

INFORMAL CONTROL
COLLECTIVE EFFICACY AMONG CORRECTIONAL STAFF

by

TaLisa J. Carter

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the University of Delaware in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Criminology

Spring 2015

© 2015 TaLisa J. Carter
All Rights Reserved

ProQuest Number: 1596838

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

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



ProQuest 1596838

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

INFORMAL CONTROL
COLLECTIVE EFFICACY AMONG CORRECTIONAL STAFF

by

TaLisa J. Carter

Approved: _____
Karen F. Parker, Ph.D.
Professor in charge of thesis on behalf of the Advisory Committee

Approved: _____
Kirk R. Williams, Ph.D.
Chair of the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice

Approved: _____
George H. Watson, Ph.D.
Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences

Approved: _____
James G. Richards, Ph.D.
Vice Provost for Graduate and Professional Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Special thanks to Dr. Karen Parker who has been an excellent advisor, resource and ally. You pushed me; I appreciate it. Thank you to my committee members Dr. Susan Miller and Dr. Dan O’Connell who shared their unique viewpoints and expertise with me without hesitation. A huge thank you to the entire Sociology and Criminology graduate program, particularly Erin K., John B., Ashley M., Kristen H., and my entire cohort. All of you have taught me there is always something to learn, something to organize and something to laugh at.

Thank you to the Delaware Department of Correction, Mr. Karl Hines, Mr. Perry Phelps, and Ms. Chelsea Hicks and especially to every staff member that clicked the Qualtrics link. I appreciate your guidance, assistance and time more than words can express.

Thanks to Prayer Temple and Judah Praise for instantly becoming my family in Del-a-where? Hugs to my family and friends near and far for never being surprised when my life update is “I’m still in school.” Love to Brandon for being my refuge and the awesome captain of team Badley.

Love to the Carter Clan: Bruce, my father; Jacqueline, my mother; Nancyia, my sister and Music, the smartest niece ever. You ground me every day in reality while simultaneously keeping me lifted.

“I can do all things through Christ which strengthens me.” – Philippians 4:14

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vi	
ABSTRACT	vii	
Chapter		
1	INFORMAL CONTROL: COLLECTIVE EFFICACY AMONG CORRECTIONAL STAFF	1
	Introduction	1
	Theoretical Background	2
	Collective Efficacy	2
	Literature Review	4
	Correctional Environments as Places	4
	Correctional Officers: Promoting Social Control	6
	Correctional Officers: Mutual Trust and Social Cohesion	7
	Correctional Facilities as Gendered Institutions	8
	Collective Efficacy and Work Performance	9
	Data and Methodology	11
	Measures	13
	Dependent Variables	13
	Independent Variables	14
	Collective Efficacy	14
	Self-Efficacy	14
	Work/Family Balance	15
	Work-Related Variables	15
	Demographic Variables	16
	Analysis	16
	Results	18
	Happy Work	18

Negative Work.....	20
A Gendered Analysis of Correctional Settings	21
Discussion.....	22
Limitations.....	26
Translational Implications	27
Conclusion.....	29
TABLES	30
REFERENCES	35
Appendix	
A COLLECTIVE EFFICACY ALPHAS.....	39
B INDEXES IN DETAIL	40
C IRB LETTER.....	43

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Univariate Statistics.....	30
Table 2	Correlation Matrix.....	31
Table 3	Happy Work: Multivariate Ordinary Least Square Regression Results..	32
Table 4	Negative Work: Multivariate Ordinary Least Squares Regression Results	33
Table 5	Supplemental Analysis Negative Work: Exploring Genders Differences	34

ABSTRACT

Collective efficacy is often measured to capture informal social control and social cohesion among groups of individuals working towards a common goal. However, the availability of collective efficacy among employees of correctional institutions has been understudied in the literature. Using original data collected from the Delaware Department of Correction, this study analyzes the impact of collective efficacy in determining types of work perceptions among corrections staff. Given that correctional facilities are firmly established as masculine organizations in the gendered institutions literature, significant sex differences are also explored. Findings suggest that collective efficacy has a significant impact on positive work perceptions but is less influential on negative viewpoints. This effect is not homogenously experienced among staff. Additionally, informal social control, not social cohesion, is the driving force behind collective efficacy within correctional institutions. Translational implications and suggestions for future research are also discussed.

Chapter 1

INFORMAL CONTROL: COLLECTIVE EFFICACY AMONG CORRECTIONAL STAFF

Introduction

Mass incarceration in the United States has major societal implications for all segments of society, including communities, families, inmates and corrections employees. Correctional officers in particular experience burnout, post-traumatic stress disorder and other consequences of high stress levels that are inherent to the incarceration environment (Whitehead 1989; Carlson and Thomas 2006). While previous research has focused on how correctional employees may experience stress, burnout, trauma and other types of victimization, few have considered mechanisms that decrease the likelihood of such negative outcomes becoming a reality. Social cohesion, trust and informal social control (the key elements of collective efficacy) may influence work outcomes among correctional staff. Applying the collective efficacy framework to incarceration environments may fill this gap in the literature.

Yet the availability of collective efficacy among employees of correctional institutions has been understudied relative to community level approaches. Because the United States is so dependent on the corrections system in processing violators of the law, failing to fully comprehend how negative work outcomes in corrections can be alleviated only furthers the unintended consequences of mass incarceration in the nation. In order to better understand how correctional staff function, this study will explore the role that social cohesion, trust and informal social control among

correctional staff plays in determining work perceptions. Because correctional facilities have been established as masculine institutions (Britton 2003; Morash 2006; Belknap 1996), considering how the gendered nature of correctional institutions impact work outcomes may provide further insight into the types of work perceptions of correctional staff.

This study provides a brief theoretical overview of collective efficacy before framing correctional facilities as a place where collective efficacy can be applied. Literature linking collective efficacy to work-related outcomes will be also be examined, highlighting differential findings based on sex. Three main research questions will be addressed. (1) Does collective efficacy exist within correctional institutions? (2) If so, what impact does collective efficacy have on types of work perceptions? (3) Is the impact of collective efficacy similarly experienced by male and female correctional employees? Using original data collected from the Delaware Department of Correction, this study will analyze the impact of collective efficacy in determining types of work perceptions among corrections staff and provide supplemental analysis where gender differences exist. Limitations, translational implications and suggestions for future research will also be discussed.

Theoretical Background

Collective Efficacy

Social settings or places have played a distinct role in the study of human behavior, with the ecological approach in Criminology comprising a vast body of literature. In 1942, Shaw and McKay asserted that certain neighborhood characteristics (poverty, ethnic heterogeneity and residential mobility) symbolize

social disorganization, or the breakdown of social relations within a community, leading to weak informal social control that promotes crime and delinquency. While research on social disorganization theory has branched into different directions, ranging from spatial analyses to systemic models, collective efficacy is by far one of the most studied aspects within the social disorganization tradition today. Focusing on the context of social ties as a method of informal control in public spaces (Sampson 2013), collective efficacy is defined as the capacity of a community to deal with internal problems, maintain trust and supervision. Low levels of collective efficacy can reflect mistrust, lack of monitoring over communal property and youth groups, and an inability to internally resolve communal issues/disputes. Because levels of social cohesion and trust within a community are stable over time, collective efficacy can be reflective of communal well-being (Sampson 2013; Moreoff, Sampson, and Raudenbush 2001; Maimon and Browning 2010). The process of collective efficacy can occur at the micro level (interactions among individuals) and at the macro level (structural interactions within the community), making it one of the few multi-level theories in Criminology.

The potential impact that collective efficacy (informal social control) and institutional based control (formal social control) has on violence and deviant behavior in public spaces has been established in the literature, primarily in neighborhoods (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997; Morenoff, Sampson, and Raudenbush 2001; Sampson, Morenoff, and Earls 1999; Browning and Dietz 2004; Maimon and Browning 2010; Mazerolle, Wicks, and McBroom 2010), and schools (Kirk 2009; Barchia and Bussey 2011; Sapouna 2010; Jex and Gudanowski 1992; Williams and Guerra 2011). Scholars are also pursuing collective efficacy in other ones, like the

police (Hsieh, Chen, Lee, and Kao 2012). For example, a study on police officers found that that high levels of collective efficacy had a positive effect on the development of individual self-efficacy and both individual and group performance (Hsieh, Chen, Lee, and Kao 2012). Correctional facilities, I argue, are another vital place for study.

The origin of collective efficacy is tied to Albert Bandura's concept of self-efficacy. Bandura considered both collective efficacy and self-efficacy to be two distinct concepts that play interrelated yet distinct roles in the accomplishment of tasks. Self-efficacy, according to Bandura, is the perceived ability that an individual can accomplish pursuits of self-interest (Bandura 1997). However, individuals do not exist alone, but in a social world in which interaction with others is instrumental in success. Bandura notes the multi-level nature and importance of collective efficacy stating, "the strength of families, communities, organizations, social institutions, and even nations lies partly in people's sense of collective efficacy that they can solve the problems they face and improve their lives through a united effort" (Bandura 1997:477) Within organizations of confinement, correctional officers rely on each other to ensure safety and resolve problems; therefore, collective efficacy may play a vital role in successful formal and informal work relations.

Literature Review

Correctional Environments as Places

"Place is thus a fluid rather than a fixed concept, but research has to start somewhere" (Sampson 2013:8). With this statement, Sampson acknowledges that the definition that is assigned to any place is capable of being modified for the purposes of

research and to address an empirical question. Although collective efficacy began as a concept that referred to the social bonds and interaction of residents within neighborhoods, the definition of “neighborhood” was and is contested. Munford (1954:258 cited in Sampson 2013:3) believes that a neighborhood exists in “some primitive, inchoate fashion...wherever human beings congregate” while McKenzie (1921:344-5 cited in Sampson 2013:6) considers the term to be one of the most difficult concept to define. Collective efficacy within institutional settings, such as schools and police departments, confirms the presence of informal social control and cohesion in other places ripe for research by establishing that settings outside of the neighborhood lend themselves to an analysis focused on social cohesion and trust. In both schools and police departments institutional actors of various statuses (i.e. teachers, students, officers and supervisors) work together to achieve educational and policing goals, respectively (Williams and Guerra 2011; Hsieh et al. 2012).

Correctional institutions can also be analyzed as a place of research where the keepers and the kept, in spite of distinct power dynamics and institutional status, experience similar environmental stressors that impact their overall well-being. Because correctional facilities are structures that create a space in which staff interact, bond and resolve problems that arise as a result of being exposed to the same conditions applying the collective efficacy framework to this place makes sense. Within neighborhoods the direct relationship between traits of social disorganization and crime has been proven to be mediated by collective efficacy. In incarceration settings, the relationship between employee work perceptions may also be impacted by collective efficacy.

Correctional Officers: Promoting Social Control

The role of a correctional staff is to ensure the security of the facility while maintaining order among the supervised population. This must be accomplished at the individual and group level, requiring correctional staff to work well alone and in conjunction with others. Correctional officer training, for example, emphasizes the importance of retaining control over inmates from the beginning. Combat training educates correctional officers on the proper way to physically control detainees. Furthermore, education on correctional legislation such as the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 highlights the formal sanction process of violations within the institution. While recognizing that correctional institutions often prefer and train officers to utilize formal sanctions, informal sanctions are methods of control as well. Although there is a risk of “institutional friction” between different actors within the facility vying for formal and informal forms of control, Marquart (1986) examined the way Norwegian prison guards’ exercise informal control in their everyday interactions with inmates. Guards formulated a complicated system of favors where inmates are controlled through informal rewards. In this way, there is maintenance of social order and an increase in a more agreeable social environment through an informal system of removing rewards within the correctional facility (Marquart 1986).

Separate from formal training and procedures, collective efficacy is a form of informal social control that exists among correctional officers, as they come to share the common goal of maintaining order within the facility. In fact, the importance of peer interactions among correctional staff in determining levels of social support and burnout was explored by researchers (Carlson and Thomas 2006; Lambert, Paoine, Hogan and Baker 2007). Lambert and colleagues in 2007 defined burnout as a combination of emotional exhaustion, ineffectiveness in job performance and feeling

as if one has no control of a situation. In their study, each dimension of burnout was influenced by different types of social support including that from family-and-friends, management, supervisors, and coworkers. Directly relating to the process of collective efficacy, the authors note that coworker support cannot exist without mutual trust and intimacy among staff. Additionally, coworker support was the only type that influenced the burnout dimension of ineffectiveness in dealing with work-related obstacles (Lambert et. al 2007). In sum, research on corrections work emphasizes the vital connection between correctional employment and informal social control.

Correctional Officers: Mutual Trust and Social Cohesion

Charged with the safety and security of a facility, officers are not only responsible for the supervision of inmates, but are expected to keep watch over their fellow coworkers and respond in times of distress. The codependent nature of the relationship between correctional officers must include a sense of mutual trust and confidence in ability or efficacy. Without both, an officer may feel isolated, unsupported and completely independent in a work environment that requires a level of social support in order to be successful. When recruited, officers are trained on the procedurally appropriate ways to conduct oneself on the job. Recruits are also socialized by veteran colleagues regarding the values, methods, and expectations of the guard culture (Crouch 1980; Lerman 2013). The correctional system is plagued by high turnover rates of officers that are unsuccessful in adjusting to the various stressors and demands innate of the occupation. Crouch defines turnover as the “result of a complex process of interaction between highly heterogeneous and unskilled guard force and a highly in-grown somewhat inflexible and very demanding prison regime” (Crouch 1980:288). Quality social ties among institutional actors are important in

building collective efficacy which impacts levels of job performance and job satisfaction. Social cohesion is therefore important in correctional employment.

In sum, correctional facilities and staff can be analyzed with theoretical frameworks traditionally applied to neighborhoods and residents because the macro and micro interactions are constructed in similar ways. The presence of collective efficacy within corrections communities can greatly impact the experiences of correctional officer as the inherent duties of the job are require a willingness to work together in order to handle stressful conditions and resolve problems. If the organizational structure of facilities do not foster collective efficacy, job performance may be negatively affected.

Correctional Facilities as Gendered Institutions

Literature has grounded incarceration institutions firmly within the gendered institutions literature by identifying gendered concepts that are both covert and apparent (Britton 2003; Morash 2006; Belknap 1996). In her book, *At Work in the Iron Cage*, Britton thoroughly applies the gendered institution framework to the organizational structure of prisons, coming to the well supported conclusion that incarceration institutions are inherently masculine (Britton 2003; Morash 2006; Belknap 1996). Because the structure of prisons often require shift work and long hours, it places value on work demands over familial obligations which traditionally may be more appealing to men rather than women. Additionally, it is often assumed that males are better suited to handle physical work assignments leaving female officers designated to assignments with less inmate contact such as control rooms, visiting areas and clerical desks. A system of honoring masculinity directly impedes women's promotion trajectory in comparison to that of a man's (Britton 2003;

Belknap 1996; Newbold 2005). Individuals who are able to work extended hours and who frequently interact with offenders are more likely to be promoted and to be male (Britton 2003). Gendered assignment distribution as well as an organization's structural approach to managing the inmate population impacts correctional officers' job experiences overall. In 1999, the Office of Justice Programs announced the standard for correctional programs in order to make institutional reforms move towards a more gender relevant structure. Programs should be "based on supporting women in relationships, providing them with good role models and mentors" (Office of Justice programs 1999: 25). Although purposed to impact the way corrections institutions process and support female offenders, this declaration called for changes in female correctional employee tasks as well. Under the guise of being gender neutral, female correctional officers were expected to serve as *models and mentors* for the confined population which can put a greater burden on them than their male counterparts. This example illustrates how policy regarding the organizational structure of corrections can enforce gender differences for employees. As a multi-level theory, collective efficacy pairs well with a framework that considers the gendered nature of the correctional setting as both acknowledge macro-level conditions that have micro level consequences. Structurally, institutions may either facilitate or inhibit the formation of collective efficacy through the establishment of policies and programs which can directly impact individual employee's gendered experiences on-the-job.

Collective Efficacy and Work Performance

Prior literature has linked collective efficacy to positive work outcomes (Feltz and Lirgg 1998; Little and Madigan 1997; Jenson, Holten, Karpatschhof and Albertsen

2011; Ayree, Burdhwari and Chen 2002; Hsieh et al 2012). In a study of the efficacy of a hockey team, Feltz and Lirgg found that team efficacy increased after a win and decreased after a loss (1998). Little and Madigan's 1997 study also found that higher efficacy is related to higher levels of work performance among self-managed work teams in a manufacturing setting. And in 2011, Jensen and colleagues examined collective efficacy's ability to moderate the relationship between physical work load and intention to quit (Jensen, Holten, Karpatschhof and Albertsen 2011). The authors found that employees that reported a higher physical workload were less likely to have intentions on leaving their jobs if they believed their workgroup had high levels of collective efficacy. Similarly, trust, a key factor of collective efficacy, was found to either fully or partially mediate the relationships between employees' perceived justice and work attitudes, job satisfaction and turnover commitment (Ayree, Burdhwari, and Chen 2002). This means that if employees find coworkers and/or supervisors more trustworthy, they are more likely to have positive feelings towards their job overall. To moderate negative outcomes, all three studies suggest organizational enhancements of collective efficacy among groups.

Although collective efficacy has been linked to positive work outcomes in the literature, the extent of benefit may vary by group composition (Fernandez-Ballesteros, Dietz-Niccolas, Caprara, Barbaranelli, and Bandura 2002; Lin and Perg 2010; Lee and Farh 2004). While there is some support that diversity in groups leads to higher levels of collective efficacy, this benefit may become evident over time. In their 2004 study, Lee and Farh demonstrate that initially homogenous groups seemed to have higher levels of collective efficacy when asked to perform a collective task. This changed over time as groups of mixed gender scored better on collective efficacy

measures (Lee and Farh 2004). This directly relates to correctional institutions hiring both males and females. Although initially there was doubt regarding the role, purpose and capability of women working within corrections (Britton 2003; Belknap 1996; Morash 2006), it is possible that as time passes, collective efficacy levels among correctional officers will increase.

Given the linkages between collective efficacy, demands of correctional employment and work outcomes, this study contributes to this gap in the literature by analyzing collective efficacy among correctional staff. As studies have shown heterogeneity among employees' work perceptions, sex differences will also be explored when justified by analysis. The following three hypothesis will be pursued: (1) Collective efficacy exists within corrections institutions; (2) Types of work perceptions among correctional staff are related to levels of collective efficacy; and, (3) Given the gendered nature of corrections, there will be differences in levels of collective efficacy based on sex.

Data and Methodology

Data were collected from the Delaware Department of Correction, hereafter DDOC, through the assistance of the Center of Drug and Health Studies (CDHS) of the University of Delaware. Using the online software Qualtrics, an electronic survey was created, heavily influenced by Sampson 1997's original collective efficacy survey (Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls 1997). Additional survey items were pulled from several studies that explored social cohesion, informal social control, staff perceptions and law enforcement employees' difficulty in balancing work and family life (Williams and Guerra 2011; Lehman, Greener and Simpson 2002; Garner, Knight and Simpson 2007; Broome, Knight, Edwards and Flynn 2009; Griffin 2013). Also

influential, Britton's (2003) work on the impacts of the masculinity of correctional institutions on staff provided insight on how to structure several open-ended items. Prior to data collection, the University of Delaware's Institutional Review Board ruled the project as exempt from IRB review in accordance with federal regulations (619011-3 Collective Efficacy among Corrections Employees: MA Thesis). Additionally, DDOC administrators were asked for access to staff email as well as their professional opinions on the structure and language of the instrument in order to be most applicable to their system.

The survey was distributed via email to all DDOC employees who were full-time and had been issued a DOC email address. Recipients of the instrument included all five branches of the Department of Correction, a total population of 2,421 employees. The five branches or levels include: (1) administrative supervision, (2) standard probation, (3) intensive probation supervision, (4) work release centers, home confinement (electronic monitoring), residential drug treatment, violation of probation centers and (5) 24-hour incarceration. The survey was open for a period of 1 month, being redistributed during the second and fourth weeks of the data collection period. Consistent with ethical standards, participation was voluntary and respondents were also not compensated. The response rate for the electronic survey was 28% (N=686). The average response rate for electronic surveys ranges from 11-33% (Penwarden 2014; Nulty 2008; Monroe and Adams 2012). Therefore, the response rate for this study is considered acceptable for the method used. Sampling analysis is provided later in this document.

Measures

Questions (or items) on the instrument were adapted to capture a range of work perception concepts including the two key elements of collective efficacy: informal social control and social cohesion/trust. Aside from demographics, this analysis exclusively uses items whose responses were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1-Strongly Disagree to 5-Strongly Agree, with 3 being a neutral category (neither agree nor disagree). An alpha scale was created for items that represented the same theoretical construct. A series of steps, including an examination of correlations and comparison of alphas were calculated and re-calculated for construct computation. A total of nine indexes were created that serve as key variables in the analyses. They are: negative work, happy work, opinion of administration, opinion of staff, self-efficacy, work/family balance and collective efficacy, informal social control and social cohesion. Each variable captures a unique theoretical concept (discussed below). Detailed information on each index used in the series of analyses can be found in Appendix B.

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables in this analysis were types of work perceptions labelled negative work and happy work. The negative work perception index was comprised of eighteen items including you feel depressed, you feel energized (RC) and you feel like you aren't making a difference. The index was constructed so that higher scores reflected more negative perceptions of work overall. The second dependent variable was happy work which consisted of the following three items: you are proud to tell others where you work, you are appreciated for the job you do at

work and you are satisfied with your present job. In this case, higher scores reflect more positive perceptions of work.

Independent Variables

Collective Efficacy

As established in previous work, the multidimensionality of collective efficacy justifies separate and inclusive analyses of its different dimensions (informal social control and social cohesion and trust). Informal social control is operationalized as staff's perceptions of the willingness of their coworkers to assist in various situations. The index for informal social control was comprised of four items including coworkers would help if: a supervisor is mistreating me and a coworker is being harassed by another employee on-line. Social cohesion is captured by asking staff's opinions of coworkers' level of agreement and ability to work together. It should also be noted that social cohesion as measured here also captures the element of trust in collective efficacy. Examples of the items that created the social cohesion index include: (1) employees in your institution work together as a team and (2) mutual trust and cooperation among employees in your institution are strong. Considering multidimensionality, indexes for informal social control and social cohesion were combined to form a collective efficacy index. On all three of these indexes (collective efficacy, informal social control or social cohesion) higher scores reflect an increase in the overall perception of the concept in question.

Self-Efficacy

Earlier in the literature review, Bandura's work states that it is important to capture both self and collective efficacy. Bandura's concept of self-efficacy is

captured in an index comprised of three items. The higher respondents scored on this measure, the more she or he believe in their own ability to accomplish tasks of self-interest. An example of a self-efficacy item included in the index is “you consistently plan ahead and carry out your plans.”

Work/Family Balance

To capture difficulties correctional staff face in managing their home lives with the demands of their jobs, the “Work Family Balance” index was formed from six items including: the demands of my work interfere with my home and family life and things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me. In this instance, higher scores reflect an increase in difficulty balancing home and family life.

Work-Related Variables

Two work-related scales were included as independent variables to account for influences on types of work perceptions influenced by correctional facilities. Opinion of Administration was a 6-item index where a higher score reflected a more positive perception of administrators. Examples of items included in this scale include: the administration at this facility/district office: (1) is doing a good job in dealing with problems that really concern employees and (2) is not able to maintain order (RC). On the Opinion of Staff index higher scores also meant respondents perceived their peers in a more positive way. This index was created from 5 items, some of which include (1) employees in your facility are well-trained and (2) frequent staff turnover is a problem at your facility (RC).

Demographic Variables

The demographic variables collected were sex, age, education level, race, whether or not respondent works in a prison and tenure in corrections/at current institution of employment. Due to missing data, some demographic variables (marital status, employment within prison, and both tenure measures) were dropped from analysis. It should be noted that none of the demographics that were removed from the analysis were significant in the all-inclusive model. Two demographic variables are used for race, White and Black are dichotomized, representing Whites and Blacks in contrast to other racial groups, respectively. Due to this conceptual difference, both were used in the final model. Descriptive statistics for all of the variables included in each phase of the analysis can be found in Table 1.

Analysis

The statistical software package STATA Version 11 was used to analyze the data. Univariate and preliminary analysis, as mentioned above, ultimately resulted in 12 independent variables (5 conceptual, 5 demographic and 2 work-related) for analysis. The majority of respondents identified as White and Male, 74% and 67% respectively. The sample ranged in ages with participants age 56 and above making up 13% of the population. Demographic comparisons between survey participants and DDOC employees did not show any major statistical differences. Therefore, findings should be generalizable to DDOC employees as a whole. To maintain confidentiality in the relatively small respondent pool, distinction between correctional officers and correctional staff were not made. However, data does allow this study to establish whether or not collective efficacy exists within a correctional setting and, furthermore, if it has an impact on types of work perceptions.

Appendix B shows details on the construction of each index created. All alphas aside from Opinion of Staff are above .7, the standard for index creation. Opinion of Staff had an alpha of .68, and was left in the analysis due to its distinction from respondents' opinions of their administrators and its relevance to the key conceptual focus of collective efficacy index. Respondent's feelings towards peers may directly relate to the extent him or her feels bonded to coworkers (social cohesion). Appendix A shows collective efficacy alphas for studies on a variety of topics ranging from .72 to .88. In this study, the alpha for the collective efficacy index is .81, which fits nicely into the expectations of alpha scores set by past research.

The correlation matrix in Table 2 shows the extent to which each variable used in the model is independent of each other. As mentioned above, Black and White both capture dimensions of race, but because they are coded as binary variables they were both left in the final model due to significant differences in conceptual meanings. The multidimensionality of collective efficacy further explains why the informal social control index was so highly correlated with the collective efficacy index, further justifying the two concepts being analyzed in separate models. Additionally, variance inflation factors were calculated for variables included in each step of the nested regression and all were found to be under the standard of 4. In sum, multicollinearity is not a methodological problem in the multivariate analysis. Because the two dependent variables being analyzed were indexes and such responses are considered consecutive integers rather than ordinal responses, a series of nested ordinary least squared (OLS) regressions were chosen as the best method of analysis. Additionally, tests to ensure homoskedasticity were performed with each step of the analysis. When

heteroskedasticity, or the unequal variability of variables, was found, robust standard errors were used.

Two separate series of analysis were conducted for each dependent variable, types of perceptions of work. Nested regression allows the separate impact of variables to be observed in a clear way. Model 1 for each dependent variable includes demographic, work-related, work/family balance and the self-efficacy measures. The second model in the step-wise regression, adds the collective-efficacy index to original model. Model 3 removes the collective-efficacy variable from analysis and includes instead its two key elements: informal social control and social cohesion. These three models were conducted for each dependent variable (happy work and negative work) separately.

Table 5 shows the regression results of male and female officers separately. The supplemental model included informal social control and social cohesion as separate variables. Z-scores were calculated to determine if the coefficients for each independent variable have significantly different impacts on male and female correctional staff.

Results

Happy Work

The step-wise regression results for the happy work outcome can be found in Table 3. Demographic control variables were not significant influences on positive work perceptions of correctional staff. In Model 1, all work-related independent variables were significant in determining levels of positive feeling about work. As respondents' opinion of administration improved, their positive perceptions of work

increased, holding all other variables constant. Controlling for all other variables, opinion of staff led to a more positive overall perception with work. Respondents who reported higher levels of belief in their own abilities, self-efficacy, were more likely to perceive work positively when controlling for all other variables. In contrast, those respondents who reported more difficulty maintaining balance between work and family life reported less positive perceptions of work overall after controlling for all other variables. Model 1 explained 39.6% of the variance in positive work perceptions among respondents.¹

Adding collective efficacy to the analysis in Model 2 increases the variance explained to 42.8%, making it a better model fit by 3.2%. In the second regression analysis, again all work-related variables and self-efficacy have independent, significant, positive relationships with the happy work index, holding all other variables constant. Also in line with the previous model, correctional staff that had more difficulty maintaining a work/family balance had lower scores on the happy work index, controlling for all other variables. Holding all other variables constant, collective efficacy had a significant, positive relationship with positive work perceptions among correctional staff. That is, an increase in collective efficacy is related to an increase in positive work perception.

¹The variance explained in the final model is 41.4%, slightly less than that explained by the collective efficacy model. This decrease in explained variance is noteworthy because it justifies collective efficacy as a meaningful joint concept rather than assessing it in parts.

Analyzing the elements of collective efficacy, rather than the combined concept, generated interesting results in Model 3. The opinion of administration, opinion of staff, self-efficacy and work/family balance indexes all maintained their significance in the expected and aforementioned directions. However, only the informal social control variable significantly impacts correctional staff's positive perceptions of work. This suggests that informal social control is the driving force behind collective efficacy within correctional institutions. Respondents reported a more positive perception of work if they also believed there were higher levels of informal social control in their place of employment, controlling for all other variables.

Negative Work

Table 4 shows the results of a series of OLS regression models for the dependent variable negative work. Note that in each of the negative work analyses, robust regression was used due to heteroskedasticity, or the inconsistency of variance among the independent variables. Unlike in the previous set of analyses, both gender and race of respondent are influential throughout the step-wise regression in determining correctional staff's overall negative feelings about work. In general, controlling for all other variables, females and Whites reported more negative perceptions of work than males and other races, respectively. Model 1 explains 44.5% of the variance among respondents. Controlling for all other variables, respondents who had a positive opinion of administration reported less negative perceptions of work. In the same regard, those staff members who thought well of their peers also perceived work in a less negative way, holding all else constant. As respondents' feeling of self-efficacy increased, their negative feelings about work decreased.

Correctional staff that have more difficulty balancing work and family life had more negative perceptions of work overall.

The second step in the series of negative regressions adds collective efficacy to the analysis. Model 2 has a better model-fit than its predecessor explaining 45.3% of the variance. Here again the variables Sex, White, Opinion of Administration, Opinion of Staff, Self-Efficacy and Work/Family Balance maintain their significance with the negative work variable and in the aforementioned directions. Collective efficacy is modestly significant, having an inverse relationship with the negative work dependent variable.

Model 3 analyzed the negative work outcome using the key elements of collective efficacy and further improved the model-fit with an R^2 value of .454. In this model, the informal social control index is modestly significant. Here respondents that reported higher levels of informal control within their employment facilities were likely to perceive work in a less negative manner holding all else constant. The social cohesion index is not significant at all. Although the significance level for both collective efficacy and informal social control is less powerful than those found when analyzing positive perceptions of work, these findings again confirm that informal social control may be more influential than social cohesion among correctional staff work perceptions.

A Gendered Analysis of Correctional Settings

The gendered analysis separated men and women respondents and focused on the negative work index as the dependent variable because the sex variable showed interesting results in the original analysis. The supplemental analyses explained 42.5% and 56.4% of the variance of negative work perceptions among male and female

respondents, respectively. This section focuses on the gendered results relating to the conceptual variables of work/family balance, self-efficacy, informal social control and social cohesion. Regardless of gender, correctional staff that reported an increase in difficulty balancing personal and work-related matters had an increase in negative perceptions of work. Male correctional staff who felt they had higher levels of self-efficacy reported a decrease in negative work perceptions, holding all other variables constant. Informal social control also had a significant negative relationship with negative work perceptions among male respondents. Social cohesion was not significant in the male analysis. Self-efficacy, informal social control and social cohesion were insignificant for the female analysis. Therefore, no element of efficacy, self or collective, was influential on female correctional staff negative perceptions of work. For men, informal social control, not social cohesion, played a role in determining overall negative work views.

Discussion

This study explored the existence and impact of collective efficacy within correctional institutions on types of work perceptions of corrections staff. Previous research has established collective efficacy exists beyond neighborhood boundaries into other places but not within correctional facilities as a place of employment. The results in this study confirm hypothesis 1 by firmly establishing collective efficacy within correctional facilities and further explores its impact on staff perceptions. Correctional employees that feel a higher sense of collective efficacy rate work conditions in a more positive way. Interestingly, the significance level of collective efficacy's impact on negative perspectives among staff was more modest than for positive viewpoints. In other words, negative feelings about work are not alleviated

with the same force as positive perspectives are encouraged by collective efficacy. Future researchers may want to explore other mechanisms that may be more impactful in decreasing employee's negative perceptions of corrections work.

For both aspects of work perceptions, happy and negative work, informal social control was significant in determining the outcome, while social cohesion was not. Informal social control may serve as the driving force behind collective efficacy in corrections work. This is contrary to the way collective efficacy manifests in other institutions. Within schools social cohesion and trust, not informal social control, plays the most important role in understanding bullying variations within schools (Williams and Guerra 2011). While schools, have a structured control system that regulates and punishes outcomes, social cohesion and trust between students, teachers and administrators proved to be most important in decreasing negative outcomes. Correctional facilities strongly emphasize measures of control. The institutions themselves represent society's formalized way of punishing individuals found guilty of violated the law. This emphasis may explain how informal social control outweighs social cohesion in determining the attitudes of correctional officers. Therefore, the environment itself may cause collective efficacy to look different. The changes in the amount of variance explained by the happy work models 2 and 3 suggest that although one element (informal social control) may be the driving force behind collective efficacy in correctional institutions, it is still important to analyze the joint concept rather than in pieces. Future researchers should continue to study the concept of collective efficacy as a whole and in parts in order to better understand the mechanism.

Work-related variables, on the other hand, had a consistent significant impact on both types of work perspectives among correctional employees. Structural rather than social conditions may need to be the focal point for improving adverse opinions towards work. Correctional institutions, therefore, may bear the burden of the responsibility in improving work conditions that will in turn improve work perceptions among staff. Independently, self-efficacy has a positive correlation with optimistic feelings about work and a negative correlation with adverse perspectives in every step of the nested-regression series. Therefore, correctional staff members are empowered overall if they feel confident with their personal skills and abilities. This highlights the importance of continued corrections training at the individual level. Bandura's linkage between self- and collective efficacy included the fact that individual's self-efficacy can be maintained while participating in collective actions towards a common goal. Correctional facilities should be sure to foster and encourage both types of efficacy in order to maximize the likelihood of positive work outcomes.

There were no demographic control variables that influenced positive perspectives among employees. Age and education level were not significant in the negative outcome analyses. Additionally, in preliminary analysis the removed demographic variables (prison employment, marital status and tenure) did not significantly impact the dependent variables. These findings of general insignificance for demographic considerations on correctional staff attitudes align with the literature which states that correctional officers will have similar perceptions regarding general work attitudes, meaning that male and female COs are more similar than dissimilar (Britton 2003; Martin and Jurik 2007; Lambert et al. 2007). In the series of negative

work analyses, significant gender differences emerged which justified supplemental analysis.

Because correctional institutions are firmly grounded as masculine places, the gendered experiences that correctional staff experience may account for divergent types of work perceptions. For instance, literature shows that women are less likely than men to have supportive, informal relationships with supervisors, known as “daddies” or “sponsors”, who will assist them in their upward movement within the corrections organization. The benefits of informal networks made from social interaction between employees are not equally available to staff, especially minorities and females who hold “othered” statuses within the institutions (Britton 2003; Martin and Jurik 2007). Additionally, female respondents with a high school education reported more negative feelings than their counterparts. Education level was not influential in the male analysis. Females may experience more structural obstacles than males at work, perceiving their lack of education as a detriment. Being a male may benefit correctional officers because of the masculine nature of the institution, which places female and male employees in certain roles as a result of gender beliefs about capability. Females did not experience any form of efficacy, self nor collective, while males reported a sense of self efficacy and informal social control. Because correctional facilities are masculine, male staff members may find collective efficacy available to them in ways that their female counterparts do not, confirming hypothesis 3. It is important that correctional institutions be aware and reactive to gender biases inherent in structural components of their facilities in order for all staff members to benefit from mechanisms such as collective efficacy. It is hoped that future research will flesh out diverse opinions of correctional officers to reflect the range of

involvement, roles and challenges of working within a gendered institution using quantitative and qualitative approaches.

Limitations

While this study contributes to the literature by establishing collective efficacy in corrections, there are important limitations to address. Because the survey is electronic, only correctional staff that had access to a DOC email address during the month of data collection were eligible to participate in the study. This may limit the respondent pool to those who are younger, more familiar with technology, and are eligible for a DDOC email account. Although no significant differences between the DDOC correctional staff and survey respondents were found, making the survey available for a longer period of time and through multiple forms of access may have assisted in overcoming this limitation. Additionally, using an electronic distribution method resulted in a relatively low response rate 28%. Future research may consider doing multiple forms of survey distribution in order to increase respondent participation. The state of Delaware is a convenient location due to the connections within correctional settings available through the Center of Drug and Health Studies. Delaware is a small state that has a unified corrections system, some housing a mixed conviction status population. This is not reflective of the majority of United States whose incarceration facilities include both jails (housing pre- and post-conviction detainees sentenced to less than 1 year) and prisons (housing convicted inmates sentenced to over 1 year). The Delawarean system may offer correctional officers a unique experience that is not common in the United States. Therefore, the results found in this study may not be generalizable. Also, individuals' perceptions prior to employment may impact how work perceptions, rather than work experiences solely

impact those perceptions. Future research that contrasts employee perceptions of work from time of hire with viewpoints after years in employment would hopefully counter external influences. Additionally, the quantitative methods utilized in this study cannot fully capture gendered experiences of collective efficacy among staff. To do this thoroughly, qualitative methods would be wisely implemented. Lastly, it is important to consider that levels of collective efficacy may be shaped by both individuals and institutions; causality cannot be inferred.

Translational Implications

Sampson and colleagues state three mandatory considerations that researchers must include in a translational suggestion: (1) mechanisms and pathways; (2) effect heterogeneity; and, (3) contextualization (Sampson, Winship, and Knight 2013). This study focuses on how collective efficacy impacts the work perceptions of corrections employees. Applying Sampson and associates' suggestions to the findings of this study, the implications of these results can inform and improve the practices and policies of corrections institutions. Because collective efficacy is a structural characteristic, it is suggested that institutional level policies and practices are implemented that facilitate and encourage collective efficacy in hopes that culture and individual agency will be impacted in turn. In other words, if the organizational structure of incarceration institutions can intertwine elements of trust, cohesion and informal social control into programs and training available to correctional officers, work experiences may improve overall. Although this study found that informal social control is the driving force behind collective efficacy within corrections, it is important to continue to foster all elements of the concept to maximize its potential impact.

Supplemental gendered analysis suggests that collective efficacy is more available to male officers than female officers perhaps because the corrections system honors masculinity in its organizational structure, culture and agency (Britton 2003). If corrections facilities hired more female officers, offered training that emphasized perceived feminine (interpersonal communication) and masculine (physical restraint) qualities equally and provided family support services (child care and family planning), they would foster a sense of concern and ability in handling gendered issues. Placing value on “feminine” matters validates and encourages cohesion among diverse officers, therefore enhancing a feeling of collective efficacy. Literature has shown that increasing “female participation in organizational, political and legislative activities likely to reduce gender gap in perceived efficacy to influence institutional practices” (Fernando-Ballesteros et al. 2002:120). Ultimately, in order to foster higher levels of collective efficacy overall, practical suggestions for improvements must consider the heterogeneous nature of work and life experiences of correctional officers. Corrections employees will require a range of support resources to increase levels of collective efficacy, meaning there is no absolute way to ensure individuals perceive coworkers, the institution and themselves in efficacious ways. While offering collective efficacy services to officers may be important in increasing positive work outcomes overall, the nature of these suggestions must be practical in their manifestation and work well with the goals of the corrections system itself. It is suggested that institutions consider both diversity and contextualization when developing collective efficacy programs in order to better cater to the unique needs of their staff and facility.

Conclusion

In all, the stressful conditions of incarceration impact both the keepers and the kept. Collective efficacy is present within correctional institutions and may be driven in large part by the informal control component in these facilities. Additionally, correctional staff do not experience collective efficacy homogenously. Translational implications must consider the diversity and purpose of the corrections system and its employees in order to be practical and successful. Future research is encouraged to include more qualitative methodological procedures in order to capture nuances of diverse work experiences. Additionally, scholars should continue to analyze collective efficacy both inclusively and in parts in order to flesh out the inner workings of the mechanism which may differ depending on environment. It is hoped that applying the collective efficacy framework to correctional officers may enlighten scholars and professionals on how to improve work outcomes within incarceration institutions, further diminishing the substantial and detrimental effects of mass incarceration.

TABLES

Table 1 Univariate Statistics

Variable	Description	N	%	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev.
Negative Work	18-item index; $\alpha=.83$	447		42	73	58.45	5.29
Happy Work	3-item index; $\alpha=.81$	472		3	15	8.78	3.19
Sex	0=Male, 1=Female	438	67% were male				
Age 56+Up	0=Younger than 56, 1=56 or older	435	13% were 56 y/o or older				
HS/GED	0=Education level above HS/GED, 1=HS/GED	433	84% had an education level higher than HS/GED				
White	0=non-White, 1=White	432	74% were White				
Black	0=non-Black, 1=Black	432	18% were Black				
Opinion of Administration	6-item index; $\alpha=.82$	497		6	30	17.82	5.19
Opinion of Staff	5-item index; $\alpha=.68$	473		5	25	12.27	3.63
Self-Efficacy	3-item index; $\alpha=.77$	472		3	15	12.46	1.79
Work/Family Balance	6-item index; $\alpha=.93$	440		6	30	17.96	5.27
Collective Efficacy	10-item index; $\alpha=.81$	483		15	51	35.31	5.81
Informal Social Control	4-item index; $\alpha=.84$	536		4	20	11.68	4.14
Social Cohesion	6-item index; $\alpha=.76$	486		8	35	20.96	4.87

Table 2 Correlation Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1. Negative Work	1.000													
2. Happy Job	.108	1.000												
3. Sex	-.039	.010	1.000											
4. Age 56+	-.059	.044	.036	1.000										
5. HS/GED	-.056	.024	-.001	.054	1.000									
6. White	.146	.007	-.010	-.027	-.052	1.000								
7. Black	-.141	-.002	.120	-.001	.105	-.797*	1.000							
8. Opinion of Administration	-.097	.559	-.067	.082	.029	.038	-.014	1.000						
9. Opinion of Staff	-.213	.457	.050	.052	.013	.046	-.004	.515	1.000					
10. Self-Efficacy	.027	.206	.075	.054	.015	-.067	-.006	.075	.113	1.000				
11. Collective Efficacy	.135	.376	-.045	-.040	-.093	.103	-.080	.321	.299	.083	1.000			
12. Informal Social Control	.141	.209	.040	-.001	-.061	.040	-.067	.115	.096	.105	.788*	1.000		
13. Social Cohesion	.030	.352	-.059	-.040	-.045	.063	-.045	.470	.430	.104	.591	.214	1.000	
14. Work Family Balance	.068	-.310	-.101	-.117	.035	.060	-.041	-.243	-.337	-.174	-.093	-.062	-.163	1.000

Table 3 Happy Work: Multivariate Ordinary Least Square Regression Results

Happy Work	Model 1 N=390			Model 2 N=386			Model 3 N=386		
Variable	Coef.	Std. Err.	VIF	Coef.	Std. Err.	VIF	Coef.	Std. Err.	VIF
<i>Controls</i>									
Sex	.095	.282	1.04	.132	.277	1.04	.060	.282	1.05
Age 56+	-.091	.374	1.03	-.012	.367	1.03	-.055	.372	1.04
HS/GED	.234	.353	1.02	.372	.346	1.03	.291	.351	1.03
White	.004	.509	2.91	-.133	.499	2.91	.042	.506	2.91
Black	-.090	.579	2.90	-.088	.566	2.90	.040	.576	2.91
<i>Institutional Attitudes</i>									
Opinion of Administration	.257***	.029	1.40	.231***	.029	1.48	.246***	.031	1.58
Opinion of Staff	.175***	.044	1.47	.141***	.044	1.52	.165***	.045	1.58
<i>Key Concepts</i>									
Self-Efficacy	.240**	.078	1.05	.226**	.077	1.05	.222**	.078	1.06
Work Family Balance	-.082**	.027	1.20	-.084**	.027	1.20	-.079**	.027	1.20
Collective Efficacy	-	-	-	.108***	.024	1.19	-	-	-
Informal Social Control	-	-	-	-	-	-	.101**	.032	1.07
Social Cohesion	-	-	-	-	-	-	.016	.032	1.44
Mean VIF- 1.56			Mean VIF - 1.54			Mean VIF – 1.53			
R ²	.396			.428			.414		

32

Note. For a description of variables and how they were measured, see Table 1. *p≤.05. **p≤.01. ***p≤.001.

Table 4 Negative Work: Multivariate Ordinary Least Squares Regression Results

Negative Work Variable	Model 1 N=392			Model 2 N=388			Model 3 N=386		
	Coef.	Std. Err.	VIF	Coef.	Std. Err.	VIF	Coef.	Std. Err.	VIF
<i>Controls</i>									
Sex	.807**	.278	1.05	.787**	.277	1.05	.829**	.275	1.05
Age 56+	.019	.386	1.03	-.016	.384	1.03	.007	.387	1.04
HS/GED	-.448	.353	1.03	-.502	.349	1.03	-.476	.353	1.03
White	1.330**	.562	2.94	1.387**	.552	2.94	1.307**	.555	2.94
Black	.986	.637	2.94	.986	.630	2.93	.910	.636	2.94
<i>Institutional Attitudes</i>									
Opinion of Administration	-.118***	.029	1.41	-.111***	.032	1.49	-.118***	.032	1.60
Opinion of Staff	-.326***	.048	1.48	-.313***	.048	1.53	-.327***	.051	1.60
<i>Key Concepts</i>									
Self-Efficacy	-.183**	.073	1.05	-.181**	.074	1.06	-.175*	.075	1.06
Work Family Balance	.158***	.026	1.19	.159***	.026	1.19	.156***	.027	1.20
Collective Efficacy	-	-	-	-.041~	.024	1.16	-	-	-
Informal Social Control	-	-	-	-	-	-	-.061~	.033	1.06
Social Cohesion	-	-	-	-	-	-	.006	.033	1.46
Mean VIF- 1.57			Mean VIF - 1.54			Mean VIF – 1.54			
R ²	.445			.453			.454		

Note. Robust regression used due to heteroskedasticity. For a description of variables and how they were measured, see Table 1. *p≤.05. **p≤.01. ***p≤.001. ~p≤.10

Table 5 Supplemental Analysis Negative Work: Exploring Genders Differences

Variable	Males N=268			Females N=126			Z Scores
	Coef.	Std. Err.	VIF	Coef.	Std. Err.	VIF	
<i>Controls</i>							
Age 56+	-.069	.418	1.03	.023	.637	1.06	-.123
HS/GED	-.012	.387	1.05	-1.417*	.598	1.03	1.972
White	1.645**	.534	2.61	-.616	.798	3.50	3.819
Black	1.052~	.631	2.65	-.354	.920	3.32	1.382
<i>Institutional Attitudes</i>							
Opinion of Administration	-.053~	.033	1.50	-.283***	.059	1.97	3.402
Opinion of Staff	-.369~	.050	1.51	-.162	.115	1.96	-1.651
<i>Key Concepts</i>							
Self-Efficacy	-.172***	.087	1.04	-.251~	.136	1.17	.489
Work Family Balance	.143***	.030	1.18	.156***	.045	1.33	-.240
Informal Social Control	-.072*	.035	1.05	.004	.058	1.12	-1.122
Social Cohesion	.026	.035	1.41	-.025	.063	1.63	.708
	Mean VIF- 1.50			Mean VIF – 1.81			
	R ² -.425			R ² - .564			

34

Note. Robust regression used only for female analysis due to heteroskedasticity. For a description of variables and how they were measured, see Table 1. **Bold** Z scores represent significance under a two tail test, +/- 1.96 is significant *p≤.05. **p≤.01. ***p≤.001. ~p≤.10

REFERENCES

- Aryee, S.; P.S. Budhwar and Z.X. Chen. 2002. "Trust as a mediator of the relationship between organization justice and work outcomes: test of a social exchange model." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(3): 267-285.
- Bandura, A. 1997. *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Barchia, K. and K. Bussey. 2011. "Individual and Collective Social Cognitive Influences on Peer Aggression: Exploring the Contribution of Aggression Efficacy, Moral Disengagement, and Collective Efficacy." *Aggressive Behavior*, 37(2):107-120.
- Belknap, J. 1996. *The invisible woman: gender, crime and justice*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Corporation
- Britton, D. 2003. *At Work in the Iron Cage: The Prison as Gendered Organization*. New York: New York University Press
- Broome, K.M.; D.K. Knight; J.R. Edwards and P.M. Flynn. (2009). Leadership, burnout, and job satisfaction in outpatient drug-free treatment programs. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 37(2), 160-170.
- Browning, C.R. and R.D. Dietz. 2004. "The Paradox of Social Organization: Networks, Collective Efficacy, and Violent Crime in Urban Neighborhoods." *Social Forces*, 83(2): 503-534.
- Browning, C.R.; L.A. Burrington; T. Leventhal and J. Brooks-Gunn. 2008. "Neighborhood Structural Inequality, Collective Efficacy, and Sexual Risk Behavior among Urban Youth." *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 49(3):269-285.
- Carlson, J. and G. Thomas. 2006. "Burnout among Prison Caseworker and Corrections Officers." *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 43(3):19-34.
- Chen, C-H.V. and R-H. Kao. 2011. "A Multilevel Study on the Relationships Between Work Characteristics, Self-Efficacy, Collective Efficacy, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Case of Taiwanese Police Duty-Executing Organizations." *The Journal of Psychology*, 145(4):361-390.
- Crouch, B.M. 1980. *The Keepers: Prison Guards and Contemporary Corrections*. Springfield Ill.: Thomas.
- Duncan, T.E.; S.C. Duncan; H. Okut; L.A. Strycker and H. Hix-Small. 2003. "A Multilevel Contextual Model of Neighborhood Collective Efficacy." *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 32(3/4):245-252.
- Feltz, D.L and C.D. Lirgg. (1998). "Perceived Team and Player Efficacy in Hockey." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(4): 557-564.

- Fernandez-Ballesteros, R.; J. Diez-Niccolas; G.V. Caprara; C. Barbaranelli and A. Bandura. 2002. "Determinants and Structural Relation of Personal Efficacy to Collective Efficacy." *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 51(1): 107-125.
- Garner, B. R.; K. Knight and D.D. Simpson. (2007). Burnout among corrections-based drug treatment staff: Impact of individual and organizational factors. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 51(5), 510-522.
- Griffin, J.D. 2013. "Are we protecting those who protect us?: Stress and law enforcement in the 21st century." Dissertation at the University of Delaware
- Hsieh W.C.; C.H.V. Chen; C.C. Lee and R.H. Kao. 2012. "Work Characteristics and Police Officers' Performance: Exploring the Moderating Effect of Social Work Characteristics and Collective Efficacy in Multilevel Analysis." *Policing*, 35(3):615-641.
- Jensen, J.N.; A.L. Holten; B. Karpatschof and K. Albertsen. (2011). "Does collective efficacy moderate the associations between physical work load and intention to leave or sickness absence?" *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. 67(11): 2425-2434.
- Jex, S.M. and D.M. Gudanowski. 1992. "Efficacy Beliefs and Work Stress: An Exploratory Study." *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13(5):509-517.
- Kirk, D.S. 2009. "Unraveling the Contextual Effects on Student Suspension and Juvenile Arrest: The Independent and Interdependent Influences of School, Neighborhood, and Family Social Controls." *Criminology*, 47(2):479-520.
- Lambert, E.; E.A. Paoine, III; N.L. Hogan and D.N. Baker. 2007. "Gender Similarities and Differences in Correctional Staff Work Attitudes and Perceptions of the Work Environment." *Western Criminology Review*, 8(1), 16-31.
- Lee, C. and J.L. Farh. 2004. Joint Effects of Group Efficacy and Gender Diversity on Group Cohesion and Performance. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 53(1): 136-154.
- Lehman, W. E. K.; J.M. Greener and D.D. Simpson. (2002). Assessing organizational readiness for change. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 22(4), 197-209
- Lerman, A.E. 2013. *The Modern Prison Paradox: Politics, Punishment and Social Community*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lin, C. and T.K. Peng. 2009. From Organizational Citizenship Behavior to Team Performance: The Mediation of Group Cohesion and Collective Efficacy. *Management and Organization Review*, 6(1): 55-75.
- Little, B.L. and Madigan, R.M. 1997. "The Relationship Between Collective Efficacy and Performance in Manufacturing Work Teams." *Small Group Research*, 28(4): 517-534.

- Maimon, D. and C.R. Browning. 2010. "Unstructured Socializing, Collective Efficacy, and Violent Behavior Among Urban Youth." *Criminology*, 48(2):443-474.
- Martin, S.E. and N.C. Jurik. 2007. *Doing justice, doing gender: Women in legal and criminal justice occupations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Marquart J.W. 1986. "Prison Guards and the Use of Physical Coercion as a Mechanism of Prisoner Control." *Criminology*, 24(2):347-366.
- Mazerolle, L.; R. Wickes and J. McBroom. 2010. "Community Variations in Violence: The Role of Social Ties and Collective Efficacy in Comparative Context." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 47(1):3-30.
- Miller, S.L.; K.B. Forest and N.C. Jurik. 2003. Diversity in blue: Job and gender issues among lesbian and gay police officers. *Men & Masculinities*, 5(4): 355-385.
- Monroe, M.M. and D.C. Adams. 2012. "Increasing Response Rates to Web-Based Surveys." *Journal of Extension*, 50(6): Article Number 6TOT7.
- Morash, M. 2006. *Understanding gender, crime and justice*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications
- Morenoff J.D.; R.J. Sampson and S.W. Raudenbush. 2001. "Neighborhood Inequality, Collective Efficacy, and the Spatial Dynamics of Urban Violence." *Criminology*, 39(3):517-558.
- Newbold, G. 2005. "Women Officers Working in Men's Prisons." *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand Te Puna Whakaaro*. 25:105-117.
- Nulty, D.D. 2008. "The adequacy of response rates to online and paper surveys: what can be done?" *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 33(3):301-314.
- Oggers, C.L.; T.E. Moffitt; L.M. Tach; R.J. Sampson; A. Taylor and C.L. Matthews. 2009. "The Protective Effects of Neighborhood Collective Efficacy on British Children Growing Up in Deprivation: A Developmental Analysis." *Developmental Psychology*, 45(4):942-957.
- Office of Justice Programs. 1999. *Conference proceedings: National symposium on women offenders*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Justice Programs
- Penwarden, R. 2014. "Response Rate Statistics for Online Surveys - What Numbers Should You be Aiming For?"
<http://fluidsurveys.com/university/response-rate-statistics-online-surveys-aiming/>
- Sampson, R.J.; S.W. Raudenbush and F. Earls. 1997. "Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy." *Science*, 277(5328):918-924
 (http://www.sciencemag.org/content/277/5328/918.abstract). doi: 10.1126/science.277.5328.918.
- Sampson, R.J. 2013. "The Place of Context; A Theory and Strategy for Criminology's Hard Problems." *Criminology*, 51(1):1-31.

- Sampson, R.J.; C. Winship and C. Knight. 2013. "Translating Causal Claims; Principles and Strategies for Policy -Relevant Criminology." *Criminology and Public Policy*, 12(4):587-616.
- Sampson, R.J.; J.D. Morenoff and F. Earls. 1999. "Beyond Social Capital: Spatial Dynamics of Collective Efficacy for Children." *American Sociological Review*, 64(5):633-660.
- Sapouna, M. 2010. "Collective Efficacy in the School Context: Does it Help Explain Victimization and Bullying among Greek Primary and Secondary School Students?" *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(10):1912-1927.
- Shamir, B.; E. Brainin; E. Zakay and M. Popper. 2000. "Perceived Combat Readiness as Collective Efficacy: Individual- and Group- Level Analysis." *Military Psychology*, 12(2): 105-119.
- Whitehead, J.T. 1989. *Burnout in probation and corrections*. New York: Praeger
- Williams, K. and N.G. Guerra. 2011. Perceptions of Collective Efficacy and Bullying Perpetration in Schools. *Social Problems* 58(1):126-143.

Appendix A

COLLECTIVE EFFICACY ALPHAS

Study	Year	Place	Alpha
Unstructured Socializing, Collective Efficacy and Violent Behavior Among Urban Youth – Maimon and Browning	2010	Neighborhood	.72
Perceived Combat Readiness as Collective Efficacy: Individual- and Group- Level Analysis – Shmir, Brainin, Zakay and Popper	2000	Military	.77
Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy – Sampson, Raudenbush and Earls	1997	Neighborhood	.80
Neighborhood Structural Inequality, Collective Efficacy, and Sexual Risk Behavior among Urban Youth – Browning, Buntington, Leventhal and Brook-Gunn	2008	Neighborhood	.81
InFormal Control: Collective Efficacy Among Correctional Staff – Carter	2014	Correctional Facility	.81
Perceptions of Collective Efficacy and Bullying Perpetration in Schools – Williams and Guerra	2011	School	.82/.85
A Multilevel Study on the Relationships Between Work Characteristics, Self-Efficacy, Collective Efficacy, and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: The Case of Taiwanese Police Duty-Executing Organizations – Chen and Kao	2011	Police	.84
Neighborhood Inequality, Collective Efficacy, and the Spatial Dynamics of Urban Violence – Morenoff, Sampson and Raudenbush	2001	Neighborhood	.85
A Multilevel Contextual Model of Neighborhood Collective Efficacy – Duncan, Duncan, Okut, Strycker and Hix-Small	2003	Neighborhood	.87
The Protective Effects of Neighborhood Collective Efficacy on British Children Growing Up in Deprivation: A Developmental Analysis – Odgers, Moffitt, Tach, Sampson, Taylor and Matthews	2009	Neighborhood	.88

Appendix B

INDEXES IN DETAIL

*Note: Items that have the label RC were reverse coded

Index Name	# of Items	Items	Alpha
Negative Work	18	<p>You feel:</p> <p>Depressed</p> <p>Energized (RC)</p> <p>Like you aren't making a difference</p> <p>Like talking to your supervisors is a waste of time</p> <p>Like talking to individuals you supervise is a waste of time</p> <p>It is a real effort to come into work</p> <p>Disagreements between employees should not be settled by administrators</p> <p>At times I fear the populations I supervise</p> <p>There are areas in this facility where I know "trouble" is expected</p> <p>Staff members are taking a big chance if you work with a supervised individual alone</p> <p>Rules set by the facility do not work in all situations</p> <p>It is OK for an employee to bend the rules, as long as they do not hurt anyone</p> <p>In order to be promoted there is no right or wrong way, only easy ways and hard ways</p> <p>An employee's life is no one else's business</p> <p>Employees at your facility often show signs of high stress and strain</p> <p>Employee frustration is common where you work</p> <p>The heavy employee workload reduces the effectiveness of our facility</p> <p>You are under too many pressures to do your job effectively</p>	.83
Happy Work	3	You are:	.81

		Proud to tell others where you work Appreciated for the job you do at work Satisfied with your present job	
Opinion of Administration	6	The administration at this facility/district office is: Doing a good job in dealing with problems that really concern employees Not able to maintain order (RC) Not doing a good job in preventing inmate misconduct (RC) Not doing a good job in preventing staff misconduct (RC) Responsive to work-related issues Not doing a good job in assisting employees in times of need (RC)	.82
Opinion of Staff	5	Employees in your facility are well trained Frequent staff turnover is a problem at your facility (RC) Support staff in your facility have the skills they need to do their jobs A larger support staff is needed to help meet the needs of your facility (RC) Your facility has enough staff to meet the current needs	.68
Self-Efficacy	3	You consistently plan ahead and carry out your plans You usually accomplish whatever you set your mind on You are effective and confident in doing your job	.77
Work/Family Balance	6	Demands of my work interfere with my home and family life The amount of time my job takes up makes it difficult to fulfill family responsibilities Things I want to do at home do not get done because of the demands my job puts on me My job produces strain that makes it difficult to fulfill family duties Due to work-related duties, I have to make changes to my plans for family activities I am very successful at balancing my career and my family life (RC)	.93
Informal Social Control	4	Coworkers would help if: A supervisor is mistreating me	.84

		<p>Coworkers are spreading rumors and lies about someone behind their back</p> <p>A coworker is being harassed by another employee on-line</p> <p>A group of coworkers is harassing another employee</p>	
Social Cohesion	6	<p>Employees in your institution work together as a team</p> <p>Mutual trust and cooperation among employees in your institution are strong</p> <p>Employees in your institution get along very well</p> <p>Employees in your institution are quick to help one another when needed</p> <p>There is too much friction among staff members with whom you work (RC)</p> <p>Some employees in your institution do not do their fair share of work (RC)</p>	.76
Collective Efficacy	10	Informal Social Control + Social Cohesion Items	.81

Appendix C
IRB LETTER



RESEARCH OFFICE

210 Hulihan Hall
University of Delaware
Newark, Delaware 19716-1551
Ph: 302/831-2136
Fax: 302/831-2828

DATE: September 26, 2014

TO: TaLisa Carter
FROM: University of Delaware IRB

STUDY TITLE: [619011-3] Corrections Efficacy among Corrections Employees: MA Thesis

SUBMISSION TYPE: Amendment/Modification

ACTION: DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT STATUS
DECISION DATE: September 26, 2014

REVIEW CATEGORY: Exemption category # (2)

Thank you for your submission of Amendment/Modification materials for this research study. The University of Delaware IRB has determined this project is EXEMPT FROM IRB REVIEW according to federal regulations.

We will put a copy of this correspondence on file in our office. Please remember to notify us if you make any substantial changes to the project.

If you have any questions, please contact Nicole Famese-McFarlane at (302) 831-1119 or nicolefm@udel.edu. Please include your study title and reference number in all correspondence with this office.

cc: