1982). *Reforming human services: Change through participation*. Sage Publications, Inc.
- *Triplett, R., Mullings, J. L., & Scarborough, K. E. (1996). Work-related stress and coping among correctional officers: Implications from organizational literature. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24(4), 291-308.
- *Triplett, R., Mullings, J. L., & Scarborough, K. E. (1999). Examining the effect of work-home conflict on work-related stress among correctional officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(4), 371-385.
- *Tewksbury, R., & Higgins, G. E. (2006). Prison staff and work stress: The role of organizational and emotional influences. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30(2), 247-266.
- Tsutsumi, A., Kayaba, K., Theorell, T., & Siegrist, J. (2001). Association between job stress and depression among Japanese employees threatened by job loss in a comparison between two complementary job-stress models. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 146-153.
- Udechukwu, I. I. (2009). Correctional officer turnover: Of Maslow's needs hierarchy and Herzberg's motivation theory. *Public Personnel Management*, 38(2), 69-82.

- *Van Voorhis, P., Cullen, F. T., Link, B. G., & Wolfe, N. T. (1991). The impact of race and gender on correctional officers' orientation to the integrated environment. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 28(4), 472-500.
- Walters, S. (1993). Changing the guard: male correctional officers' attitudes toward women as co-workers. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 20(1-2), 47-60.
- Warr, P., Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1979). Scales for the measurement of some work attitudes and aspects of psychological well-being. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 52(2), 129-148.
- Watson, D. (2002). Positive affectivity. *Handbook of Positive Psychology*, 106-119.
- *Whitehead, J. T., & Lindquist, C. A. (1989). Determinants of correctional officers' professional orientation. *Justice Quarterly*, 6(1), 69-87.
- *Whitehead, J., Linquist, C., & Klofas, J. (1987). Correctional officer professional orientation: A replication of the Klofas-Toch measure. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 14(4), 468-486.
- Wright, K. N., & Saylor, W. G. (1992). A comparison of perceptions of the work environment between minority and non-minority employees of the federal prison system. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20(1), 63-71.
- *Wright, K. N., Saylor, W. G., Gilman, E., & Camp, S. (1997). Job control and occupational outcomes among prison workers. *Justice Quarterly*, 14(3), 525-546.

VITA

Channing R. Carpenter

EDUCATION

Master of Arts in Criminal Justice and Criminology at Sam Houston State University, January 2016 – present. Thesis title: An Examination of Scales to Understand Correctional Officer Experiences

Bachelor of Science (December 2016) in Criminal Justice, Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas.

ACADEMIC EMPLOYMENT

Graduate Research Assistant, Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology, Sam Houston State University, Spring 2017- present. Responsibilities include: over 500 hours collecting data from a probation office. Data entry and analysis, qualitative analysis, unstructured interviews with probationers convicted of sexual crimes, and conducting observations between probationers and probation officers.

Graduate Teaching Assistant, Department of Criminal Justice and Criminology, Sam Houston State University, Spring 2017- present. Responsibilities include: assisting professors with the preparation and presentation of undergraduate courses and grading.

PUBLICATIONS

Butler, H. D., Tasca, M., Pettyjohn, A., & Carpenter, C. R. (Under review). *A Systematic Review of the Literature on Correctional Officers: Identifying New Avenues for Research*.

PRESENTATIONS AT PROFESSIONAL MEETINGS

Butler, H. D., Tasca, M., Pettyjohn, A., & Carpenter, C. R. (2017, November). *A Systematic Review of Research on Correctional Officers*. Presentation conducted at the meeting of American Society of Criminology, Philadelphia, PA.

Butler, H.D., Tasca M., Carpenter, C. R., & Pettyjohn, A. (2017, September). *An Examination of Scales Used to Understand Correctional Officer Stress*. Presentation conducted at the meeting of Southern Criminal Justice Association, New Orleans, LA.

Carpenter, C. R., Hernandez, C. N., & Blasko, B. L. (2016, November). *Prison as a Turning Point in the Era of Mass Incarceration*. Poster conducted at the meeting of the American Society of Criminology, New Orleans, LA.

ACADEMIC AWARDS

Graduate Fellowship (\$1,000), Sam Houston State University, Spring 2018

Dan Richard Beto Endowed Scholarship (\$1,000), Sam Houston State University, Spring 2018

Graduate Fellowship (\$1,000), Sam Houston State University, Fall 2017
Dan Richard Beto Endowed Scholarship (\$1,000), Sam Houston State University, Fall 2017
Graduate Fellowship (\$1,000), Sam Houston State University, Summer 2017
Emerging Scholars Honor (\$800), Sam Houston State University, Fall 2016
The (STAPP) Award for travel to the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology (\$680), Fall 2016
Emerging Scholars Honor (\$200), Sam Houston State University, Spring 2016
Honors College, Sam Houston State University, 2014-2016

RELEVANT TRAINING

Criminal Justice Information System Security and Awareness Training (Level 2 CJIS Security Training), Sam Houston State University, January 2017
Texas Crime Information Center (TCIC) Criminal Justice Practitioner Online Training, Sam Houston State University, January 2017
Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI) for Protection of Human Subjects Research (Social and Behavioral Science Focus), Sam Houston State University, January 2016

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOPS

Stable and Acute 2007 Assessment Training, Montgomery County, Probation Department, Conroe, TX, August 2017
Organizational Meeting with Administrative for Agenda, August 2017
Evidence-Based Practices for Field Visits, September 2017