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Correctional officers have broad areas of discretion. Consequently, correctional officers must find cues to guide their discretionary decision making. Discretionary outcomes depend largely on the defining of a situation. Degrees of defining a situation affect the correctional officer’s interpretation of the correctional policies and organizational norms. At this point in time the literature has shown limited attention to emotional dissonance that arises from contradictions between emotional labor and street level bureaucracy. Additionally there is limited data on the consequences of correctional officer’s emotional dissonance (role conflict, burnout, and negative affect) on discretionary decision making. This research study attempted to answer the question, how does emotional dissonance (role conflict in conjunction with burnout and negative affectivity) impact the custodial orientation attitude of correctional officers in public prisons?

The research methodology design for identifying, gathering, and analyzing data on the negative impact of emotional dissonance on discretionary decision-making was exploratory and the research approach utilized cross-sectional survey dispersion. In using a cross-sectional survey research design, this researcher administered surveys to correctional officers who work in research-accessible correctional facilities. The surveys contained instruments to identify seven cues (independent variable) which are role conflict, burnout, negative affectivity, age, race/ethnicity, gender and tenure and the
correctional officer’s reported attitude about custodial orientation (dependent variable). The survey packets were administered to all correctional officers working within the research accessible correctional facilities of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (ODRC). A t-test was used to examine the bivariate relationships; while factor score multiple regressions were performed to examine multivariate relationships.

Through the analysis of quantitative data, this research explored the degree to which the correctional officer usage of discretion is negatively impacted by emotional dissonance. A distinctive approach for understanding the negative effect of emotional dissonance (role conflict, burnout and negative affectivity) on deviant discretion was ascertained. This methodology lead to rectifying problems bearing on the reaction of the correctional officer to incidences and the handling of discretionary power by public human service workers within an institutional environment.

One hundred and sixty-five responses were collected within the Grafton Correctional Institution and the Mansfield Correctional Institution. Outcomes of this study identified that socio-contextual cues (components of emotional dissonance and race/ethnicity) have an influence on the completion of custodial tasks. In terms of deviant discretion, components of emotional dissonance can not be classified as “deviant”, but as harmful by-products, these indicators could possibly influence deviant behavior, counter-productivity and counter-role activity, based on explicit settings and circumstances.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this dissertation study is to fill in gaps within the literature regarding role contradictions between street level bureaucracy and emotional labor, in addition to contributing to the knowledge base of emotional dissonance and deviant discretion among correctional officers. Additionally, this study will examine areas of deviance in correctional officer’s application of discretion by focusing on the impact emotional dissonance (role conflict, burnout, and negative affectivity) has on discretionary decision-making.

By studying the influence of emotional dissonance (role contradictions between emotional labor and street level bureaucracy), this dissertation anticipates finding new means to minimize the negative effect on the use of discretionary power. Specifically, this research proposes to examine a blend of negative emotional dispositions (burnout and negative affect) combined with correction organizational role conflict to determine relational influence on deviant discretion.

The objectives of this study are:

- Determine degrees of emotional dissonance, which is a direct result of emotional labor/street level bureaucratic contradictions.
• Achieve a clear insight into the hybridization of emotional dissonance stemming from emotional labor/street level bureaucratic contradictions and paradoxes.

• Gain an understanding of person-role conflict by merging views on role conflict, burnout, and negative affect.

• Explore role conflict and negative emotional dispositions (negative affectivity and burnout) negative impact on correctional officer’s custodial orientation attitude in order to learn more about deviant discretionary decision making.

• Address and acknowledge the significance of demographic concerns such as age, race/ethnicity, gender and years of employment on emotional dissonance and discretionary decision making.

Background

In the last fifty years there has been a division in correctional attention and the landscape of correction research on the issue of custody versus rehabilitation (Stohr, Lovrich & Wood, 1996). Craig (2004), using concepts from Sykes (1958), derived that the controversy between control and treatment stems from precedence and ineffectiveness of correctional goals. Gibson (1999) wrote that criminologist and scholars in the 1950’s and 1960’s attempting to become “scholar-princes”, contributed to the growth of the rift separating custody and rehabilitation. These scholars led a social movement that shifted the standards of correctional conduct from punitive-centered to treatment and reintegration (Gibson, 1999).

For the last two decades criminologist, researchers and practitioners have debated about which goal subsumes all other goals and which goal of corrections is more effectual (Gibbons, 1999, p.272). Rothman (1980) pointed out that the rehabilitative initiative occurred in the middle 1950’s through early 1960’s. Although this initiative was never implemented as intended, the language of “corrections” became apparent.
Rothman (1995) indicated that prisons became known as “correctional institutions”, prison guards were developed into correctional officers, and the American Prison Association modified its designation to American Correctional Association. During this period, a range of treatment programs were introduced inside correctional institutions, for example counseling, therapeutic environment, vocational training, work-release programs and education curriculums (Cullen & Gendreau, 2000, p. 118). Cullen & Gendreau (2001) noted that the correctional institutions enhanced the “long staple of prison rehabilitation” by “supplementing psychological classification systems, token economies, and college education. (p. 320).”

In the 1960’s, 1970’s, and 1980’s, rehabilitation was challenged, critical criminology grounded on Marxism offered a new paradigm that revealed rehabilitation was just an effort to adjust offenders to a society that was “crimonogenic” (Cullen & Gendreau, 2001, p. 325). Critical criminologists viewed rehabilitation as means of solving social injustices rather than reconditioning the inmate population (Cullen & Gendreau, 2000). This period was labeled the “nothing works” or “few intervention effort works” era of correctional research by Martinson (1974). Martinson’s (1974) study provided final and definitive evidence that correctional rehabilitation failed.

Hanley (2002) wrote that research inspired by Martinson’s ideals revealed positive tendencies for treatment and interventions with the provision that not all treatments are effective every time. Hanley (2002) also identified that Martinson (1974, p. 24) reached the conclusion that treatment is a failed attempt in rehabilitation or reduction in recidivism. Martinson garnered this outcome after examining evidence
provided by 231 evaluations of treatment programs performed during 1945-1967, thus asserting that all treatment was ineffective (2002, p. 8).

While Martinson (1979) was not the only one to advocate treatment had failed; his work was embraced by practitioners, politicians, the media, and the general public (Hanley, 2002, p. 8). It is noteworthy to recognize that in later years Martinson (1979) retracted from his “nothing works” doctrine. Martinson (1979) instead affirmed that treatment is effective and ineffective under certain conditions. Martinson stated:

“Thus great care must be taken when introducing alternatives to our standard procedures- probation, imprisonment and parole supervision. Those treatments that are helpful must be carefully discerned and increased; those that are harmful or impotent eliminated” (Martinson, 1979, p. 258).

Altogether Martinson withdrew his “nothing works” ideology; it still remains one of the most cited works in criminology (Cousineau & Plecas, 1982). Following the ideology of “Nothing Works”, in the 1980’s and the 1990’s criminology and correctional research rediscovered treatment. Criminologists took a more optimistic view of rehabilitative intervention (Gibbons, 1999, p. 276). Andrews, et al. (1990) gives four general principles for an effective and productive correctional treatment:

- Treatment for offenders should correspond with services based on recidivism, needs, or cognitive proficiency.
- Required to employ behavioral modeling and reinforcement to direct offenders regarding productive behaviors and attitudes.
- Investment of both the program staff’s and inmates’ time and energy.
- Must monitor inmates’ assimilation into the community and provide contacts with social service as well as perform other additional tasks.

Regrettably, the rediscovery of treatment was short lived. In the late 1990’s, the public started to bolster more retributive paradigms of severe punishments, harsher
sentencing, lengthy prison terms, and the endorsement of the death penalty (Farkas, 1999, p. 495). This sparked the shift to the dominant “Get Tough” era on law breaking and offenders. The “Get Tough” philosophy forced the construction of legislation that would establish stronger crime policies, i.e. the “three strikes and you’re out” laws, restoration of the death penalty and chain gangs (Levrant et al., 1999, p. 3). Policy makers and the public proposed that the ideals of “Get Tough” philosophy would assert community disapproval of deviant behavior, deprecate crime, and bring penalties to offenders (Bazemore, 1998, 769). Some criminologist and correctional researchers have corroborated that the “Get Tough” era was an attempt to challenge and extinguish alternative perspectives (Cullen, Fisher, & Applegate, 2000).

Fortunately, there is still support for rehabilitation in the form of correctional professionals, community sanctions, and progressive policies (Cullen, Fisher, & Applegate, 2000). There are individuals in the public, political, criminology, and correctional areas that are still emphasizing new avenues for treatment and rehabilitation such as individual treatment models (Bazemore, 1998, p. 769). In view of the emphasis of new avenues, the restorative justice philosophy surfaced as an alternative perspective to “Get Tough” paradigm. The basis of restorative justice is the standard that justice is provided by balancing the needs of citizens, offenders, and victims (Zehr, 1990). Zehr (1990) focuses on the premise that crime is an infringement of people’s relationships rather than a violation of the law. Marshall (1996) best describes restorative justice by writing:

“Restorative justice is a process whereby all the parties with a stake in particular offense come together to resolve collectively how to deal with the aftermath of the offence and its implication for the future” (Marshall, 1996, p. 37).
Restorative Justice appears at first glance to be a viable solution to felony reduction because if offers something to all parties involved. Levrant et al. (1999) cautions about fully buying into restorative justice, like all paradigms, there are certain drawback. Levrant et al. (1999, p. 22) suggested restorative justice could be corrupted. There are a few potential criticisms of restorative justice:

- The first criticism of restorative justice is that it erodes legal rights. Restorative justice fails to offer procedural safeguards or to defend offender’s rights (Morris, 2002, p.602).

- The second criticism is rooted in the claim that the intervention is a form of entitlement to offenders. Levrant et al. (1999) explains that the problem of entitlement is based on the principle of less eligibility. Social benefits such as restorative justice are undeserved, yet it demands high levels of accountability.

- A third concern is that restorative justice does not provide a “plausible blue print” to handle criminal deviance. Restorative justice provides little framework to handle severe and persistent offenders (Levrant et al., 1999, p. 22).

Critics have brought attention to the point that there is some confusion and uncertainties in the restorative justice literature as to the precise definition of “restore” (Morris, 2002, p.604). These criticisms clarify that the restorative justice paradigm centers on the usage of publicly shaming as a method of rehabilitating criminal characters. Restorative justice as a paradigm can only be effectual if the public is certain about their protection (Levrant et al., 1999, p. 23).

In midst of continued ideological shifts from Punitive to Rehabilitation to “Nothing Works” to “Get Tough”; and then to Restorative Justice in the past three
decades, there is still continual support to redefine criminal justice, especially the correctional organization. Cressey (1960) and DiIulio (1987) voiced the opinion of balancing the goals of overall rehabilitation and punishment, and overall safety and control, but historically issues remain centered more on custody/rehabilitation precedence and ineffectiveness to justify problems uncovered in the correctional system (Cullen and Gendreau, 2001).

The custody/rehabilitation controversy has been utilized as a catalyst for correctional organizations’ role conflicts (Johnson & Price, 1981). A study done by Zald (1962) reports that correctional institutions committed to custody and treatment generates more role conflict than institutions concerned only with custody. Correctional organization’s role conflicts are variances between the requirements directed at employee or role occupant and the directives of the correctional institution (Shamir, 1980). The correctional institutions’ directives come in the form of policies, rules, regulations, or verbal instructions from supervisors and the requirements directed at employees from the prison population. In recent years there has been a growing interest in evolving the profession of the correctional officer to handle the problems and issues that arise from organizational role conflicts (Hemmens, & Stohr, 2000).

Definition of Terms

The following terms will be defined as they will be used in this dissertation study:

- **Contradictions**: Disjunctions of structural principles of system organizations (Giddens, 1979, p. 131). Dialectic contradictions are paradoxes constituted by the relationship between modes of behavior and thinking that are mutually
dependent, but are at the same time, in conflict with each other (Savelsberg, 2000, p. 1023).

- **Organized Dissonance**: Functions as a means of binding incompatible ideals in addition to an approach to prove that contradiction can be functional, critical, and valuable, rather than just a dilemma to be resolved (Ashcraft, 2001, p. 1304; Buzzanell et al., 1997; Ferguson, 1993). Ashcraft (2001) also subscribes to the idea that organizational dissonance is a hybrid of bureaucracy. Ashcraft defines hybrid as a unification of multiples forms that reflect combinations designed to either solve problems or create considerable conflict.

- **Correctional Officer**: An agent of the correctional organization with the responsibility for creating and maintaining the human environment (Farkas, 1999, p. 496). Because of their direct interface with inmates, correctional officers undertake the role of problem solver, disciplinarian, and bureaucratic intermediate (Farkas, 1999, p. 496).

- **Street Level Bureaucrat**: Public service workers, whose work interaction is client-centered or citizen-centered. Street level workers have considerable use of discretion in the execution of their labor (Lipsky, 1980, pp. 3-4).

- **Emotion**: The state of readiness from cognitive appraisal of events or thoughts. Emotions are accompanied by physiological process such as physical expressions or specific actions to affirm or cope with the emotion. Emotion depends on its nature and meaning (Bagozzi, Gopinath & Nyer, 1999, p. 186).

- **Emotional Labor**: The act of demonstrating appropriate emotions, despite discrepant internal feelings. Emotional labor is comprised of emotional
management and emotional expression consistent with organizational display rules (Glomb & Tews, 2004).

- **Emotional Dissonance**: A type of person-role conflict resulting from discord between felt and displayed emotion. It is also a paradoxical fusion of inner feeling or moods and organizational roles (Domagalski, 1999, p.845). It is a hybrid form as the clash between personal values (emotion) and role demands of other role sets (i.e. prescribed emotions, and boundary roles) of the organization manifested as conflicted emotions (Rafeli & Sutton, 1987).

- **Discretion**: A range of choices within a set of constraints that define the behavior of an individual service provider. Discretion is also the procedures that legally authorizes criminal justice officials to make decisions in concurrence with personal judgments and principles instead of strictly imposing laws, policies, regulations, rule or procedures (Freeman, 2003, p. 191).

- **Deviant Discretion**: A situation that results from an employee exercising beyond the degree of discretion allowed them. Discretion can lie within the realm of acceptable job performance or deviant depending upon the organizational situation. Deviant Discretion is also the act of counter-role behaviors (i.e., circumventing the rules or authority) (Kundu & Vora, 2004, p. 45). Counter-role behaviors are not part of job descriptions or role expectations (Kundu & Vora, 2004). Deviant discretion does not abide by the organizational constraints placed on bureaucratic rational decision making (Morgan, 1987, p. 277).

- **Role Conflict**: The proportion of congruency- incongruency or compatibility-incompatibility in the provisions of the role. The congruency or compatibility is
estimated based on the set of values or circumstances that are imposed upon role performance (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970, p. 155).

- **Role Contradiction:** Characterized as a negative/counterproductive outcome of the paradoxical functions of correctional officer as a public human service worker (emotional labor and street level bureaucrat’s use of discretion) (Toch, 1985).

- **Burnout:** A condition or pattern of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and diminished personal accomplishment that can occur among employed individuals (Maslach, 1982). Emotional Exhaustion is a diminution of emotional resource. Depersonalization is defined as a detachment to work and the development of a negative attitude concerning employment and performance. Diminished personal accomplishment is the reduced aptitude relating to a job (Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004, p. 859).

- **Negative Affect:** A subjective dimension of distress and displeasing engagement that comprises of various unconstructive mood states (i.e., anger, contempt, disgust, guilt, fear, nervousness) (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988, p. 1063).

- **Positive Affect:** A subjective dimension of constructive optimism that reflects moods of enthusiasm, invigoration, and alertness. High levels of positive affect result in states of high energy, full concentration and pleasure (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988, p. 1063).

- **Demographic Characteristics:** Assist in understanding and managing organizations (Pfeffer, 1985, p. 69). Research has recognized that demographic variables are significantly related with perception, attitudes, and work results.
McIntire, Moberg, and Posner (1980) documented that demographic characteristics have greatly influence decision making.

- **Correctional Orientations:** Explore the nature and sources of correctional officers’ ideology. The findings of Conte et al (2005) that discretion can be examined based the work attitude attributed to the task. It is important to examine correctional officer’s correctional orientation because these attitudes could affect the ways they interact with inmates (Farkas, 1999). Correctional officers do not simply embrace rehabilitation and human service; though the literature indicates that they are also supportive of punitive and custodial views. Poole and Regoli (1980) describes custody orientation as a reflection of correctional officer’s obligation to the control of inmates.

**Correctional Profession**

Toch (1985) wrote that the profession of correctional staff is the most ignored area of research studies; though at the micro-level they encompass the largest part of the correctional system’s workforce and social environment. Cheatwood (1974) specified that correctional professional is placed in the position of middlemen, “neither being a part of nor identifying themselves with the administrative subculture or subculture of the inmates” (p.173). Philliber (1987) supported by writings from Weber (1957), Jacobs and Retsky (1975), McLaren (1973), Pogrebin and Burton (1983), and Caeti et al. (2003) declared that role conflict is experienced by the correctional officer population working in the correctional system. Role conflict is created when “two or more sets of conflicting role expectation, defined by the organization as legitimate by the fact that they are derived from an official goal” (Grusky, 1959, p. 453).
The existence of custody and treatment goals within correctional facilities is an impending source of staff role conflict (Zald, 1962). At the micro-level or frontline of the correctional institution, the role identity of the correctional officers has been bifurcated as a result of correctional organization role conflict (Cressey, 1959). Correctional officers must maintain or preserve order and discipline since one of the essential goals of the institution is custody (Cressey, 1959, p. 3). Hemmens & Stohr (2000) write that the correctional officer must additionally go beyond security of the institution and enter into the realm of rehabilitation.

Correctional officers are also requested to assume more of a service function with rehabilitative/treatment implications (Hemmens & Stohr, 2000, 327). Correctional officers must assist in rehabilitation programs that are implemented by the institution, i.e. institutional therapy and individualized-treatment goal (Cullen & Gendreau, 2000). Jacobs and Retsky (1975) established that in addition to preventing escapes, riots and predatory/counter productive behavior; correctional officers have taken on the role of rehabilitation. Jacobs and Retsky (1975) declared:

“It is not surprising that contradictory organizational goals have caused conflict in such organizational micro-units as the guard role. Under the role prescriptions dictated by the rehabilitative ideal, the guard is to relax and to act spontaneously. Inmates are to be ‘understood,’ not blamed, and formal disciplinary mechanisms should be triggered as infrequently as possible... what is allowed one prisoner may be denied another depending on evaluation of individual needs...The rehabilitative ideal has no clear directives for the administration of a large-scale people-processing institution. In order to carry out primary tasks and to manage large numbers of men and materials, bureaucratic organization and impersonal treatment are necessary” (1975, pp. 7& 8).

Although this contribution is important in understanding the root of correctional officer’s organizational role conflict, Cressey (1959) disagreed with Jacob and Retsky’s
on the “no precise rule.” Cressey (1959) proposed that the practice of rehabilitative treatment lies in the realm of professional decision. Nevertheless, Jacobs and Retsky (1975) should be credited for clarifying that the role of rehabilitative or professional authority is established on the foundation of manipulation, handling and bargaining, while authority for custodial role relies on the basis of position/rank in the bureaucratic caste system.

In merging both custodial and treatment functions, correctional research set sights on redefining correctional officer’s role into a human service professional (Johnson & Price, 1981; Farkas, 1999). Human service roles represent the correctional officers’ concerns for inmates’ “quality of life” (1981, p. 344). Hepburn and Knepper (1993, p. 315) asserted that the correctional officer create and preserve the human environment of the institution. The correctional officers are classified by their duties as public human service worker. Public human service workers are front line staff whose duties involve working with inmates, and trying to assist them as well as perform services for them (Shamir & Drory, 1982).

Public human service work is highly dependent on the relation between employee and client (Pousette & Jacobsson, 2003). As a public human service worker, the correctional officer’ obligations are to guard the correctional community by preserving security and control over inmates. Correctional officers as a public human service worker also advise, support, console, refer, and deal with inmate problems and predicament based crises (Cherniss, 1980, p. 344). Hemmens and Stohr (2000, p. 329) observed that human service roles aid in making available goods and services to inmates; referrals, recommendation, and advocacy; and assistance in adjusting to penal life.
These aspects of the correctional officer function fulfill the requirements of the organizational roles.

Organizational roles ensure the proper implementation of policy tasks within an organization as well as providing support for the integrity of a formulated organizational policy (Green, Wamsley, & Keller, 1993). Roles are defined by Rizzo et al. (1970, p. 155) as a set of expectations about a position’s behavior in the organization’s social structure. Rizzo et al. (1970) described role expectation as behavioral conditions or boundaries derived from experience, knowledge, values, perceptions and practice. Kahn et al. (1964) defined role expectations as demands that are conveyed verbally and nonverbally to administrators. Role expectations are transferred via job descriptions, training and avenues of socialization (Coleman, Brudney, & Kellough, 1998, p. 720).

Correctional Officers’ roles in correctional institutions are organizational/client-centered also termed as boundary-spanning roles (Shamir & Drory, 1982; Chung & Schneider, 2002). Boundary-spanning roles cause correctional officers “to encounter multiple role expectations resulting in cross-pressures and conflicts on the job” (Coleman, Brudney, & Kellough, 1998, p. 720). As a boundary spanning agent, the correctional officer “operates on the periphery or boundary of an organization with elements outside it” (Leifer & Delbecq, 1978). Two key features of complex bureaucratic organizations are the distinctions between authority (formal members) and clients (non-members) and the distinctions between organizational objectives. These features help to shape the set of boundary roles, which are crossed by boundary spanning agents in order to complete tasks and organizational goals. In understanding the
boundary crossing abilities of the correctional officer, it is necessary to look within the correctional bureaucratic system (Shamir & Drory, 1982; Chung & Schneider, 2002).

Inside the correctional bureaucratic system, correctional frontline micro-level workers perform various set of roles in context of the organizational and the social system. The primary role set of the correctional officer is tasked with the duty of handling and caring (custody and rehabilitation) for inmates and detainees, which is classified as the social system (Dvoskin & Spiers, 2004). The correctional officer is also duty bound to fulfilling the objectives of the correctional organization. Correctional officers are frontline primary workers, who interact on a daily basis with the offender population (Ben-David, 1992). Frontline occupations, such as correctional officers, work directly and intimately with specific clientele. Correctional officers’ work is geared to monitoring and protecting their clienteles’ quality of life (Farkas, 2000). Hepburn and Knepper (1993) made claim that the correctional officer is accountable for his clients experience while incarcerated. Correctional officers’ direct and prolonged interaction is influential in assisting or providing rehabilitative services (Farkas, 2000).

The correctional officers’ organizational positions also have a secondary role set. These roles focus on supporting the organization’s objectives, but are less connected to the daily interaction with the social system. Unlike the primary role set, the secondary role is related to the organization’s strategic processes (Floyd & Lane, 2000). The secondary role set involves the acquisition and exchange of information related to environmental change and organizational response. Secondary roles are intended to improve organizational performance and adaptability (Floyd & Lane, 2000, p. 158).
These distinctions between primary and secondary role sets create boundaries in interactions as well as define the role of formal authority inside the organization. Aldrich & Herker (1977) points out that boundary delineate the scope of roles, and in turn, roles are shaped by boundaries which filter and dispel information into the organization structure (p. 218). Boundary roles bond organizational structure to environmental elements through buffering, moderating or influencing the environment. Nevertheless, boundary roles expose three problems that can be traced to three contributors (Pettus & Severson, 2006, p. 216):

- *Influence of Organizational power*- A great deal of information has external origin based on the macro level of the organization. It becomes visible that much of the policy directives are based on unrelated information (Strauss, 1962). This poses a dilemma for the boundary spanner because their behavior, if not immediately modified, will conflict with recent organizational developments or delay in the solving of problems.

- *Conflict in Interaction*- Difficulty in effectively mediating between functional groups and micro-agents within the organizational system (Kochan, 1975). Boundary roles involve maintaining or improving the hegemony of the organization. Boundary role also mediates between organizational systems. Difficulty in mediation would cause a closing or curtailling of the communication channels between organizational groups.

- *Status differences of professionals handling conflict*- Dissatisfaction of boundary agent’s subordinate position affect the organization’s vertical access (Aldrich & Herker, 1977). This poses a dilemma resulting in boundary spanners increasing their informal power, possibly leading to a counter productive outcome.

Wall and Adams (1974) explains that when one or more of these boundary conflict contributors are enacted, the boundary crosses negotiates between all levels of the organization and their representatives. These organizational systems make demands as well as set rules for interactions. The Roles that cross boundaries can be enacted in various settings and at various times (Ashforth, Kreiner and Fugate, 2000, p. 474).
Ashforth, Kreiner and Fugate (2000) also confirm that when boundary role problems are resolved by the efficacy of “boundary crossing” then the boundaries of roles are spanned.

Boundary spanning is characterized based on practical context to which the action occurs. Pettus and Severson (2006, p. 211) describes boundary spanning as a designed activity that permeates constructed social barriers, and gather background organizational information in order to understand the nature and scope of systematic conflicts and address social problems. Frontline boundary spanners, such as correctional officers, examine the “‘fit’ between organizations, missions, goals, objectives, tools and tasks and brings together science, policy, and action into a total scheme” (Pettus and Severson 2006, p. 212)

Boundary spanning roles assist in preserving equal balance between the rights and responsibilities of groups functioning within the organizational system (Kochan, 1975). Boundary spanning role are necessary for interactions between goals, functions, and systems that are partially conflicting. Boundary-spanning roles link organizational systems within the environment, which the organization operates (Chung & Schneider, 2002, p. 72). Lynonski and Woodside (1989) substantiate that correctional officer’s boundary spanning role links the organization with a network of organizational groups such as macro-level (i.e. administration, management, and network), and meso-level (i.e. supervisors) with the inmate population. Accordingly, correctional officers are charged with the duty of engaging in networking and integrating tasks by cultivating relationships exchange, and maintaining organizational bonds (Kinney, 2006).

Using the combined research of Lombardo (1985); Weissert (1994); and Chung and Schneider (2002), the correctional officers’ role set which comprises of frontline
position, bureaucratic utility, human service functions, and boundary-spanning roles, can be compressed into the simple term of street-level bureaucrat. Russ et al. (1998) recognized that boundary spanning role can be considered as a discretionary job. As a discretionary job, boundary spanning role routinizes the effect of power inside the bureaucratic framework (Russ et al., 1998, p. 131). Additionally, Kerfoot and Korczynski (2005, p. 389) confirmed that bureaucratic framework, and administration is a key component structuring contemporary frontline service work. Drawing on Lipsky’s work, Anagnostopoulos (2003) stated that the frontline worker is also a street level bureaucrat because he/she labors directly with clients in human service organizations. Weissert (1994) supported this claim by affirming that frontline human service workers serve as “boundary spanning agents” between the bureaucracy and the clients. Lombardo (1985) made the case that the correctional officer is a human service officers, who assists inmates with institutional problems by acting as an advocate agent in the correctional bureaucracy.

Bureaucratic actions influence the correctional officers’ roles and role expectations. Kaiser and Polczynski (1982, p. 129) wrote that bureaucratic forces prevent the correctional organization from “meandering,” while goal forces allow for achievement. Although the correctional officers are goal-oriented, they are forced into bureaucratic behavior. Bureaucratic behaviors are patterns of activity that are clearly defined by a rationally organized social structure and limited by organizational rules (Merton, 1940, p. 560). Bureaucratic behaviors can also be viewed as series of actions that functionally relate to the hierarchal organizational purpose (Merton, 1940, p. 560). Kaiser and Polczynski (1982, p. 130) confirmed that this forced bureaucratic behavior
leads to pressure outside of the correctional bureaucracy. This outside pressure establishes a change in relation to goals and goal orientation.

Armstrong (2004) identified one of the outside pressures as the performance of emotional work within the correctional institution. Weber (1946, p. 220) pointed out that goal orientation may be decided on more emotional grounds. Hoggett (2006) acknowledged emotion in public organizations. Hoggett (2006, p. 192) remarked that the frontline public human service worker/street level bureaucrat needs to be aware of the emotional dimensions that are incorporated into the public organizational space. Stivers (1993) suggested that emotion is a complementary role. Stivers (1993, p. 144) illustrated this by describing administrative discretion as “concrete, situational, experience based, interactive and grounded in perception and feelings as well as rational analysis.”

Fineman and Sturdy (1999) confirmed that attention to emotion in organizational and sociological theory is recently and rapidly budding. Briner (1999) commented that there is an apparent interest in emotions within work and organizational psychology as well as other related fields, at the same time there is still not a large body of published theory and evidence. There are also not many practical techniques for assessing or intervening in emotion at work (Briner, 1999, p. 323).

Fineman (2004) upheld that the missing element in understanding organizational life is the role of emotion. Regrettably, past research on the contradictions of emotion and bureaucracy within organizations focused on bureaucratic rationality as a means of sustaining the perception of emotion as a chaotic and subjective domain (Domagalski, 1999). Bureaucratic logic is perceived as symbolizing reason, recognition, and rationality. This impression of bureaucracy reinforced the belief that unemotional
impersonality, hierarchical control, and rule domination are consequences of effective organizational functioning (1999, p. 836). Hummel (1982) illuminated that “bureaucratic action is not a social action.”

Nonetheless, scholarly research expressed the opinion that the bureaucratic system assigns purpose to emotion by relegating it into labor process to be managed and controlled relevant to productivity (Domagalski, 1999, p. 836; Ashforth & Humphrey, 1995). Hummel’s writing substantiated Domagalski’s (1999) opinion of emotion as a social action input within the bureaucratic system (1982). Hummel (1982, p.5) wrote that Weber defined bureaucracy as the means of transforming social action into rationally organized action.

Hummel (1982, p. 5) further explained that human functions and human behaviors can only be in context as a “rationally organized action”, if the action is logically consistent with the goals of the organization. This concept highlighted that if the value of emotion does not encompass the system’s purpose, then it has no logical function and would be termed “illogical” or “irrational.” Thus, irrational behavior runs counter to the formalized norms of the organization resulting in disapproval (Merton, 1940, p. 567). In opposition to this concept, Hanoch (2002) asserted that working only within the cognitive framework and concentrating on the ends rather than process are apparent reasons for neglecting to examine the role of emotions as rational.

Hanoch (2002) used the works of Herbert Simon as a means of understanding the rationality and irrationality of emotive values. Herbert Simon (1985) disagreed with the customary models of human rationality and irrationality. He argued that the human
rationality and rationality models could not cover a “realistic representation of human
behavior” (Hanoch, 2002, p. 2). Simon wrote

“We may deem behavior irrational because, although it serves some particular
impulse, it is inconsistent with other goals that we may deem more important. We
may deem it irrational because the actor is proceeding on incorrect facts or
ignoring whole areas of relevant facts. We may deem it irrational because the
actor has not drawn the correct conclusions from the facts. We may deem it
irrational because the actor has failed to consider important alternative course of
action. If the action involves the future, as most action does, we may deem it
irrational because we don’t think the actor uses the best methods for forming
expectations or for adapting to uncertainty. All of these forms of irrationality play
important roles in the lives of every one of us, but I think it is misleading to call
them irrationality. They are better viewed as forms of bounded rationality”

Simon’s work on bounded rationality created a juncture for the use of emotion as
a mechanism for organizational functioning. Utilizing Simon’s research, Hanoch (2002)
isolated a possible means wherein emotion can be seen as a rational functional
mechanism. Hanoch (2002) suggested that emotions “operate with rational thinking in
two distinct modes (p. 3)”. 1.) Professionals restrict range of options contemplated and
evaluated; 2.) Professionals focus attention on specific parameters or aspects of the
information (Hanoch, 2002, p. 3). Street-level bureaucrats committing to this practice,
when making decisions, allow emotion to be integrated into the bureaucratic equation as
well as have a beneficial and/or undisruptive effect on the bureaucratic system

A more comprehensive and amicable way of integrating emotion into the
bureaucratic system was theorized by Hochschild (1983). Hochschild perceived that
emotion could be logical and productive to the organization if it is structured as a “labor
of emotion” or “emotional labor.” Hochschild described the labor of emotion as “the
management of feelings to create a publicly observable facial and body display” (1983,
p.7). Emotion, as a component of labor, has an exchange value. Emotion could also be
classified as a social product and a condition of control. Fineman and Sturdy (1999) endorsed that control is not unidirectional, unaffected, or a neutral process in generating productivity and efficiency. Control operates in an environment molded by actor resistance, cooperation, and compliance (Fineman & Sturdy, 1999, p. 632). Based on Foucault’s labor process theory, the existence of control in an organizational relationship has emotional consequences on the social system. Fineman and Sturdy (1999) affirmed that emotion is essential to the control process. Emotion becomes a significant aspect of control rather than being just looked at as the “control of emotion” or emotion work control.

Zapf et al. (1999) described emotion work control as the degree at which a street level bureaucrat makes the decision to make desired emotions apparent. Emotional work control is socially situational; this means that emotional work control is either solely reactive to a situation within the environment or at least receptive to situational sensitivity. Emotion work control becomes operational within a bureaucratic organization based on job control or discretion in regards to displayed emotion and interaction control. Tolich’s (1993) explanation of “operationalization” clarified the concept that emotion work follows certain organization display rules that empower front line workers to deviate from organizational policies and rules.

Unfortunately, much of the previous organizational research failed to absorb the role of emotion into the bureaucratic equation, organizational and criminology studies isolate emotion work from the bureaucratic scheme by assigning emotion as a negative exchange, customer-oriented worth or labor value (Hearn, 1993). Ashforth and Humphrey (1995) argued that the division of emotion and the bureaucratic system is a
misconception of Weber’s “Bureaucracy” and that it is actually “interpenetrated”. Ashforth and Humphrey (1995) asserted that emotion has been “over rationalized” by organizations. Their findings illustrate that emotion has utility in the organizational system in areas of human dynamics, motivation, and leadership. Their findings also justify using emotive or emotional values to appropriately identify influences on macro and micro levels of bureaucracy.

Steinberg and Figart (1999), in support of emotive value within the bureaucratic equation, indicated that the labor of emotion is often an unacknowledged component of a service worker’s job, often requiring a skilled, efficient and productive profession. Additional work done by Weiss and Cropanzano (1996) has actually proposed that affective or emotional experiences stimulate emotion driven behavior that contribute to judgment driven-behaviors or acts of public citizenship.

This present study will not attempt to give a full and detailed review of emotion’s growth and change over time. It is important to recognize that emotional research has expanded from significant examinations of role conflict, human service, bureaucracy, and emotional labor (Lipsky, 1980; Hochschild, 1983; Wharton, 1999; Tracy, 2000 & Garot, 2004). Criminology and correctional research examination of role conflict and human service have suggested that correctional officers juggle contradictory work priorities (Grusky, 1959), balance competing work concerns and occupy multiple roles in organization (Tracy, 2004, p. 120).

Tracy (1997) pointed out that despite the work place “dilemmas,” otherwise known as organizational role conflicts, role contradictions or paradoxes are apparent. It is clear that achievements or failure, and productivity or un-productivity are dependent on
how correctional officers react to these role contradictions. In order to explore role contradictions; this research used the emotion principle of Tracy (2004) and Ashcraft (2001) organizational dissonance. Organized dissonance was defined as strategic merger of contradictory forms (i.e., roles, goals, objectives, and policies) recognized as hostile or conflicting. It is also a paradoxical fusion of inner feeling or moods and organizational roles (Domagalski, 1999, p.845). Tracy (2004) believed that contradictions among correctional officers are marked by significant emotional challenges. Tracy (2003 & 2004) in previous research showed specific linkage of contradictions stemming from role conflict. Ashcraft (2001) described the linkage of contradictions as organized dissonance.

As an offshoot of recent attempts to understand the emotional contradictions of the correctional officer, this dissertation study will look at paradoxes stretching beyond the organizational role conflict into organized dissonance that is rooted in custodial, rehabilitative, and emotive contradictions. This study will examine the organized dissonance of distinct role definitions: street level bureaucrat and the emotional laborer. This research will delve into the role-conflict that stems from the contradictions of street level bureaucrat and the emotional laborer referred to as emotional dissonance and its practical applications on deviant discretion.

Job Description of the Correctional Officer

A correctional officer is employed by a correctional institution to assist with the carrying out of its mission. The basic mission of a correctional institution is to protect society by confining offenders in the controlled environment of the correctional setting (Appelbaum, Hickey, & Packer, 2001, p. 1344). These institutions are structured to be
safe, humane, and appropriately secure. Another goal of correctional institution’s mission is the intent to rehabilitate offenders. Correctional institutions provide work and other self-improvement opportunities to assist offenders in becoming law-abiding citizens (Caeti et al., 2003, p. 385). To accomplish this goal the correctional institutions empower and assign their correctional workforce with activities and routines to manage, enforce and promote safety and rehabilitation (Federal Bureau of Prison [BOP], 2006).

The correctional officer is a micro-level worker, who interacts on a daily basis with the offender population. As stated by Hawkins (1976), the correctional officer is “the key figure in the penal equation, the man on whom the whole edifice of the penitentiary systems depends” (p. 105). Correctional officer’s occupational status ensures that the offender population follows all rules and regulations. They are empowered through correctional policies to make decisions to ensure prisoners’ conformity to the routines of the organization (U.S. Office of Personnel Management [OPM], 1971).

In order to clearly understand the position of correctional officers it is important to examine their job function, power base, and social interaction:

*Job Function:*

A Correctional facility is a place of custody and rehabilitation of felons. Correctional facility has two broad goals. The first goal “is to safely keep convicted offenders until authorized to release them” (U.S. Office of Personnel Management [OPM], 1971, p. 4). The second goal of the correctional facility “is to attempt to change the undesirable attitudes and behavior patterns of offenders” (U.S. Office of Personnel Management [OPM], 1971, p. 4). To accomplish these goals the correctional
administration hires correctional staff to ensure that the routines and regulations are upheld. The correctional officer role involves the security and control of felons incarcerated within the institution (U.S. Office of Personnel Management [OPM], 1971, p. 5).

Liebling (2000, p. 335) defined the goals of security and control as policing. Policing is a set of processes aimed at the provision of security through surveillance and the threat of sanctioning. Leibling (2000, p. 335) stated that the completion of the policing task requires power and authority, the use of discretion, the pursuit of order and an opposition of lawlessness. Policing is only one facet of this occupation. Several other tasks performed by correctional officers are as follow (O-net Online, 2004):

- Monitor conduct of inmates according to policies, regulations, and procedures (O-net Online, 2004).
- Inspect conditions of locks, bars, grills, doors and gates at the correctional institution (O-net Online, 2004).
- Search inmates, cells, vehicles for weaponry, valuables, or drugs (O-net Online, 2004).
- Inspect for contraband (O-net Online, 2004).
- Escort inmates within and outside of the institution (O-net Online, 2004).
- Record information such as identification, charges, and incidence of disturbance (O-net Online, 2004).
- Take disciplinary action on inmates (Federal Bureau of Prison [BOP], 2005).

The correctional officers are trained for and contribute to every area of the institutions activity. These institutional activities encompass communicating with supervisors, peers or subordinates; gain and evaluate information; document and record information; make decisions and solve problems; resolve conflicts and negotiate with
others; monitor processes, materials, and surroundings; establish and maintain interpersonal relationships; and finally inspect equipment, structures or materials (O-Net Online, 2004). Correctional officers are able to contribute to the activities of the institution because they are micro-level workers continuously interact directly with the inmate population and their trained skills and abilities (Shamir & Drory, 1982). O-Net Online (2004) describes the skills of the correctional officer as follow:

- **Active Listening**- offering full attention to what people are saying, understanding important points of the conversation, as well as asking questions and not interrupting.

- **Flexibility and Social Perceptiveness**- Being aware and understand people’s reaction to a situation and having the ability detect hidden patterns.

- **Monitoring**- Assessing performance in order to make improvements or take corrective actions.

- **Deductive and Critical Thinking**- Using logic and reasoning to determine solutions and approaches to problems. Applying rules to specific problems

- **Speech Clarity, Oral and Reading Comprehension and Writing**- Able to communicate effectively and understand written documents

- **Coordination**- Adjusting action to specific situations.

- **Instructing**- Educating others on procedures or policies.

- **Persuasion**- Influencing others actions

- **Problem Sensitivity**- Ability to comprehend the criteria of problems

Correctional officers are responsible for the conduct and discipline within the facility. This means that correctional officers’ duty above all things is to set a good example by being positive role model to the inmates within the facility (U.S. Office of Personnel Management [OPM], 1971, p. 5). Correctional Officers retain a supervisory position in the correctional facility. They monitor inmate work details in conjunction
with other departments. Correctional officers supervise services offered within the facility (educational, recreational, and religious, e.g.) (Zimmer, 1987, p. 417).

Correctional officers are rotated through various assignments during a period of time (U.S. Office of Personnel Management [OPM], 1971, p. 4). Their shifts consist of 24 hour, 7 days a week operations, which include, night shifts, weekends, holidays and overtimes. Correctional officer must remain at all times vigilant and attentive during these shifts (Zimmer, 1987). There are times when their post or jobs are isolated, but there are also other times where their jobs put them in emergency situations. At those times when they respond to disturbances they may be required to use reasonable force, including firearms and other emergency equipment (U.S. Office of Personnel Management [OPM], 1971).

Zimmer (1987) piggybacking off of Johnson (1981) described the correctional officer’s job as needing to comply with uniformed code during their shifts. Zimmer (1987, p. 416) states that prison guards must follow the rules and the direction of his superiors. Correctional officers must not act freely regarding inmates either sentimentally or punitively. Correctional officers are assigned to posts by their supervisor and given post orders (ODAS, 2004). Post orders are detailed written instructions that convey the requirements, consistency, and continuity of correctional operations to the officers working within the facility (ODAS, 2004). Post orders are established within acceptable security practice guidelines, administrative regulations and department policies (Oklahoma Office of Personnel Management, 2005).

Post orders detail correctional officer’s activities or post assignments as well as comprise instructions on performance and frequency of activities (Oklahoma Office of
Personnel Management, 2005). The Correctional officers must adhere to the uniformed code of the specific duty post for their safety, the safety of fellow officers and the well being of the inmate (ODAS, 2004). During the time of the correctional officers’ assignment to a post, he/she will read the specified post order then initial and date the post order acknowledgment form (Oklahoma Office of Personnel Management, 2005). Initialing the acknowledgment form verifies that the correctional officer understands the post order. Ultimately, it is the duty and power of correctional officer to interpret and execute post orders (ODAS, 2004).

Base of Social Power:

Power is the authority to act or produce an effect based on legality, possession of control, influence over others, and capacity of rights (French & Raven, 1959). Authority is the ability to control derived from acknowledged status (Merton, 1940, p. 560). Weber (1968, p. 53) considered that power is a probability that a professional has the ability to carry out his/her own will despite resistance. Weber (1968) stated that there are multiple bases of power to be mobilized as resources. Similarly, Hinkin and Schriesheim (1989, p. 562) identified that power bases involve the ability to administer tangible (things) and intangible (feelings) results.

Interestingly, Cyert and March (1963) perceived power as a base is exercised by the practitioner to affect decision outcomes. Stichman (2002) contributes to this idea by putting forward that power base is socially dependent. Social dependence in this instance suggest the “there must be a social relationship between the influencing agent and the target” (Stichman, 2002, p.15). Jayadev and Bowles (2006) wrote that common usage of power suggests several characteristics that must be present in its definition. Initially
power is interpersonal, an integral part of social relationships. Secondly, the use of power entails threat and use of regulations. Thirdly, power should be normatively unfixed, allowing for reasonable outcomes. Lastly, power must be appropriately sustainable (2006, p. 329). Correctional Officer’s hold a high degree of control over inmates; Dululio (1987) recognized that officer’s power base is guided by norms and regulations to ensure safety and professionalism.

French and Raven (1959) examined various typologies of power bases by which professionals and practitioners participate in decision making in order to understand the utilization of power. French and Raven (1959) discovered that power is established by social relationships and level of authority or position. Olsen (1978) also recognized that power is based upon factors such as specialization, interdependence, persuasion, constraint, identification, and interpersonal attraction. For the purpose of this discussion on correctional officers there are six common bases of power set forth by French and Raven (1959) and Hawkins (1992) (See Figure 1.1): legitimate power (position), coercive power (physical force), reward power (persuasion), referent power (respect for individual) and expert power (skill) and discretionary power (delegated) (Hawkins, 1992; Stichman, 2002, p. 5).
The discussion for each power is as follow:

The first base of power is legitimate power. This type of power is a result of structural position which endows the professional with the formal authority to control and regulate (Stichman, 2002, p. 24). By virtue of structural relationship correctional officers have the right to control inmates. Hepburn (1985, p. 146), using the writings of Cressey (1960), shared that inmates comply with the orders of the correctional officer simply
because they are inmates. Stichman (2002) identified that legitimate power is capable of acquiring inmates’ compliance. Conversely, Hepburn (1985, p. 146) confirmed that legitimate power is only apparent to inmates’ view of the correctional officer’s authority to enforce and regulate organizational rules. Sykes (1958) drew attention to the point that inmates generally feel no sense of compulsion to obey correctional officer’s legitimate authority (Hepburn, 1985, p. 146).

The second base of power is coercive power. Coercive power is a result of inmates’ perception that correctional officers have the ability to discipline noncompliance. Stichman (2002) noted that correctional officer’s rely on coercive power to gain compliance because correctional institutions are inherently coercive environment. Coercion to acquire compliance is an outcome of the correctional coercive containment goals (Etzioni, 1975). Liebling (2000, p. 335) defined the coercive containment goals as security and control or policing. Policing is a set of processes aimed at the provision of security through surveillance and the threat of sanctioning (i.e., periodic cell searches, segregation units and the availability of lethal force) (Hepburn, 1985, p. 147). The correctional officer’s coercive power is utilized based on a measure of force that is deemed reasonable once all correctional policies are met, for example 541.10 of the Federal code sustains:

“So that inmate may live in a safe and orderly environment it is necessary for institution authorities to impose disciplines of those inmates whose behavior is not in compliance with Bureau Prison rules. The provisions of this rule apply to all persons committee to the care and custody and control (direct or constructive of the bureau of prisons)” (Federal Bureau of Prison [BOP], 2005, p. 23).
The general principles of sanctioning set by the 540.10 of the federal code are described in Table 1.1 as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Table 1.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>540.10-General Principles Apply in Every Disciplinary Action Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(BOP, 2004, p.13-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Only institution staff may take disciplinary action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Staff takes disciplinary action at such time and to the degree necessary to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regulate an inmate’s behavior within Bureau rules and institution guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and to promote a safe orderly institution environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Staff shall control inmate behavior in completely impartial and consistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Disciplinary action may not be capricious retaliatory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Staff may not impose or allow imposition of corporal punishment of any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>If it appears at any stage of the disciplinary process that an inmate is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mentally ill, staff shall refer the inmate to a mental health professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for determination of whether the inmate is responsible for his conduct or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is competent. Staff may take no disciplinary action again an inmate whom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mental health staff determines to be in competent or not responsible for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>his conduct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sykes (1958) conveyed that correctional officers, who rely on coercive power alone to acquire compliance, are in jeopardy of retaliation by inmates as well as disobedience. Rather than actually initiating formal sanctions (force or punishment), Coercive power gains compliance through informal sanctions which removes the ability to resist or threaten disciplinary action (Stichman, 2002, p. 27). Sykes (1958) upheld that formal punishment do not differ much from inmates’ usual condition. Officer’s use of informal sanctions including nonviolent actions such as keeping inmates locked in cells while other inmates are released, holding or delaying mail and phone privileges,
and withholding goods or luxuries (hot water). Stichman (2002) contended that violent sanctions (physical coercion) are deemed necessary in order to control inmates.

The third base of power is reward power. Reward power is a result of inmates’ perception that correctional officers have the ability to issue rewards (Hepburn, 1985, p. 147). Correctional officers have few formal privileges and benefits to bestow awards. Bureaucratic and judicial reforms have reduced correctional officer’s influence on decisions (Hepburn, 1985, p. 147). On the other hand, correctional officers have sustained an informal reward system through the deficiencies of legitimate power, coercive power, and formal rewards. Correctional officers establish an informal norm of reciprocity with inmates which resources, partiality and “favors” are exchanged (Hepburn, 1985, p. 148). Norms of reciprocity maintain stability and order, but also creates coveted leadership positions (merchants, politician, emissary, and “right guys”) in the correctional social systems that are governed by the correctional officer.

The fourth base of power is referent power. Referent power is a product of inmates respect and admiration of the correctional officer (Hepburn, 1985, p. 149). Referent power is derived from social intimacy and inmates’ perception. Lombardo (1985) terms referent power as personal authority. Hepburn (1985) described personal authority as control and influence established based on leadership and rather than presence. In other words, correctional officer’s who are fair and impartial in their relation and use of power, display a degree of respect, and keep promises gain the deference and admiration of the inmate population.

The fifth base of power is expert power. Expert power is the capacity to administer to another information, knowledge, or expertise (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1989,
This form of power is usually specialized and limited to the particular area in which the expert is trained and qualified. Expertise is founded on technical competence and decision-making is founded on the goals of the organization (Cressey, 1960). Expert power is the result of compliance obtained by correctional officer’s special skill, knowledge, or expertise. The professional judgment of the necessities of inmates and expertise characterizes the correctional officer’s exercised control. Hepburn (1985, p. 148) considered that correctional officer’s expertise resides in settling conflicts and shaping the appropriate course of inmates’ conduct.

Hepburn isolated two areas where expertise may constitute barriers. The first barrier can be found in the control and management of inmates. Hepburn (1985, p. 148) acknowledged that the expertise in the absence of legitimate, coercive, and reward power are insufficient to control prisons. Secondly, Hepburn contended that expert power may weaken bureaucratic administrative procedures (1985, pp. 148 & 149). Thus the correctional macro organization has tried to centralize decision-making in addition to routinizing task and technical procedures in an attempt to regulate and restrict expert powers of the correctional officer (Hepburn, 1985, p. 149).

Finally, the sixth base of power is discretionary power. Galligan (1990) regarded discretionary power as being allocated within a system of authority to a field, endowing the official the ability to find some significant scope on reasons and standards to which power (legitimate, referent, coercive, reward, and expert) is to be exercised and applied to a specific decision (Hawkins, 1992, p. 15). Discretionary power is the freedom or the authority to make judgments and to act as seen fit (Hunt, 1997, p. 521). Personal judgment or ‘acting as seen fit’ occurs not only when specific and consistent standards
are not given, but also when a situation deems necessary interpreting and assessing standards relative to conflict criterion. Brown (1981, p. 34) identified a set of organizational conditions that increase discretionary power of professionals. These conditions are intense socio-political conflict over organizational goals, pressure to provide adequate solutions to difficult and demanding social problems, and difficulties in rationalizing organizational decision-making (Gilbert, 1997, p. 50). These conditions are clearly seen as reasons for correctional officer’s discretionary power. Gilbert (1997) wrote:

“On a daily basis they must translate vague philosophical notions into concerted actions and specific work behaviors. The lack of clarity as to the purpose, role, and function of prisons, the variation between institutions and systems, the inability of correctional managers to communicate consistent philosophical principles and values, and the autonomy that is given to line officers broaden their individual discretionary power” (Gilbert, 1997, p.51).

As discretion-holders, correctional officers unilaterally affect the lives of inmates residing in the correctional institutions (Bell, 1992). Discretionary power endows the correctional officer with the ability to control inmates, enforce correctional rules, and distribute of resources (Kessler & Piehl, 1998). Correctional officers are authorized based on discretion to subjectively determine decisions in relations to inmates (Bell, 1992).

Social Interaction:

Within the Correctional system, correctional officers must concern themselves with the safety and the rights of these two groups: Correctional officers and Inmates. Correctional facilities create networks of social relationships amongst the group members embedded in group structure of norms values, rules and roles beliefs and ideals (Kreijns, Kirschner, Jochems, & Buuren, 2004). These two Castes have the most interaction with
the correctional officer. Interaction with these two strata of the correctional facility each creates a relationship that defines correctional officer’s purpose. Although correctional officer’s role is centered on custody and rehabilitation, Gilbert (1997, p. 53) acknowledges that correctional officer’s role does not produce security, control, or safety, but rather social interaction. Gilbert (1997, p. 53) affirmed that it is the social interaction of the correctional officer that influences the safety, security, and control within the correctional facility.

A correctional officer when he/she is hired he becomes a member of a same occupational group (Lombardo, 1985, p. 82). This membership is multidimensional. The correctional officer becomes a civil servant, a member of the department of corrections and an employee of the Criminal Justice System (1985, p. 82). He/She is no longer considered by individuality, he/she is required to accept the role of a team player. Correctional officers as a group essentially have the same job title and fundamentally perform the same tasks.

Motivations for becoming apart of this group stems from job security, pay, and employment, but the stimulus that induces correctional officers to be a teammate occurs entirely from a different motivation (Lombardo, 1985, p. 83). Lombard (1985, p. 82) assumed that group identity and cohesiveness is easily maintained because solidarity. Group solidarity for a correctional officer is a response to perceived threats from other inmates or correctional administrators. Janis (1968) contended that external threats foster increased reliance in the group.

Threats are not the only reason why correctional officer cling to the solidarity of the group. Another reason comes from the general atmosphere. Lombardo (1985, p. 85)
asserted that the atmosphere that correctional officer work in stimulates the attractiveness of membership. Conformity to the general atmosphere fosters perceptions of promotions, and perk job assignments. The general atmosphere creates an environment of brotherhood, and having each others back (Janis, 1968). Inside the correctional facility it is important to foster this type of solidarity with his/her “brother” officers because without it, individuals will feel they are alone dealing with the problems of their jobs and problems with dealing with the “risky” inmate population (Lombardo, 1985).

Whitehead, Linquist, and Klofas (1987, p. 470) promote the idea that the correctional facility represents a special environment that is distinguished by an ongoing relationship between the keepers and the kept. The role of the correctional officer as ‘keeper’ places him/her in direct interaction with the inmate population. Accordingly correctional officers could be thought of as having a great impact on the attitudes and behavior of the prison population (U.S. Office of Personnel Management [OPM], 1971, p. 4). Correctional officers “ensure prisoners earn privileges by responsible behavior, hard work and constructive activity” (Liebling, 2000, p. 336).

Hepburn and Crepin (1984, p. 140) claim that prisoners are dependent on guards for protection, safety, assignments and disciplinary actions, allocation of position, goods and services. Ben-David (1992) work supports this idea of dependency between staff and inmates. Ben-David (1992) in his previous work conceptualized and validated five prototypes of staff-inmate relationship.

The five prototypes of staff-inmate relations are described as follow:

1.) *Punitive type*: maintenance of an authoritative status by order and demanding obedience (Ben-David, 1992, p. 213).
2.) *Custodial type:* relates to inmates as “kept” people, and are determine to keep them neat and clean (Ben-David, 1992, p. 214).

3.) *Patronage type:* relates to inmate in a more guidance and cooperation model. Correctional officers tend to needs and the request of inmates (Ben-David, 1992, p. 214).

4.) *Therapist Type:* relates to the inmate in the role of advisor and guide (Ben-David, 1992, p. 214).

5.) *Integrative type:* attempt to integrate the situation and inmate. Correctional officer respond to the inmate in accord with the inmates’ behavior at the time (Ben-David, 1992, p.215).

There is a dependency between the correctional officer and inmate (Ben-David, Silfen, & David, 1996). The cause of this interrelationship is a result of the correctional facility. The correctional facility on the basis of its mission to protect society by confining offenders in a controlled environment, places the correctional officer in a position of authority, supervision, and caretaker of the inmate population (U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1971). This position also relegates them into the position of dependency. This dependency although apparent is not sanctioned by the administration, but is visible in the attitudes of the correctional officer (Ben-David, Silfen, & David, 1996).

Weinberg (1942) states that correctional officers because of the dynamics of their relationships label inmates with negative depictions of “subordinate,” “felons,” “murder and rapist,” “diseased,” “criminals,” and “risk & threat.” This perception stigmatizes the inmate population. Affixing this negative perception, Correctional officers work in arenas of danger or hazards. The U.S. Office of Personnel Management (1971, p. 7) describes that the hazards of correctional work stem from incidents that frequently occur within the confines of the institution (e.g., fights among inmates, assaults on officers,
riots, escape attempts). Officers are often assaulted with deadly weapons, and held hostage in riots, with the chances of injury, or even death. For this reason it necessitates officers to have alertness, skills and the necessary judgment criteria to avoid danger, and handle harmful circumstances effectively (U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1971, p. 7). It is important to note that the degree of difficulty in the assignments of the correctional officer is based on the grade levels of position, rather than the characteristics of the post. No matter the post, the objective of the correctional officer still consists of policing, observing inmates as well as assisting in inmates’ adjustment to the environment and rehabilitation (U.S. Office of Personnel Management, 1971, p. 4).

Statement of the Problem

Correctional Officer’s are empowered through correctional policies to make decisions to ensure that prisoners conform to organizational routines (Liebling, 2000). Lipsky (1980) classified the role of the correctional officer within the correctional institution as a street level bureaucrat. Street level bureaucrats are public service workers. In the position of a public service worker, correctional officers interact directly with citizens in the course of their jobs and have substantial discretion in the execution of the work (Lipsky, 1980, p. 1).

Liebling (2000, p. 335) defined the correctional officer’s interaction as policing. Policing is a set of processes aimed at the provision of security through surveillance and the threat of sanctioning. Liebling (2000, p. 335) stated that the completion of the policing task requires power and authority, the use of discretion, the pursuit of order and an opposition of lawlessness. Discretionary power of a correctional officer is important
to policy implementation. Gilbert (1997) confirmed that there is a disagreement over how discretionary power should be guided or managed.

In conjunction with discretionary power, there is another of part policing that must be guided and managed. Correctional officers, as public human service workers or street level bureaucrats, must deal with emotional labor. Emotional labor deals with emotions within him/herself that is generated by their working environment (Martin, 1999). Emotional labor considers correctional officer’s feeling about their work as well as inmates’ behaviors; both have serious implications on the officer’s routine practices. As an effective emotional laborer, the correctional officer must control their own feelings and the emotional displays relating to the inmate population (Martin, 1999, p. 112).

According to Bakker, Leblanc, and Schaufeli (2005) micro-level public human service workers such as correctional officers have heavy work loads and extensive responsibilities but limited authority. With high demand and low control, a correctional officer evokes psychological and physical distress. The correctional staff has insufficient resources to aid them in coping with their distress (Morgan, Van Havern, & Pearson, 2002). Working conditions involving person-role conflict eventually deplete officer’s emotional resources and initiate the burnout syndrome. Martin (1999) describes that within a work environment, correctional officers encounter activities and incidents that arouse deep emotions that if not managed may have high costs.

Poole and Regoli (1980) affirmed that correctional officers have wide areas of discretion. The correctional officer must find cues to guide his decision making. Poole and Regoli (1980) confirm that discretionary outcomes depend largely on the defining of a situation. Degrees of defining a situation affect correctional officers’ interpretation of
the rules (1980). It is the concern of this research to isolate correlated indicators of emotional dissonance that arise from contradictions between emotional labor and street bureaucracy. Rafaeli and Sutton (1987) classified emotional dissonance as a form of person-role conflict. Finally, through studying consequences of correctional officer’s emotional dissonance (role conflict, burnout, and negative affect) this research will attempt to examine factors that negatively impact discretionary decision making.

Significance of the Study

Correctional officers encounter high-risk situations, where they might have bodily contact with inmates. They routinely perform pat searches, strip searches, and cell searches. On a regular basis, correctional officers handle situations where blood is spilt, inmates who bite, spit, or hurl body waste. Correctional officers have cited dealing with inmate scuffles and they may have to apply force to restrain or protect from assault (Aegis, 2004). Unfortunately, in most disciplinary situations, correctional officers can not physically force prisoners into obedience. Correctional officers must rely on discretionary reciprocity. Officers exercise flexibility, punitive actions and freedom in return for good behavior (Marquart et al., 2001).

Situations that bring hazard, threat, alarm or danger (being harmed, injured, or infected) to the correctional officer’s occupation elicit emotions, feelings, and mood, i.e. anger, fear, and anxiety. Officers, who fail to cope with the negative affect of their emotions in conflict with the occupational norms of the correctional institution, could elicit counterproductive behavior, and inappropriate work-related activities also known as occupational deviance (Marquart et al., 2001).
Occupational deviance in correctional officers’ vocation negatively influences the use of discretion. Counterproductive decision making or deviant discretion are based on perceptions of recklessness, cowardice, worry, bias, and prejudice (Crawley, 2004). Occupational deviance based on emotional conflicts lead to a misuse of discretionary power allotted by the correctional institution (Crawley, 2004).

It is vital that research focused on the management and control of correctional officer’s usage of deviant discretion. Research done on this subject matter will assist in creating a discretionional framework that will include emotion. This dissertation study desires to provide background information concerning major issues encompassing correctional officers’ role contradictions (emotional laborer/street level bureaucrat).

Additionally, this inquiry into the person-role conflict presents preliminary knowledge on conceptualizing the underlying indicators of deviant discretionary decision making. This study does not attempt to resolve any disagreements about likely causations or best predictors of correctional officer behavior. This dissertation study assumes that officers are affected by multiple factors or cues in exercising discretion. This study will also assume that these multiple factors are predictors of deviant discretion.

The factors or cues utilized by this dissertation study are taken from elements of emotional dissonance. A distinctive methodology for understanding the negative effect of emotional dissonance (role conflict, burnout and negative affectivity) on deviant discretion will be ascertained. This methodology will hopefully lead to rectifying problems bearing on correctional officer’s reaction to incidence and the handling
discretionary power by public human service workers within an institutional environment.

Conceptual Framework

Emotional dissonance has not received the necessary attention in the realm of discretionary decision making because there has been no theory, or even a pre-theoretical framework for this form of conflict (Brehmer, 1976). In order to understand how emotional dissonance negatively impacts correctional officer’s discretionary decision making, this study will employ the Social Judgment Theory (SJT) as a conceptual framework. The Social Judgment Theory (SJT) is an analysis of human judgment that stems from Brunswik’s probabilistic functionalism (with the Lens Model as its conceptual framework) and related “ratiomorphic” principles of representative design to the study of human judgment (Cooksey, 1996; Doherty & Kurz, 1996, p. 114).

The SJT conceptual framework makes the description of tasks and cognitive systems possible in terms of organizing principles for the cues; weighing the importance of the cues for predicting criteria or judgment; illustrating the functional relations between cues and criteria and between cues and judgments; and lastly demonstrating consistency or predictability of criterion values and judgment based on the proper combination of cues (Brehmer, 1976, p. 987).

SJT conceptual framework provides an opportunity to empirically measure cues for a selected group of information (Stefl-Mabry, 2003, p. 881). The term “cue”, “sign” or “information” can be used interchangeably (Doherty & Kurz, 1996, p. 115). Cues are described as stimulus variables linked equally to distal and proximal (Doherty & Kurz, 1996, p. 115). The social judgment theory as a framework establishes a criterion for
suggesting that information has the potential to be cues to understand behaviors such as making judgments, decisions or using discretion (Stefl-Mabry, 2003, p. 881).

The social judgment theory (SJT) conceptual framework uses a Lens Model to depict the complexities of the relationship between the social environment and the cognitive processes of correctional officers. The Lens Model is a representation for studying decision-making or human judgment (Cooksey, 1996). The Lens Model can vary and be extended in numerous ways without altering or distorting the essential concept. This research will use for the Lens Model a single system design, which is identical to the classical policy capturing model used in personnel-related applied judgment research (Gilliland, Wood, & Schmitt, 1994).

The single system design does not incorporate any ecological criterion. The ecology is exhibited in the configuration of emotional dissonance cues that confront correctional officers, but no comparison to actual environmental outcomes is possible (Doherty & Kurz, 1996). This study will use the single system design of SJT to explore how emotional dissonance cues have an effect on the value systems of correctional officers. Figure 1.2 depicts the simplest model used in SJT research, the Single system Design:
Research Design

This research is based on a single system design of the social judgment theory and will be used as a hypotheses generating exploratory study, to provide an empirical examination of emotional dissonance, negative effect on correctional officer’s discretionary decision making. The process of decision making gain informed sources from perceptions and beliefs established on obtainable information and impacted by affect, attitudes, motives and preferences (Ben-Akiva, McFadden, & Garling, 1999, p.188). This study employs Social Judgment Analysis, a research approach that applies a cross sectional survey research design and multivariate/bivariate statistical methodology to identify information sources or judgment values experienced by correctional officers.
Connolly et al. (2000) indicated that the analysis built on the social judgment theory identifies preferences that individuals and groups use in making decisions or developing dispositions.

Survey is defined by Tanur (1982) as a means of gathering information about the characteristics, actions, attitudes, or perception of a group of people or population. Glock (1967) noted that research conducted using surveys have three elements. First, survey research is a quantitative method requiring standardized information about studied population. Survey research generated quantitative details for the investigated population. The population investigated may be subjects, groups, organizations, projects, or systems (Pinsonneault & Kraemer, 1993).

Secondly, survey research amasses self-reported data through structured inquiries and predefined questions. Survey research classifies subjects as unit of analysis which comprises the data to be analyzed (Pinsonneault & Kraemer, 1993, p.77). Thirdly, survey research is generally collected from a sample of the studied population. The data is collected by techniques that allow the findings gained to be generalized to the general population. The sample is usually sizeable enough to permit extensive statistical analyses (Pinsonneault & Kraemer, 1993, p.78).

Although the survey research can be used for description and explanation purposes, this research design centers on exploration. Exploratory survey research occurs in early stages of research into a phenomenon (Forza, 2002, p. 155). Survey research method provides “search device” into a particular topic (Babbie, 1990, p. 53). Exploratory survey research allows for insight into the best facets to measure the phenomenon and provides for more thorough investigation (Malhorta & Grover, 1998).
Exploratory research provides support of connection among concepts. Exploratory research designs also build foundations and examine the valid boundaries of tentative theories (Forza, 2002, p. 155).

Once survey researchers explore, or examine a population at one specific occasion, the cross-sectional design is most fitting (Babbie, 1990). Cross-sectional design examines a population or sample at one particular instance. Cross-sectional designs safely generalize the findings taken from the population or sub-sets of the population (Fowler, 1993). “A population is the theoretically specified aggregation of survey elements” (Babbie, 1990, p. 72).

The cross-sectional survey design collects a one-time portrait of a population’s perception or attitudes at the time the questions are solicited (Folz, 1996). Cross-sectional survey design assembles relevant data in order for the researcher to access, manipulate, and analyze a database for specific interest or objective (O’Sullivan & Rassel, 1989). In a cross-sectional survey design, measurements are gathered at once and statistical methods are implemented to examine the relationships between the variables. The limits of cross-sectional designs are its inability to construct causal assumptions or acquire temporal priority. Consequently, cross-sectional survey research analysis is generally unsuitable for examining the independent variable or set of independent variables causes a specified outcome (Folz, 1996, p. 29).
Research Questions

Based on the research interests and assumptions as expressed within the context of this study, one central research question and three sub-questions will be considered:

Central Question:
How does emotional dissonance impact the custodial orientation attitude of correctional officers in public prisons?

Sub questions:
1. How does role conflict impact the custodial orientation attitude of correctional officers in public prisons?
2. How does burnout impact the custodial orientation attitude of correctional officers in public prisons?
3. How does negative affect impact the custodial orientation attitude of correctional officers in public prisons?

The answers to these research questions help us to better understand how emotional dispositions (Burnout and Negative Affect) influence line correctional officer’s day-to-day decision making practices within the correctional institutional work setting. The responses will also provide data on how role conflict, emotional exhaustion, negative affectivity in conjunction with demographic control variables (i.e. race/ethnicity, age, gender, and tenure). The responses from this study will play a part in understanding the effects hybridizing micro-level bureaucracy organizational form on correctional officer’s deviant discretionary decision making process (cognitive and emotional response).
Limitations of the Study

There are several limitations to this study based on research design and analysis preference. First, this study does not seek to analyze or deliberate the ethical and moral implications of emotion’s sway or influence on street level bureaucrat’s discretion. This study does not intend to discuss emotion’s rationality or discern the consequences of role ambiguity. The focal of this study will add new knowledge not only to emotional dissonance but moreover to deviant discretion.

In addition, the findings of this dissertation research will be gained through a cross-sectional design and self-report of correctional officers working within correctional facilities. Cross sectional survey designs are limited because it gives only a snapshot (the situation could possibly differ resulting from another time frame) over a short period of time; therefore the study’s analysis cannot determine a causal inference (Levin, 2006).

Grimes and Schulz (2002) wrote that with cross-sectional designs internal and external validity entails tradeoffs. External validity can suffer if participants choose not to take part in this study or restricted based on criteria. This study because of design and small size of the population may suffer from attrition, bias and the inability to establish a generalization to the total correctional officer population operating with in the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (ODRC) or any other state correctional system.

Grimes and Schulz (2002) also note that bias can undermine the internal validity of a cross-sectional research design, specifically selection bias. Selection bias is based on a deficiency of comparability between groups studied (Grimes and Schulz, 2002, p. 248). Nevertheless given that this study in exploratory in nature, this study is intended to be a
preliminary step to examine the type, source and effect of emotional dissonance on the discretion of correctional officers operating within a specific correctional institution.

Chapter Summary

Chapter I introduces the purpose of this dissertation, which is a study of role contradictions between street level bureaucracy and emotional labor. In addition, this chapter proposes the investigation into the realms of emotional dissonance and deviant discretion. Background information on the correctional system and correctional officers were gathered, this resulted in the following findings:

- Historically, issues remain centered more on custody/rehabilitation precedence and ineffectiveness to justify problems uncovered in the correctional system (Cullen, 2001).

- Correctional officers’ role set comprising of frontline position, bureaucratic utility, human service functions, and boundary-spanning roles, can be compressed into the simple term, street level bureaucrat. As a street level bureaucrat, correctional officers juggle contradictory work priorities (Grusky, 1959), balance competing work concerns and occupy multiple roles in organization (Tracy, 2004, p. 120).

- To explore role contradictions, it is possible to use the emotion principle of Tracy (2004). Tracy (2004) believes that contradictions among correctional officers are marked by significant emotional challenges.

- Emotional dissonance has not received the necessary attention in the realm of organized dissonance, micro-level bureaucracy and discretionary decision making (Ashcraft, 2006; Tracy, 2004).

Chapter I identifies and discusses the definition of terms, significance of study, statement of the problem, conceptual framework, research design, research questions, and limitation of study. It is the intention of this dissertation study, to explore negative impact of emotional dissonance on discretionary decision-making, by employing the Social Judgment Theory conceptual framework and analysis. The Social Judgment
Analysis (SJA) is a research approach that applies a cross-sectional survey research design and multivariate/bivariate statistical methodology.

Using the outcome of Chapter I, Chapter II will discuss a review of the literature. Incorporated in the literature review are reviews of scholarly works, empirical studies, and a conceptual framework that are relevant to the primary purpose of this study. First, a discussion of emotional and bureaucratic contradictions of the correctional officer is provided. Second, a discussion of contributions made by concentrating on understanding street-level bureaucrat, emotional labor and the role conflict provides an overview of dialectic contradictions between both correctional roles. Third, a focus will be directed relating to the potential emotional dissonance translating into street-level bureaucrat’s discretionary decision making and behavior. In addition, an overview of Social Judgment Theory will be used to obtain multiple cues in a study of human decision making.

Chapter III will describe the research questions and hypotheses that were formulated from operationalizing the Social Judgment Theory (SJT) in order to examine the negative effect of emotional dissonance on correctional officer’s decision making. Each research question and hypothesis were framed from the operational model, in order to acquire information from the seven cues consisting of components of emotional dissonance and demographic variables (independent variable) and the correctional officer’s reported attitude towards custodial orientation (dependent variable).

Chapter IV will consist of the research design and methodology used to explore the negative effect that emotional dissonance has on correctional officer’s discretionary decision-making. The research design is a cross-sectional exploratory survey research to collect and quantify data gathered on correctional officers at one point in time.
If approved, this dissertation will progress into the following chapters:

Chapter V will present and discuss the major findings of the research analysis. The characteristics of a correctional officer, as well as the test of hypotheses will be provided. The research findings concerning the research and the research questions will be discussed.

Chapter VI will consist of the conclusions and further recommendations of the study. The factors that contribute to the negative effect of emotional dissonance on discretionary decision making will be identified.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The function of Chapter II is to provide a detailed review of the literature, and draw attention to the findings from scholarly and empirical inquiries related to this current research study. This chapter consists of fifteen sections. The first section in this chapter will offer a brief introduction into the contradictions suffered by correctional officers based on role definitions. The second section looks at organization dissonance as a medium for supporting emotional dissonance as a variant micro-level bureaucratic organizational form. The next two sections will define and describe the roles of street level bureaucrat and emotional laborer. These sections are then followed by discussions on the person-role conflict that is created from contradictions between street level bureaucrat and emotional laborer roles (emotional dissonance) as well as a discourse on discretion, deviant discretion, and discretionary decision-making. The last six sections will describe research theoretical framework and review variables that will be looked at in this line of investigation. Finally, Chapter II will conclude with a summary of the literature.
Contradictions/Paradoxes of Role Definitions

Chapter I discusses the position that paradoxes in custody and rehabilitation generate role conflicts inside correctional institutions. Paradoxes or contradictions are commonly apparent in contemporary organizational systems (Stohl & Cheney, 2001). Bensman and Gerver (1963) observed that organizations distribute goals, if performed correctly and efficiently, result in a closely integrated and functioning system. Disappointingly, many organizations such as correctional institutions provide competing goals or insufficient means of attaining socially valued outcomes. Contention and insufficiency result in a dysfunctional element, which can be classified based on tension-centered approach as contradictions.

Savelsberg (2000) wrote that “societal contradictions and antagonisms contribute to social change, under particular circumstances to revolutions” (p. 1022). This social concept refers to contradictions as the catalyst for social outcomes; this concept has, moreover, been accepted by organizational scholars. From the organizational standpoint, contradictions are barriers to productivity and result in organizational conflict, but Benson (1977) asserted that organizational order produced in the process of social construction also contains contradictions in the fabric of social life. Accordingly, Benson (1977) termed contradictions as system-destructive, which means that certain organizational variables can undermine and negate the system.

The contradiction-centered approach focuses on the premise that organizations are conflicted sites of human activity. Contradictions direct us in understanding actual organization practices, thereby aiding in the improvement of organizational structure and theory (Trethewey & Ashcraft, 2004). Contradictions can be “productive or
unproductive, good or bad, liberating or paralyzing” (Tracy, 2004, p. 120). The consequences of contradiction depend on the various ways employees or agents react to the contradiction. Organizational agents structuring of contradictions can have both a personal and organization effect.

Stohl and Cheney (2001) established that organizational contradictions are found not only in macro-levels, but specifically in micro-levels. Trethewey & Ashcraft (2004) identified that there is a growing interest in practitioners’ organizational dilemmas that are embedded in contradictions. Jacobs and Retsky recognized “that contradictory organizational goals have caused conflict in such organizational micro-units as the correctional officer” (1975, p. 8). Berry (2004, p. 260) specified that determining “how to do a personnel function” and “what value to favor or what system to use” are critical in a micro-level bureaucracy, because each policy may contradict on the treatment of clients. Berry (2004) also comments that treatment decisions based on contradictory policies further conflict over the appropriateness of strategies used by professionals to achieve effectiveness and efficiency (Birch, 1993; Klinger & Nalbandian, 1998).

Correctional officers react to various contradictions in their occupation: vacillation, attending to paradoxical norms and withdrawal (McGuire, Dougherty & Atkinson, 2006). Kerfoot and Korczynski (2005) made the argument that a useful way of capturing the contradictory tensions within organization (i.e. correctional institutions) underpinning frontline service work is providing the concept of the client-oriented bureaucracy. Bureaucratic organizations characterized by client-oriented bureaucracy indicate the weight of human service worker’s multiple roles inside the organization. Organizational environments are systematic spaces in which frontline service workers
must mediate between the dual logics. Kerfoot and Korczynski (2005) adhered to the idea that workers bring their own personality and perception to the routines of service work. It is within the client-oriented bureaucracy that contradictions thrive for the human service worker.

Frontline human service workers such as correctional officers are plagued with dialectic contradictions. Lipsky (1980) and Prottas (1979) revealed that dialectic contradictions are at the surface of correctional officer’s role as a street level bureaucrat. The term street level bureaucrat describes the correctional officer as a human service work agent, working within the rules of client-centered bureaucracy with the objective of administering public-welfare policies as well as interpreting policies to accomplish organizational goals Lipsky (1980).

Dialectic contradictions are paradoxes constituted through the relationship between modes of behavior and thinking that are mutually dependent, but at the same time, in conflict with each other (Savelsberg, 2000, p. 1023). The primary dialectic contradiction faced by a correctional practitioner is a product of the organizational goals for custody and rehabilitation. A correctional officer must control and limit the activities of inmates, yet they are endowed with the responsibility of rehabilitation and nurturing (Tracy, 2004, p. 124).

A second contradiction is that bureaucratic rules and policies dictate correctional work but in order for correctional officers to efficiently work in this environmental space there is a need for flexibility, latitude, and discretion (Foucault, 1977). Finally, contradictions for the correctional officer are triggered by social distance. Toch (1985) discussed social distance as a contradiction- tension brought on by a reduction in officer’s
opportunities for positive interaction with inmates. An increase in social distance makes it difficult for correctional officers to establish rehabilitative relationships with inmates. Officers in some correctional facilities tend to “operate in pairs and converse only with each other” (Toch, 1985, p. 62).

Baxter (1990) deemed dialectic contradictions to be intrinsically undisruptive, and may offer mutually exclusive alternatives. Dialectic contradictory tensions occur progressively throughout the relationship. These contradictions can be problematic, particularly if they are pragmatic paradoxes. Pragmatic paradoxes hamper relationships by impinging on the mandates of social norms (Stohl & Cheney, 2001, p. 354). The impingement of mandated social norms double binds practitioners within an organization. Double-binding is a circumstance in which primary and secondary norms conflict directly with one another.

Employees that experience paradoxical social norms react in a few ways (Stohl & Cheney, 2001, p. 354). First, a practitioner facing double binds is likely to be preoccupied or fixated on finding vital clues to make sense of the situation. Secondly, a practitioner will abstain from independent thinking and rely on the complete literalness of rules and policies (Stohl & Cheney, 2001, p. 354). Lastly, a practitioner will withdraw from human involvement through social distancing (i.e. physical isolation or conceptual blocking of social input channels) (Tracy, 2004, p. 122). The consequence of unregulated pragmatic paradoxical tensions is confusion, displeasure, social distance, or possible counter-productive behavior (Tracy, 2004, p. 122).
Organized Dissonance

Guided by the concepts of sustained paradoxical tensions and dialectic contradictions, organized dissonance combines contradictory organizational forms to accomplish conflicted goals (Ashcraft, 2006). Organized dissonance is a strategic union of presumed hostility, or hierarchical and self-governing modes of authority (Ashcraft, 2001). Buzzanell et al. (1997) and Ferguson (1993) suggested that organized dissonance functions as a means of binding incompatible ideals and as an approach to prove that contradiction can be functional, critical, and valuable, rather than just a dilemma to be resolved. Simply put, “organized dissonance entails the active use of contradictions” (Ashcraft, 2001, p. 1304).

Ashcraft (2001) subscribed to the idea that organized dissonance can be perceived as a hybrid of bureaucracy. Ashcraft defined hybrid as a unification of multiples forms that reflect combinations designed to either solve problems or create considerable conflict. Borys and Jemison (1989) explained that the attempt to combine multiple heterogeneous forms is a major difficulty of hybrids. Hybrids are a system of tensions or conflict between opposing goals that build bridges between opposed sides of organizational forms, values, roles, or authority (Romme & George, 1999). As a hybrid, organized dissonance may appear to be a manifestation of counter bureaucratic ideal type, but in actuality it is an interpretation of imperfections found in contradictions. Organized dissonance analyzes the contradictions and “paradoxes and tensions that arise from enacting oppositional forms” (Ashcraft, 2001, p. 131).

More recently, Ashcraft (2006) acknowledged that new organizational forms are hybrid and paradoxical in nature. Ashcraft used organized dissonance as an approach of

Dialectic reframing allows organized dissonance to identify organizational form in the dynamic interaction between structures and practices (Ashcraft, 2001, p. 1304). An Organizational form describes governance of structure by concentrating on “structural features or patterns that are shared among many organizations” (Fulk & DeSanctis, 1999, p. 5) and “the purposeful specification of relationships” (Keidel, 1995, p. 5). Another definition was written by Reed (1997, p. 33). Reed wrote:

“Organizational forms consist of relational structures into which people enter and pre-exist the people who enter them, and whose activity reproduces or transforms them. They are structures by virtue of the fact that they have spatially, temporally and socially enduring institutional properties that are irreducible to the activities of contemporary agents. Yet, these same structures derive from the historical actions which generated them and which establish a structured context for current action” (Reed, 1997, p. 33).

Whitchurch (2004, p. 281) wrote that on the micro-level organizational form of bureaucracy there is a change in the features of the administrative profession (i.e. public service workers as well as traditional regulatory, and ‘civil service’ type roles). Whitchurch (2004) identified three features changing public administrative characteristics. First, public workers have integrated roles requiring specialist expertise and knowledge of management, where independent and discretionary decision making are called for during various levels of risk (Whitchurch, 2004, p. 281). Second,
professionals have become more complicated; they are created within functional areas as support service specialist (Whitchurch, 2004, p. 281). Third, the boundaries between professional service roles have become unspecified and their activities are now cross-functional, boundary-spanning, and interlinking in complex ways (Whitchurch, 2004, pp. 281 & 282). This has created hybrid forms of the micro-level bureaucracy (Whitchurch, 2004, p. 281).

To explore the hybridization of micro-level bureaucratic form, this study investigates the manifestation of organized dissonance as it appears from the contradictions of the correctional officer’s function, as a result of combining street level bureaucratic form with emotional labor. Previous studies on correctional role of street level bureaucrat and contradictions have not focused on a premise that bureaucratic structure and emotional practice stand on equivalent footing. A number bureaucratic and institutionalization theorist suggest that bureaucracy must dominate or detach itself from emotional practice (Hummel 1982; Mumby & Putman, 1993; Noon & Blyton, 1997). In contrast, Crawley (2004), Tracy (2003), and Poole and Regoli (1980) endorsed the assessment of emotional foundations of the correctional profession. Katz and Kahn (1966) suggested that employees facing unclear, dissonant, or contradictory expectations experience role conflict. Tracy (2004, p. 125) imparted that contradictory norms and structures in the correctional system generate role conflicts with emotional reaction.

Harmon (1995) disclosed that correctional officers are dichotomous, between internal or emotive, and external or procedural responsibility. Responsibility is defined as functioning in accordance with duty and personal expectations (Petter, 2005, p.198). Responsibility is valued based on a correctional officer’s role as a street level bureaucrat,
and ability to engage in discretionary decision making. Harmon (1995) revealed that in the case of the correctional officer, the two ideas of responsibility, internal and external are contradictory, but is essential to other. A significant contribution can be made by concentrating on understanding street level bureaucrat, emotional labor and the organized dissonance (role conflict resulting from the dialectic contradictions). This research contends that emotional dissonance when extended to accommodate the bureaucratic form becomes a variation of organized dissonance and a hybrid of micro-level bureaucratic form.

Street Level Bureaucrat

The correctional officer is first and foremost a street level bureaucrat. The street level bureaucrat is a professional, whose expertise is built upon being a skilled administrative politician and requires normative, constitutional, and rhetorical competence (Green, Wamsley, and Keller, 1993). Green, Wamsley, and Keller (1993, p. 517) identified that the profession of the bureaucrat is empowered by formal institutional position and administrative duties. The street level bureaucrats are public employees, who interact with individual clients and have substantial discretion in distributing services or employing sanctions (Lipsky, 1980). Hoggett (2006) identified the role of a street level bureaucrat as applying judgment and using discretion in the use of policies to specific circumstances.

Berry (2004) acknowledges that “at the point where policy is translated into practice, professional provides crucial role in determining the effectiveness of the policy, he/she is typically the street level bureaucrat” (p. 264). Berry (2004) establishes that street level bureaucrat in dealing with the public must cope with contradictory and
ambiguous institutional goals as well as limited resources for treatment implementation. Visser (2002, p. 54) asserted that the role of the street level bureaucrat is salient in complex bureaucratic situations in which issues rapidly exceed time, and experience.

Mashaw (1983) stressed that in highly bureaucratized human service organizations, policy implementation requires policy adaptation. The correctional officer as a street level bureaucrat must make major or minor decisions on applying and interpreting rules and policies. Decisions made by street level workers are day to day vehicles ensuring that the routines and regulations are upheld. Street level workers’ decision making, active ruling, and applying correctional policies make them the locus for boundary spanning activities (Visser, 2002). Lipsky (1978 & 1980) merged policy and implementation constructs describes that the interaction between clients and the boundary-spanning roles of the street level bureaucrat constituted the policy to be delivered.

Boundary spanning comprises four roles: strategic planning, managing and leveraging resources, evaluation, and policy practice (Menefee, 1998; Pettus & Severson, 2006, p. 213). Planning, coordination, and resource acquisition take place across multiple situations inside the organization (Pettus & Severson, 2006). Boundary spanners cross boundaries by maintaining loyalty to the organization while dealing with multiple groups and engaging in cross-system communication through the fulfillment of needs, expectation and demands. In terms of boundary spanning roles, Correctional officers are brokers of privileges and resources between the organization and clients (Scott, 1997, p. 37). Correctional officers negotiate between various levels of the organization, procure resources, monitor the inmate population, and promote effective
collaboration among the various organizational systems using appropriate professional power and influence (Pettus & Severson, 2006, p. 213).

Nonetheless, the main organizational performance must focus upon the interface of clients and the correctional officer (Kanter & Brinkerhoff, 1981, p. 338). As the street level bureaucrat, the correctional officer regulates the degree of contemporary conflict by virtue of their boundary spanning role as agents of social control (Lipsky, 1980, p.11). Whitehead, Linquist, and Kofas (1987, p.470) revealed that the correctional facility represents a special environment that is distinguished by an ongoing relationship between the keepers and the kept. The role of the correctional officer as ‘keeper’ places him/her in direct interaction with the inmate population. As the keeper the correctional officer emphasizes control, security, and surveillance of inmates (Toch, 1978).

Accordingly, the correctional officer’s role inside the institution generates a great impact on the attitudes and behavior of the prison population. Research has exposed that professional bureaucrats are more significant predictors of behavior than bureaucratic factors (Hodges & Durant, 1989). The correctional officer must utilize strategies for gaining routine inmate observance of institutional rules (Jenne, & Kersting, 1998). Bottom (1999, p. 209) describes the correctional officer’s work as “the reiteration of daily routines.” Correctional officers must dutifully ensure that daily social routines are followed and new routines become efficiently assimilated by inmates (Bottom, 1999, pp. 209-210). Jenne and Kersting (1998) described physical force, persuasion, and threats of punishment as techniques used by correctional officers to influence inmates. Jenne and Kersting (1998) also stated that correctional officers hardly exercise physical force to maintain order. Toch (1978, p. 25) wrote that correctional officers employ rules on
behalf of inmates in need, as well as consider loopholes in bureaucracy in order to solve problems.

Correctional officers achieve order by relying on forms of negotiations, accommodations, and manipulations, such as responsible behavior, hard work and constructive activity (Jacobs, 1981; Liebling, 2000, p. 336). Correctional officers craft “continuous streams” of decisions that influence their clients’ lives (Schwalbe, 2004). Maynard-Moody, Musheno, and Palumbo (1989) expressed that street level influence over policy implementation is a precondition of justice in delivery of human service. Kelly (1994, p. 120) described correctional officers’ decisions as justice judgments, which significantly affect inmates in various ways. As a street level bureaucrat, the principles held by correctional officers alter policy outcomes (Musheno, 1986). Correctional officers apply principles of justice to specific situations in order to utilize correctional policies (Kelly, 1994). These decisions weigh the use of interventions at prevention of delinquent and illicit behavior.

Correctional officers’ position bears a strong influence on the lives of the inmate populace. This influence stems from the correctional officer, who is considered a “discretionary agent” (Guenther & Guenther, 1971). As a discretionary agent, the law allows the correctional officer to act in certain circumstances or situations in “accordance with an official’s or an official agency’s own considered judgment and conscience” (Pound, 1960). The correctional officers are imbued with high levels of bureaucratic discretion, despite their low ranks, because correctional facilities are continually short-staffed and supplied with limited resources (Greenely & Kirk, 1973). Bureaucratic discretion is the liberty or authority to make decisions and act as one sees fit. Discretion
permits correctional officers to operate as an advocate to circumvent the system or fight on the inmates behalf (Toch, 1978, p. 26). Poole and Regoli (1980) describe correctional officer’s utilization of discretion as a wide area. Correctional officers on a daily basis use their discretion to translate numerous organizational policies and mandates into actions and specific discretionary work behaviors (Gilbert, 1997, p. 51).

The theoretical foundation for understanding correctional officer’s discretionary work behavior is found in Muir’s typology of discretionary behavior. Correctional Officer’s role within the correctional facilities has different work dimensions and descriptors (nature) of their discretionary behavior which reside within two determinants. Muir’s first determinant of discretionary behavior stems from the correctional officer’s ability to resolve ethical or moral dilemma concerning correctional officer’s use of coercive power to accomplish their duties (Gilbert, 1997, p. 52). When coercive power is used appropriately in the professional role then this condition is considered to be “integrated morality” (Gilbert, 1997, p. 52). If correctional officer’s can not resolve using coercion in their professional duties then this difficulty is considered to be “conflicted morality” (Gilbert, 1997, p. 52).

The second determinant is derived from the correctional officer’s capacity for developing tragic sense. Tragic sense is the aptitude for empathy, sensitivity, or compassion that allows the correctional officer to perceive inmates as well as their own deviation in behavior (Gilbert, 1997, pp. 52-53). Without this tragic capacity the correctional officer will gain a “cynical perspective” and would thus have a dualistic view of human nature (i.e., good and bad, predator and prey, victim and victimizer, weak and strong) (Gilbert, 1997, p. 53). Based on Muir’s description of determinants, there are
two typology dimensions: primary axis of integrated morality/conflicted rationality and secondary axis of Tragic/Cynical (See Figure 2.1).

Therefore, Muir (1977) categorized correctional officer’s discretionary behavior based on four descriptors found in each quadrant of the discretionary typology: Professional (Reasonable and to make exceptions), Reciprocator (Counseling orientation regarding enforcement duties), Enforcer (By the book, and unable to make exceptions), and Avoider (Defines tasks out of the job to limit enforcement activities) (Gilbert, 1997, p. 52). Table 2.1 provides Muir’s (1977) discretionary behavioral description of correctional officers (Gilbert, 1997, pp. 54-55).
| **Table 2.1**
| Description of Correctional Officer’s Discretionary Behavior  
| (Gilbert, 1997, pp. 54-55) |
| **Professional** | 1.) Develops housing units; 2.) Take educated risks; 3.) Provides inmates advice on rules and regulation; 4.) Increase pressure over time to change behavior; 5.) Use the "write-up" as a last resort; 6.) Tries to preserve the dignity of inmates through the use of non-demeaning behaviors and attitudes; 7.) View offenders as not much different from self; 8.) Empathizes with the human condition of inmates; 9.) Allows for exceptions in his/her own behavior and that of others; 10.) Uses coercion and force judiciously; calm and easy-going; 11.) Articulates and open; 12.) Focuses on ensuring due process and decency in security and control tasks; 13.) Views most other officers as being enforcer-oriented. |
| **Reciprocator** | 1.) Allows inmate leaders to keep unit settled as well as a mutual accommodation; 2.) Uses clinical/social work strategies to help inmates “worthy” of assistance; 3.) Rationalizes situations; 4.) Attempts to educate, cure, or solve the inmate’s problems; 5.) Low tolerance for rejection of offered assistance; 6.) Easily frustrated; 7.) Often does not use coercion when it should be used; 8.) Inconsistent job performance; 9.) Irrational behavior by inmates stymies the officer; 10.) Displays superior attitude to others; 11.) Highly articulate. |
| **Enforcer** | 1.) Aggressive rule enforcement; 2.) Issues many “warnings”; 3.) Actively seeks violations; 4.) Use force or excessive force; 5.) View treatments functions as what other’s do with or for inmates; 6.) Stringent security and control 7.) Limited empathy for inmates; 8.) Inmates submit grievances for officer’s behavior; 9.) Rigid, rule-bound, makes few exceptions; 10.) Dualistic view of human nature; 11.) Detest management’s position; 12.) Postures for effect; 13.) Takes unnecessary risks; 14.) View other officers as soft and weak if not like him/her; 15.) View officers with similarities as the majority. |
| **Avoider** | 1.) Leaves situations as promptly; 2.) View communication with inmates not a part of security and control; 3.) Use security and control to reduce contact with inmates; 4.) Often the last to reach the scene of an emergency; 5.) Likely to select isolated duty away from inmates; 6.) Frequently backs down; 7.) Blames others for avoidance and inadequacies; 8.) Avoid observing infractions and use of coercion; 9.) Avoids confrontation and interactions with inmates |
Becker’s (1960) findings confirmed that broad discretion is essential because the correctional officer must search for proper cues in a situation to guide decision making. Correctional officer’s discretion is not implemented without reference to institutional policies and rules (Hunt, 1997). Based on specific situations the correctional officer must interpret and exercise the rules, instead of rigidly enforcing laws, regulation rules, or procedures. This is demonstrated by the correctional officer’s decisions to process rule infractions formally and informally (Flanagan, 1980). Correctional officers decide whether to recognize an inmate’s behavior as a violation of rules. Correctional officers may also decide that the event fell within the bounds of allowable conduct (Light, 1990).

Ultimately, discretion should be discerned as a result of inmates’ dependence upon the correctional officer (Mechanic, 1962). Mechanic’s study (1962) perceived that discretionary control of inmates is based on access, and manipulation of information, persons, and instrumentalities. Mechanic defined these components as follows:

- Information is the knowledge of the organization, persons, norms, procedures, rules and techniques.
- Persons include organizational staff as well as clients residing within the organization.
- Instrumentalities are any aspect of the organizations physical environment or organization resources (equipment, machines, and money).

Hepburn and Crepin (1984, p.140) claimed that prisoners are dependent on guards for protection, safety, assignments and disciplinary actions, and allocation of position, goods and services. Correctional officers control or deliver services to inmates and retain a supervisory position in the correctional facility (Gilbert, 1997). They monitor inmate work details in conjunction with other departments. Correctional officers also supervise
services offered within the facility (i.e. educational, recreational, and religions) (Zimmer, 1987, p. 417).

It is important to point out that the actions of the correctional officer determine the conductivity of the correctional environment to rehabilitation. Gilbert (1997) asserted that the correctional officer’s actions within the correctional environment may indeed be constructive or destructive. Many scholarly writings only isolate incremental incidents of disorder within the correctional institution (Hemmens & Stohr, 2000; Lombardo, 1985; Johnson & Price, 1981). Disturbances within correctional environment stimulate great debates about correctional officer’s reactions with regards to isolated incidents. Yet, many researchers and scholars have felt that feelings, moods, or emotions in bureaucratic reaction to incident are irrelevant. Yang (2005) wrote based on Hummel’s (1977) work on bureaucracy that “when functions replace social relations, operational codes replace social norms, effectiveness replace ethics, work identity replaces personality and command replaces dialogue, human emotion is not and should not be present” (Hummel, 1977).

An opposing view to Hummel’s concept of the street level worker’s reaction to incidents can be found in the literature of Fineman and Sturdy (1999). Fineman and Sturdy (1999) through interviews with regulatory inspectors exposed that street level bureaucrats not only create meanings and rules of regulation, but emotionalize controlled encounters. The term emotionalize refers to internalizing emotive values. Whether these values are important or subordinate, they are used to ensure responsible bureaucratic behavior, i.e. discretion. Street bureaucrats within a client-centered bureaucracy, i.e. correctional officer within a prison environment, engage in emotional performances that
meet contradictions in organizational mandates of custody (suspect and discipline) and rehabilitation (treatment, nurture, and respect) (Tracy, 2004, p. 530).

**Emotional Labor**

Emotionalizing controlled encounters by the street level bureaucrat resonates with concepts of emotion labor, and sparks interest of emotions within the correctional organizational system. Emotions are experienced within all parts of organizational life (Martin et al. 1998). Fineman (2000) wrote that behavior and attitudes are displayed through the activity of sentient emotion which are deeply integrated into organizational roles and characterize as well as inform the organizational system. This systematic activity is in synch with the foundation of the organization. Emotion as an activity drives individual and organizational performance through the behavior and the actions of organizational members (Weinberger, 2002, p. 215).

Many explorations on integrating emotion into the bureaucratic organizational systems has been deemphasized, marginalized, overlooked or excluded (Mumby & Putman, 1992; Pringle, 1989; Hummel, 1982; Simon, 1958). Ashcraft (2000) called attention to the mainstream bureaucratic belief that “bureaucracy bans emotional and personal factors for decision making” (p. 353). Scholars have used impersonal criteria to describe decision making or restraints on emotional expression in bureaucratic systems, such as correctional institutions (Weber, 1981). Alternatively Crawley (2004) argues that focus should be centered on emotions that are experienced within the organizational system, i.e. correctional institution. Crawley asserted that the daily emotional life of prisons has a greater theoretical impact. It is through micro-level or day-to-day
performance and management of emotion that correctional activities are accomplished (Crawley, 2004, p. 412).

On a micro-level, the Correctional officer’s roles are observed as involving, managing, and performing regulated emotion within the correctional institution on a daily basis (Hall, 1995, p. 377). Tracy (2004) subscribed to the idea that the micro routines and procedures of correctional officers’ profession continually shape emotional identities. The correctional officer in this instance becomes an emotional laborer. Sociology of the prison has documented the impact of prison on the emotional lives of prisoners (Sykes, 1998; Ben-David, 1992). Unfortunately, there has been much less academic interest in the emotional effect of the prison on correctional officers (Fineman, 1996; Crawley, 2004). Consequently little knowledge has been accumulated on officer’s emotional and psychological adjustments to the correctional environment (Crawley, 2004, p. 412).

Crawley (2004, p. 412) focused on the emotional setting of the correctional environment; describing correctional facilities as emotional spaces. Crawley contends that emotions run high within correctional facilities. This high emotive wave results in the correctional officers internalizing emotions generated by their work environment. Crawley (2004, p. 415) considered that correctional officer’s feeling about work, and inmates have serious implications on routine practices. Hoschil supported this claim by perpetuating “that an effective officer must control both their own feelings and the emotional displays of citizens” (1983, p. 7).

Although critical literature on organization theory acknowledge that emotions are generally not condoned within bureaucratic organizations, Hearn (1993) stated that emotional expression or emotive values are condoned in different contexts at some point
in time. Emotive values are permissible by bureaucratic systems for instrumental and practical purposes, known as emotional labor (Fineman & Sturdy, 1999). Emotion is termed as a state of readiness from a cognitive appraisal of events or thoughts (Thoit, 1989, p. 318). Emotion involves boundless or inhibited display of expressive indicators (Thoit, 1989, p. 318). Emotions are accompanied by a physiological process such as physical expressions or specific actions to affirm or cope with the emotion (Bagozzi, Gopinath, & Nyer, 1999, p. 186). Lastly, Emotion is a socio-cultural label applied to specific environmental context (Thoit, 1989, p. 318).

Labor in this study is defined as individual behavior and intra-social concepts of physical and mental work demands, work motivation, work involvement, and work design (Zapf et al., 1999, p. 373). Hochschild (1983) wrote that social systems (i.e. bureaucratic) emotionalize or internalize emotion labor, so that it can be used as a subtle normative control for employees, who work independently of close supervision, such as street level bureaucrats.

The study of emotional labor as an organizational role begins with the importance of converging emotions with the labor force. Diefendorf and Gosserand (2003) affirmed that the organizational behavior researchers are now realizing the importance of emotions in work life. Emotional demeanor is created from interaction between individual practices and organizational “discursivities” (Tracy, 2004). In recent years interest has been given to the emotional labor or the management of emotions as part of the work role (Fisher & Ashkanasy, 2000). Goffman (1959) realized that behaviors are influenced by the “invisible hand” of norms for suitable behavior or expectation that are conventional by organizational standards. Emotion norms are
described as the position about suitable sequence, range, concentration, duration and aims of emotive dispositions in relation to situations (Thoit, 1989, p. 322). Goffman’s “invisible hand” of norms is considered to be a role set of emotional labor by Ashforth & Humphrey (1993).

Emotional norms are generated and structured based on the level of the emotional laborers’ emotional intelligence. Mayer and Salovey (1995) define emotional intelligence “as the capacity to process emotional information accurately and efficiently, including that information relevant to the recognition, construction, and regulation of emotion in oneself and others” (p. 197). In later years, the concepts of perceiving, assimilating, understanding, assimilating and managing of emotion were integrated into the definition of emotional intelligence (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2000). Jordan highlights that emotional intelligence is a multi-dimensional construct consisting of emotional awareness, emotional facilitation, emotional knowledge and emotional regulation. By examining each dimension Jordan revealed that emotional awareness refers to the capability to be conscious of personally experienced and express emotion and emotional needs. Conversely, emotional awareness includes being conscious of others’ emotions and emotional expression (Jordan, 2004, p. 459).

Jordan (2004) describes emotional facilitation as the capacity to use emotion to prioritize thoughts by concentrating on experienced emotive information. Emotion facilities also integrate multiple perspectives to assess problems. As a third component of emotional intelligence, emotional intelligence allows the emotional laborer the capacity to comprehend emotional complexity and sequences. Emotional knowledge focuses on considering mutually the indicators and consequences of emotive values (emotion,
moods, and disposition) (George, 2000, p. 1037). Furthermore, Emotional knowledge concentrates on how emotive values transition over period of time, i.e. moving shifting from happiness to anger (George, 2000, p. 1037). Discerning emotional transitions stems from professionals’ awareness and understanding of emotional knowledge during various events or interactions that stimulate the generation of emotions (Jordan, 2004; George, 2000).

Emotional regulation, the final feature of emotional intelligence, allows the emotional laborer to manage his/her emotional dispositions, furthermore relying on emotional knowledge assist in the discernment of appropriateness, indications, and malleability of emotion (George, 2000, p. 1038). Based on the reflective nature of emotional regulation, emotional laborers gain the ability to attach or detach emotion from a specific situation depending upon its utility (George, 2000; Mayer & Salovey, 1995). Mayer and Salovey (1995) posit that emotional intelligence based on its features has the capability of influencing and regulating organizational interaction and behaviors.

Armed with emotional intelligence the emotional laborer engages in activities that are a result of either the expression of felt emotions or a decision to manage them (Kruml & Geddes, 2000, p.10). Ashforth & Humphrey (1993, pp. 88-89) attest that emotional labor role ensures that on a professional on a micro-level express socially desirable emotions during service transactions. Professions entailing emotional labor typically necessitate the interaction with other people external to or within the organization, usually involving face-to-face or voice-to-voice, and principally public service work (Figart & Steinberg, 1999). Emotional labor is executed when employees are required to feel, or project the appearance of certain emotions relevant to job interaction.
Grandey (2000, p. 95) wrote that emotional labor entails augmenting, pretending, or suppressing emotions. In order to adapt emotional expressions to organizational goals, Emotional laborer’s surface act, deep act, active deep act or passive deep act:

- **Surface Acting**: Hochschild (1983) recognized that frontline service workers surface act, which means that they change their outward appearance and behavior when exhibiting required emotions.

- **Deep Acting**: Service workers can deep act, wherein they have the ability to modify or choose their inner feelings. Grandey (2003) defines deep acting as portraying a role by altering emotions to become the role.

- **Active Deep Acting**: At times when human service worker’s emotions don’t fit the situation, they may use training or past experiences to create the appropriate emotion. Hochschild (1983) terms the invoking of appropriate emotions as active deep acting.

- **Passive Deep Acting**: Hochschild (1983) added the idea that employees engage in passive deep acting. Passive deep acting involves the spontaneous exertion of required emotions.

Organizations control the exhibition of emotions through display guidelines or standards. Display rules are transferred and related by selection, training, or communicated by other coworkers. Display rules help to regulate emotions. Rafaeli & Sutton (1989) defines display rules as a function of social norms, occupational norms, and organizational norms. Norms govern differentiated behavior (Biddle, 1986, p. 70). By regulating emotions, it is believed that display rules will induce appropriate service performance and behavior. For example Fineman (1993) remarked:
“Many professional workers… are … paid for their skill in emotion management they are to look serious, understanding, controlled, cool, empathetic and so for with clients or patients… Benign detachment disguises and defends against, any private feelings of pain, despair, fear attraction, revulsion or love; feelings which would otherwise interfere with the professional relationship” (Fineman, 1993, p.19).

This statement suggested human service workers, i.e. correctional officers must control stimulation and their cognitions that delineate emotions. Additionally Fineman (1993) dictated that since emotion is termed as an organizational norm, it can be also identified as a component of role expectation for the street-level workers (Rafaeli and Sutton, 1987). The congruent relation of displayed emotional norms and role expectation are grounded by functional role theorist discernment that role expectations are social norms (Bates & Harvey, 1975). Furthermore, Biddle (1986, p. 60) ascribed that role expectations generate roles.

The functional role theory has focused on characteristics of agents within a stable social system (Biddle, 1986, p. 70). The functional theory points out that displayed emotional norms or role expectation are added to a given position’s governed conduct and specific roles in order to accomplish specific functions. Roles are perceived as “as the shared, normative expectations that prescribe and explain agent’s behaviors” (Biddle, 1986, p. 70). Thus Ashforth and Humphrey (1993) research in emotion work concluded that emotional labor is an observable role. Various emotion theorists have chosen to describe the observable roles of emotional labor as a sub system of subjective feelings, physiological reaction patterns, and expressive behaviors (Zapf et al., 1999, p.374).

Emotional labor has several defining characteristics and may be analyzed along with several dimensions. Morris and Feldman (1996) speculated that frequency,
intensity, duration and variety are role requirements of emotional labor. These role requirements have positive, negative, or non-existent affect on each other (Briner, 1999, p. 335). Even so these four role requirements are viewed as a unitary construct in order to understand emotional labor’s roles (behavioral response to service interactions). In studying these role requirements, Morris and Feldman (1996) discovered that frequent emotional displays limit the duration, frequency and intensity of emotional labor’s behavioral responses. Morris and Feldman (1996) also related that a variety behavioral response rise when the duration and intensity of emotional displays rise. Emotional role requirements are one way in which may have effects the range of work behaviors and cognitions (Briner, 1999, p. 335). Conversely, Morris and Feldman (1997) also identified adverse consequences of emotional labor. One consequence of emotional labor is a reduction of discretion exercised by the workforce in performing their jobs (Ashforth & Humphrey, 1993; Mumby & Putman, 1993; Noon & Blyton, 1997). Morris and Feldman (1997) labeled another negative consequence of emotional labor as emotional dissonance.

Emotional Dissonance

Emotional dissonance is defined by Hochschild (1983) as a type of person-role conflict resulting from discord between felt and displayed emotion. This definition of emotional dissonance is limiting, focusing only on the essential self. Understanding emotion work concepts appropriately entail looking at broader social relations (Sturdy, 2003). Dissonance draws attention to the negative quality of feelings and its motivational repercussion (Jansz & Timmers, 2002). People that display dissonant emotions act to curb this feeling (Jansz & Timmers, 2002, p. 80). In other words, one
emotion may produce a subsequent feeling. This secondary feeling motivates the regulation of the primary emotion and the tendency to take action (Fridja, 1986).

Emotional dissonance is an outcome of emotionally evaluating an experience (Jansz & Timmers, 2002, p.81). Dissonance functions and occurs normally on an intrapersonal level although it also affects interpersonal activities, such as the regulation of behavior (Jansz & Timmers, 2002, p. 81). In order to pin down the operation of emotional dissonance, Tracy (2005, p. 262) identified that discerning emotional dissonance from post-structuralize perspective caused other issues to emerge that have an effect on the emotional laborer. Abraham (1997) recognized that emotional dissonance as a facet emotional labor is of both theoretical and practical interest. Therefore there are two ways to view emotional dissonance: Scholarly view & Research view.

**Scholarly View:**

Using a post-structural lens allow for observing emotional dissonance within an organizational realm (Tracy, 2005, p. 263). Rafeli and Sutton (1987) wrote that emotional dissonance occurs when conveyed emotions conform to organizational norms but conflict with actual feelings. Therefore expanding the description of emotional dissonance necessitated supplementing the identity of the “essential self” (inner feelings) with organizational conflict (i.e. lack of power, negative personal and social image, and strained social relationships) (Tracy, 2005, p. 262).

Richard and Gross (1999) detected that regulation of emotional norms effort to suppress and fake emotions, by means of displayed rules, may impair the cognitive performance of human service workers. Tracy (2005) expansion of correctional officer’s emotional dissonance gave access to insight in emotional reaction or adaptation to the
social system, and other conflicting roles that encompass frontline service work. Emotional dissonance should incorporate the conflict facing the correctional role of the street level bureaucrat. In studies among service worker, emotional dissonance is linked to the requirement of an organizational situation (Hochschild, 1983). As noted at the end of the discussion on street level bureaucrat; bureaucrats engage in emotional internalization to meet contradictions in organizational mandates of custody (suspect and discipline) and rehabilitation (treatment, nurture, and respect) (Tracy, 2004, p. 530).

Correctional officers respond to various contradictions and paradoxical norms (Foucault, 1977; Tracy, 2004; McGuire, Dougherty, & Atkinson, 2006). Role contradictions (street level bureaucrat/emotional labor) stemming from the internal role interaction of the frontline public human service work produce emotional dissonance between prescribed or supervised emotions and actual emotions ingrained inside of the organizational pragmatic paradox. Emotional dissonance becomes a divergence experienced by agents residing in the organizational system, i.e. correctional officer’s work, that advocate opposing directives of custody and rehabilitation. Kahn et al. (1964) wrote that emotional dissonance is a reaction to conflicting role expectations of the desired level of emotion.

As recognized by previous research, organizations stipulate the goals of the organization as well as the emotional display rules, which may require employees to suppress inappropriate felt emotions (Wharton, 1999). As a result the employee may fake unfelt emotions (positive emotions and avoiding the expression of negative emotion) in order to accomplish organizational goals (Diefendorff & Gosserand, 2003, pp. 945-946). Emotional dissonance “operationalizes” incompatible concerns between
organizationally mandated and experienced emotive values concerning organization goals.

Ashcraft (2001) subscribed to the idea that “operationalization” transforms emotion dissonance into a variation organized dissonance. As discussed previously, organized dissonance is a hybrid of bureaucracy. Ashcraft (2001) defined hybrid as a unification of multiples forms that reflect combinations designed to either solve problems or create considerable conflict. Similar to Ashcraft’s concept, Rafaeli and Sutton (1987) best defined the emotional dissonance’s hybrid form as the clash between personal values (emotion) and role demands of other role sets (i.e. prescribed emotions, and boundary roles) of the organization manifested as conflicted emotions.

Research View:

Shifting from the scholarly view of emotional dissonance we turn to a more functional view of emotional dissonance. Hochschild (1979) inquiries into emotional dissonance offer an understanding about the consequences of emotional labor. Hochschild (1979) contended that performance of emotional labor is potentially psychologically damaging. Hochschild (1983) acknowledged that the negative effects of emotional labor may be more severe for some workers than others, but he affirms that negative social-psychological consequences associated with emotional labor primarily pertains to workers’ orientation to feeling as well as degrees of job demand. Wharton (1993, p. 211) research on emotional labor gives the similar outcome that “workers expressing higher levels of job involvement are expected to suffer more negative and conflicting consequences from performing labor than those less involved in their job.
Person-conflicts, such as emotional dissonance, between the roles of the correctional officer arise from priorities assigned to accomplishing organizational goals (Hochschild, 1983). Goode (1961) asserted that officers trying to fulfill conflicting role expectations result in paradoxical role tensions. A great deal has been centered on the effects of contradictory organizational goals on staff role conflict, but there has been few attempts done on understanding the impact of emotional dissonance on discretionary power. Reasons for neglecting discretionary power stem from the belief that officer’s performance of duty is routinized by a set of clear rules and procedures governing the officer’s authority. Discretion is also criticized as being arbitrary unfair, biased, and too dependent (Schneider et al., 1996, p. 110).

Evidence found in Hepburn and Alobonetti (1980) study refuted this ideology and substantiates Lipsky’s notion that it is the responsibility of the micro-level service worker to use discretion. Discretion is essential in the role of correctional officer’s jobs in order to understand the role of rules and regulations in determining subjective actions. Micro-level workers such as correctional officer’s work in situations too complicated to reduce to a programmatic format (Lipsky, 1980, p.15). Discretion is also important within other facets such as:

“Street level bureaucrats work in situations that often require responses to human dimensions of situations… Discretion is not likely to be eliminated bear more on the function of the lower-level workers who interact with citizens than with the nature of the tasks” (Lipsky, 1980, p.15).

A study of the literature confirms that correctional officer’s occupational status ensures that the offender population follows all rules and regulations. Equally working as a public human service worker, the correctional officer is constantly affected by the
emotional space of the correctional institution (Crawley, 2004, p.412). Emotional experience and expression constitutes a large part of the work performed by the public service, i.e. the correctional officer (Waldron & Krone, 1991). Hochschild depicted working within the emotional space as emotional labor, as seen in figure 2.2.
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Emotional labors engage in thinking about situations and objectives in an emotional context. Emotion-context prompts reactive tendencies (Manstead & Fischer, 2001). Public human service workers by appraising or reflecting on various antecedents (emotional, rules, regulations, and social norms) plan on how to cope with the specific situation. Appraising organizational antecedents means coping, inhibiting or amplifying actions, and suppressing or inhibiting outward expressions. Even though the appraisal of
the situation is inhibited by situational constraints, Fridja, Kuiper, and ter Schure (1989) wrote that emotional antecedents are concerned with the actual conversion of emotions into actions. The outcome of evaluating an emotional antecedent with respect to other organizational antecedents may be either positive or negative.

Emotional dissonance emerges in appraising specific situations. Appraising emotional dissonance refers to subjectively evaluating the experience (Lazarus, 1991). To clearly evaluate the situational experience entails recognizing the cognitive dimension of emotion is a complex process rather than a mental state. Jansz and Timmers (2002) describe emotion dissonance as a result that “occurs when someone evaluates an emotional experience as a threat to his or her identity” (p. 80). Therefore in a practical sense we can use Abraham’s idea that emotional dissonance is a negative emotional antecedent that appears in negative appraising or evaluating emotional context (Abraham, 1998).

As identified by several authors, Emotional dissonance is a form of role conflict (Tracy, 2005; Janz & Timmers, 2002; Domagalski, 1999; Hochschild, 1983). The attempt to meet multiple conflicting demands lead to frustration and emotional distress culminating in emotional exhaustion (Abraham, 1998, p. 138). Role conflict has been found to be antecedent to emotional exhaustion, which is a component of Maslach’s burnout. Maslach defined burnout as a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a reduction of personal accomplishment that can occur among work in the human service arena (1982, p. 3). Raefeli and Sutton (1987) thus concluded that emotional dissonance is a predictor of emotional exhaustion or burnout.
Manlove (1993) established that both negative affect and role conflict accounted for variance in emotional exhaustion. Abraham (1998) isolated negative affect had a mediator effect on emotional dissonance outcomes. Abraham (1998) identified that burnout is correlated with the underlying personality variable of well being, negative affectivity. Finally, Abraham (1998, 141) empirical study suggested that negative affectivity exhibited a perfect mediator effect on the relationship between emotional dissonance and burnout, thus it is conceivable to apply role conflict, negative affect, and burnout as descriptive components or cues of emotional dissonance. Emotional dissonance signals the function of work cues, as antecedents in a negative direction and motivates human service workers to reduce negative feeling anyway possible sometimes irrespective of the appropriateness (Jansz & Timmers, 2002, p.90).

*Emotional Dissonance/Deviance:*

Emotional dissonance is considered by emotional labor research as emotive deviance. Jaggar (1999) described emotional dissonance as disallowed emotive value that arises from contradictions with accepted or expected cultural norms. Equally, Thoits (1990, p. 181) characterizes emotional deviance as “emotion that differs from that which is expected, conventional, or obligatory.” Thoits (1990) perspective of emotional deviance was similar to viewing emotional dissonance as a result of mutually contradictory expectations of multiple roles.

Labeling emotional dissonance as emotional deviance stems from the fact that social norms with respect to emotions has be presented as if it they operate external to the employees’ identity. Emotion generally makes an impact on organizational behavior. Oately (1992) wrote that emotions relay that something important has happened which
necessitates action. Investigations in emotional dissonance appraisals have shown that negative emotive values can be converted into counter productive behavior or action based on a specific situation.

There are still limited amounts of empirical exploration done on emotion dissonance, as hybrid form of micro-level bureaucratic form, stemming from street level bureaucratic/emotional labor contradictions. There are also limited research on emotional dissonance (organizational role conflict, burnout, negative affect) negative effect on the discretionary decision making process of the correctional officer. Finally, if emotional dissonance leads behavior in a negative direction, there is a need for focus to be directed to the potential emotional dissonance translating into street level bureaucrat’s judgment/decision, behavior or usage of discretion/deviant discretion.

Discretion

Correctional officers within a total institution are given broad discretion in controlling inmates, enforcing correctional rules, and distribution of resources (Kessler, & Piehl, 1998). Correctional officers are authorized based on discretion to subjectively determine decisions in relations to inmates (Bell, 1992). As discretion-holders, correctional officers unilaterally affect the lives of inmates residing in the correctional institutions (1992). The American Bar Association (1974, p.12) wrote that many of the correctional institutional rules are indistinct, indefinite, and unable to differentiate between permissible conduct and rule violations. Flanagan reasoned that correctional officer’s micro-level usage of discretion results from correctional institutions incapacity to “manage the adjudication of every minor rule violation that might be charged” (1996, p. 162).
Pound (1960, p. 926) posited that discretion is the legal authority to make decisions in agreement with personal judgment and conscience instead of firmly enforcing policies, rules, procedures, regulations or laws. Kessler and Piehl (1998) conceived discretion as a behavior by which correctional officers in the correctional system surrogate their own judgment, interests, or objectives for formally statutory policies in order to influence correctional outcomes. Miller (1967) found that discretion could be considered as the tendency of street level bureaucrats to deviate from organizational standards in selecting and providing appropriate services.

Prottas (1978 & 1979) discovered that street level bureaucrats use bureaucratic discretion to manipulate organizational information about clients as well as restrict agency’s influence over organizational behavior. From a micro-perspective, that of a street level bureaucrat, bureaucratic discretion is the latitude or flexibility exercised when making decisions for agencies, organizations, or institutions (Warren, 2003). Bureaucratic discretion is a variety of options inside a set of parameters that restrict the behaviors of individual service provider (Lipsky, 1980). Cooper (1982) defined the parameters of bureaucratic discretion as organizational rules, laws, social norms or codes. Parameters assist in determining the appropriateness and acceptable action (1982). Hunt (1997, p. 521) defined discretion as the authority to make judgments and the freedom to operate on personal insight.

Cox (2005) borrowed from Ardent (2003) and Weber (1946), who specified that discretion is comprised of four elements or activities of choice: “experiencing, thinking, judging, and acting” (2005, p. 5). Cox (2005) argued that by examining these four interrelated elements would create the potential of the decision architecture as a
framework for understanding the act of discretion (discretionary decision making process). The decision architecture leads to social consequence and as a framework, it justifies considering discretionary decision making as “a continuing process, a subtle and shifting affair that is the result of substantial human interpretative work” (Baldwin, 1995, p. 25).

Cox’s viewpoint assisted in identifying discretion’s incorporation of many influential values that are not necessarily delimited by legality (2005). Galligan (1990) wrote in support of this discretionary viewpoint, that discretion is a degree of subjective latitude that connotes an element of choice that is a legitimate exercise of authority within a given context. The more salient influential values of discretion are situational task, decisional context, workload pressures, organizational social culture, rules and policies, and external organizational environment (Scott, 1997, p. 37). The act of discretion or discretionary decision making enables agents to implement policies within social norms that may or may not reflect formal law (Kessler & Piehl, 1998, p.257). Kelley (1993) suggested that social values, such as organizational culture, influence the structural characteristics that moderate the level and type of discretion.

Discretionary Dimension

Kelley (1996) classified discretion based on appropriateness or inappropriateness based on level of standardization or customization intended to gain a situational outcomes. Kelley (1996) identified three dimensions of discretion: routine discretion, creative discretion and deviant discretion. Brief explanations will be given for routine and creative discretion. The focus of this study is on the effects of emotional dissonance
on deviant discretion, therefore a more in-depth exploration of deviant discretion will be given.

Routine discretion is applied when the potential means for accomplishing service task are available to frontline public service agents (Kelley, 1993). Routine discretion creates a list of possible alternate actions and frontline public service agents must then select the appropriate means of task performance (Kelley, 1993, pp. 105 & 106). The alternate list of actions is a set of possible means for performing a task of which the frontline public service agent must make a selection (Kelley, 1993, p. 106). Routine discretion creates behaviors that are expected as well as essentially a requisite by the organization (Kelley, 1993, p. 106). Brief and Motowildo (1986) described routine discretion as involving the specified enactment of role prescribed behaviors that is part of the agent’s formal role within the organization.

Creative discretion is applied when employees must develop alternative means for performing a task (Kelley, Longfellow, & Malehorn, 1996). Kelley (1993, p. 106) reported that creative development of means for performing a task is often necessary during service provision. Creative discretion occurs when goals or task are provided, but the means for performing the task is developed by the public service agent (Kelley, Longfellow, & Malehorn, 1996, p. 138). Brief and Motowildo (1986) asserted that creative discretion occurs during a situation where by agents perform extra-role behaviors that are not formally specified as a role requirement, but viewed legitimate by the organization.
**Deviant Discretion:**

The final type of discretion discussed by Kelley (1996) is deviant discretion. Kelley (1993, p. 107) viewed this type of discretion as undesirable and acknowledges that deviant discretion can take place while using routine or creative discretion. Deviant discretion can arise during the selection or development of means for performing a task. Thompson (1967) explained that discretion is labeled “deviant” if the employment criteria in exercising discretion are unacceptable to the organizational model. Deviant discretion affects decisions, resulting consequences, and actions of controlling the organization and persons labeled as deviant (Berstein, Kelly, & Doyle, 1977, p. 743).

Rafiq and Ahmed (1998) described deviant discretion as a situation that results from an employee exercising beyond the degree of discretion allowed them. Morgan (1987) defined deviant discretion as a decision that does not abide by the requirements for rational decision making (clarification of goals, an identification of all the alternatives for meeting the goals, an assessment of the consequences of each choice, and a selection of the best alternative). Morgan also identified that organizational models follow standard operating procedures, even if there is no fulfillment of the required rationality (1987, p. 277). This model shows that deviant discretion occurs if discretion does not improve the “integrity of organizational life and programs” (Morgan, 1987, pp. 277-278).

Kelley (1993) noted that deviant discretion engage in the carrying out of deviant behaviors. Deviant behaviors are voluntary behaviors that violate significant organizational norms and jeopardize the interests of an organization (Robinson & Bennett, 1995, p. 556). Deviant behavior is defined in terms of organizational norms or standards that are prescribed by formal and informal organizational policies, rules, and
procedures (Kaplan, 1975). Organizational norms determine deviance in terms of a specified social group (Kaplan, 1975). The two categories of deviant behavior related to deviant discretion are counter-role behaviors (Staw & Boettger, 1990) and counter productive behaviors (Martinko, et al., 2002).

Counter-role behaviors are behaviors that are not a part of employees’ formal job description, and are not apart of ideal employees’ role expectation (Staw & Boettger, 1990). Counter-role behaviors are forms of deviance and dissent regarding role performance. Counter role behaviors can take time and energy from organizational productivity (Staw & Boettger, 1990, p. 536). Counter-role behavior by revising work procedures or veering away from organizational goals can be a costly exit from the established regulation (Staw & Boettger, 1990, p. 536).

Hogan and Hogan (1981) wrote that counter productive behavior, as a concept, consist of all deviant behaviors ranging from absenteeism to assault. Counter productive behavior disregards of societal and organizational rules, policies, and values (Collins & Griffin, 1998). Counterproductive behavior is also defined as actions that harm and threaten the welfare of organizations and their employees (Martinko et al., 2002, p. 37). Counter productive behaviors break implicit and explicit policies and standards concerning suitable and appropriate behavior (2002, p. 37).

In his work, Kelley (1993 & 1996) emphasized that routine and creative discretion lie within the realm of acceptable job performance or deviant depending upon the organizational situation as seen in figure 2.3. Moreover, discretionary behaviors can be considered organizationally deviant, but at the same time, lead to acceptance or favorable perception by clientele of the organization (Kelley, 1993). In due course, it is
probable that organizational deviant discretion may have the reverse effect depending upon the outcome of the discretionary action, such as bias, stereotype, and negative labeling (Kelley, 1996) (See figure 2.3).

As seen by Poole & Regoli (1980), deviant discretion raises concerns of acceptability in the nature of rule enforcement within a correctional organization. Correctional officers have broad discretion in which to gather and assimilate proper cues of a situation and guide decision making (see figure 2.3). Defining the situation gives the correctional officer’s reference to interpret and deviate from organizational regulations to reach a specific outcome. Becker (1963) commented that correctional officers who

Figure 2.3: Realm of Discretion

As seen by Poole & Regoli (1980), deviant discretion raises concerns of acceptability in the nature of rule enforcement within a correctional organization. Correctional officers have broad discretion in which to gather and assimilate proper cues of a situation and guide decision making (see figure 2.3). Defining the situation gives the correctional officer’s reference to interpret and deviate from organizational regulations to reach a specific outcome. Becker (1963) commented that correctional officers who
deviate from organizational regulations are not necessarily labeled as a “deviant”, while correctional officers’ discretionary behaviors are labeled as deviant when the outcome demonstrates a mistreatment of inmates.

Rafiq and Amhed (1998) concluded that agents (i.e. street level bureaucrats, frontline public service workers, or specifically correctional officers) exercise discretion, and are not empowered to do so by the organization can be considered deviant. Rafiq and Amhed (1998, p. 386) stated that this behavior is detrimental to the organization. Deviant discretion encapsulates acts directed against organizations, and accounts for deviant acts directed to an interpersonal nature (Robinson & Bennett, 1995, p. 557). By examining how arbitrators punish rule-breaking behavior, leads to the classification of forms of employee deviance into serious offenses and non serious offenses (Wheeler, 1976). Significantly, Rafiq and Amhed (1998) remarked that deviant discretion is an action depending on the continuity and severity, which should be looked upon as deserving disciplinary action.

Discretionary Approach

In principle correctional officer’s usage of discretion is strictly constrained by procedural regulations, but in practice correctional officers have a wide arena of discretion. Schneider (1991) commented that discretion’s classic advantage is that it provides leeway or stretch that allows decision makers to complete task within an individual case or situation. There are many views of bureaucratic discretion because the concept is reliant upon context and levels of application (Scott, 1997, p. 36).

Using Weber’s typology of decision making, discretion can be viewed on two linear axes which are formal/substantive and rational/irrational. The primary axis of
formal/substantive is concerned with the autonomy of legality (Sterling & Moore, 1987). Formality is defined as legal procedures within the system; the greater the reliance on extra-legal position, the more the system can be described as practical or substantive. Weber perceived that the formal/substantive axis is positioned between irrationality and rationality from within the legal system of the organization and address the concerns of legal and social problems and demands (Sterling & Moore, 1987, p. 72).

It should be noted that Horwitz and Wasserman (1980) identified that describing the primary axis only by formal and substantive blurs crucial distinctions within Weber’s typology. Therefore, Horwitz and Wasserman rectified this problem by adding a discriminatory criterion (as seen in figure 2c.). The discriminatory criterion examines the interaction of substantive with legal and discriminatory conditions. Horwitz and Wasserman identified that the discriminatory criterion would determine the extent to which the use of substantive criterion conflicts with the principles of formal rationality. This criterion would resolve whether the use of substantive criterion indirectly leads to unwarranted discretion against the affected population (client).

The secondary axis of irrationality/rationality is the principle that the greater the degree of the generality and universality of the rules utilized, the greater the level of rationality by the system (Trubek, 1972, p. 729). Weber defines rational as the form of legal procedures and not quality of decisions (Sterling & Moore, 1987). Legal decisions entail employ applying organization principles and legal propositions. Thus on the secondary axis, rationality rises above the irrationality of the individual situation (Sterling & Moore, 1987, p. 73). In the assessment of irrationality there is no distinction between legality (policy and guidelines) and illegality (social context).
Therefore based on this Weber’s view on primary and secondary axes of discretion, there are four possible discretionary forms: formal-rational, formal-irrational, substantive-irrational, and substantive-rational (as seen in figure 2.4).

- **Formal-irrational discretion** lacks general standard of rules. Therefore rules can not predict decisions (Sterling & Moore, 1987).

- **Formal-rationality discretion** uses rules to decide cases. Rules are based on legal concepts independent of social context such as ethics, morality, religion, feelings, and other criteria (Sterling & Moore, 1987).

- **Substantive irrationality discretion** makes case by case decisions that are guided by extra legal social context such as ethical, emotional, or politics (Sterling & Moore, 1987).
Substantive rationality discretion use general rules derived from social context to decide cases. Sterling and Moore (1987) consider substantive rationality to be “natural law.”

Rather than just viewing discretion based on formality/substantive and rationality/irrationality, Varavithya and Esichaikul (2005) supported focusing on variations of professional discretion depending upon the context of legality and environmental situations. Schneider (1992, p. 2242) maintained that discretionary sources are the outcome of granting discretionary authority (of varying levels of totality) to the decision maker. Schneider (1992) described discretion based on four categories of discretionary authority (see figure 2.5):

Figure 2.5
Categories of Discretionary Authority
• **Rule-binding or rule-building discretion:** discretion making where lawmakers place positive value on practical experience. Professionals are allowed to develop rules as they go along.

• **Rule-compromise discretion:** decision making as a result of legislature or rule making body incapacity to agree on appropriate ruling and consequently passes responsibility on individual decision makers. This discretion is derived from institutional structure of decisions.

• **Rule-failure discretion:** discretionary authority is created in anticipation complex, difficult, and variations of cases and the inability of rules to guide decision making with regards to the results.

• **Khadi discretion:** decision making of individual cases, based on ad hoc decisions involving legal, ethical, emotional, and political consideration

The first style of discretion, rule-binding or rule building, allows law makers to put positive values on practical experiences into the decision-making system (Webber, 2003, p. 252). In this style of discretion, the macro-organization considers that practitioners or professionals (decision makers) gain insight in dealing with situations by experiencing individual cases over long periods of time. This insight allows the practitioner a better handling of generic problems being dealt with under concrete circumstance in which the problem presents itself (Webber, 2003). Correctional officer’s uses role-binding discretion within a social space that warrants informal practice in order to enact formal policy.

In order to protect the macro-organization as well as the clients, correctional guidelines, such as post orders, are issued to correctional officers to prohibit the overriding of operational requirements of the institution (Webber, 2003). Rule-binding discretion deters the correctional officer from improperly restricting operational judgment where organizational regulations are necessary in guiding a task (Webber, 2003, p. 253).
Lastly rule-binding reinforces the independence of correctional officers to identify what they perceive as a problem at their location and to use correctional policies appropriately (Webber, 2003).

Incorporating Weber and Schneider’s perspective of discretion, rule-binding discretion is characterized as substantive-rational based on two typology dimensions: primary axis of irrationality/rationality and secondary axis of formal/substantive (See Figure 2.4). The primary axis of formal/substantive is concerned with the autonomy of legality (Sterling & Moore, 1987). The secondary axis of irrationality/rationality is the principle that the greater the degree of the generality and universality of the rules utilized, the greater the level of rationality by the system (Trubek, 1972, p. 729). Weber perceived that the formal/substantive axis is positioned between irrationality and rationality from within the legal system of the organization and address the concerns of legal and social problems and demands (Sterling & Moore, 1987, p. 72). Thus rule-binding would be located in the upper left quadrant (See figure 2.5.1).
The second style of discretion, rule-compromise, differs from rule-building discretion because it grants the professional intentional compromises (Schneider, 1991). Rule-compromise discretion occurs when the macro-organizational rule makers are unable to agree on rules or guidelines and thus must pass the responsibilities of decision making to the practitioner (Schneider, 1991, p. 2245). Webber (2003) writes that rule-compromise discretion is an alibi to conceal the conflicting goals found within policies and guidelines. Custody and treatment goals within correctional facilities are an impending source of correctional officer’s role conflict (Zald, 1962). Correctional officer’s are under continual pressure to meet the custody and treatment objectives of the correctional organization. Rule-compromise discretion would allow correctional
officer’s the authority to decide cases without direct macro-organizational involvement (Schneider, 1991, p. 2245).

Incorporating Weber and Schneider’s perspective of discretion, rule-compromise discretion is characterized as formal-rational based on two typology dimensions: primary axis of irrationality/rationality and secondary axis of formal/substantive (See Figure 2.4). The primary axis of formal/substantive is concerned with the autonomy of legality (Sterling & Moore, 1987). The secondary axis of irrationality/rationality is the principle that the greater the degree of the generality and universality of the rules utilized, the greater the level of rationality by the system (Trubek, 1972, p. 729). Weber perceived that the formal/substantive axis is positioned between irrationality and rationality from within the legal system of the organization and address the concerns of legal and social problems and demands (Sterling & Moore, 1987, p. 72). Thus rule-compromise would be located in the upper right quadrant (See figure 2.5.2).
The third style of discretion employs “rule-failure” reasoning (Schneider, 1991, p. 2244). Rule-failure discretion is formed “where it is believed that cases will arise in circumstances so varied, so complex, and so unpredictable that satisfactory rules are unable to accurately guide decision-makers to correct results in a sufficiently large number of cases cannot be written” (Schneider, 1992, p.62). Rule-failure discretion endows professionals with flexibility. As the decision-maker, the professional must interpret vaguely-defined rules. Organizational guidelines confer discretion in order for the professional to apply their preferred standards (Scheider, 1991, p. 2244).
Although guidelines are provided as criteria, there is no order of priority or detailed content of instructions. Professionals under rule failure discretion rely on experience and logic to guide their decisions. Professionals consider this kind discretion “to be constrained by peer review, and the availability of organizational space than by formal rules” (Weber, 2003, p.251). Rule-failure discretion in relation to correctional officers would therefore incorporate interpretation and motives of the professional into the discretionary decision making process.

Incorporating Weber and Schneider’s perspectives on discretionary decision-making, rule-failure discretion is characterized as Substantive-rational based on two typology dimensions: primary axis of irrationality/rationality and secondary axis of formal/substantive (See Figure 2.4). The primary axis of formal/substantive is concerned with the autonomy of legality (Sterling & Moore, 1987). The secondary axis of irrationality/rationality is the principle that the greater the degree of the generality and universality of the rules utilized; the greater the level of rationality by the system (Trubek, 1972, p. 729). Weber perceived that the formal/substantive axis is positioned between irrationality and rationality from within the legal system of the organization and address the concerns of legal and social problems and demands (Sterling & Moore, 1987, p. 72). Thus, rule-failure would be located in the lower right quadrant (See figure 2.5.3).
Finally, khadi discretion is considered in some situations and instances as decision-making whereby professionals understand principles and policies of the organization as well as already know or is in the position to discover pertinent and significant information of a dispute through contact with parties or through personal inquiry (Schneider, 1992, p. 2242). Decision makers with this type of ‘wisdom’ use discretion to decide cases. Max Weber contends that this brand discretion uses khadi-Justice. Weber claimed that khadi justice is ‘popular justice’ based on ‘free discretion’ with the intention of pleasing the stance of social context of the ‘layman’ particularity the underprivileged classes and criminality (Levin, 1972, p. 206). Khadi (quadi) justice
is defined as practical value judgment that is “oriented toward ethical, religious, political, and other postulates of substantively rational law rather than fixed rules of a formally rational law” (Merry, 1990, p. 1312).

Incorporating Weber and Schneider’s perspectives on discretionary decision-making, khadi discretion is characterized as substantive irrational based on two typology dimensions: primary axis of irrationality/rationality and secondary axis of formal/substantive (See Figure 2.4). The primary axis of formal/substantive is concerned with the autonomy of legality (Sterling & Moore, 1987). The secondary axis of irrationality/rationality is the principle that the greater the degree of the generality and universality of the rules utilized, the greater the level of rationality by the system (Trubek, 1972, p. 729). Weber perceived that the formal/substantive axis is positioned between irrationality and rationality from within the legal system of the organization and address the concerns of legal and social problems and demands (Sterling & Moore, 1987, p. 72). Khadi discretion would be located in the lower left quadrant as seen in figure 2.5.4:
Substantive irrational decision making (seen in Fig. 2.5.4) is determined by specific situations and employ ethical, emotional, political or practical criteria (Sterling & Moore, 1987, p. 73). Substantive irrational decision making is thought of as being realized after the problem is dealt with but do not provide a concrete general policy for future decision-making. Distinctively, khadi discretion as a substantive irrational discretion is slightly different because it includes legal factors (rational) (Hutton, 1995). Khadi discretion selects from a combination of appropriate factor (irrational- ethical, political, emotional, political and rational- legal factors) based on the situation (Sterling & Moore, 1987; Hutton, 1995).
Khadi discretion is socialized into the informal shared norms but limited by rules and policies of the organization (Hutton, 1995). This style of discretion is irrational because the weighting or relevance of appropriate factors is not precisely specified by rules. Hutton (1995, p. 556) notes that although khadi discretion is irrational in terms of the deficiency in general rules, appropriate type of limitations, and the calculating of appropriate degrees of freedom, there are levels of rationality or legality present.

Discretionary Decision-Making

Feldman stated that “discretion is an act of choice” (Hawkins, 1992, p.167). As a result, studies on discretion have described its nature based on understanding decision making (Key, 2002, p. 220). Exercising discretion requires professionals to make decisions and recommendations that take all factors (organizational, social, political and bureaucratic conditions and constraints) and requirements into account (Evetts, 2002, p. 245). Discretion has been identified by Key as (2002) “as a pivotal concept in individual decision making as part of an organizations social responsibility” (p. 220).

One of the clearest descriptions of discretionary decision making came from Galligan, et al. (1998, p. 14). Galligan, et al. depicts discretionary decision making as the ability of choice whereby one or more possible decisions or active options are available (1998, p. 14). Galligan, et al. (1998) emphasized that discretionary decision making must comply with certain standards such as rationality, purposive, ethics and morality. He requires at minimum that discretionary decision making be based on fair and impartial reason that is related to purpose, policies, principles and rules. Galligan (1990) also imposed that discretionary decision making comply with critical considerations of morality.
Varavithya and Esichaikul (2005) write that because discretion is an undertaking of choice, it important to gain knowledge of the decision making process. Bell added that in order to explain discretionary decision making it is important to situate it within the context of social institution (Hawkins, 1992, p. 101). Bell also determined that institutional context (micro, meso, and macro) assist in explaining behavior and placing the weight of discretionary decisions within actual organizational functioning (Hawkins, 1992, p. 101).

The macro-perspective of the organization concentrates on using the rational actor model or the classical rational model of the simple decision-making process as means of explaining a general discretionary decision-making process. This type of perspective is characterized based on five steps: 1.) A problem is identified. 2.) Goals are established for the solution of the problem. 3.) Alternative solutions are proposed. 4.) Information is gathered to assess these alternatives. 5.) Make a choice amongst the alternatives that maximizes efficiency. These five steps of discretionary decision making process are modeled in Figure 2.6:
Figure 2.6
Macro-Discretionary Decision-Making model
While the classical rational model of simple decision making is a valid approach to decision-making, Feldman claimed that researchers and practitioners have advocated that decision-making does not fit this simple description (Hawkins, 1992, p. 169). Fortunately, Hutton (1995, p.556) makes the case that while on a macro level the institution’s practices have undergone the process of rationalization, the micro-perspective of discretionary decision making still remains for most part a substantive irrational process. Hebert Simon (1993) confirmed that substantive irrational approach to discretionary decision making process allows the micro level professional to make “broad decisions regarding the values to which he is going to direct his activities, the general methods he is going to use to attain these values, and the knowledge, skills, and information he will need to make particular decision within limits of the policy laid down and to carry out decisions” (p. 97).

Simon (1993) further established that the professional’s daily decision-making framework (procedural activity) used to focus his/her attention, channel information and knowledge must conform to a substantive plan. The substantive irrational approach allows the professional make optimal choices rather than maximizing efficiency. Simon perceived that the professional makes an optimal choice by seeking satisfactory solutions based on limited information or so called bounded rationality. The professional’s bounded rationality takes into consideration policy, values, knowledge, and a social constructed environment (Simon, 1993, p. 97).

In the case of the correctional officer, because of the duality of the correctional goals (custody & rehabilitation), each officer is expected to maintain order as well protect the community by rehabilitating inmates. Therefore emphasis on custody results in the
officer’s performance of duties is routinized by a set of unambiguous rules and procedures governing the officer’s authority. Alternatively divergent to the requirements of custody, rehabilitation necessitates social interaction lines that are less formal and less one-directional with greater decentralization of officer’s decision making. The correctional officer based on rehabilitative goals must form affective ties with inmates and exercise practical (substantive) discretion rooted in individual differences (irrational).

Micro-level discretionary decision-making provides solutions to problems in a continuously changing environment (Misra, Hariharan, & Khaneja, 2003). It is important to take notice that on a micro-level, discretionary decision making vary depending on the context of laws and environmental situations (Schneider, 1992). Both Schneider and Simon substantive view of micro level discretion decision-making is supported by Scheingold (1978, p. 878), who contended that discretionary decision making implies the advantage of variations in the professional practice according to the fulfillment of procedures and interaction of the social segments. In the case of the correctional officer because of correctional goals (custody & rehabilitation), each officer is expected to maintain order as well protect the community by rehabilitating inmates. Therefore emphasis on custody results in the officers’ performance of duties is routinized by a set of definite rules and procedures directing the officer’s authority. Alternatively contrary to the requirements of custody, rehabilitation necessitates social interaction lines that are less formal and less one-directional with greater decentralization of officer’s decision making. The correctional officer based on rehabilitative goals must form affective ties with inmates and exercise practical (substantive) discretion rooted in individual differences (irrational).
As a final point, Schneider (1992) posited that khadi discretion is a substantive irrational discretionary decision making style. Khadi discretion describes decision making of an individual case involving more than just the necessary legal context but also social context, i.e. emotional, ethical, and political considerations. For this reason, khadi-discretion will be used by this research, as a mechanism to clearly discuss the professionals’ substantive approach discretionary decision making.

*Khadi Discretion:*

Khadi discretion is derived from Max Weber’s concept of khadi justice. Weber characterized ‘khadi justice’ as a form of substantive irrationality lacking a systematic body of rules (Sterling & Moore, 1987, p. 73). Lawerence Rosen (1990) addressed the idea of irrationality by arguing that khadi discretion is acquired reputation by Western Scholarship as a professional who exercises vast amounts of “discretion and at the same time providing new perspectives for thinking” (p. 2312). Rosen (1990, p. 2312) believed that khadi discretion should be accepted as neither being arbitrary and unknowable or as a danger to the governing of law. Instead, khadi discretion is an expression of the social principles and levels (macro- and meso-) of the larger organization within which the professional works (Rosen, 1990, p. 2312).

Professional are aware of a great number of aspects which they must take into account in deciding the proper action (Hutton, 1995, p. 556). Hutton (1995) wrote that sometimes relevant factors are almost obvious but at other times particular factors may pull in contradictory directions. The professional must weigh the factors in order to make a discretionary decision making. In selecting the appropriate discretionary decision, professionals are aware of the existence of rules and standards, which they must
endure. Hutton (1995) asserted that rules do not interrupt their reasoning as they are making a decision. Hutton (1995) also affirmed that discretionary decision making is an irrational process because relevance and weighing are not precisely specified by rules.

Although, Davis contended that “to exercise discretion is to exercise free choice, constrained by legal limits” (1969, p.4), Feldman (1992) proposed that social context should be used as limits to regulate the use of discretion instead of the formal limits such as rules. In this view, discretion based on ‘khadi’ facilitates the incorporation of non-legal and legal considerations (seen on figure 2.7).

Both non-legal and legal considerations allows decision making to distinguish each case from every other case as well as take into account each cases’ individual merit (Richard, 1997, p. 70). Khadi selects the combination of factors which is considered appropriate. The combination of factors will vary base on the individual case. The decision maker will then socialize shared norms and engage in a social process of decision making.
Social processing of Decision Making:

Theories of practice define the social process of decision making as an association that links micro actions inside organizations with the macro social structure (Hallet, 2003, pp. 129 & 130). The practice approach regards organizations as social spaces where professionals exist in relation to cultural capital (credential, titles, and disposition) and social capital (norms, network and situation) (Hallet, 2003, p. 130). Weber proposed based on his standpoint on substantive-irrational (khadi-discretion) that the professional action is oriented to habituation (Waters, 1989, p. 949). To examine this idea of habituation, Bourdieu theorized that professional’s practice of decision making resides within a ‘habitus’ or social framework (Hallet, 2003).

Bourdieu wrote:

“The conditionings associated with a particular class of conditions of existence produce habitus, systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations that can be objectively adapted to their outcomes without presupposing a conscious aiming at ends or an express mastery of the operations necessary in order to attain them. Objectively ‘regulated’ and ‘regular’ without being in any way the product of obedience to rules, they can be collectively orchestrated without being the product of the organizing action of a conductor” (Mutch, 2003, p. 389).

Bourdieu categorized the concept of profession as a field. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) defines field as a “network or a configuration of objective relations between positions” (p. 72). Grenfell (1996) believed that field permits the objectifying of objective relational structures. Fields confer to the practitioner or professional structuring power. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) reincorporate the professional into a full reality of the organizational social structure.
Consequently, the professional experience is encumbered by inherent stresses, tensions and conflicts. The “redefined” professional is embedded in social time and space of the organization which sets up decision making or practice. Therefore the practice of decision making by the professional emerge from individual choice, as well as the organization’s social environment. Keller (2001, p. 5) clearly identified this domain as task environment. Task environment allows the professional, and other organizational groups (correctional officers and inmates) to affect the performance of the organizational tasks. Within the task environment, decision making becomes objectively identifiable in context of a profession (Keller, 2001, p. 5). The practice professional decision making can then be conceived as structured structures or structuring structures.

Bourdieu (1982) contends that the field or the profession operates in two ways (1982). Field either structures the habitus or it conditions the habitus to act as a construct of cognitive knowledge. The habitus then designates mediation between objective structures and practices (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 43). The habitus utility is rooted in its schemes of thought, dispositions to act (Grenfell, 1996, p. 291). Pfeffer and Salanlick (1978) defined the habitus as a framework or structure consisting of social context and “ecology of the organization” required for the professional (field agent) to completely understand the condition of the organizational environment (p. 1). Habitus as a structure is concrete in terms of systematizing organizational terms, rules and policies as well as theories, and social ideas (Grenfell, 1996, p. 291). Conversely the habitus also lends to the notion that within the habitus (structure), various decision making structures are generated.
In terms of khadi discretionary decision-making, Rosen (1990) describes the habitus as representing the ideas that all interactions between professionals contain obligations. That reciprocal obligation is a matter of obligation and manipulation (Rosen, 1990, p. 2314). It is this web of obligation and negotiated relationships that constitute the core of the professional (Rosen, 1990, p. 2314). It then makes sense to refer to the professional’s criterion as his/her truth and reality.

The habitus is generative in nature, thus it is a mode of knowledge accumulation that does not inevitably include its own principles of knowledge or make up rational behavior (Lizardo, 2004). Bourdieu’s operational conception of the habitus was influenced by the work of Piaget. Piaget’s emphasized that knowledge is operative in nature as well as cognitively developed based on interplay of different structural systems (bodily-motor and symbolic representational). Piaget also considered that knowledge transforms reality in order to understand how certain events occur (Lizardo, 2004, p. 385). Knowledge of the habitus (nature, origins, and web of indebtedness) relays how a professional is likely to act in a particular situation (McNay, 1999). To clarify the influence of knowledge on the operation of the habitus, Piaget (1970) deemed:

“Knowing reality means constructing systems of transformations that correspond, more or less adequately with reality. They are more or less isomorphic to transformations of reality. The Transformational structures of which knowledge consist are not copies of the transformations in reality; they are simply possible isomorphic models among which experience can enable us to choose” (Piaget, 1970, p. 15).

In order to understand the application of knowledge relating to the habitus, it must be recognized that knowledge exists in different forms. Lam (2000) identified that knowledge “can be articulated explicitly or manifested implicitly. New knowledge is generated by the interconnection and fusion of tacit and explicit knowledge (Nonaka &
Takeuchi, 1995). Kogut and Zander (1992) created “construct of knowledge” model, as seen in Figure 2.8, which applies using tacit/explicit and passive/active dimensions in order to highlight aspects of the professional’s acquisition of knowledge. Heylighen, Neuckmans, & Bouwen, (1999, p. 216) identified that the first mode of construct knowledge is passive and scientific in which knowledge is observed, abstract and academic. The second constructive mode is active and technical. In this mode, knowledge is embedded in and developed through the activity of devising and implementing (Heylighen, Neuckmans, & Bouwen, 1999, p. 217).

Kant recognized that experience is the basis for knowledge (Heylighen, Neuckmans, & Bouwen, 1999, p. 212). Lee & Yang (2000) described knowledge as

Figure 2.8
Construct of Knowledge
“observer’s distinction of objects through which he brings forth from the background of experience a coherent and self consistent set of coordinated action” (p.783). In Lee and Yang point of view, information is just data arranged in meaningful patterns. Thus, knowledge is more than just information. Figure 2.8 indicates that on a passive knowledge level experience is acquired, but if not used then experience becomes information and used as data.

Once active knowledge is applied to the professional’s problem-solving capabilities then knowledge becomes “know-how” or skill if it is tacit as seen in figure 2.8 (Lee & Yang, 2000). The active knowledge level converts “know-how” into “know-that” if it is explicit (Gerrans, 2005, p. 54). In the shifting of knowledge levels from passive to active, knowledge becomes tacit or skilled when experience transitions to “know how”. Correspondingly, knowledge can be transmittable if information is coded to “know-that”; shifting explicit knowledge from passive to active knowledge.

Using the “construct of knowledge” model (see figure 2.8) to describe explicit /tacit and passive/active dimensions of knowledge leads to distinguishing cognitive-influence and organizational-influenced knowledge based on four categories suggested by Collins (1993) and later adapted by Blackler (1995): ‘Embrained’, ‘Embodied’, ‘Encoded’, and ‘Embedded’ knowledge (Lam, 2000, p 492).

- Embrained Knowledge: This type of knowledge is dependent on the professionals’ formal expertise and cognitive aptitude (Ernst & Kim, 2002, p. 1423; Lam, 2000, p. 492). Lam (2000, p. 492) considers this type of knowledge to be individually explicit therefore it is abstract theoretical logic (knowing).
• Embodied Knowledge: Lam describes this kind of knowledge as being more substantive and behavior oriented. Embodied knowledge is tacit which integrates ‘physical’ or practical experience within a specific context (Ernst & Kim, 2002, p. 1423).

• Encoded Knowledge: Ernst & Kim (2002, p. 1423) describes encoded knowledge as explicit in formal and systematic language. Encoded knowledge is expressed by signals, markers and indicators, furthermore this knowledge can be transmitted, stored, retrieved through various mechanisms (Ernst & Kim, 2002, p. 1423).

• Embedded Knowledge: Embedding knowledge requires knowledge to be combined and shared (collective). Embedded knowledge is strong strategically because it encompasses meaning (cognitive, affect, and social context) and praxis (behavior and routines) (Spender, 1996, p. 73).

Lam (2000) stated that “all organizational environments potentially contain a mixture of knowledge types” (p. 493). Knowledge allows professionals to “make sense” of what is happening within their environment and to make decisions on practices, discourses, or moves appropriate for a specific instant (Schirato & Webb, 2002, p. 256). Accordingly, professionals obtain knowledge through all processes that make that structuring effectual including the internalization of principles, reinforcement learning and routinization of procedures (Gaines, 2003). Knowledge allows the professional to navigate the context and within the field (Schirato & Webb, 2002, p. 256). Varavithya and Esichaikul (2006), using the classification of Lenk et al. (2002), identifies five layers of knowledge normally utilized in a professional’s discretionary decision-making habitus.
Using the works of Mayer and Salovey (1995) in addition to Law et al. (2004), the layers of knowledge was expanded to include emotional intelligence or emotional knowledge as seen in Figure 2.9:

- Legal knowledge: Professionals and practitioners should be able to search for sufficient legal elements to make decisions. Legal elements are viewed as legal regulations such as administrative directives, guidelines, instructions, rules, procedures and post orders (Varavithya & Esichaikul, 2006, p. 7).
- Situational Knowledge: The facts of each case can be in the form of structured and unstructured types of information (i.e. policy directions, social context, descriptive text, legal facts, and evidence (Varavithya & Esichaikul, 2006, p. 8).
• Procedural knowledge: Procedural knowledge incorporates coordinated steps, time, place, and participants as well as the alternatives of decision choices (Varavithya & Esichaikul, 2006, p. 8).

• Consequential knowledge: This type of knowledge is important to the decision makers’ outlay. Consequential outlay constitutes avoiding past mistakes by understanding the effectiveness of various measures (Varavithya and Esichaikul, 2006, p. 8).

• Processed cognitive knowledge: Processed understanding of the decision making process is conceived by the need to connect with the organization using personal capacities. The resulting decision making process create a collaboration to find solutions to problems in constantly changing situations. Archiving processed cognitive knowledge creates reservoirs of experience that professionals can cognitively use as lessons for potential problems (Varavithya and Esichaikul, 2006, p. 8).

• Emotional Knowledge: the capacity to process emotional information relevant to recognition, construction, and regulation of emotion in oneself and others within the social environment (Mayer & Salovey, 1997, p. 197). Mayer and Salovey described emotional knowledge as an element of emotional intelligence. Emotional Knowledge can be defined, understood, and attained using four elements of emotional intelligence. These four elements are as follow (Law, Song, & Wong, 2004, p. 284): 1.) Emotional self-appraisal and expression- the individually comprehending and expressing his/her emotions; 2.) Emotional appraisal and expression of other’s emotion- perceiving and comprehending other
people within the social environment; 3.) *Emotional self-regulation*- capacity to self-regulate his/her emotions, which enables psychological recovery and defense; 4.) *Emotional performance*- self-direction pertaining to constructive activities and personal performance.

Lam (2000) posited that the six layers of knowledge found in the habitus harness tacit knowledge (p. 493). Lam further contended that the formation of new knowledge in the habitus involves the creation and application of tacit knowledge (Lam, 2000, p. 491). Friedland (1999) indicated that “the habitus is the tacit knowledge that is the condition of possibility of institutional life” (p. 304). In the bounds of institutional life the habitus is an environmental criterion that is structured by objective conditions. The objective conditions signify the professional’s position in objective social space.

Even though Bourdieu (1977) described the habitus as structured within an objective space, the professional’s discretionary role is stimulated by a system of durable, transposable dispositions of the habitus (Bridge, 2002). In this outlook, cues or dispositions within the habitus are shared bodies of information that is perceptible and therefore proximal to the professional. Dispositional information is utilized as “tools” or knowledge-base in order to provide background, initiate practical reasoning and guide the decision making process within the organizational social environment (Bridge, 2002, pp. 205-216).

Gerrans (2005) regards dispositional information as tacit knowledge, focusing on “know-how” rather than “knowing-that” (pp. 53 & 55). Brown and Duguid (1998, p. 95) describes “know-how” as a result of experience along with the tacit perceptiveness experience supplies. Tacit knowledge offers five types of “know-how”: 1.) Awareness
that it is impossible to practice all institutional norms at all cost and in all circumstances;
2.) Awareness that counter-norms are habitually the real norms existing within an
institution; 3.) Knowing how to handle conflicting rules, when to invoke one and practice
the others; 4.) Intuition about self-discipline and the disciplines of others within the social
environment; 5.) Finally, knowing how practitioners’ actions will relate to or affect others
and their actions with in the organization (Gerholm, 1990, pp. 266-265).

Wittgenstein gave a slightly different perspective by identifying tacit knowledge
as a set of dispositions that offer a priori argument that all knowledge, reduces to a
socially acquired concordance of behavior and conduct (Gerrans, 2005, p. 60).
Dispositional tacit knowledge socially acquires capacities, propensities or tendencies of a
professional to act aptly in a situation. Gerrans (2005) perceives that dispositional tacit
knowledge allows the professional to agree substantively (practical) without explicitly or
consciously representing reference as a goal. Dispositional tacit knowledge, along with
formal rules, filters individual attitudes in addition simultaneously respond or react to
past events of social structures (Lazaric, 2000, p. 160).

Conte et al. (2005) presents that disposition tacit knowledge has trait-like
influence on decision making and can be categorized depending on its bearing on
completing a task. The professional (field) acts on a set of transposable dispositions
(habitus) in relation to the interaction within the social structure as a practice of
completing a task as seen in Figure 2.10.

The practice of completing a task within the task environment focuses the habitus
as a motivator of decision making and shapes the interaction with other the different
levels of the organization (microsystem, mesosystem, and macrosystem) (Hallet, 2003, p.
Using Bronfenbrenner’s ecological approach, Blevins and Deason-Howell (2002, p. 278) defined microsystem as an individual level whereby characteristics of the correctional facility, its staff, its administration, its residents are considered. Blevins and Deason-Howell viewed the mesosystem “as the interaction of actors with one another” (2002, p. 278). Likewise, the macrosystem encompasses state and federal legislations, institutional goals, cultural standards, and the current perspective of political systems (Blevins & Deason-Howell, 2002, p. 278). Significantly, Hallet (2003, p. 131) discovered that micro practices are linked to macro-social structure; but approaching the meso-level of the organization requires shifting from micro practices to the social interactions informed by those practices.
Noticeably, decision making has a structuring affect that reproduces the conditions from which the habitus is derived. Professionals bring their habitus or “tool kit” to the organization and their practice of decision making is informed by the habitus. Bourdieu establishes that discretionary decision making can be grasped by observing the enactment of dispositions in practice or in accomplishing the set task. Thus discretionary decision making can be perceived as a “corporeal hexis” or a style of expression that manifest empirically within the habitus (Bourdieu, 1989, p. 56).
Swidler (1986) similar to Bourdieu’s discussion, remarks that professionals extract from their habitus (social toolkit) to generate actions. The habitus formulated by dispositions are filled cues (i.e., habits, skills, and styles) that aid professionals in generating solutions to solve problems (Swidler, 1986, p.273). Likewise, Bourdieu (1990) asserts that discretionary decision making based on formal organizational rules and the habitus lead to the practice of completing the task.

To sum up this section, discretionary decision making is clearly defined as the ability of choice whereby one or more possible decisions or active options are available (Galligan, 1998, p. 14). On macro-level discretionary decision making can be demonstrated using the five steps of the rational actor model or the classical rational model of the simple decision making process. On the contrary, the micro-level viewpoint of discretionary decision making is quite different. Micro level discretionary decision-making vary depending on the context of laws and environmental situations (Schneider, 1992). Khadi discretion was used as an attempt to illustrate the micro perspective of discretionary decision making. The discussion on Khadi discretion identified that decision makers on the micro-level socialize shared norms and then engage in a social process of decision making.

The social processing of decision making entails locating the ‘habitus’ which is the link between the practice of decision making, the organizational social structure, and the task. Bourdieu (1989) classifies the profession as field or a network of similar positions set up to accomplish an equivalent objectives. Professional or ‘field agents’ bring their habitus or ‘social tool kit’ consisting of dispositions into the organization in order to generate solutions in completing the organizational task.
One illustration of professional habitus is the correctional officer, who must define inmate actions of rule violations or not, or decide whether to intervene or not to intervene. In this instance the correctional officer must select the appropriate dispositions to guide in selecting the optimal solution to this situation. Poole and Regoli (1980) observes that the correctional officer because of his wide area of discretion must search for the proper dispositions or suitable cues in a situation to guide in his decision making. On a micro level the outcome is dependent on the definition of the situation. In the field of correctional officer, the habitus aids not only in the interpretation of rules or policies but in addition the guiding of decision making and the enactment of action to complete a specified situational task.

Conceptual Framework

To understand how emotional dissonance negatively impacts correctional officer’s discretionary decision making, this study will employ the Social Judgment Theory (SJT) as a conceptual framework. The SJT will assist in mapping within the correctional officer’s habitus a single structure with the purpose of examining the effects of emotional dissonance on discretionary decision-making.

This section consists of an overview of Social Judgment Theory. Additionally, a brief summary will be given on the components of emotional dissonance (independent variable) and custody orientation (dependent variable). These components will be used by Social Judgment Analysis (SJA) as cues and information to identify preferences in correctional officers’ use in making deviant discretionary decisions or developing negative attitudes regarding inmates that impact perceptions of custodial approach (task).
Stewart, Roebber, and Bossart (1997, p. 206) argued that the study of judgment there is a relationship between the public human service worker (practitioner) and the environment (task). They recognized that judgment or decisions cannot be realized without understanding the properties of the task (Stewart, Roebber, & Bossart, 1997, p. 206). The properties of the task facilitate or limit the accuracy of judgment. The task describes the environment in which judgment occurs. Correspondingly in understanding discretionary decisions Bisantz et al. (2000) provided the conception that practitioners make decisions in working, time demanding, and actual conditions which are based on perception and pattern recognition of relevant information in the environment (p. 605).

The Public human service workers during the appraisal of a specific situation reflect on various antecedents (emotional, rules, regulations, and social norms) that give them needed information in order to react (Fridja, 1986). Lazarus (1991) stated that emotions occur in order to appraise or evaluate an event. Emotional dissonance is the result of subjectively evaluating an emotional experience (Jansz, and Timmers, 2002).

A research strategy is needed to attain the ability to fully understand the occurrence of emotional dissonance and its negative influence on discretionary decision making. This Strategy must disentangle and identify variables that help to predict, moderate or mediate emotional dissonance and discretionary decision making. Variables that predict, moderate, or mediate are individually information sources. Decision making requires understanding how different patterns of multiple variable or “information source interact, as well as how varying degrees of conflict and amount among those sources affect information satisfaction” (Stefl-Mabry, 2003, p. 879). Leckie, Pettigrew, & Syvain (1996) agreed that variables or sources are required to fill necessary information
and the continual interaction contributes to the overall complexity of each source as variable affecting information seeking.

Organizational agents make rational decisions by using information searches, which involve elaborating and evaluating all potential outcomes before choosing an optimal decision strategy. Herbert Simon (1993) theorized that agents terminate the information search process when they obtain various cues. Cues can be described as the minimum level of information satisfaction (Stefl-Mabry, 2003). Goldstein & Hogarth (1997) suggest that agents accept the decision strategy that meets the minimal criteria for acceptability rather than optimizing. One such strategy incorporates the Social Judgment theory.

Social Judgment Theory is a general conceptual framework for analysis of human judgment. The Social Judgment Theory uses levels of information satisfaction to understand decision making. Connolly, Arkes & Hammond (2000, p. 45) discovered Social Judgment Theory could be used for obtaining and representing multiple cues in a study of human decision making. The Social Judgment Theory was derived from Brunswik (1952), who focused on the notion of casual ambiguity in the environment (the environment generally being termed the judgment ecology). Brunswik argued that inductive cognitive tasks are probabilistic in nature and completely describes systems of this category. The Social Judgment Theory was later extended to incorporate the Probabilistic Functionalist psychology, which the expanded Social Judgment Theory to incorporate multiple correlation and regression-based statistical analysis (Hammond, 1955; Kaplan & Schwartz, 1975; Cooksey, Freebody & Davidson, 1986). This allowed
Social and cognitive psychologists created the Social Judgment Analysis (SJA) as an operational technique to using the Social Judgment Theory. Social Judgment Analysis provides an opportunity to empirically measure cues for a selected group of information (Stefl-Mabry, 2003, p. 881). Social Judgment Analysis establishes a criterion that suggest that information has the potential to be cues to understand behaviors such as making judgments, decisions or using discretion (Stefl-Mabry, 2003, p. 881). Cues are then integrated by judgment criterion. Cooksey, Freebody and Davidson (1986) established that “different cues have different degrees of relationship or correlation with the actual criterion being judged” (p. 46). The relational differences of cues’ significance are considered cue utilization validity. Cue utilization validities determine the degree to which cue information is integrated into a judgment criterion (Cooksey, Freebody & Davidson, 1986). Additionally, cues are correlated with each other to some degree (1986, p. 47).

Social Judgment Analysis examines behavior (dependent variable) based on the degree of information relation or satisfaction derived from specific quantities of positive and/or negative information from sets of multiple information sources/cues (independent variables). SJA offers the thoroughness and ability of replication often lacking in research studies focused on judgments and decisions (Machlup & Mansfield, 1983). SJA provides an empirical view of the subject’s thoughts by capturing respondent’s cognitive processing during one period of time.
SJA identifies preferences that individuals and groups use in making decisions or developing attitudes (Cooksey, 1996). The decision making process that is collected by SJA based on multiple regression modeling have been proven in “massive volumes of research which has occurred since 1960, to be useful in explaining why achievement is high or low with respect to the ecology of judgment task and why people agree or disagree in their judgments” (Cooksey, 1996, pp. 157-158).

A conceptual lens model for SJA suggests that preferred cue profiles influence information satisfaction. This research will use for the Lens Model a single system design, which is identical to the classical policy capturing model used in personnel-related applied judgment research (Gilliland, Wood, & Schmitt, 1994). The single system design does not incorporate any ecological criterion. The ecology is exhibited in a judgment criterion, which is a configuration of cues that confront subject, but no comparison to actual environmental outcomes is possible (Doherty & Kurz, 1996), as shown in figure 2.11:
Ben-Akiva, McFadden, & Garling (1999, p.188) described the process of decision making as being informed by sources of perceptions and beliefs established on obtainable information and impacted by affect, attitudes, motives and preferences. For this study the independent variables are functionally defined by the components of the expanded version of emotional dissonance (role conflict, burnout, and negative affect) as well as demographic factors identified in this research study. The dependent variable is
Role Conflict:

Correctional institutions goals incorporate elements of custody and treatment. These dualistic elements often result in two delineated and mutually antagonistic priorities (Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980). Antagonistic priorities emanate from role expectation (Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980, p. 446). The correctional officer trying to fulfill conflicting role expectations result in role strain or role conflict (Goode, 1960). Role conflict is created when “two or more sets of conflicting role expectation are defined by the organization as legitimate because these sets are derived from an official goal” (Grusky, 1959, p. 453).

Zald (1962) described that the existence of custody and treatment goals within correctional facilities is an impending source of staff role conflict. Kahn et al. (1964) commented that role conflict occurs when an individual is unable to reconcile the inconsistency between sets of expected role behaviors. Cressey (1960) explained that role conflict for correctional officers stem from them simultaneously by using discretion and overlooking minor infractions while maintaining custody and control.

Another definition of role conflict is derived by Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman (1970). Rizzo et al. referred to role conflict as the “dimensions of congruency-incongruency or compatibility-incompatibility in the requirements of the role, where congruency or compatibility is judged relative to a set of standards or conditions which impinge upon role performance” (1970, p. 155). Rizzo et al. (1970) classify four types of role conflict: intra-role conflict (occurs when individuals violate personal values or
standards in order to accomplish a job); intra-sender conflict (occurs when a request is made which individuals perceive beyond his/her capabilities, time, or resources); inter-role conflict (occurs when individuals has to perform several different roles within an organization which require different or incompatible behaviors); inter-sender conflict (occurs when an individual is caught by conflicting expectations and demands by the organization through incompatible policies, conflicting request, or incompatible standards of evaluation).

Emotional dissonance should be clarified as a type of inter-role conflict (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). Emotional dissonance is a conflict between personal values (genuine emotions) and role demands of others in the role set (prescribed emotions) manifested as conflicting emotions (Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987). To study the role conflict component of emotional dissonance, role conflict will be characterized as occurring when behaviors are inconsistent with one another (Rizzo et al., 1970).

Burnout:

Maslach (1982, p. 3) defined burnout as a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a reduction of personal accomplishment that can occur among work in the human service arena. Burnout is an individual’s experience that is specific to the work context (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001, p. 407). Jackson, Schwab, and Schuler (1986) determined that burnout occurs when employees become overly emotionally involved in interaction with clients and organizational life. It has been proposed by writers such as McGee (1989, 345), Muldary (1983) and Paine (1984) that “burnout impairs professional’s aptitude to attend, concentrate as well as complex thinking and problem solving.”
Maslach and Jackson (1979) described the first element of burnout as a phenomenon that increases feelings of emotional exhaustion. Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter (2001) recognized that emotional exhaustion is the central quality and manifestation of burnout. Cordes and Dougherty (1993, p. 644) considered emotional exhaustion as the key experience of burnout and the first stage of the burnout process. Halbesleben & Buckley (2004) referred to emotional exhaustion as a depletion of emotional resources. Babakus et al. (1999) described this phenomenon as individual’s having empty emotional “tanks” or a lack of energy. The energy discussed by Babakus et al. (1999) is the vigor and power that employees need to perform their work (Halbesleben & Buckley, 2004, p. 859).

Emotional exhaustion is not independently sufficient to acquire the critical aspects of the relationship employees have with their work (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001, p.403). Emotional exhaustion prompts emotional and cognitive distance as well as reduces employees’ sense of achievement (Beckstead, 2002, p. 785). The terms for these symptoms prompted by emotional exhaustion are depersonalization and decrease personal accomplishment.

Depersonalization occurs as employees become aggravated or discouraged with organizational life and careless about the welfare of their clients (Morgan et al., 2002, p. 145). Depersonalization is a “detached, callous, and even dehumanized response to a client” (Maslach, 1982, .p. 4). Similarly, Cherniss (1980) described depersonalization as dehumanization with notions of withdrawal from a hostile situation and a display of indifference to others. Finally, burnout is a reduction of personal accomplishment. Personal accomplishment occurs if employees feel strained by their work (Morgan, 2002,
Personal strain results in a decrease in job productivity. Therefore personal accomplishment can be equated to a sense of inadequacy and a perception of failure (Morgan, 2002, p. 146).

**Affect/Affectivity:**

Affect or affectivity “refers to the emotional state of the decision maker and its effect on the cognition of the decision task” (Ben-Akiva, McFadden, & Garling, 1999, p. 188). Affect describes the disposition to perceive events and individuals in generally positive or negative manner (Watson & Clark, 1984). Affect encompasses both moods and emotions (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). Slovic et al. (2005) describe affect as specific quality of goodness or badness experienced as a conscious or unconscious feeling state. Affect distinguishes whether the quality of a stimulus is positive or negative (Slovic et al., 2005, p. 36). Information or stimuli perceived by employees are marked to varying degrees. Peters et al. (2006) identify integral and incident as two functions of affect. Integral affect is experienced feelings about a stimulus (Peters et al., 2006, p. 80). While incidental affect is feelings that are independent of a stimulus but can be misattributed to it or can influence decision making (Kahneman, Schkade, & Sunstein, 1998).

Perceived stimuli are cognitively assigned to affect clusters designated by positive and negative markers (Kahneman et al., 1982). The intensity of these markers varies with the cognitive information. Accordingly affectivity, as independent dimensions, varies between high and low (Finucane et al., 2000). Kahneman, Slovic, and Tversky (1982) stated the employees consult affectivity clusters in process of decision making. Affectivity clusters serve as cues for various judgments, and act as
common currency to compare the values of very different decision options, and spotlight new information (Schwarz & Clore, 2003).

Affect distinguish whether the quality of a stimulus is positive or negative (Iverson, Olekalns, and Erwin, 1998, p. 4). Positive affect refers to the degree to which individual experience positive moods and emotions (i.e. feelings of joy, interest, energy, enthusiasm, or alertness) (Watson & Clark, 1997, p. 269). On the contrary, negative affect refers to the scope to which individuals experience negative or aversive moods or emotions, such as feelings of anxiety, sorrow, irritation, guilt or hatred (Watson & Clark, 1997, p. 269).

Demographic Influence: Age, Race/Ethnicity, Gender, Tenure, Education Level, & Institution:

Demographic characteristics of personnel such as age, gender, tenure, education level and institution have been considered important variables in sociological and psychological research (Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989, p. 402). Demographic characteristics assisted in understanding and managing organizations (Pfeffer, 1985, p. 69). Research has recognized that demographic variables are significantly related with perception, attitudes, and work results. Vanhoois et al. (1991, p.473) argued that individual qualities of the correctional officer such as age, race/ethnicity, sex, gender, and education affect work practices (perceptions, experiences and tasks). Correctional officers bring these attributes into the workplace which influences their work orientation and status. McIntire, Moberg, and Posner (1980) documented that demographic characteristics have greatly influence decision making.
Pfeffer (1983) wrote that organizational demographic variables describe similarities and differences in the composition of groups in terms of the distribution of basic attributes (age, gender, tenure, race/ethnicity, education level and institution). Pfeffer (1985) recognized that employees sharing similar experiences and attitudes promote interpersonal attractions and develop common bonds. The similarities and differences identified by demographic variables define social relations (Pfeffer, 1985, p. 70). Demographic variables also assess the extent to which a group is heterogeneous or homogenous (Pfeffer, 1985, p. 70).

Pfeffer asserted that “demography is measurable” (1985, p. 70). Controlled demographic variables in research provide supplementary information about organizational members’ characteristics attitudes and behaviors by attaining social aggregates and the affects of social relations (Tsui & O’Reilly, 1989). Organizations are composed of multiple sets of relationships with distributional properties of demographic effects. Consequently, methodologies must be employed to assess the properties of distribution (Pfeffer, 1982, p. 278).

Hogan et al. (2006) suggested studying demographic effects by utilizing demographic characteristics as control variables. Control variables are variables that are held constant in order to establish relationships between other variables. In this study of the impact of emotional dissonance on discretion, four demographic characteristics of gender, age, and race/ethnicity, tenure will be selected as control variables (Hogan et al., 2006, p. 51). Gender will be measured as a dichotomous variable with men coded as 0 and women coded as 1. Age, education and tenure will be measured in continuous years.
Institution will be categorized by names of research accessible correctional facilities.

Custody Orientation:

Correctional orientations explore the nature and sources of correctional officers’ ideology. The findings of Conte et al (2005) that discretion can be examined based the work attitude attributed to the task. It is important to examine correctional officer’s correctional orientation because these attitudes could affect the ways they interact with inmates (Farkas, 1999). Correctional officers do not simply embrace rehabilitation and human service; though the literature indicates that they are also supportive of punitive and custodial views. Poole and Regoli (1980) describes custody orientation as a reflection of correctional officer’s obligation to the control of inmates.

Surveillance and regulation of inmates’ behavior are considered as mandatory for maintenance of institutional order and security (Poole and Regoli, 1980, p. 218). Custodial dictates represent the punitive authority over inmates’ activities (Poole and Regoli, 1980, p. 218). Philliber (1987) also commented that custodial orientation may be perceived as equivalent to negative attitudes relating to inmates. On the contrary, Poole and Regoli (1980) wrote that correctional orientation is not necessarily a punitive orientation and it should not be seen as inherently negative. As a final point, Griffin (2002) discussed that custodial orientation and punitive orientation are exchangeable notions, yet the primary focus of an officer’s occupation is to maintain custody (p. 258).

Custody orientation will be measured by responses to seven statements designed to measure the correctional officers’ attitude in regards to custodial approach of handling inmates (Cullen, Lutze, Link, & Wolfe, 1989). Poole and Regoli (1980) developed
statements 2, 3, 4, and 5, while Cullen, Lutze, Link, and Wolfe (1989) added items 1, 6, and 7. The custodial orientation scale uses a 7-point Likert scale (ranging from Very Strongly Agree (1) to Very Strongly Disagree (7)) (Cullen et al., 1989).

**Operational Model**

Drawing upon the dependent variables and independent variable used in this study an operational model was developed. The operational model will use the single system design of SJT to explore the issue of emotional dissonance cues effect on the value systems of correctional officers. The information gained by the nine cues consisting of components of emotional dissonance (independent variables) and demographic (control variables) will be correlated with each other and each information source has the potential to contributing positively or negatively to the correctional officer’s reported attitude regarding custodial orientation (dependent variable). An operational model (Figure 2.12) shows this potential relationship of the following variables:
Figure 2.12
Operational model
Chapter Summary

In this chapter, a review of the literature is cultivated in order to understand the emotional and bureaucratic contradictions of the correctional officer by focusing on paradoxes stretching beyond the organizational role conflict rooted in custodial and rehabilitative contradictions. A significant contribution can be made by concentrating on understanding street level bureaucrat, emotional labor and the role conflict resulting from the dialectic contradictions between both correctional roles. Role contradictions (street-level bureaucrat/emotional laborer) stemming from the internal role interaction of the correctional officer, as a public frontline human service work, produce emotional dissonance between prescribed or supervised emotions and actual emotions ingrained in a organizational pragmatic paradox.

As demonstrated in this review, if emotional dissonance leads behavior in a negative direction, there is a need for attention to be directed to the potential emotional dissonance translating into street level bureaucrat’s judgment/decision, behavior or usage of discretion or deviant discretion. This review of the literature illustrates that deviant discretion raises concerns of acceptability in the nature of rule enforcement within a correctional organization. Correctional officers use substantive (practical) and irrational (incorporating social context) discretion to gather and assimilate proper cues of a situation to guide decision making.

This research study explores the occurrence of emotional dissonance and its negative influence on discretionary decision making. The exploratory analysis provides insight in disentangling and identifying cues that help to predict, moderate or mediate emotional dissonance and discretionary decision making. Variables that predict,
moderate, or mediate are individually information source cues. Organizational agents make rational decisions by using information searches, as well as elaborating and evaluating all potential outcomes before choosing an optimal decision strategy.

The review of the literature illuminates that the Social Judgment Theory could be used to obtain and represent multiple cues in a study of human decision making. Social Judgment Analysis unlocks an opportunity to empirically measure emotional dissonance cues. Social Judgment Analysis establishes a criterion that suggests that information collected from a situation involving emotional dissonance has the potential to be cues to understand behaviors such as making judgments, decisions or using discretion.

Based upon this review, the gaps in the literature are apparent, and have led to the conclusion that a practical application of Social Judgment Theory framework can be used to understand the negative effects of emotional dissonance on discretionary decision making. In employing the Social Judgment Theory framework, cues consisting of elements of emotional dissonance and demographic variables will be correlated with each other. Each information source cue has the potential to contributing positively or negatively to the correctional officer’s reported attitudes about custodial orientation.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH DESIGN & METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Using the Social Judgment Analysis (SJA) (see conceptual framework in Chapters I & II), Chapter III employs a research approach that applies a cross-sectional exploratory survey research design and multivariate/bivariate statistical methodology to examine the effects of emotional dissonance on deviant discretionary decision making found in the realm of correctional officers. This Chapter is divided into two main sections: The first section presented research questions and hypotheses in order to examine the research concept. The second section focused on the research design, sample frame, data collection & analysis procedures were identified and the unit of analysis of this study was described. A discussion on procedures of obtaining institutional consent and handling missing data was provided as well as a description of the instruments that were used for data collection and methods that will be used to analyze the data.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

It was demonstrated in Chapter II that emotional dissonance is a type of person-role conflict resulting from discord between felt and displayed emotion. It is also a paradoxical fusion of affectivity (inner feeling or moods) and organizational roles (Domagalski, 1999, p.845). Rafeli & Sutton (1987) wrote that emotional dissonance occurs when conveyed emotions conform to organizational norms but conflict with actual
feelings. Therefore expanding the description of emotional dissonance necessitated supplementing the identity of the “essential self” (inner feelings) with organizational role conflict (i.e. lack of power, negative personal and social image, and strained social relationships). Role conflict has been found to be antecedent to emotional exhaustion, which is a component of Maslach’s burnout. Maslach defined burnout as a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a reduction of personal accomplishment that can occur among work in the human service arena (1982, p. 3). Raefeli and Sutton (1987) thus concluded that emotional dissonance is a predictor of emotional exhaustion or “burnout.”

Manlove (1993) established that both negative affect and role conflict accounted for variance in emotional exhaustion. Abraham (1998) isolated negative affect had a mediator effect on emotional dissonance outcomes. Abraham (1998) identified that burnout is correlated with the underlying personality variable of well being, negative affectivity. Finally, Abraham (1998, p.141) empirical study suggested that negative affectivity exhibited a perfect mediator effect on the relationship between emotional dissonance and burnout, thus it is conceivable to apply role conflict, negative affect, and burnout as descriptive components or cues of emotional dissonance.

Using the operational model based Social Judgment Theory; this study examines the negative effect of emotional dissonance based on Abraham, 1998, Manlove, 1993 and Rafaeli and Sutton’s (1987) findings on correctional officer’s discretionary decision making. After reviewing the literature, research questions and hypotheses were created to look into the relationships between cues derived from emotional dissonance and custodial orientation. Each research question and hypothesis were framed from the
operational model, in order to acquire information from the nine cues consisting of components of emotional dissonance and demographic variables (independent variable) and the correctional officer’s reported attitude regarding custodial orientation (dependent variable). One central research question and three sub-questions were formulated for this study:

Research Questions

Central Question:

How does emotional dissonance impact the custodial orientation attitude of correctional officers in public prisons?

Sub questions:

1. How does role conflict impact the custodial orientation attitude of correctional officers in public prisons?

2. How does burnout impact the custodial orientation attitude of correctional officers in public prisons?

3. How does negative affect impact the custodial orientation attitude of correctional officers in public prisons?

This study uses an exploratory approach to address the primary research question. In addition to the central premise of this study, three sub-hypotheses will be explored. An operational model and equations will be used to determine suitability and aptness of the proposed hypotheses.

Hypotheses

Using the research objectives and themes found in the research questions and a review of the literature, research hypotheses were formulated to evaluate the influence of emotional dissonance on (role conflict, negative emotional dispositions) on the custodial orientation attitudes of the correctional officer working within a public prison:
Main Hypothesis:

$H_0$: Emotional dissonance has a negative impact on the custodial orientation attitude of correctional officers in a public prison.

Operational Model- The operational model of the main hypothesis will use the single system design of SJT to explore the issue of emotional dissonance negative effect on the correctional officer’s custodial orientation attitude. The information gained by the nine cues consisting of components of emotional dissonance (independent variables) and demographic (control variables) will be correlated with each other and each information source has the potential to contributing negatively to the correctional officer’s reported attitude about custodial orientation (dependent variable). The components of emotional dissonance are role conflict, burnout, and negative affect. The control variables used in this study are age, race/ethnicity, gender, tenure, education, and institution. An operational model (see Figure 3.1) shows the potential impact of the following variables on the custodial orientation:
Quantitative Equation - This study assumed that the correctional officers reported experiencing emotional dissonance (independent variable) which has a negative effect on their attitude concerning custodial orientation (dependent variables). The null
hypothesis, \( H_0: Y_{CO} = \beta_0 + \beta_{RC}x_{RC} + \beta_{BO}x_{BO} + \beta_{NA}x_{NA} + \beta_{age}x_{4age} + \beta_{race}x_{race} + \beta_{gender}x_{gender} + \beta_{tenure}x_{tenure} + \beta_{education}x_{education} + \beta_{institution}x_{institution} + e = 0 \), means that the correctional officers have reported that emotional dissonance does not have a negative effect on their attitudes regarding custodial orientation. If the correctional officers report that emotional dissonance has had a negative effect on their attitudes relating to custodial orientation then the null hypothesis will be rejected and the hypothesis will be accepted as follow

\[ H_{01}: Y_{CO} = \beta_0 + \beta_{RC}x_{RC} + \beta_{BO}x_{BO} + \beta_{NA}x_{NA} + \beta_{age}x_{4age} + \beta_{race}x_{race} + \beta_{gender}x_{gender} + \beta_{tenure}x_{tenure} + \beta_{education}x_{education} + \beta_{institution}x_{institution} + e \neq 0. \]

Sub-Hypotheses:

To determine whether each component of emotional dissonance (role conflict, negative affect, and burnout) has an inverse negative effect on the correctional attitudes towards custodial orientation, the following hypotheses will be examined:

\[ H_1: \] Correctional officers with role conflict are more likely to have a negative effect on custodial orientation attitude.

Operational Model- The operational model of this hypothesis will use the single system design of SJT to explore the issue of role conflicts negative effect on the correctional officer’s custodial orientation attitude. The information gained by the five cues consisting of components of role conflict (independent variables) and demographic (control variables) will be correlated with each other and each information source has the potential of contributing negatively to the correctional officer’s reported attitude about custodial orientation (dependent variable). The control variables used in this study are age, race, gender and tenure. An operational model (see Figure 3.2) shows this potential impact of the following variables on the custodial orientation:
This study assumed that the correctional officer reported that they experienced role conflict (independent variable) which has a negative effect on their attitude towards custodial orientation (dependent variables). The null hypothesis, 

\[ H_0: Y_{CO} = \beta_0 - \beta_{RC}x_{RC} - \beta_{age}x_{age} - \beta_{race}x_{race} - \beta_{gender}x_{gender} - \beta_{tenure}x_{tenure} - \beta_{education}x_{education} - \beta_{institution}x_{institution} + e = 0, \]

means that the correctional officers have reported that role conflict...
conflict does not have a negative inverse effect on their attitudes to custodial orientation.

If the correctional officers reports that role conflict has had a negative inverse effect on their attitudes to custodial orientation then the null hypothesis will be rejected and the hypothesis will be accepted as follow: $H_1: Y_{CO}=\beta_0-\beta_{RC}x_{RC}-\beta_{age}x_{age}-\beta_{race}x_{race}-\beta_{gender}x_{gender}-\beta_{tenure}x_{tenure}-\beta_{education}x_{education}-\beta_{institution}x_{institution}+e \neq 0$.

$H_2$: Correctional officers with negative affect (anxiety) are more likely to have a negative effect on custodial orientation attitude.

Operational Model- The operational model of this hypothesis will use the single system design of SJT to explore the issue of negative affect negative effect on the correctional officer’s custodial orientation attitude. The information gained by the five cues consisting of components of negative affect (independent variables) and demographic (control variables) will be correlated with each other and each information source has the potential to contributing negatively to the correctional officer’s reported attitude towards custodial orientation (dependent variable). The control variables used in this study are age, race, gender and tenure. An operational model (see Figure 3.3) shows this potential impact of the following variables on the custodial orientation:
Quantitative Equation- This study assumed that the correctional officer reported that they experienced negative affect (independent variable) which has a negative effect on their attitude to custodial orientation (dependent variables). The null hypothesis, H₀:

\[ Y_{CO} = \beta_0 + \beta_{NA} \times NA + \beta_{age} \times age + \beta_{race} \times race + \beta_{gender} \times gender + \beta_{tenure} \times tenure + \beta_{education} \times education + \beta_{institution} \times institution + e = 0, \]

\[ e = 0, \] means that the correctional officers have reported that negative...
affect does not have a negative inverse effect on their attitudes as it pertains to custodial orientation. If the correctional officers reports that negative affect has had a negative inverse effect on their attitudes towards custodial orientation then the null hypothesis will be rejected and the hypothesis will be accepted as follow:

\[ H_2: Y_{CO} = \beta_0 + \beta_{NA}x_{NA} + \beta_{age}x_{age} - \beta_{race}x_{race} - \beta_{gender}x_{gender} - \beta_{tenure}x_{tenure} - \beta_{education}x_{education} - \beta_{institution}x_{institution} + e \neq 0. \]

H₃: Correctional officers with burnout are more likely to have a negative effect on custodial orientation attitude.

Operational Model- The operational model of this hypothesis will use the single system design of SJT to explore the issue of burnout negative effect on the correctional officer’s custodial orientation attitude. The information gained by the fives cues consisting of components of burnout (independent variables) and demographic (control variables) will be correlated with each other and each information source has the potential to contributing negatively to the correctional officer’s reported attitude towards custodial orientation (dependent variable). The control variables used in this study are age, race, gender and tenure. An operational model (see Figure 3.4) shows this potential impact of the following variables on the custodial orientation:
Quantitative Equation—This study assumed that the correctional officer reported that they experienced burnout (independent variable) which has a negative effect on their attitude towards custodial orientation (dependent variables). The null hypothesis, $H_0$: $Y_{CO} = \beta_0 - \beta_{BO}x_{BO} - \beta_{age}x_{age} - \beta_{race}x_{race} - \beta_{gender}x_{gender} - \beta_{tenure}x_{tenure} - \beta_{education}x_{education}$
\[ \beta_{\text{institution}}x_{\text{institution}} + e = 0, \]
means that the correctional officers have reported that burnout does not have a negative inverse effect on their attitudes to custodial orientation. If the correctional officers report that burnout has had a negative inverse effect on their attitudes towards custodial orientation then the null hypothesis will be rejected and the hypothesis will be accepted as follow

\[ H_3: Y_{\text{CO}} = \beta_0 - \beta_{\text{BO}}x_{\text{BO}} + \beta_{\text{age}}x_{\text{age}} - \beta_{\text{race}}x_{\text{race}} - \beta_{\text{gender}}x_{\text{gender}} - \beta_{\text{tenure}}x_{\text{tenure}} - \beta_{\text{education}}x_{\text{education}} - \beta_{\text{institution}}x_{\text{institution}} + e \neq 0. \]

The hypotheses, operational model and quantitative equation are important in the interpretation of the negative impact of emotional dissonance on the correctional officer’s attitudes toward custodial orientation. Chapter IV will identify the research design, sample frame, data collection and procedures used to analyze the above hypotheses.

**Research Design and Methodology**

This section on Research design and methodology is organized into eight sections: a.) Research Design; b.) Population; c.) Population Frame; d.) Respondents; e.) Effect Size; f.) Data Collection Method; g.) Institutional Consent; h.) Handling of Missing Data; and i.) Data Analysis Procedure.

**Research Design**

The research design for this study is a cross-sectional exploratory survey design. The term, cross-sectional exploratory survey design, is a one-time portrait of a population’s perception or attitudes at the time the question is solicited (Folz, 1996, p. 29). In a cross-sectional design measurements are collected at once and statistical methods are implemented to examine the relationships between the variables.

The cross-sectional exploratory survey design incorporate methods and procedures utilized to collect, and analyze research data. A description of this research
usage of the cross-sectional survey design will be organized into sub sections: sampling frame, data collection methods, institutional consent, missing data and data analysis procedures.

Population

The population proposed for this study was comprised of correctional officers working within the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. The correctional officers within the ODRC oversee inmates assigned to daily activities. Correctional officers make periodic rounds in assigned areas to ensure orderly movement, security and control of inmates. Correctional officers implement institution policies and departmental rules, policies and procedures. Correctional officers’ duties include checking assigned areas for contrabands; safeguard and protect facility property; manage use of equipment and supplies, food, clothing, utilities, etc. and prepare forms and reports as required. Correctional officers must also assist in providing a safe, secure environment by using procedural safety practices and security measures (ODRC, 2006).

Population Frame

The population frame for this research study consisted of a collection of correctional officers (CO) working within the research-accessible correctional facilities. This assembly became available once the research is approved by the Human Subjects Research Review (HSRR) committee of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (ODRC). At the time this research, the ODRC employs 7077 correctional officers throughout its various facilities that range from super maximum to minimum security facilities. The ratio of inmates to COs in the ODRC is 6.6 to 1. This research
ensured that all correctional officers within research accessible correctional facilities have an equal opportunity to participate in this study.

**Respondents**

The researcher was given the option of choosing respondents for this study who work within eight accessible correctional facilities of the ODRC (Grafton Correctional Institution, Lake Erie Correctional Institution, Mansfield Correctional Institution, Marion Correctional Institution, North Central Correctional, North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility, Northeast Pre-release Center, and Toledo Correctional Institution as seen in Table 3.1). Two correctional institutions were randomly selected to be used as research sites (Grafton Correctional Institution and Mansfield Correctional Institution).

The Grafton Correctional Institution was opened in 1988 (ODRC, 2007). It offers inmates vocational programs and rehabilitative services to increase success in the transition from prison (ODRC, 2007). According to the ODRC website, Grafton Correctional Institution has a total staff of 350 including 177 security staff. Their inmate population totaled 1,438 as of April 5, 2007, with 698 Black inmates, 658 white inmates, 72 Hispanic inmates. The institution is classified as a Level One and Level Two facility, formerly known as minimum and medium security (ODRC, 2007). Eight hundred and fifty-nine inmates reside in Level One security, while 599 inmates reside in Level Two security. Classification levels vary on a daily basis (ODRC, 2007).

Mansfield correctional institution was opened in 1991. This facility focuses on providing inmates with vocational programming and rehabilitative services to reduce recidivism after release from prison. Mansfield correctional institution employs a total staff of 617 including 385 security staff (ODRC, 2007). This institution provides a safe,
efficient, secure, and humane environment for 2,370 inmates residing within the facility. As of April 5, 2007, the inmate population consists of 1,322 Black inmates, 966 White inmates, and 79 Hispanic inmates (ODRC, 2007). These inmates are categorized based on five security levels: level one (minimum) contains 327 inmates; level two (medium) holds 105 inmates; level three (close) consist of 1886 inmates; level four (maximum) contains only one inmate at this time and finally in level five (administrative maximum) there are thirty-six death row inmates (ODRC, 2007).

Table 3.1
List of Research Accessible Correctional Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Total Security Staff</th>
<th>Inmate Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grafton Correctional Institution</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield Correctional Institution</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>2,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion Correctional Institution</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>2090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Central Correctional Institution</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>2334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Pre-release Center</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effect Size

This study surveyed correctional officers working in accessible Correctional facilities. Power analysis was conducted to determine the number of response necessary to achieve the statistical power essential to complete this study (as seen in Table 3.2). In choosing the necessary effect size for this study, power analysis was conducted assuming 120 degrees of freedom for the denominator for the 9 independent variables (10 degrees
of freedom of the numerator). This analysis revealed that an effect size of 177 would be adequate to provide statistical power of .80 assuming a small effect size of .10 an alpha level of .05 and a two-tailed test of hypothesis (Cohen, 1988).

| Table 3.2
| Effect Size |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Small Effect Size = .02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Between Small and Medium Effect Size = .10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium Effect Size = .15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Between Medium and Large Effect Size = .25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Large Effect Size = .35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infinite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection Method

Based upon the Social Judgment Analysis framework instituted for this study, the data collection technique used in this research followed modified guidelines for cross-sectional survey design (Folz, 1996). Cross-sectional survey method examines a population or cases at one particular point in time. Cross-sectional analysis is generally
unsuitable for examining the independent variable or what a set of independent variables causes on a specified outcome. This analysis can not determine causal relationships. Occurrences of independent variables can not be manipulated or controlled by cross-sectional analysis.

Fortunately, a major use of cross-sectional designs is to expose relationships between the dependent and independent variables. Cross-sectional designs accumulate and analyze the data collected through surveys (O’Sullivan & Rassel, 1989, p.22). Before the main research study is conducted, this study will perform a pilot study. Knapp (1998) defines pilot study as a miniature of a primary study.

Pilot Research Study:

A pilot study was conducted; survey packets will be dispersed within the Virgin Islands Bureau of Corrections (VIBC). The proposed design for identifying, gathering, and analyzing data on the impact of emotional dissonance negative impact on discretionary decision-making employed an exploratory and the research approach that utilizes a cross-sectional survey. In using a cross-sectional survey research design, this researcher administered questionnaires to correctional officers working in within the Golden Grove Adult Correctional Facility (GGACF) of the Virgin Island Bureau of Corrections (VIBC). The GGACF employs 80 correctional officers. The questionnaire contained instruments that identified nine cues (independent variable) which are role conflict, burnout, negative affectivity, age, race, gender, education, tenure, institution and the correctional officer’s reported attitude to custodial orientation (dependent variable). The survey packets were disseminated to all correctional officers working within the Golden Grove Adult Correctional Facility (GGACF) during their morning roll call.
These survey packets contained questionnaires, a cover letter, and a self-addressed embossed stamp envelope. The survey packets were collected at point of distribution, additionally correctional officers given the option of mailing there packets to the researcher.

Conducting the pilot study gauged the measuring instruments and determined if the proposed data analyses was defensible. In general the pilot study was an opportunity to get the bugs out of the research study before conducting the principle study (Knapp, 1998, 208 & 209). This pilot study involved the administration of all research instruments that will be used in the primary research study. As seen in Appendix B, the instruments used for this research study for each area of study are as follows:

- **Custody Orientation Scale (Cullen, Lutze, Link & Wolfe, 1989):**

  This instrument consists of seven items created to measure the extent to which a custodial approach towards the dealing of inmates is sustained by correctional officers. Statements 1, 6, & 7 were created by Cullen, Lutze, & Wolfe (1989); the remaining items 2, 3, 4, 5 were developed by Poole & Regoli (1980). This instrument makes use of a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from Very Strongly Agree (1) to Very Strongly Disagree (7). This instrument has been used by Cullen, Lutze, Link, & Wolfe (1989) - Cronbach’s alpha: .61; Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link, & Wolfe (1991) - Cronbach’s Alpha: .64 and Robinson Porporino, & Simourd (1996) - Cronbach’s Alpha: .71.

- **Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach, & Jackson, Leiter, 1996):**

  This instrument was designed to measure features of the burnout syndrome. The Maslach Burnout Inventory Human Services Survey (MBI-HSS) measures burnout as it manifests itself in staff members in human services institutions and health care occupations such as nursing, social work, and psychology. This instrument consists of 22 items divided into three subscales: Emotional Exhaustion (EE), Depersonalization (D), and Personal Accomplishments (PA). MBI-HSS uses a six-point Likert scale, ranging from “never” to “everyday.” This instrument has been used by Maslach, & Jackson, Leiter, (1996) - Cronbach’s Alpha: EE= .90 D= .79 PA= .71, Janssen, de Jonge, & Bakker (1999) - Cronbach’s Alpha: Internal Consistency= .86, Schaufeli & Van Dierendonck (2000)- Cronbach’s Alpha: EE=.85 D=.75.
• PANAS Schedule (Watson, Clark, and Telegen, 1988):

The PANAS (Positive and Negative Affect Schedule) comprise 20 adjectives used to describe positive and negative feeling and emotions. PANAS includes two subscales, each consisting of 10 positive affect items (interested, excited, strong, enthusiastic, proud, alert, inspired, determined, attentive, and active) and 10 negative affect items (distressed, upset, guilty, scared, hostile, irritable, ashamed, nervous, jittery, and afraid). Participants are asked to rate items on a scale from 1 to 5, based on the strength of emotion where 1 = "very slightly or not at all," and 5 = "extremely". Relevant scores are summed to give separate total scores (range 10-50) for positive and negative affect. The higher scores indicate greater positive and negative affect. This instrument has been used by Watson, Clark, & Tellegen (1988) - Cronbach’s Alpha: PA=.90 & NA=.87; Osman et al. (2000) - Cronbach’s Alpha: Internal Consistency=.80 PA=.88 & NA=.87 Denollet & De Vries (2006) - Cronbach’s Alpha: Internal Consistency=.94

• Role Conflict Scale (Hogan, Lambert, Jenkins & Wambold, 2006):

The instrument consists of five items (e.g. “I regularly receive conflicting request at work from two or more people” and “The rules that we’re suppose to follow seem to be very clear”). The items are drawn from Cullen et al. (1985), Ivancevich and Matteson (1980), and Triplett et al. (1996). This instrument made use of a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” This instrument has been used by Hogan, Lambert, Jenkins, & Wambold (2006) – Cronbach’s Alpha: .72

• Demographic Variable (Hogan, Lambert, Jenkins & Wambold, 2006):

Demographic characteristics are frequently used as control variables. Control variables are variables that are held constant in order to establish relationships between other variables. In this study of the impact of emotional dissonance on discretion, four demographic characteristics of gender, age, race, tenure, education, and institution will be selected as control variables (Hogan et al., 2006, p. 51). Gender will be measured as a dichotomous variable with men coded as 0 and women coded as 1. Race refers to the racial and ethnic category identified by respondents. If respondents select black, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaskan Native or Asian/Pacific Islander, then the race variable will be coded as 1 otherwise the variable is coded as 0. White survey respondents are the excluded category in the regression equation. Therefore, regression results will be compared against correctional officers, who indicated their racial/ethnic category is white. Age, Education and Tenure will be measured in continuous years (Hogan et al., 2006, p. 51). Finally, institution will be categorized as Golden Grove Adult Correctional Facility (GGACF) and St. Thomas Detention Center.

An attempt was made to carry out the pilot research study’s analysis with the same vigor as intended for the final analysis. A t-test was used to examine the bivariate relationships; while correlation, factor analysis and factor score multiple regressions will
be performed to examine multivariate relationships. Babbie (1990) noted that in reality pilot study analysis never turn out as expected. Pilot studies often point out errors in reasoning or designs. By uncovering these errors allows for improvements to be made to the research design before committing to the final survey (Babbie, 1990, p. 227).

Overview/Findings:

The survey packets were distributed following the methodology previously described. During the morning roll call at the Golden Grove Adult Correctional Facility (GGACF), on January 10, 2007 at 8:30am, survey packets were distributed to 40 correctional officers who were either a part of the night or morning shifts at the facility. Correctional Officers were asked to fill out the distributed survey packets and returned to the researcher (at point of distribution or via mail). To date, 34 survey packets were returned by the correctional officers to the researcher (30 were returned at point of dissemination and 4 were received through the mail).

The pilot study was unable to meet a sample size of at least 50 respondents, consequently this research could not conduct factor score regression. Nonetheless, there were some valuable descriptive findings discovered about the correctional officers working within the GGACF. Using three survey instruments data was collected on demographics, role conflict, affect, burnout, and custodial orientation. As reflected in Table 3.3, Pilot Demographic Data more than half of the correctional officers were men (66%) and 34% were female. All of the correctional officers were minority (100% were Black). Of the correctional officers employed in the GGACF, more than 76.5% were 35 years older or over. Specifically, 23.5% were between 25-34 years of age, 67.8% were between 35-44 years old and 8.7% were between the ages of 45-54. Table 3.3 also shows
that most of the correctional officers only have high school diplomas (82.4%), 8.8% have associate degrees and 8.8% have a bachelor degree. Nearly all correctional officers reported working in their profession for less than 19 years; only 8.7% have worked for 20-25 years.
In order to study emotional dissonance, three survey instruments were used: role conflict, PANAS schedule and Maslach’s burnout. A role conflict instrument was used to solicit feedback on perceived inconsistency between sets of expected role behaviors. Correctional officers were asked to respond to the following statements (seen in Table 3.4):
| Table 3.4  
Role Conflict (Pilot)  
(Frequency Distribution of Survey Respondents, N=34) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules and Regulation are clear about what I can and cannot do on my job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly receive conflicting requests at work from two or more people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems come up here people seldom agree on how it should be handled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules we follow seem to be very clear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bickering between various departments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome of this instrument showed that 65% of the correctional officers agreed that rules and regulations are clear, and correctional officers know specifically what they can and can not do. Some of the correctional officers (38%) admitted to regularly receiving conflicting requests at work from two or more people. Nearly half of the correctional officers (41.2%) disclosed that when problems come up in the correctional facilities, people seldom agree on how it should be handled. Finally, 71% of the correctional officers interviewed agreed that the rules followed are very clear, and acknowledged that there are bickering between the various departments.
PANAS schedule was used to describe positive and negative feelings and emotions of correctional officers working in the GGACF. Table 3.5 showed that 79.4% of the respondents have high positive affect levels; 61.8% of the correctional officers reported having a negative disposition about their position. A paired-sample t-test demonstrated that on average correctional officers working in the GGACF have a greater positive disposition or mood than negative disposition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Affect Levels</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High (48-50 scores)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (32-47 scores)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (16-31 scores)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low (10-15 scores)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Affect Levels</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High (48-50 scores)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (32-47 scores)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (16-31 scores)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low (10-15 scores)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maslach defined burnout as a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a reduction of personal accomplishment that can occur among work in the human service arena (1982, p. 3). Correctional Officers were asked questions for each component of burnout (seen in Table 3.6). Almost all of the correctional officers (91.2%) reported feeling high levels of emotional exhaustion. All respondents (100%) confirmed from suffering from depersonalization. Finally, 55.9% accounted for experiencing low personal accomplishment.
Custodial orientation is a reflection of correctional officer’s task within the correctional facility. Table 3.7 depicts a summary of responses in relation to the custodial approach of handling inmates (task). 91.2% of the correctional officers working in the GGACF agreed that keeping the inmates from causing trouble is their major concern when their on the job. Half of the correctional officers (50%) perceived that prisons are too soft on inmates in addition to inmates going straight only if they find prison life to be hard.

Conversely, 73.5% reported disagreeing with the notion that the best way of handling inmates is only to feed them or work them hard. Nearly half of correctional officers interviewed also disagreed that success would occur if inmates were taught at least a little bit of respect for authority. About 79% of the correctional officers made
known by their response that they cared about inmates receiving rehabilitation. As a final point, most of the correctional officer (76.5%) believed that their job is to assist in inmates’ rehabilitation rather than just simply performing their custodial duties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.7</th>
<th>Custodial Orientation (Pilot)</th>
<th>(Frequency Distribution of Survey Respondents, N=34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep inmates from causing trouble is the major concern of my job</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisons are too soft on inmates</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmates will go straight if he/she finds prison life hard</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep'em, feed'em &amp; work'em is the best way to handle inmates</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful if we taught inmates a little respect for authority</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as inmates stay quiet, &amp; don’t cause trouble, I don’t care if they are rehabilitated</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job isn’t to rehabilitate; it’s to keep them orderly</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the pilot research study was unable to carry out research analysis with the same vigor as intended for the final analysis, the research outcome data showed that rules and regulations within the GGACF correctional facility are clear, and correctional officers know specifically what they can and cannot do. Some of the correctional officers revealed regularly receiving conflicting requests at work as well as bickering
between the various departments. Most significant, correctional officers perceived themselves as having positive dispositions about their job, high levels of burnout, and believe that there job consist of both custody and rehabilitative duties.

The pilot research study revealed that distributing surveys rather than survey packets during roll call was an effective method collecting data (envelopes were provided when necessary). The pilot research study also revealed that rate of response will increase if correctional officers are given the option to complete surveys during roll call or mailing to the researcher using a self addressed stamped envelope. Additionally, many of the correctional officers reported having difficulty in filling-out the PANAS schedule instrument because of the written instructions. Modifications were made on the instructions of the PANAS schedule before the primary research study was conducted.

*Primary Research Study:*

In this current research study, surveys were dispersed within the research-accessible correctional facilities. The surveys were distributed to the correctional officer population operating within these facilities. A survey which included instruments and a cover letter were disseminated during correctional officers’ roll call.

The cover letter contained an explanation of the questionnaire’s purpose; a description of procedures used to facilitate tracking of feedback and informs the respondents that participation will be both voluntary and anonymous. Survey responses were kept confidential. The instruments were self-administered, and instructions will be provided on proper procedures in completing each instrument questionnaires. Correctional officers were given the option to complete the survey during roll call or mail finished surveys to the researcher in a self-addressed and embossed stamped envelope.
The questionnaire instruments in this study were composed of questionnaires used in prior research studies. These instruments were sectioned into five areas. These areas included: Role Conflict, Positive and Negative Affectivity (PANAS), Burnout, and Custody Orientation Attitudes. Additionally, demographic data were collected in order to determine if age, race, gender and tenure (years of employment) have an impact on the research findings. In using seven instruments, it is important to recognize that long questionnaires lead to practical and theoretical problems.

Lenk et al. (1996) wrote that “response rates tend to decrease with increasing questionnaire length, and more importantly, academic evidence indicates that long questionnaires may induce response biases” and attrition (p. 173). In order to reduce the bias and attrition, it is important to design efficient and parsimonious questionnaires that take minimum time and are easy to complete (Lenk et al., 1996, p. 186). With lengthy questionnaires, it is also best to have instructions in place that will give clear and efficient directions on implementations of each instrument in addition to identifying an approximate time of survey completion.

**Instrumentation**

As seen in Appendix B, the instruments used for this research study for each area of study are as follows:

- **Custody Orientation Scale (Cullen, Lutze, Link & Wolfe, 1989):**

  This instrument consists of seven items created to measure the extent to which a custodial approach in regards to the dealing of inmates is sustained by correctional officers. Statements 1, 6, & 7 were created by Cullen, Lutze, & Wolfe (1989); the remaining items 2, 3, 4, 5 were developed by Poole & Regoli (1980). This instrument makes use of a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from Very Strongly Agree (1) to Very Strongly Disagree (7). This instrument has been used by Cullen, Lutze, Link, & Wolfe (1989) – Cronbach’s alpha: .61; Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link, & Wolfe (1991) –
Cronbach’s Alpha: .64 and Robinson Porporino, & Simourd (1996) – Cronbach’s Alpha: .71.

- Maslach Burnout Inventory (Maslach, & Jackson, Leiter, 1996):
  This instrument was designed to measure features of the burnout syndrome. The Maslach Burnout Inventory Human Services Survey (MBI-HSS) measures burnout as it manifests itself in staff members in human services institutions and health care occupations such as nursing, social work, and psychology. This instrument consists of 22 items divided into three subscales: Emotional Exhaustion (EE), Depersonalization (D), and Personal Accomplishments (PA). MBI-HSS uses a six-point Likert scale, ranging from “never” to “everyday.” This instrument has been used by Maslach, & Jackson, Leiter, (1996) – Cronbach’s Alpha: EE= .90 D=.79 PA= .71, Janssen, de Jonge, & Bakker (1999) – Cronbach’s Alpha: Internal Consistency= .86., Schaefli & Van Dierendonck (2000)- Cronbach’s Alpha: EE=.85 D=.75.

- PANAS Schedule (Watson, Clark, and Telegen, 1988):
  The PANAS (Positive and Negative Affect Schedule) comprised of 20 adjectives used to describe positive and negative feeling and emotions. PANAS includes two subscales, each consisting of 10 positive affect items (interested, excited, strong, enthusiastic, proud, alert, inspired, determined, attentive, and active) and 10 negative affect items (distressed, upset, guilty, scared, hostile, irritable, ashamed, nervous, jittery, and afraid). Participants are asked to rate items on a scale from 1 to 5, based on the strength of emotion where 1 = “very slightly or not at all,” and 5 = “extremely”. Relevant scores are summed to give separate total scores (range 10-50) for positive and negative affect. The higher scores indicate greater positive and negative affect. This instrument has been used by Watson, Clark, & Tellegen (1988) – Cronbach’s Alpha: PA= .90 & NA= .87; Osman et al. (2000) – Cronbach’s Alpha: Internal Consistency=.80 PA= .88 & NA= .87 Denollet & De Vries (2006) – Cronbach’s Alpha: Internal Consistency=.94

- Role Conflict Scale (Hogan, Lambert, Jenkins & Wambold, 2006):
  The instrument consists of five items (e.g. “I regularly receive conflicting request at work from two or more people” and “The rules that we’re suppose to follow seem to be very clear”). The items are drawn from Cullen et al. (1985), Ivancevich and Matteson (1980), and Triplett et al. (1996). This instrument made use of a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from “Strongly disagree” to “Strongly Agree.” This instrument has been used by Hogan et al. (2006) – Cronbach’s Alpha: .72

- Demographic Variable (Hogan, Lambert, Jenkins & Wambold, 2006):
Demographic characteristics are frequently used as control variables. Control variables are variables that are held constant in order to establish relationships between other variables. In this study of the impact of emotional dissonance on discretion, four demographic characteristics of gender, age, race, tenure, education, and institution will be selected as control variables (Hogan et al., 2006, p. 51). Gender will be measured as a dichotomous variable with men coded as 0 and women coded as 1. Race refers to the racial and ethnic category identified by respondents. If respondents select black, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaskan Native or Asian/Pacific Islander, then the race/ethnicity variable will be coded as 1, otherwise the variable is coded as 0. White survey respondents are the excluded category in the regression equation. Therefore, regression results will be compared against correctional officers, who indicated their racial/ethnic category is white. Age, Education and Tenure will be measured in continuous years (Hogan et al., 2006, p. 51). Finally, institution will be classified as research-accessible correctional facilities.

Institutional Consent

As seen in Appendix A, consent from both the University of Akron and the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction Human Subjects Research Review Committee were obtained before instruments were distributed to correctional officers. The first step in gaining access to ODRC’s correctional officers was the submission of a research proposal along with the required Institutional Review Board (IRB) forms to the Institutional Review Board of the University of Akron for approval. In compliance with Federal law and institutional policy, all research projects involving human subjects or human material was reviewed and approved by the IRB. All biomedical, social and behavioral research projects conducted by the faculty, the staff and students of the university are subject to the policies and procedures of the Institutional Review Board.

The overall criteria for IRB approval are:

- The risks to subjects are minimized as much as possible.
- The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to anticipated benefits.
- The informed consent is adequate.
• Where appropriate, the research plan makes provisions for the safety of the subjects during the data collection process.

• Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and maintain confidentiality of data.

• Appropriate safeguards are included within the study to protect the rights and welfare of the vulnerable subjects.

Upon approval of the University of Akron’s IRB, a research proposal form was submitted to the ODRC Human Subjects Research Review Committee (which is similar in function to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) of most universities) to obtain access to the correctional officers working at the research-accessible facilities.

The following documents were needed to review the proposed research: 1) a completed application for review of research proposal; 2) a completed research proposal approval form; and 3) a letter indicating university’s IRB approval of the research (for university-affiliated requests). The Department’s Human Subjects Research Review Committee will meet and review the proposal (the committee meets monthly).

Handling of Missing Data

Missing data are a part of almost all research (Babbie, 1990). Some of the ways this research dealt with missing data:

Proposal stage:

• Anticipate data collection problems and work them out before hand.

• Drop subjects who have missing data for more than 10% of items on any scale.

• Use item’s mean or mode imputation for subjects with small amounts of missing data.

• Use regression-based imputation for subjects with small amounts of missing data.
Administering/ Data Collection:

- Instruments: presented caution with construction, instructions, copying and analysis.
- Instructions: provided precise and clear instructions for proper completion of all instruments. Correctional officers will be asked to fill out all sections of the instruments entirely.
- Collection: instruments were clearly defined with instructions given on how to mail instrument to the researcher in the self-addressed, stamped reply envelope provided in each packet.
- Data entry: paper provided a verification process for paper instruments, ensuring that data entry errors remain below set limits. Each survey was given a specific number, in order to reduce data entry error.
- Missing data: after data was examined, SPSS was used to replace missing values with the mean of the variable. The mean value gives an average expected response of correctional officers.

Data Analysis Procedures

T-test was used to examine the bivariate relationships; while correlation and Factor score multiple regressions was performed to examine multivariate relationships. SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) was utilized for this analysis. SPSS are programs that are used for statistical analysis, data management and data documentation.

This research study looked at two dimensions of analysis:

Bivariate methods include any test that compares samples from different groups.

T-test: is a method used to compare sample means to distinguish if there is enough evidence to determine if the means of the corresponding group distributions differ. T-test simply determines if the means of the samples are of significant interest. There are several types of t-test; this research used Paired-Sample T-test to determine if there is a significant difference between correctional officer’s positive affect and negative
affect and if larger levels of negative affect reside with in correctional officer employed in the research-accessible correctional facilities. Paired-Sample t-test is described as contrasting the means of two different samples. The two samples share some variable of interest in common, but the objective is to determine if there is any overlap in relation between two groups (George & Mallery, 2000, pp. 122-123).

Multivariate statistical methods are designed to evaluate more than one variable at a time. The following analysis will be used:

Correlation analysis: indicates the strength and direction of a linear relationship between two variables. Correlation examines bivariate relationships between two variables. A correlation, also known as the Pearson Product-moment or the Pearson r, is designated by the lower case “r” and range from +1 to -1. A correlation designated as positive relation signifies that as one variable increases the other variable increases. A correlation designated as negative relation denotes that as one variable increases the other variable tend to decrease. When a correlation is perfect, this suggest that one variable is precisely predictable from the other variable. It should be noted that perfect correlation endure only in mathematical formulas and physical or numerical relations (George & Mallery, 2000, pp. 112-113). Correlation analysis was used to determine the relationships between correctional officer’s role conflict, burnout, negative affect, age, race, tenure (years of employment), education, and institution.

Factor Analysis: Factor analysis is a multivariate technique used to “generate the number and nature of underlying constructs from a grouping of manifest characteristics whose latent counterparts are unknown but are of considerable interest” (Knapp, 1998, p.
Knapp (1998) recognized that factor analysis is utilized for exploratory research. In this technique, factors are orthogonal to each other (Kim & Mueller, 1978, p. 9).

Factor analysis is used in theory construction, which “assumes the observed variables are linear combinations of some hypothetical or unobservable factors” (Kim & Mueller, 1978, p. 9). Factor analysis is an effort to reduce dimensionality of a dilemma by converting large number concrete variables into a relatively small number of abstract constructs that might provide a more prudent explanation of an occurrence (Knapp, 1998, p. 118).

Factors analysis entails measuring variables at least at the interval level (Hair, 1992). To measure variables in this technique requires the usage of correlation or covariance matrices. Additionally, specified variable sums are weighed and a factor scale is constructed as a weighed sum of the observed variable. Factor scales are constructed for two reasons:

- Because some fundamental dimensions are found.
- Researchers want to use one or more factors as variables.

Finally factor analysis results can be used for several other ways, the most widespread application is factor scores. Factor scores, also referred to as component scores, can give simple summary information found in the raw data devoid of the preference to factor analytic assumptions (Kim & Mueller, 1978, p. 72). Factor scores are acquired by “combining the raw variables with weights that are proportional to their component (factor) loading” (Kim & Mueller, 1978, p. 72). Hair (1992) remarked that factor scores can be only used if instruments used to collect data are soundly constructed, valid, and reliable.
Factor analysis determined patterns among the variations in values of several variables (Babbie, 1990, p. 312). Factor analysis produced factors that correlate highly with several real variables (Babbie, 1990, p. 313). Factors were centered on observed relations among variable plus the correlation of factor loadings (Babbie, 1990, p. 313). Factor loadings are factor pattern coefficients or structure coefficients that vary between +1 or -1. Factor loading indicated the strength of relationships between a particular variable similar to correlation. Once factors were selected, they should be rotated. Rotation is necessary to achieve a simple structure; high factor loadings on one factor and low loadings on all others. It should be noted that rotation does not affect the mathematical accuracy of the original factor structure; rotation makes interpretation easier. Factor analysis for this research was performed using varimax rotation. This technique uses an orthogonal rotation criterion to maximize the variance of the squared elements in the columns of a factor matrix. Factor scores were constructed using SPSS.

Once factor score were generated, they become input data for subsequent multivariate analyses (Acito & Anderson, 1986). Factor scores can be used like any variable in a multivariate analysis, although this type of score will be strongly collinear with the measures that generate them.

Factor Score multiple regression analysis: Factor score multiple regression analysis uses factors as independent variables in multiple regression analysis (Lastovicka & Thamodaran, 1991, p. 105). Factor score multiple regressions theoretically enhance research studies in terms of interpretation and generalizablity (Dobie, Mc Farland, and Long, 1986, pp. 337-338). Factor score regression generates scores that are maximally correlated with the underlying common factors (Acito & Anderson, 1986). This type of
multiple regression gains its advantage from factor analysis. Factor analysis decreases the “number of regression degrees of freedom in the analysis, thereby increasing the research sensitivity” (Acito & Anderson, 1986, p. 338).

Following the construction of factor scores, stepwise regression will be conducted. Vogt (1999) defines stepwise multiple regression as a technique use for calculating a regression equation, in order to find the best equation by entering independent variables in various combinations of ways. Stepwise multiple regression incorporates a combination of forward and backward elimination selections. Independent variables are selected and eliminated until variables are either chosen or met the criteria for removal (Vogt, 1999).

Multiple regression analysis permits more than one independent variable to have an influence on the dependent variable (George & Mallery, 2000, p. 180). Multiple regression analysis establishes a regression equation. Vogt (1999) indicates that regression equation designates the nature and closeness of the relationship between two or more variable, particularly, the degree to which you can make predictions. The regression equation is usually written $Y = a + bX + e$, where ‘$Y$’ is the dependent variable; ‘$b$’ is the slope or regression coefficient; ‘$a$’ is the intercept and $e$ is the error term (Vogt, 1999).

Table 3.8 summarized the operational information as well as the variable definition for each of the independent variables and control variables used in the stepwise multiple regression equation for the dependent variable:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Source (Survey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Custodial Orientation (xCO)</td>
<td>Factor Score</td>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>Section II: Items: 2-6; p. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout (xBO)</td>
<td>Factor Score</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Section IV: Items: 1-6, 10, 11, 13, 14,16, 20; pg. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict 1 (xRC1)</td>
<td>Factor Score</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Section I: Items 2, 3, 5; p. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Conflict 2 (xRC2)</td>
<td>Factor Score</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Section I: Items 1, 4; p. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect (xNA)</td>
<td>Factor Score</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Section III: Items 2,3,6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 20; p.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (xage)</td>
<td>Dummy variable: 0=20-39, 1= 40 or more</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Section I; p. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (xrace)</td>
<td>Dummy variable: 0=non-minority, 1=minority</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Section I; p. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (xtenure)</td>
<td>Dummy variable: 0=1-15, 1= 16-30</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Section I; p. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of education (xeducation)</td>
<td>Dummy variable: 0= high school; 1= 13 or more years (college)</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Section I; p. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution (xinstitution)</td>
<td>Dummy variable: 0= Grafton, 1= Mansfield</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Section I; p. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (xgender)</td>
<td>Dummy variable: 0= female, 1= male</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>Section I; p. 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was one main hypothesis equation and three sub- hypotheses equations created for this research:
Main Hypothesis

\[ \text{H}_0: \text{Y}_{\text{CO}} = \beta_0 - \beta_{\text{RC}} x_{\text{RC}} - \beta_{\text{BO}} x_{\text{BO}} - \beta_{\text{NA}} x_{\text{NA}} - \beta_{\text{age}} x_{\text{age}} - \beta_{\text{race}} x_{\text{race}} - \beta_{\text{gender}} x_{\text{gender}} - \beta_{\text{tenure}} x_{\text{tenure}} - \beta_{\text{education}} x_{\text{education}} - \beta_{\text{institution}} x_{\text{institution}} + e \neq 0 \]

\[ \text{H}_1: \text{Emotional dissonance has a negative impact on the custodial orientation attitude of correctional officers in a public prison.} \]

\[ \text{H}_0: \text{Y}_{\text{CO}} = \beta_0 - \beta_{\text{RC}} x_{\text{RC}} - \beta_{\text{BO}} x_{\text{BO}} - \beta_{\text{NA}} x_{\text{NA}} - \beta_{\text{age}} x_{\text{age}} - \beta_{\text{race}} x_{\text{race}} - \beta_{\text{gender}} x_{\text{gender}} - \beta_{\text{tenure}} x_{\text{tenure}} - \beta_{\text{education}} x_{\text{education}} - \beta_{\text{institution}} x_{\text{institution}} + e = 0 \]

Null: Correctional officers reported that emotional dissonance does not have a negative effect on their attitude toward custodial orientation.

Sub- Hypotheses

\[ \text{H}_1: \text{Y}_{\text{CO}} = \beta_0 - \beta_{\text{RC}} x_{\text{RC}} - \beta_{\text{age}} x_{\text{age}} - \beta_{\text{race}} x_{\text{race}} - \beta_{\text{gender}} x_{\text{gender}} - \beta_{\text{tenure}} x_{\text{tenure}} - \beta_{\text{education}} x_{\text{education}} - \beta_{\text{institution}} x_{\text{institution}} + e \neq 0 \]

\[ \text{H}_1: \text{Correctional officers with role conflict are more likely to have a negative effect on their attitude towards custodial orientation attitude.} \]

\[ \text{H}_0: \text{Y}_{\text{CO}} = \beta_0 - \beta_{\text{RC}} x_{\text{RC}} - \beta_{\text{age}} x_{\text{age}} - \beta_{\text{race}} x_{\text{race}} - \beta_{\text{gender}} x_{\text{gender}} - \beta_{\text{tenure}} x_{\text{tenure}} - \beta_{\text{education}} x_{\text{education}} - \beta_{\text{institution}} x_{\text{institution}} + e = 0 \]

Null: Correctional officers have reported that role conflict does not have a negative effect on their attitude towards custodial orientation.

\[ \text{H}_2: \text{Y}_{\text{CO}} = \beta_0 - \beta_{\text{NA}} x_{\text{NA}} - \beta_{\text{age}} x_{\text{age}} - \beta_{\text{race}} x_{\text{race}} - \beta_{\text{gender}} x_{\text{gender}} - \beta_{\text{tenure}} x_{\text{tenure}} - \beta_{\text{education}} x_{\text{education}} - \beta_{\text{institution}} x_{\text{institution}} + e \neq 0 \]

\[ \text{H}_2: \text{Correctional officers with negative affect (anxiety) are more likely to have a negative effect on their attitude towards custodial orientation.} \]

\[ \text{H}_0: \text{Y}_{\text{CO}} = \beta_0 - \beta_{\text{NA}} x_{\text{NA}} - \beta_{\text{age}} x_{\text{age}} - \beta_{\text{race}} x_{\text{race}} - \beta_{\text{gender}} x_{\text{gender}} - \beta_{\text{tenure}} x_{\text{tenure}} - \beta_{\text{education}} x_{\text{education}} - \beta_{\text{institution}} x_{\text{institution}} + e = 0 \]

Null: Correctional officers have reported that negative affect does not have a negative effect on their attitude towards custodial orientation.

\[ \text{H}_3: \text{Y}_{\text{CO}} = \beta_0 - \beta_{\text{BO}} x_{\text{BO}} - \beta_{\text{age}} x_{\text{age}} - \beta_{\text{race}} x_{\text{race}} - \beta_{\text{gender}} x_{\text{gender}} - \beta_{\text{tenure}} x_{\text{tenure}} - \beta_{\text{education}} x_{\text{education}} - \beta_{\text{institution}} x_{\text{institution}} + e \neq 0 \]

\[ \text{H}_3: \text{Correctional officers with burnout are more likely to have a negative effect on their attitude towards custodial orientation.} \]
\( H_0: Y_{CO} = \beta_0 - \beta_{BOxBO} \cdot age \cdot \beta_{race} \cdot \beta_{gender} \cdot \beta_{tenure} \cdot \beta_{education} \cdot \beta_{institution} + \epsilon = 0 \)

Null: Correctional officers have reported that burnout does not have a negative effect on their attitude towards custodial orientation.

Before regression models can be accepted, stepwise regression will test for multicollinearity and heteroscedasticity. Collinearity is the extent to which the independent variables in a regression analysis are correlated with one another. A multicollinearity diagnostic test was conducted by examining for variance inflation factor and tolerance (VIF) value (Vogt, 1999). VIF reflects the presence or absence of multicollinearity. VIF has a range of 1 to infinity (Vogt, 1999). When VIF is high, which is larger than ten, indicates levels of high multicollinearity. The rule of thumb for multicollinearity is that the VIF should not be greater than 5. Tolerance has a range from zero to one. The closer the tolerance value is to zero signifies levels of mulitcollinearity.

Heteroscedasticity is a condition where models have considerable variances in the dependent variable from the same values of the dependent variable in different populations being sampled and compared (Vogt, 1999). Heteroscedasticity can be visually detected using scatter plot of the standardized residuals. The “best” residuals will be spherical, i.e. scattered randomly in an approximate circular patter. Signs of heteroscedasticity are indicated if residual plots fans outward or inward in a funnel shape.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Introduction

Arranged in three sections, this chapter presents an account of the findings and a discussion on the analysis of data collected for this research study. The first section offered a depiction of correctional officers working in Mansfield and Grafton correctional facilities using accrued demographic information. The second section reports descriptive information about the perceptions of the correctional officers about role conflict, disposition, burnout and custodial orientation to their position.

Finally, the third section examines research variables using the results of bivariate analysis and multivariate analysis. The results of bivariate analysis highlighted differences in the correctional officers’ disposition. This analysis determined if correctional officers perceive themselves as exhibiting positive or negative moods relating to their position. The results of multivariate analyses (factor analysis, correlation, and factor score regression) ascertained the strength and direction of relationships between role conflict, negative affectivity, and burnout. The results of the multivariate analyses were established if these components of emotional dissonance have an effect on custodial orientation.

In addition, the third section provided the determined significance of the models that were created based on the proposed research question and the sub-hypotheses. These
models will determine if in fact emotional dissonance has some level of impact on the discretionary decision-making process of the correctional officer.

Demographic Information of Survey Respondents

Surveys were disseminated to correctional officers working within the Mansfield correctional facility and the Grafton correctional facility during various roll calls (morning, special duties, and afternoon) as well as throughout a training session. At roll call, officers were given the option of returning the completed survey to the researcher at the end of roll call or to mail the completed survey using an embossed stamped self addressed envelope. Table 5.1 showed that this technique of collecting data resulted in the researcher obtaining surveys from 27% of the 385 correctional officers employed in the Mansfield correctional facility and 34% of the 177 employed in the Grafton correctional facility. Although the researcher received 81.2% of the surveys at the end of roll call, an additional 18.8% of the surveys were received by mail as displayed in Table 4.1.
There were some valuable descriptive findings discovered about the correctional officers working within the Mansfield and Grafton correctional facilities. As revealed in this survey research, correctional officers were characterized based on five demographic characteristics: gender, race, age, tenure, and years of education.

Gender: Four-fifths of the survey respondents were male. Specifically, 80% were male and 20% were female. Table 4.2 displayed the frequency distribution of the survey respondents by gender.
Table 4.2
Gender (Frequency Distribution of Survey Respondents, N=165)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race/ Ethnicity: Almost three-fourth of the survey respondents are non-minority. Specifically, 73 percent of the survey respondents were White/Caucasian; 20.6 percent were African American/Black; 1.2 percent were Hispanic; 4.2 percent were Native American and 1 percent did not want to be categorized by any of the itemized ethnic characteristics. Table 4.3 displayed the frequency distribution of survey respondents by racial/ethnic group.

Table 4.3
Race/Ethnicity (Frequency Distribution of Survey Respondents, N=165)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino/Latina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age: More than two-thirds of the survey respondents were over the age of forty. Specifically, 7.3 percent of the survey respondents were between the age of 20 and 29; 7.3 percent were between the age of 30 and 39; 47.9 percent were between the age of 40 and 49; 20.6 percent were between the age of 50 and 59; and 4.2 percent were between
the age of 60 and 69. Table 4.4 displays the frequency distribution of survey respondents by age.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 to 29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 59</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 69</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tenure: More than two-thirds of the survey respondents have worked for more than 10 years as a correctional officer. Specifically, 28.5 percent of the survey respondents have 1 to 9 years of tenure; 55.8 percent of the survey respondents have 10 to 19 years of tenure; 15.8 percent have 20 to 29 years of tenure. Table 4.5 displayed the frequency distribution of survey respondents by tenure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Tenure</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education: As seen in Table 4.6, a little over three-fifths of the survey respondents have at least a high-school or equivalent diploma. Specifically, 61.2 percent of the survey respondents have at least a High-school or equivalent diploma; 12.1 percent
have at least completed one year of college; 19.4 percent have an associate degree; 4.8 percent reported having a bachelor degree; and only 2.4 of the survey respondents have a higher education degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Education</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 years (high school or equivalent diploma)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>62.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least 1 year of college</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 years (AA or AS)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 years (BA or BS)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 or more years (Higher Education)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive Information of Surveyed Respondents

Using four survey instruments, data was collected on role conflict, affect, burnout, and custodial orientation. In order to understand emotional dissonance, three survey instruments were used: role conflict, PANAS schedule and Maslach’s burnout. A role conflict instrument was used to solicit feedback on perceived inconsistency between sets of expected role behaviors. Correctional officers were asked to respond to the following statements:

Role Conflict: A role conflict instrument was used to solicit feedback on perceived inconsistency between sets of expected role behaviors. There are 5 statements of job-related perceptions. The frequency distribution for the role conflict variables are displayed using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from one through five, one signifying “Strongly disagree”; two signifying “disagree”; three signifying “Uncertain”; four
signifying “Agree”; and five signifying “Strongly Agree.” Surveys respondents were asked if they agreed or disagreed about with statements focusing on role conflict.

Correctional officers were asked to respond to the following statements (seen in Table 4.7). Fifty-one percent of the survey respondents reported agreeing that rules and regulations are clear about what they can and cannot do on their job. Forty-one percent of the survey respondents agreed upon receiving conflicting request at work from two or more people. Thirty nine percent of the survey respondents agreed that if problems come up, people seldom agree on how it should be handled. Forty-seven percent of the survey respondents agreed that rules follow seems to be very clear. Finally, 66.1% confirmed that there are bickering between various departments.
Table 4.7
Role Conflict (Frequency Distribution of Survey Respondents, N= 165)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rules and Regulation are clear about what I can and cannot do on my job</td>
<td>5.5% (17.6%)</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly receive conflicting request at work from two or more people</td>
<td>9.7% (32.7)</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems comes up here people seldom agree on how it should be handled</td>
<td>6.1% (25.5)</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules we follow seem to be very clear</td>
<td>6.1% (22.5%)</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bickering between various departments</td>
<td>7.3% (14.6%)</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers within the parentheses ( ) are the percent totals of respondents that agree or disagree with statements.

Affectivity: PANAS schedule was used describe positive and negative feeling and emotions of survey respondents. There are 20 statements of affectivity - 10 focused on the positive and 10 focused on the negative. The frequency distribution for both negative affect and positive affect variables were displayed using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from one through five, one signifying “Very Slightly or Not at all”; two signifying “A Little”; three signifying “Moderately”; four signifying “Quite A Bit”; and five signifying “Extremely”. Surveys respondents were asked to determine the degree of
specific words and phrases that describe different feelings and emotions best describe their disposition.

The findings of the PANAS survey are explored in Tables 4.8.1 and 4.8.2. Additionally, Table 4.8.3 displayed the affect levels found in this research study. Raw scores were compiled from both positive affect and negative affect statements. These raw scores were then categorized as 48-50 scores meaning very high affect levels, 32-47 scores meaning high affect levels, 16-31 scores meaning low affect levels, and finally 15-10 scores meaning very low affect levels.

Table 4.8.1 showed that at least one-third of the correctional officers moderately felt irritable and distressed. Interestingly, most of the survey respondents reported feeling little or no negative feelings regarding their jobs. Over two-fifths of the correctional officers participating in research study reported feeling little or no nervousness, and hostility. Fifty-nine percent of the survey respondents reported not feeling jittery. More than three-fifths of the survey respondents reported have very slight or no feelings of embarrassment, or fear (scared/afraid). Lastly, 78.8% of the correctional officers in the research revealed that they had on feeling of guilt about their position.
Table 4.8.1
Negative Affect (Frequency Distribution of Survey Respondents, N= 165)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Slightly</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irritable</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashamed</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilty</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jittery</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conversely, table 4.8.2 revealed that 36.4% of correctional officers perceived that
they have quite a bit of interest in their jobs. Forty percent of the survey respondents felt
that they showed either a quite a bit or extreme alertness while on their job. More than
one-third of the correctional officers that completed the survey feel that they are strong
(Quite a bit), inspired (Moderately), attentive (Quite a bit). Over one fourth of the survey
respondents felt enthusiastic (Moderately), active (moderately), and proud (Moderately &
Quite A Bit) about their jobs.
Table 4.8.2
Positive Affect (Frequency Distribution of Survey Respondents, N= 165)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Slightly</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Quite A Bit</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alert</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8.3 displayed that a little over a half of the survey respondents reported having high levels of positive dispositions about their position. Specifically, 2.4% of the respondents had high positive affect levels; 53.3% reported having high levels of positive affect about their position; 41.8% reported having low positive affect about their position and 2.4% reported having a very low positive affect about their position. On the other hand, 6.1% reported having high negative affect about their position; 61.2% of the correctional officers reported having a low negative disposition about their position and 32.7% of the survey respondents reported having very low negative disposition about their position.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Affect Levels (10-50 scores)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High (48-50 scores)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (32-47 scores)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (16-31 scores)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low (15-10 scores)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negative Affect Levels (10-50 scores)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very High (48-50 scores)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (32-47 scores)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (16-31 scores)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low (15-10 scores)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Burnout: Maslach defined burnout as a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a reduction of personal accomplishment that can occur among work in the human service arena (1982, p. 3). The Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI) - Human Services Survey was used to discover how human service professionals view their position and the people with whom they have interaction. This survey used the “recipients” to refer to the people for whom they provide service, care, treatment or instructions.

There are 22 statements of job-related feelings. The frequency distribution of survey respondents for both negative affect and positive affect variables are displayed using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from one through seven, zero signifying “Never”; one signifying “A few times a year or less”; two signifying “Once a month or less”; three signifying “A few times a month”; four signifying “Once a week”; and five signifying “A few times a week”; and six signifying “Every day”.
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The findings of burnout instrument responses were explored in Tables 4.9.1 and 4.9.2. Additionally, Table 4.9.3 displays the level emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and personal accomplishments found in this research study. Raw scores were compiled from the responses for the 22 burnout statements for each component of burnout. First, the emotional exhaustion’s raw scores were then categorized as 27 or over scores meaning high levels, 17-26 scores meaning moderate levels, 0-16 scores meaning low levels. Second, depersonalization raw scores were then categorized as 13 or over scores meaning high levels, 7-12 scores meaning moderate levels, 0-6 scores meaning low levels. Thirdly, personal accomplishment raw scores were then categorized as 0-31 scores meaning high levels, 32-38 scores meaning moderate levels, 39 or over scores meaning low levels.

Table 4.9.1 displays the frequency distribution of survey respondents of first 11 statements of burnout. These first statements exposed that 40% of the correctional officers within this study believed that everyday they deal effectively with the problems of their recipients. At least one-fifth of the correctional officer reported that everyday they positively influence other people’s lives through their work. A little over 20% of the survey respondents reported that there work has harden them emotionally and that they are becoming more callous relating to people since taking this type of job. Furthermore, some 20% of Correctional officers within this study disclosed that every few months they feel emotionally drained and used up at the end of the work day.
Table 4.9.1
Burnout 1 (Frequency Distribution of Survey Respondents, N=165)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Few times a year</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Few times a month</th>
<th>Once a Week</th>
<th>Few times a week</th>
<th>Every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Drained</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel used up</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel Fatigued</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand recipient feelings</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treat recipients as impersonal objects</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain on me</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal effectively recipient’s problems</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel Burned out</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Influencing</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callous towards people</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardening emotionally</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9.2 displayed the frequency distribution of survey respondents of last 11 statements of burnout. About 29.7% of the survey respondents made it known that they deal with emotional problems calmly every day. Another 23.7% of the survey respondents also disclosed that can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with their recipients. Twenty-two percent of the correctional officers don’t believe that recipients blame them for some of their problems.

Table 4.9.2 also revealed that 55.2% of the survey respondents reported never feeling like they were at the end of their ropes. Forty percent of the correctional officers within this study never feel like that working with people directly puts too much stress on
them. Unfortunately, 30.9% of the correctional officers within this study are never exhilarated after working closely with their recipients.

Table 4.9.2
Burnout 2 (Frequency Distribution of Survey Respondents, N = 165)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Few times a year</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Few times a month</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Few times a week</th>
<th>Every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Energetic</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrated by job</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working too Hard</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care about recipient</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People put too much stress on me</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create relax Atmosphere</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhilarated</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplished worthwhile things</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of my rope</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal calmly with emotional problems</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient of blame</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9.3 exposed that correctional officers were asked questions for each component of burnout. Almost all of the correctional officers (90.9%) reported feeling high levels of emotional exhaustion. Almost all of respondents (98.2%) confirmed suffering from depersonalization. Finally, 49.7% experienced high personal accomplishment.
Custodial orientation: This instrument is a reflection of correctional officer’s custody task within the correctional facility. There are 7 statements of perceptions on custody. The frequency distribution for the role conflict variables are displayed using a 7-point Likert scale ranging from one through seven, one signifying “Very Strongly Agree”; two signifying “Strongly disagree”; three signifying “disagree”; four signifying “Uncertain”; five signifying “Agree”; six signifying “Strongly Agree” and seven signifying “Very Strongly Agree”. Surveys respondents were asked if they agreed or disagreed about with statements focusing on custodial orientation.

Table 4.10 depicted a summary of responses about the custodial approach of handling inmates (task). Seventy-eight percent of the survey respondents working in both of the Mansfield and Grafton correctional facilities agreed that keeping the inmates from causing trouble is their major concern when their on the job. Seventy-six percent of
the survey respondents perceived that prisons are too soft on inmates. Forty-nine percent of the survey respondents agreed that inmates will go straight only when he/she finds that prison life is hard. About 49.6% of the survey respondents agreed that correctional facilities would be successful if all we taught inmates was a little respect. Forty-nine percent believe that their job isn’t to rehabilitate but to keep inmates orderly so that they don’t hurt anyone or destroy the facility.

Equally, 43.7% of survey respondents reported that they disagreed with the idea that “sleep’em, feed’em, and work’em” is the best way of handling inmates. Nearly half of the survey respondents also disagreed with the belief that as long as inmates are supervised and stay quiet and don’t cause trouble, they don’t care if they are getting rehabilitated or cured while they are incarcerated.
Table 4.10
Custodial Orientation (Frequency Distribution of Survey Respondents, N=165)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Very Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keep inmates from causing trouble is the major concern of my job</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisons are too soft on inmates</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inmates will go straight if he/she finds prison life hard</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sleep’em, feed’em &amp; work’em is the best way to handle inmates</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful if we taught inmates a little respect for authority</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as inmates stay quiet, &amp; don’t cause trouble, I don’t care if they are rehabilitated</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job isn’t to rehabilitate; it’s to keep them orderly</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers within the parentheses ( ) are the percent totals of respondents that agree or disagree with statements.

Bivariate and Multivariate Analyses

This section presents and examines research variables using the results of bivariate analysis and multivariate analysis. The result of bivariate analysis (paired-sample t-test) determines difference in the correctional officers’ emotional disposition. This analysis determines if correctional officers perceive themselves as exhibiting greater positive or negative moods to their position.
The results of multivariate analyses (factor analysis, correlation, and factor score regression) will ascertain the strength and direction of relationships between role conflict, negative affectivity, and burnout. The results of the multivariate analyses also established if these components of emotional dissonance have an effect on custodial orientation.

Bivariate Analysis: Babbie (1990) described bivariate analysis as the examination of two variables simultaneously for the purpose of discovering the empirical relationship between them. This analysis will be utilized to test for difference in correctional officers’ perceptions of positive and negative affectivity. Specifically, a paired samples t-test was conducted in this research.

Paired Samples T-test

A paired sample t-test compares the means of two variables. This technique computes the difference between the two variables for each case and test to see if the average differences are significantly different from zero. It should be assumed that both the positive affect variable and the negative affect variable are normally distributed. The overall hypothesis tested using this analysis was the mean score of positive and negative affect. The hypotheses for this analysis are stated as:

\[ H_0: \mu_{PA} - \mu_{NA} = 0 \]

Null: There is no significant difference between the means of positive affect and negative affect

\[ H_1: \mu_{PA} - \mu_{NA} \neq 0 \]

Alternate: There is a significant difference between the means of positive affect and negative affect.
Where $\mu_{PA}$ and $\mu_{NA}$ are the mean scores of positive affect and negative affect of correctional officers, the analysis was performed in SPSS using its paired samples t-test technique for survey data and excluding missing data. The summary results of the analysis were presented in Table 4.11. The paired-samples t test analysis indicated that for the 165 respondents, the mean score for positive affect (32.8424) was significantly greater (by 13.38, p=.000) than the mean score of the negative affect (19.4606). These results also indicated that there was no significant correlation existing between these two variables ($r= -.114$, $p>.05$) indicating that there is no relationship between positive affect score and negative affect score. This meant that positive scores will not change if negative affect score changes and vice versa, thus they are independent of each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair: Positive Affect Score – Negative Affect Score</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>.861</td>
<td>11.68, 15.08</td>
<td>15.54, .000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Correlations</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 Positive Affect Score &amp; Negative Affect Score</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Multivariate Analysis: This technique uses several methods for examining multiple variables at the same time. Multivariate analyses allow the researcher to examine the relation between two or more variables while simultaneously controlling for how each of these may be influence by other variables. Specifically, research conducted a factor score regression.

**Factor Score Regression**

Factor score multiple regression analysis uses factors as independent variables in multiple regression analysis (Lastovicka & Thamodaran, 1991, p. 105). Factor score multiple regression theoretically enhances research studies in terms of interpretation and generalizibility (Dobie, Mc Farland, and Long, 1986, pp. 337-338). Factor score regression generates scores that are maximally correlated with the underlying common factors (Acito & Anderson, 1986). This type of multiple regression gains its advantage from factor analysis. Nine cues consisting of components of emotional dissonance (independent variables: role conflict, burnout, and negative affect) and demographic (control variables: age, race, gender, tenure, education and institution) were correlated with each other and each information source has the potential to contributing negatively to the correctional officer’s reported attitude concerning custodial orientation (dependent variable).

Documented below are the findings of factor score and stepwise multiple regression:

**Factor Scores-**

Factor scores were created for the three components of emotional dissonance, which are role conflict, burnout, and negative affect, and custodial orientation.
1.) Role Conflict Factor Score: The first attempt of factor analysis was conducted on five statements of role conflict in order to create a factor score that will be used as a role conflict variable. Factor analysis was also performed to reduce the number of inter-correlated measures among factors into a small number of interpretable dimensions. Table 4.12.1 showed that although the component scores loaded high (greater than .45), it was necessary to separate the components in order to gain greater correlated significance, in addition stronger correlation and reliability.

The first attempt of role conflict identified five variables of role conflict. The factor identification was based on the eigenvalue (greater or equal to 1). Based on two identifying variable, varimax rotation occurred.
Table 4.12.1  
Role Conflict Factors- 1st attempt  
(Correlation Matrix of Factor Analysis) 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>rules and regulation</th>
<th>Conflicting request</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Rules clear</th>
<th>Bickering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rules and regulation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>-.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting request</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems agree</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules clear</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>-.222</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bickering</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  |                      |                     |          |             |           |
| Sig. (1-tailed)  |                      |                     |          |             |           |
| rules and regulation | .278                | .134                | .000     | .176        |
| Conflicting request | .134                | .000                | .062     | .000        |
| Problems agree   | .000                | .002                | .062     | .047        |
| Rules clear      | .176                | .002                | .000     | .047        |

a Determinant = .558

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rules &amp; Reg.</td>
<td>1.821</td>
<td>-.555</td>
<td>.671</td>
<td>.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting</td>
<td>1.265</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems</td>
<td>.797</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rule Clear</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>-.676</td>
<td>.539</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bickering</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsequently, the first component of role conflict created a factor score out of three variables (conflicting request, program agrees, and bickering) of five role conflict statements. These variables consist of following statements: a.) Conflicting request- I regularly receive conflicting requests at work from two or more people; b.) Problems agree- When a problem comes up here, people seldom agree on how it should be handled; c.) Bickering- There is bickering between the various departments.
Table 4.12.2 showed the correlation between these three variables; this reason favors the creation of a corrected factor score (correlations were found significant). One factor was identified from the five variables of role conflict. The factor identification was based on the eigenvalue (greater or equal to 1). Based on there being one identifying variable, varimax rotation could not be performed. Table 4.12.2 also showed high factor loading between .6 and .8. The reliability test for Role Conflict 1 variables had a standardized Cronbach’s Alpha of .548, which is slightly below the minimum requirement of .6 for internal consistency reliability to be established. A factor score was created for this variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conflicting request</th>
<th>Problems agree</th>
<th>Bickering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinant</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting Request</td>
<td>1.578</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems Agree</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bickering</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third attempt at role conflict factor analysis created the second component of factor score out of 2 variables (“rule_regulation” and “rule_clear”) of the 5 statements that signify role conflict. These components were the findings of the following statements:
a.) Rule regulation- The rules and regulations were clear enough here that I know specifically what I can and cannot do on my job; b.) Rule clear- The rules that we’re suppose to follow seems to be very clear.

Table 4.12.3 showed the correlation between two variables; hence favoring the creation of a corrected factor score (correlation was found significant). Table 4.12.3 also showed high factor loading was greater than .8. The factor identification was based on the eigenvalue (greater or equal to 1). Based on there being only one identifying variable, varimax rotation could not be performed. The reliability test for Role Conflict 2 variables had a standardized Cronbach’s Alpha of .661, which is greater than .6 for internal consistency reliability. A factor score was created for this variable.

Table 4.12.3
Role Conflict Factors Analysis 3rd attempt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>rules_regulation</th>
<th>rules_clear</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules regulation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rules clear</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>Rules regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determinant = .757</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rules_regulation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rules_clear</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eigenvales</td>
<td>Component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules and Regulation</td>
<td>1.493</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules clear</td>
<td>.507</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.) Negative Affect: Factor analysis was conducted on ten statements of negative affect in order to create a factor score that will be used as a role conflict variable. These components are the findings of the following words: Irritable, distressed, ashamed, upset, nervous, guilty, scared, hostile, jittery, and afraid.
Factor Analysis was also performed to reduce the number of inter-correlated measures among factors into a small number of interpretable dimensions. All ten statements were used as factors for the negative affect variable. There were two factors that were identified as reason for rotation from the ten variables of negative affect (based on the eigenvalues). Based on two identifying variable, varimax rotation occurred. The correlation matrix displayed that all ten variables have good correlation and that all correlations are significant (equal or less than .05). Table 4.13.2 showed high factor loading from 5.47 to .734 and the variables had a standardized Cronbach’s Alpha of .857, which is greater than .6 for internal consistency reliability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Irritable</th>
<th>Distressed ashamed</th>
<th>upset</th>
<th>Nervous</th>
<th>guilty</th>
<th>scare</th>
<th>Hostile</th>
<th>jittery</th>
<th>afraid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irritable</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashamed</td>
<td>.370</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>.538</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilty</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.199</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.407</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jittery</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>.296</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>.540</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Irritable</th>
<th>Distressed ashamed</th>
<th>upset</th>
<th>Nervous</th>
<th>guilty</th>
<th>scare</th>
<th>Hostile</th>
<th>jittery</th>
<th>afraid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.13.1
Negative Affect Factor Correlation Matrix
Table 4.13.2  
Negative Affect Factor Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Eigenevalue</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irritable</td>
<td>4.390</td>
<td>.640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed</td>
<td>1.620</td>
<td>.632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashamed</td>
<td>.882</td>
<td>.617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilty</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td>.377</td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jittery</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.) Burnout Factor Score: the first attempt at Factor analysis was conducted on 22 statements of burnout in order to create a factor score that will be used as a burnout variable. Factor analysis was conducted also to reduce the number of inter-correlated measures among factors into a small number of interpretable dimensions. Table 4.14.1 showed that four factors were identified from the 22 variables of burnout (based on the eigenvalues). Based on four identifying components, varimax rotation occurred. The results of the first attempt at burnout factor analysis showed that some of the correlations between the 22 components of burnout were not significant. Table 4.14.1 showed that by using all 22 factors to create factors scores that the factor model would have a very good reliability of .846. Inopportunely, four component scores would be created because several of the 22 components have a closer relationship to one another.
A second attempt at factor analysis created an improved burnout factor score by removing 10 statements in order to create a more workable burnout variable. A factor component was identified from the 12 variables of the new burnout variable. These variables consisted of the following statements: a.) I feel emotionally drained from my work; b.) I feel used up at the end of the workday; c.) I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job; d.) I can easily understand how my recipients feel about things; e.) working with people all day is really a strain for me; f.) I feel burned out from my work; g.) I feel frustrated by my job; h.) I’ve become more
callous toward people since I took this job; i.) I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally; j.) I feel I’m working too hard on my job; k.) working with people directly puts too much stress on me; and l.) I feel I’m at the end of my rope.

The factor identification was based on two eigenvalues; rotation was performed using varimax. Tables 4.14.2 showed that the correlation between all 12 variables were good and significant (less or equal to .005). Table 4.14.3 displayed a high factor loading of .483 to .842. A reliability test of the factor variable displayed a standardized Cronbach’s Alpha of .911, hence favoring the creation of a factor score.
## Table 4.14.2
Burnout Factor Analysis (Correlation Matrix) 2nd-attempt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emot. drained</th>
<th>feel used up</th>
<th>feel fatigued</th>
<th>easy und.</th>
<th>caus strain</th>
<th>feel burn</th>
<th>Frustrate</th>
<th>callous</th>
<th>Hard</th>
<th>too hard</th>
<th>puts stress on me</th>
<th>end of my rope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>emotion drained</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel used</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel fatigued</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>0.437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easily understand</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.373</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cause strain</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.446</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel burned out</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.692</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frustrated by job</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>0.582</td>
<td>0.566</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>become callous</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.355</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hardening emotional</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working too hard</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>0.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puts stress on me</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td>0.482</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.721</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.496</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end of my rope</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.423</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>0.598</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.494</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>emotion drained</th>
<th>feel used up</th>
<th>feel fatigued</th>
<th>easy und.</th>
<th>caus strain</th>
<th>feel burn</th>
<th>Frustrate</th>
<th>callous</th>
<th>Hard</th>
<th>too hard</th>
<th>puts stress on me</th>
<th>end of my rope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>emotion drained</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel used</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel fatigued</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easily understand</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cause strain</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel burned out</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frustrated by job</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>become callous</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hardening emotional</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working too hard</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puts stress on me</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end of my rope</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.) Custodial Orientation: the first attempt at factor analysis was conducted on 7 statements of correctional orientation in order to create a factor score that will be used as a custodial orientation variable. Factor analysis was conducted to reduce the number of inter-correlated measures among factors into a small number of interpretable dimensions. Table 4.15.2 showed that two components of the custodial orientation variable were identified from the 7 variables of custodial orientation (based on the eigenvalues). The factor identification was based on the eigenvalue, rotation was performed using varimax.

Table 4.15.1 displayed the correlation matrix, which showed that some of the correlations between the 7 variables of custodial orientation were weak correlation and non-significance. Table 4.15.2 also showed that two components were created thus indicating the factor loadings of variables. A new factor analysis was performed to deal with weak correlation and non-significance.
### Table 4.15.1
Custodial Orientation Analysis (1st Correlation Matrix)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Causing trouble</th>
<th>soft on inmates</th>
<th>hard prison life</th>
<th>sleep_feed_work</th>
<th>respect authority</th>
<th>Superv. not rehab</th>
<th>Oderly inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Causing trouble</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft on inmates</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard prison life</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleep_feed_work</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respect authority</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise not rehab</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oderly inmates</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.179</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.626</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sig.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Causing trouble</th>
<th>soft on inmates</th>
<th>hard prison life</th>
<th>sleep_feed_work</th>
<th>respect authority</th>
<th>Superv. not rehab</th>
<th>Oderly inmates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Causing trouble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft on inmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard prison life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleep_feed_work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respect authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise not rehab</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oderly inmates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.15.2
Custodial Orientation Analysis & Reliability (1st)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>Comp 1</th>
<th>Comp 2</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Causing trouble</td>
<td>2.384</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soft on inmates</td>
<td>1.323</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard prison life</td>
<td>.947</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sleep_feed_work</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respect authority</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise not rehab</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>-.487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oderly inmates</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>-.514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A second attempt factor analysis created an improved the custodial orientation factor score, by extracting 2 components. Five factors were identified from the 7
variables of the new correctional orientation variable. These variables consist of following statements: a.) Many people don’t realize it, but prisons are too soft on the inmates; b.) An inmate will go straight only when he/she finds that prison life is hard; c.) Sleep’em, feed’em, and work’em is the best way to handle inmates; d.) We would be successful even if all we taught inmates was a little respect for authority; e.) So long as the inmates I supervise stay quiet and don’t cause any trouble, I really don’t care if they are getting rehabilitated or cured while they are in here.

The factor identification was based on the eigenvalue; there was only one factor greater than 1, thus rotation could not be performed. Tables 4.15.3 showed the correlation between all 5 variables were good and significant (less or equal to .005). Table 4.15.3 displayed a high factor loading of .539 to .735. A reliability test of the factor variable displayed a standardized Cronbach’s Alpha of .639, hence favoring the creation of a factor score.
Stepwise Multiple Regression-

Stepwise multiple regression was performed using the newly created independent variables (role conflict, negative affect, and burnout factor scores) and dependent variable (custodial orientation factor score). In addition, demographic variables (control variables: age, race, gender, tenure, education and institution) was also incorporated into this technique. Listed below are the findings of the stepwise multiple regression for the main hypothesis and the three sub-hypotheses of this research study:

H_{01}: Emotional dissonance has a negative impact on the custodial orientation attitude of correctional officers in a public prison.

Two versions of the operational models for the main hypothesis were created using the single system design of SJT to explore the issue of emotional dissonance.
negative effect on the correctional officer’s custodial orientation attitude. The information gained from both models consist of nine cues of emotional dissonance (independent variables) and demographic (control variables) were correlated with each other. Each information source had the potential to contributing negatively to the correctional officer’s reported attitude to custodial orientation (dependent variable). The first model looked at emotional dissonance from the perspective of first component of role conflict, burnout, and negative affect. The second model looked at emotional dissonance from the perspective of the second component of role conflict, burnout, and negative affect. The control variables used for both models in this study are age, race, gender, tenure, education, and institution. The first operational model (see Figure 4.1.1) showed the potential impact of the following variables on the custodial orientation:
This study assumed that the correctional officers reported that they experience emotional dissonance (independent variable) which has a negative effect on their attitude towards custodial orientation (dependent variables). The null hypothesis, $H_0: \gamma_{CO} = \beta_0$.
\[ \beta_{RC1 \times RC1} + \beta_{BO \times BO} + \beta_{NA \times NA} + \beta_{age \times age} + \beta_{race \times race} + \beta_{gender \times gender} + \beta_{tenure \times tenure} + \beta_{education \times education} + \beta_{institution \times institution} + e = 0. \]

This means that the correctional officers have reported that emotional dissonance does not have a negative effect on their attitudes to custodial orientation. If the correctional officers report that emotional dissonance has had a negative effect on their attitudes towards custodial orientation then the null hypothesis would be rejected and the hypothesis would be accepted as follow:

\[ H_{01a}: Y_{CO} = \beta_0 + \beta_{RC1 \times RC1} + \beta_{BO \times BO} + \beta_{NA \times NA} + \beta_{age \times age} + \beta_{race \times race} + \beta_{gender \times gender} + \beta_{tenure \times tenure} + \beta_{education \times education} + \beta_{institution \times institution} + e \neq 0. \]

Stepwise multiple regression was performed and key elements were identified: F-test is statistically significant (.000), therefore the model is statistically significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. Only two variables contributed to the equation (burnout, role conflict) and seven variables were excluded (negative affect, race, tenure, institution, gender, years of education and age). Table 4.16.1 shows that burnout, role conflict, and custodial orientation are not highly correlated. The R was significantly different from zero, and the R-square value indicated that about 12.4% of the variance in custodial orientation is explained by burnout and role conflict. The \( \beta \) values indicate the relative influence of the entered variables, therefore, burnout has the greater influence on custodial orientation (\( \beta = .236 \)), followed by role conflict (\( \beta = .182 \)). The directional influence for both independent variables is positive.
Before accepting the regression model, both the correlation matrix and the collinearity statistics were observed to make sure that multicollinearity was not an issue. Additionally using scatter plot diagram, this model was examined for heteroscedasticity.

Because the tolerance for Burnout (.840) and Role Conflict (.840) is not close to zero, this is a sign of no multicollinearity present. As for the VIF test, Burnout (1.191) and Role Conflict (1.191) are smaller than 10 for the model. It is therefore safe to say that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Custodial orient.</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>tenure</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>RC1</th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>Negativ Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Custodial orient.</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>-0.212</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>-0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-0.212</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>-0.100</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC1</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>-0.242</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negativ Affect</td>
<td>0.203</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>custodial orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negativ Affect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.16.1
Main Hypothesis (H01a)
Correlation Matrix
model one does not show to be multicollinear. Finally, Figure 4.1.2 detected no sign of heteroscedasticity.

This regression model rejected the null hypothesis. The results and interpretation of model one is listed below as followed:

\[ Y = .236x_{BO} + .182x_{RC} \]
The Operational Model for this Equation (See Figure 4.1.3):

![Diagram](image)

Figure 4.1.3
Operational Model (R1)-
Main Outcome of H_{01a}
The second operational model (see Figure 4.1.4) shows the potential impact of the following variables on the custodial orientation:

- Role Conflict 2
- Burnout
- Negative Affect
- Age
- Race/Ethnicity
- Gender
- Tenure
- Education Level
- Institution

Figure 4.1.4
Operational model- H₀₁b
This study assumed that correctional officers reported experiencing emotional dissonance (independent variable) which has a negative effect on their attitude towards custodial orientation (dependent variables). The null hypothesis, $H_0$: $Y_{CO} = \beta_0 - \beta_{RC2}x_{RC2} - \beta_{BO}x_{BO} - \beta_{NA}x_{NA} - \beta_{age}x_{age} - \beta_{race}x_{race} - \beta_{gender}x_{gender} - \beta_{tenure}x_{tenure} - \beta_{education}x_{education}$ - $\beta_{institution}x_{institution} + e = 0$, means that the correctional officers have reported that emotional dissonance does not have a negative effect on their attitudes pertaining to custodial orientation. If the correctional officers report that emotional dissonance has had a negative effect on their attitudes about custodial orientation then the null hypothesis will be rejected and the hypothesis will be accepted as follow $H_{01b}$: $Y_{CO} = \beta_0 - \beta_{RC2}x_{RC2} - \beta_{BO}x_{BO} - \beta_{NA}x_{NA} - \beta_{age}x_{age} - \beta_{race}x_{race} - \beta_{gender}x_{gender} - \beta_{tenure}x_{tenure} - \beta_{education}x_{education}$ - $\beta_{institution}x_{institution} + e \neq 0$.

Stepwise multiple regression was performed and key elements were identified: F-test is statistically significant (.000), therefore the model is statistically significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. Only one variable contributed to the equation (burnout) and eight variables were excluded (2nd component of role conflict negative affect, race/ethnicity, tenure, institution, gender, years of education and age). The R was significantly different from zero, and the R-square value indicated that about 9.6% of the variance in custodial orientation is explained by burnout. The $\beta$ value indicates the relative influence of the entered variables; burnout has a positive directional influence on custodial orientation ($\beta = .309$).

Before accepting the regression model, both the correlation matrix and the collinearity statistics were viewed to make sure that multicollinearity was not an issue. Additionally using scatter plot diagram, this model was examined for heteroscedasticity.
Because the tolerance for Burnout (.1000) is not close to zero, there is no sign of multicollinearity present. As for the VIF test, Burnout (1.000) is smaller than 10 for model. It is therefore safe to say that model one does not show to be multicollinear. Finally, Figure 4.1.5 detected no signs of vital heteroscedasticity.

This regression model rejected the null hypothesis. The results and interpretation of model one is listed below as followed:

\[ Y = 0.309x_{\text{Burnout}} \]
Sub-Hypotheses:

To determine whether each component of emotional dissonance (role conflict, negative affect, and burnout) has an inverse or negative effect on the correctional officer’s attitudes about custodial orientation, the researcher hypothesized that:

H₁: Correctional officers with role conflict are more likely to have a negative effect on custodial orientation attitude.

The operational model of this hypothesis will use the single system design of SJT to explore the issue of role conflicts negative effect on the correctional officer’s custodial orientation attitude. The information gained by the six cues consisting of two components of role conflict (independent variables) and demographic (control variables) will be correlated with each other and each information source has the potential to contributing negatively regarding the correctional officer’s reported attitude towards custodial orientation (dependent variable). The control variables used in this study are
age, race/ethnicity, gender and tenure. An operational model (see Figure 4.16.2) shows this potential impact of the following variables on the custodial orientation:

This study assumed that correctional officers reported that they experience role conflict (independent variable) which has a negative effect on their attitude towards custodial orientation (dependent variables). The null hypothesis, $H_0: Y_{CO}=\beta_0-\beta_{RC|1}x_{RC|1}$
\[ \beta_{RC2 \times RC2} - \beta_{age \times age} - \beta_{race \times race} - \beta_{gender \times gender} - \beta_{tenure \times tenure} - \beta_{education \times education} - \beta_{institution \times institution} + e = 0, \]

means that the correctional officers have reported that role conflict does not have a negative inverse effect on their attitudes towards custodial orientation. If the correctional officers reports that role conflict has had a negative inverse effect on their attitudes towards custodial orientation then the null hypothesis will be rejected and the hypothesis will be accepted as follow: 

\[ H_1: Y_{CO} = \beta_0 + \beta_{RC1 \times RC1} - \beta_{RC2 \times RC2} - \beta_{age \times age} - \beta_{race \times race} - \beta_{gender \times gender} - \beta_{tenure \times tenure} - \beta_{education \times education} - \beta_{institution \times institution} + e \neq 0. \]

Stepwise multiple regression was performed and key elements were identified: F-test is statistically significant (.000), therefore the model is statistically significant and the null hypothesis is rejected. Only two variables contributed to the equation (role conflict component 1, and race/ethnicity) and six variables were excluded (role conflict component 2, tenure, institution, gender, years of education and age). Table 4.17 shows that role-conflict and race/ethnicity are not correlated. The R was significantly different from zero, and the R-square value indicated that about 10.5% of the variance in custodial orientation is explained by burnout and role conflict. The \( \beta \) values indicate the relative influence of the entered variables, that is role conflict has the greater influence on custodial orientation \( (\beta = .264) \), followed by role conflict \( (\beta = -.382) \). The directional influence of race/ethnicity (negative) and role-conflict (positive) are both opposite.
Before accepting the findings of the regression model, both the correlation matrix and the collinearity statistics were viewed to make sure that multicollinearity was not an issue. Additionally using scatter plot diagram, this model was examined for heteroscedasticity. Because the tolerance for role conflict component 1 (.994) and race/ethnicity (.994) are not close to zero, there is no multicollinearity present. As for the VIF test, role conflict (1.006) and race/ethnicity (1.006) are smaller than 10 for model. It is therefore safe to say that model one does not show to be multicollinear. Finally, Figure 4.2.2 detected no sign of heteroscedasticity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>custodial orientation</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>race</th>
<th>tenure</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>RC1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>custodial orientation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-0.189</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>-0.212</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.107</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-0.212</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC1</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>custodial orientation</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>race</th>
<th>tenure</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>RC1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>custodial orientation</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>0.308</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.490</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.220</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This regression model rejected the null hypothesis. The results and interpretation of model one is listed below as followed:

\[ Y = 0.102 + 0.264x_{R1} - 0.382x_{race} \]
H2: Correctional officers with negative affect (anxiety) are more likely to have a negative effect on custodial orientation attitude.

The operational model of this hypothesis used the single system design of SJT to explore the issue of negative affect negative effect on the correctional officer’s custodial orientation attitude. The information gained by the fives cues consisting of components of negative affect (independent variables) and demographic (control variables) will be correlated with each other and each information source has the potential to contributing negatively towards the correctional officer’s reported attitude about custodial orientation (dependent variable). The control variables used in this study are age, race, gender and tenure.
An operational model (see Figure 4.3.1) shows this potential impact of the following variables on the custodial orientation:

![Operational model- H2](image)

This study assumes that correctional officers reported that they experience negative affect (independent variable) which has a negative effect on their attitude about custodial orientation (dependent variables). The null hypothesis, $H_0: Y_{CO} = \beta_0 - \beta_{NA} X_{NA}$,
\[ \beta_{\text{age} \times \text{age}} - \beta_{\text{race} \times \text{race}} - \beta_{\text{gender} \times \text{gender}} - \beta_{\text{tenure} \times \text{tenure}} - \beta_{\text{education} \times \text{education}} - \beta_{\text{institution} \times \text{institution}} + e = 0, \]

means that the correctional officers have reported that negative affect does not have a negative inverse effect on their attitudes towards custodial orientation. If the correctional officers report that negative affect has had a negative inverse effect on their attitudes towards custodial orientation then the null hypothesis will be rejected and the hypothesis will be accepted as follow:

\[ Y_{CO} = \beta_0 - \beta_{NA \times NA} - \beta_{\text{age} \times \text{age}} - \beta_{\text{race} \times \text{race}} - \beta_{\text{gender} \times \text{gender}} - \beta_{\text{tenure} \times \text{tenure}} - \beta_{\text{education} \times \text{education}} - \beta_{\text{institution} \times \text{institution}} + e \neq 0. \]

Stepwise multiple regression was performed and key elements were identified:

F-test is statistically significant (.003), which meant that the model is statistically significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. Only two variables contributed to the equation (negative affect and race) and five variables were excluded (tenure, institution, gender, years of education and age). Table 4.18 shows that negative affect and race/ethnicity are not correlated. The R was significantly different from zero, and the R-square value indicated that about 7.0% of the variance in custodial orientation is explained by negative affect and race/ethnicity. The \( \beta \) values indicate the relative influence of the entered variables, that is negative affect has an influence on custodial orientation \( (\beta = .186) \), followed by race/ethnicity \( (\beta = -.384) \). The directional influence of negative affect (positive) and race/ethnicity (negative) variables are both opposite.
Table 4.18
Sub-Hypothesis 2
Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>custodial orientation</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>race</th>
<th>tenure</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>gender</th>
<th>Negative Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>custodial orientation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd age</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-.189</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>-.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>-.096</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.212</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>custodial orientation</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>.308</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenure</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Before accepting the findings of the regression model, both the correlation matrix and the collinearity statistics were viewed to make sure that multicollinearity was not an issue. Additionally, using scatter plot diagram, this model was examined for heteroscedasticity. Because the tolerance for negative affect component (.990) and race (.990) are not close to zero, therefore, there is no multicollinearity present. As for the VIF test, negative affect (1.010) and race/ethnicity (1.010) are smaller than 10 for model. It is therefore safe to say that model one does not show to be multicollinear. Finally, Figure 4.3.2 detected no sign of heteroscedasticity.
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**Figure 4.3.2**
Sub Hypothesis 2 Scatter Plot

This regression model rejected the null hypothesis. The results and interpretation of model one is listed below as followed:
$Y = .103 + .186x_{NA} - .384x_{race}$

The Operational Model for this Equation (seen in Figure 4.3.3):

H3: Correctional officers with burnout are more likely to have a negative effect on custodial orientation attitude.

The operational model of this hypothesis used the single system design of SJT to explore the issue of burnout negative effect on the correctional officer’s custodial orientation attitude. The information gained by the five cues consisting of components of burnout (independent variables) and demographic (control variables) will be correlated with each other and each information source has the potential to contributing negatively towards the correctional officer’s reported attitude about custodial orientation (dependent variable). The control variables used in this study are age, race, gender and tenure. An
operational model (see Figure 4.4.1) shows this potential impact of the following variables on the custodial orientation:

This study assumed that correctional officers reported that they experience
burnout (independent variable) which has a negative effect on their attitude towards custodial orientation (dependent variables). The null hypothesis, \( H_0: Y_{CO} = \beta_0 - \beta_{B}X_{B} - \beta_{a}X_{a} - \beta_{r}X_{r} - \beta_{g}X_{g} - \beta_{t}X_{t} - \beta_{e}X_{e} - \beta_{i}X_{i} + e = 0 \), means that the correctional officers have reported that burnout does not have a negative inverse effect on their attitudes to custodial orientation. If the correctional officers report that burnout has had a negative (inverse) effect on their attitudes towards custodial orientation then the null hypothesis will be rejected and the hypothesis will be accepted as follow 
\( H_3: Y_{CO} = \beta_0 - \beta_{B}X_{B} - \beta_{a}X_{a} - \beta_{r}X_{r} - \beta_{g}X_{g} - \beta_{t}X_{t} - \beta_{e}X_{e} - \beta_{i}X_{i} + e \neq 0. \)

Stepwise multiple regression was performed and key elements were identified: F-test is statistically significant (.000), therefore the model is statistically significant and the null hypothesis was rejected. Only one variable contributed to the equation (burnout) and six variables were excluded (race/ethnicity, tenure, institution, gender, years of education and age). The \( R \) was significantly different from zero, and the \( R \)-square value indicated that about 9.6% of the variance in custodial orientation is explained by burnout. The \( \beta \) value indicates the relative influence of the entered variables; burnout conflict has a positive directional influence on custodial orientation (\( \beta = .309 \)).

Before accepting findings of the regression model, both the correlation matrix and the collinearity statistics were viewed to make sure that multicollinearity was not an issue. Additionally using scatter plot diagram, this model was examined for heteroscedasticity. Because the tolerance for burnout (1.000) is not close to zero, therefore, there is no multicollinearity present. As for the VIF test, burnout (1.000) is
smaller than 10 for model. It is therefore safe to say that model one does not show to be multicollinear. Finally, Figure 4.4.2 detected no sign of heteroscedasticity.

This regression model rejected the null hypothesis. The results and interpretation of model one is listed below as followed:

\[ Y = .309x_{\text{Burnout}} \]
The Operational Model for this Equation (seen in Figure 4.4.3):

Figure 4.4.3
Operational Model-Outcome of $H_3$
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the research study, implications, and recommendations in eight sections. The first section gives an overview of the study followed by the next section that provides a discussion on procedures used by the research to collect and analyze the data for this study. Section three gives a detailed description about the limitations of the study that was discovered after the primary research study was conducted. Section four gives a descriptive depiction from the analysis. Section five, provides an interpretation of the data based on analytic examination of the models created as a result of the research question and sub-hypotheses. Finally, this dissertation will conclude with three sections which will give implications and recommendations derived from this study in addition to making suggestions for future studies.

Overview of the Study

Against theoretical and empirical background, this research explored the impact of emotional dissonance on correctional officer’s discretionary decision-making. This study investigated the appearance of organized dissonance as it manifests from contradictions of the correctional officer’s function. Correctional officer’s functional contradictions are a result of combining street level bureaucratic form with emotional
labor. Tracy (2004, p. 125) imparted that contradictory norms and structures in the correctional system generate role conflicts with emotional reaction.

As identified by several authors, Emotional dissonance is a form of role conflict (Tracy, 2005; Janz & Timmers, 2002; Domagalski, 1999; Hochschild, 1983). The attempt to meet multiple conflicting demands lead to frustration and emotional distress culminating in emotional exhaustion (Abraham, 1998, p. 138). Role conflict has been found to be antecedent to emotional exhaustion, which is a component of Maslach’s burnout. Maslach defined burnout as a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and a reduction of personal accomplishment that can occur among work in the human service arena (1982, p. 3). Raefeli and Sutton (1987) thus concluded that emotional dissonance is a predictor of emotional exhaustion or “burnout”.

The concern of this research was that if emotional dissonance can lead behavior in a negative direction, there is a need for focus to be directed towards the potential emotional dissonance translating into street level bureaucrat’s discretionary decision making. Discretionary decision making is defined as the ability of choice whereby one or more possible decisions or active options are available (Galligan, 1998, p. 14). The process of decision making is informed by sources of perceptions and beliefs established on obtainable information and impacted by affect, attitudes, motives and preferences (Ben-Akiva, McFadden, & Garling, 1999, p.188).

Decision-making requires understanding how different patterns of multiple variable or “information source interact and how varying degrees of conflict and volume among those sources affect information satisfaction” (Stefl-Mabry, 2003, p. 879). Rational decision-making can be achieved by using information searches, which involve
elaborating and evaluating all potential outcomes before choosing an optimal decision strategy. Herbert Simon (1958) theorized that the information search process can be used to obtain various cues.

Cues can be described as the minimum level of information satisfaction (Stefl-Mabry, 2003). Using Khadi discretionary approach, decision-makers select the combination of cues which is considered appropriate. The combination of cues will vary based on the individual case. The decision makers will then socialize shared norms and engage in a social process of decision making within a habitus. Habitus is a decision strategy that produces structures.

Goldstein & Hogarth (1997) suggested that an accepted decision strategy meets the minimal criteria for acceptability rather than optimizing. One way to examine the decision making structure within the habitus is by using the Social Judgment Theory. The Social Judgment Theory gains a systems-oriented perspective for analyzing human decision making based on specific circumstances (Cooksey, 1996, p. 141). The SJT will assist in mapping within the correctional officer’s habitus a single structure with the purpose of examining the effects of emotional dissonance on discretionary decision-making.

This research centered on a single system design used the social judgment theory to generate hypotheses and to provide an empirical examination of emotional dissonance, negative effect on correctional officer’s discretionary decision making. The research question and hypotheses were framed from the operational model, in order to acquire information from the nine cues consisting of components of emotional dissonance and demographic variables (independent variable) and the correctional officer’s reported
attitude about custodial orientation (dependent variable). One central research question and three sub-hypotheses were formulated for this study: 1.) How does emotional dissonance impact the custodial orientation attitude of correctional officers in public prisons? 1a.) Role conflict has a negative impact on the custodial orientation attitude of correctional officers in public prisons. 1b.) Burnout has a negative impact the custodial orientation attitude of correctional officers in public prisons 1c.) Negative affect has a negative impact the custodial orientation attitude of correctional officers in public prisons.

This study employed Social Judgment Analysis, a research approach that applies a cross sectional survey research design and multivariate/bivariate statistical analysis to identify the information judgment values experienced by correctional officers. Social Judgment Analysis examined behavior (dependent variable) based on the degree of information relation or satisfaction derived from specific quantities of positive and/or negative information from sets of multiple information sources/cues (independent variables). SJA offered the thoroughness and ability of replication often lacking in research studies focused on judgments and decisions (Machlup & Mansfield, 1983). SJA provides an empirical view of the subject’s thoughts by capturing respondent’s cognitive processing during one period of time. For this study the independent variables are functionally defined by the components of the expanded version of emotional dissonance (role conflict, burnout, and negative affect) as well as demographic factors identified in this research study. The dependent variable is operationally defined as a measure of the custodial orientation.
Data Collection and Analysis Procedure

Surveys were distributed to the correctional officer population operating within the Mansfield and Grafton correctional facilities through various roll calls. Surveys contained instruments that identified role conflict, burnout, negative affectivity, age, race/ethnicity, gender, education, tenure, institution and the correctional officer’s reported attitude towards custodial orientation. Once a database was created from the research findings, a paired sample t-test was used to examine the bivariate relationship between negative affect and positive affect; while correlation and factor score multiple regressions was performed to examine multivariate relationships between nine cues which are role conflict, burnout, negative affectivity, age, race/ethnicity, gender, education, tenure, institution (independent variable) and the correctional officer’s reported attitude pertaining to custodial orientation (dependent variable). SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) was utilized for this analysis. SPSS are programs that are used for statistical analysis, data management and data documentation.

Limitations of the Study

As discussed in the first chapter, there are a number of limitations to this study rooted in the research design and the analysis. First, the data for this dissertation research was gained through an exploratory cross-sectional design. Cross sectional survey designs are limited because it gives only a snapshot (the situation could possibly differ resulting from another time frame) over a short period of time; therefore the study’s analysis could not determine a causal inference (Levin, 2006). Secondly, this study’s research findings were self-reported by consenting correctional officers working within only two specific
facilities on exact dates and during specific times (morning, afternoon, special duties roll call & training). Consequently, there were officers who did not contribute to this study. Thirdly, the sample used in this study was limited by response rate, effect size and by the use of only two research accessible correctional facilities. This study, because of design and the use of a nonrandom small-sized sample may have suffered from attrition and bias. The study could not establish a generalization to the total correctional officer population operating within the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (ODRC) or any other state correctional system. However, given that this study is exploratory in nature, this study intended to be a preliminary step to examine the type, source and effect of emotional dissonance on the discretion of correctional officers operating within a specific correctional institution.

The fourth limitation is the acknowledgment that like most research studies missing data was a problem for this study. SPSS had a mechanism for handling missing data, the presence of missing data still remained a serious concerned for this study. The fifth limitation of this study may have been as a result of using factor score regression modeling. Using factor scores leads to a variety of problems including a reduction in the variance explained by the regression equation and also it may cause a loss of predictor variables. Both of these problems influenced predictive power of the model (Kukuk and Baty, 1979).

Factor score may also cause the loss of understanding regarding the effects of the original variables on the criterion. Fleming (1981) wrote that the loss of understanding is a result of factor analyses searches for what is common among set of predictors. Even though multiple regression analysis is based on discovering the uniqueness between
variables, a unique predictor variable will be lost in factor score regression if it is too small. Nevertheless, factor score regression is beneficial in that it can be used to interpret based on correlated variables.

As a final point, there is a possibility that individuals or other contextual factors (i.e. post orders, rank, wages, family, or stressors) inside or outside of the correctional environment can affect the perceptions of correctional officers relating to their jobs. These issues are reserved for future research.

Depiction of Respondents

Before discussing data interpretations, this section presents valuable informative descriptive findings about the surveyed respondents working within the Mansfield and Grafton correctional facilities. The descriptive data collected based on five demographic features (gender, race/ethnicity, age, tenure, and years of education) “characterizes” the responses of the surveyed correctional officers. For instance, the research data revealed that four-fifths of the survey respondents were male. Almost three-fourth of the survey respondents were white/Caucasian, while 26% were minority (African American, Native American, & Hispanic). Over two-thirds of the survey respondents were over the age of forty and have been working in the correctional field for more than 10 years. All of the correctional officers have at least the required high-school or equivalent diploma, but 33.9% of the survey respondents have 1 or more years of college.

A depiction of the surveyed respondents working in the Mansfield and Grafton correctional facilities was also shaped based on their responses to the survey instruments. This depiction exposed that correctional officer’s perceive themselves as possessing high level of burn out, feelings of role conflict and encouraging attitudes to custodial
orientation. Constructively, this research discovered that more than half of the correctional officers perceive that they have positive dispositions about their job and feel high levels of personal accomplishment. Conversely, this research also gathered that almost all of the surveyed correctional officers felt like they have been depersonalized at work and suffer from high level of emotional exhaustion.

Despite the fact that half of the respondents agreed that the rules and regulations are clear, many of the correctional officers were of the same mind that there are bickering between departments. Many of correctional officers felt that correctional institutions were too lenient on inmates. Furthermore, nearly half of the correctional officers that were surveyed confirmed the belief that inmates will only go straight if their prison life is hard. Similarly, 49% believed that their job is not to rehabilitate but to keep inmates orderly.

Quite the opposite, there were respondents (49%); who believed that their job is more than just custodial duties. Forty-nine percent actually reported that they cared about inmates’ rehabilitation. Ultimately, this percentage of respondents is diminutive compared to the resounding 78% of the survey respondents, who felt that keeping the inmates from causing trouble was the main concern of their job.

Interpretation of Data

In this study, the researcher’s main concern focused on emotional dissonance and its negative impact on the custodial orientation (task) attitude of correctional officers in a public prison. The components of emotional dissonance are role conflict, burnout, and negative affect. A major concern arose from the descriptive data about correctional officer’s negative affect. Although only half of the correctional officer’s reported
perceived having positive affect, 60% percent reported suffering from low negative affect. Caution was taken to ensure that positive affect wouldn’t mask the effects of negative affect. At the beginning of analysis, paired-sampled t-test was performed. The results of this procedure indicated that although positive affect is significantly greater, there was no significant correlation existing between positive affect and negative affect. This discovery indicates that correctional officers can have both positive and negative views on completing a task all at once. Both of these types of moods can influence custodial orientation at different degrees. Therefore, it is necessary to look at negative affect even if respondents have greater degrees of positive affect.

With this concern resolved, the researcher proceeded to create factor scores (burnout, negative affect, role conflict and custodial orientation) and then used stepwise multiple regression to examine the main research question and three sub-hypotheses. This research controlled for demographic factors such as race/ethnicity, tenure, institution, gender, years of education and age. The main hypothesis investigated emotional dissonance factors that effect custodial orientation. The first model of the main hypothesis excluded negative affect from the equation in addition to all the control variables (race/ethnicity, tenure, institution, gender, years of education and age). The outcome of this method revealed that burnout and role conflict has a positive directional influence on custodial orientation. When correctional officers suffer from both burnout and role conflict, they tend to consider the greater importance of custodial orientation (task).

The model of the main hypothesis excluded the second component of role conflict and negative affect from the equation in addition to all of the control variables
(race/ethnicity, tenure, institution, gender, years of education and age). These results indicate correctional officers suffer from both burnout, they tend to feel that the task of custodial orientation is more important than rehabilitative orientation.

This research then looked at each component of emotional dissonance separately to determine the influence each component has on custodial orientation. The first sub-hypothesis looked at role conflict’s impact on custodial orientation. All the control factors (tenure, institution, gender, years of education and age) were excluded except for race. Stepwise multiple regression revealed that role conflict and race/ethnicity are not correlated, but they both have an influence on custodial orientation. This study also revealed that role conflict and race/ethnicity have opposing directional influence. When correctional officers suffer from role conflict, they tend to feel that the task of custodial orientation is important when compared to rehabilitative orientation. Finally, minorities are more likely to see more than just custodial orientation as the main concern of their job.

The second sub-hypothesis looked at negative affect’s negative impact on custodial orientation. All the control factors (tenure, institution, gender, years of education and age) were excluded except for race/ethnicity. Stepwise multiple regression demonstrated that negative affect and race/ethnicity are not correlated, but they both have an influence on custodial orientation. This study also revealed that role conflict and race/ethnicity have opposing directional influence. When correctional officers suffer from negative affect, they tend to feel that the task of custodial orientation is important when compared to rehabilitative orientation. Added, minorities are more likely to disagree with the greater importance of custodial orientation.
The third sub-hypothesis looked at burnout’s negative impact on custodial orientation. All the control factors (race/ethnicity, tenure, institution, gender, years of education and age) were excluded from the equation. Stepwise multiple regression revealed that burnout has a positive directional influence. When correctional officers suffer from burnout, they tend to feel that the task of custodial orientation is very important.

As an endnote, the first and second sub-hypotheses provided evidence that the race/ethnicity variable while not correlated to either negative affect or role conflict have an inverse directional influence on custodial orientation. This finding indicated that the minority correctional officers surveyed in this study are more likely to accept the notion that there is more to their job than just custody.

Recommendations of Study

Although this study has made an effort not to label certain individual and contextual factors as “deviant,” it is safe to affirm that certain socio contextual features of emotional dissonance significantly influence (positive or negatively) correctional officer’s decision making. The components of emotional dissonance (role conflict, burnout, and negative affect) are by-products of correctional officers’ stressors (Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007). Job stressors are defined as a negative relation between the employee and the work environment (Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000, p. 21). The findings from this present study have micro-level and macro-level implications for improving the staff environment in the Mansfield and Grafton correctional institutions. With respect to the micro-level, emotional dissonance is the rooted within physical danger, work load, role problems, problematic inmate behaviors and highly responsible job. On the macro
level, emotional dissonance is derived from problematic relationships with supervisors, inadequate wages, work force shortage, shift design and work conditions. This researcher offers some suggestions for handling micro-level and macro-level stressors:

On a micro-level, this study recommends coping-strategies; cognitive structuring and “stress inoculation” sessions as well as relaxation exercises should be incorporated into yearly facility training. Additionally, this study suggests improving the physical work condition, encourage supervisors to promote social and peer support, and provide guidance and counseling traumatic events (Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007). Proactive intervention to stress reduction will open up the officer to the opportunity of seek help from colleagues and organizational counselors. Support groups and counseling will also provide forums for officers to pose questions, voice their opinions and grievances about rules and regulations as well as address their occupational and organizational concerns without fear of penalization.

Recommendations for reducing job stress on the macro-level advocate increasing correctional officer productivity, increasing morale, and incorporate more opportunities for correctional officers to participate in organizational planning and decision making. The idea is to make correctional officers allies of the administration rather than enemies. To begin with, the administration should upgrade application selection process (Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007). Secondly administrators need to consult with their line staff, since the correctional officers is the expert of the institutional environment. Correctional officers can supply invaluable information about the daily realities of correctional life and the correctional institutions continually changing environment.
Another macro-level recommendation is the creation of mentoring programs for new recruits. This program will create a “buddy system” which assigns new correctional officers with tenured ones, in order for them to learn the ropes and provide an opportunity for disclosure. Furthermore, the administration should offer training sessions and retreats to all correctional staff, to improve communication between supervisors and correctional officers and to promote rehabilitative orientation (Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007). Specifically, researchers have already suggested that the administration should proactively implement random psychological screenings and incorporate work-related emotional topics such as depersonalization, stress, tension, and paranoia into special training sessions (Tracy, 2004, p. 529).

In line with supporting and maintaining correctional officer’s positive disposition and high-levels of personal accomplishment, management needs to increase job satisfaction. Paoline et al. (2006) view job satisfaction as an emotional affective response to improving the conditions of job. Job satisfactions are the gratification of professionals perceiving fair and just handling, and the fulfillment of expected, needed, wanted, desired perks, necessities and requirements. Administrators and Management can increase job satisfaction by more motivational and promotional opportunities, rewards for outstanding behavior, variety, authority, and learning opportunities (Jurik & Winn, 1987). The administration must also invest in training programs and group activities (Paoline et al., 2006, p. 201).

In harmony with the findings of this study, continual support should focus on simplifying paper work and post orders for the correctional officers in order reduce role conflict. In order to reduce job stressors, it is recommended that administrators create
and implement designed strategies aimed at increasing levels of social support for officers, who differ in age, gender, race/ethnicity, and tenure (Morgan, et al., 2002). Administrators must make certain that policies are constant and moderately applied to all staff throughout the correctional facility. Managers and supervisors must also make the effort to communicate consistency, fairness, and equality in the dissemination of policies and duties.

Implications of Study

The dissonance facing the hybridization of street level bureaucrat and emotional labor within an institutional bureaucratic environment was highlighted in this research study. Possible responses to the problems of emotional dissonance were attained from the research findings and a review of the literature. This study also imparted substantive implications that inform the administration of correctional facilities (Warden, assistant-warden, department heads, and supervisors) about socio-contextual factors that impact the discretionary decision making process of correctional officers. Through this research, the mapping of emotional dissonance’s influence on street level bureaucratic behavior was accomplished. Likewise, an understanding of correctional officer’s perceptions on custodial orientation, role conflict, burnout, and their disposition was formed, plus a relational depiction of the correctional officers, who participated from the Mansfield and Grafton correctional facility, was given.

This study offered models that predicted the influence of socio-contextual factors (such as emotional dissonance), acting by itself or in combination of other factors, on the behavior and task of the correctional officer. This research has shown that correctional officers tackle role conflict, emotional exhaustion, and depersonalization on a daily basis.
Particularly, role conflict appears to have a connection with burnout. The components of emotional dissonance all indicate a positive directional influence on custodial orientation. This indicates that increasing one of these factors augments the importance of custodial orientation. This tendency to accept custodial orientation could support the view that when confronted or cornered, correctional officers rely on custodial policies and training. In support of this view, survey respondents reported believing that custodial orientation is the most vital part of their duties and behavior. Many survey respondents also perceived that correctional facilities are too soft on inmates. Most respondents recognized the need for harder prison life.

It is important to acknowledge that completing a task is subject to correctional officers’ shifting attitudes and values. The implication of this data indicated that correctional officers recognized the value of custodial orientation in terms of coping with emotional dissonance. Custodial orientation allowed the correctional officer to professionally distance himself/herself relating to social interaction with the inmate population as well as deny responsibility for conscious decision-making. Custodial orientation also allowed the correctional officer to rely on routines and policies to protect them from the liabilities of their decisions. Custodial orientation also empowered and produced clarity for the correctional officer within the organizational dynamics. By focusing on custodial orientation, correctional officers attempted to reduce emotional exhaustion, create distance from the problems of the post, and alleviate their conscience as well as find worth and achievement in their professional duties and activities.

Optimistically, this research study revealed that the surveyed correctional officers within Mansfield and Grafton correctional facilities have a positive disposition to
their position and feel personally accomplished in their profession. The surveyed correctional officer’s also disclosed that they perceived the rules, regulation and policies to be clear. They identified with their specific position within the correctional institution. Additionally, this study made indications that the surveyed minority correctional officers are more open to rehabilitation than their non-minority counterparts.

In conclusion, this study sought to explore and examine components of emotional dissonance involved in producing deviance in discretionary decision making. By identifying relationships among variables, it became apparent that there are more socio-contextual cues involved in inducing severe “levels of negativity” into discretion. As seen by this study, socio-contextual cues (components of emotional dissonance and race/ethnicity) have an influence on task completion; yet this did not necessarily equate to deviant outcomes. Deviance in discretion is dependent upon the situational outcome of discretionary action. Therefore, the components of emotional dissonance can not be classified as “deviant”; but as harmful derivatives or stressors, these indicators could possibly influence deviant behavior (counter-productivity and counter-role activity) stemming from explicit settings and circumstances.

Recommendations for Future Research

This present study supplements the literature on role contradictions between street level bureaucracy and emotional labor by exploring emotional dissonance and the attitudes of correctional officer’s to their job. This study only offered a snapshot of public human service workers within the correctional arena. However, this research study made significant contributions to the knowledge base of emotional dissonance and deviant discretion among correctional officers. Further research of this correctional issue
should address the concerns that were provided within this study’s limitations. Researchers replicating this study should consider altering the conceptual framework, research design, and methodology of multivariate analysis.

First, it is suggested that future research can improve on the conceptual framework by utilizing a double system design used in Social Judgment Theory research. Cooksey (1996, p. 145) recommends that the double system design (DSD) clearly compares decision making with values for an ecological criterion. The ecological criterion formats and categorizes available cues. DSD equips the research with tools needed for the examining cue usage within the ecology (Cooksey, 1996, pp. 146 & 147). DSD improves accuracy and attainment to investigating individual’s discretionary decision making process (Cooksey, 1996, p. 147). Figure 5.1 provides an example of how DSD can be incorporated into the new research study:
A second recommendation for future study piggybacks off of the incorporation of the Social Judgment Theory double system design. This suggestion provides opportunity for altering and adding new variables to improve the research model as seen in Figure 5.1. Rather than limiting the task to just focusing on custodial orientation, this new research should also include situational conditions and rehabilitative orientation. By using circumstances, custodial, and rehabilitative orientations allow for the consideration of the “complete picture” of the correctional officers task. This new variable would be known as a situational correction orientation.
The double system design also adds a new segment to the social judgment model by incorporating an ecological criterion; therefore the new research study should add a variable and instrument that examines the issue of emotional dissonance as seen in Figure 6.1. Invariably, the new research study should look at other cues found in the correctional literature that affect correctional officer’s behavior, such as wage/salary, rank/position, harassment, perception and attitudes concerning post orders and work conditions, as well as job and family stress (Zimmer & Jacobs, 1981; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000). Lastly, the present study bivariate analysis revealed that correctional officers perceive themselves as having higher levels of positive disposition rather than negative disposition. The new research study should take this into consideration and possibly use positive affectivity instead of negative affectivity in understanding emotional dissonance.

A third recommendation leans to the new study obtaining a larger sample size. Augmenting the sample size can be accomplished by adding more research accessible correctional institutions; disseminating surveys during all roll calls (morning, afternoon, evening, special duties), and training sessions; offer the option of returning surveys via mail and present non-monetary incentives either to the facility or respondents.

Increasing the sample size would reduce attrition and bias. Moreover, it allows for the establishment of a generalization and capturing a “bigger picture” of correctional relationships. A large sample size improves the effect size necessary to utilize a more accurate technique to analyzing, mapping and modeling.

This present research study used factor score regression to analyze the research findings. Although factor score regression complements the present study’s research
design, this method of analysis may have caused some limitations such as loss of predictor variables and variance explained by the regression equation. The concluding recommendation promotes using Structure Equation Modeling (SEM) as the key analytical technique for the new research study.

Structural equation modeling is a comprehensive cross-sectional statistical modeling method for analyzing and interpreting theoretical models (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988, p. 411). SEM creates expressions of complicated variable relationships through hierarchal/non-hierarchal, recursive/non-recursive structured equations (Gefen et al., 2000). Generally, SEM is a confirmatory technique used for specifying and estimating models of linear relationships among variables. SEM also allows for more flexible assumptions, reduction in measurement error, and the ability to model mediating variables. Utilizing SEM in this research offers the opportunity to gain a more complete picture of understanding how emotional dissonance and other contextual cues impact the discretionary decision-making of the correctional officer.
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PERMISSION LETTERS/APPROVAL FORMS

Government of the
Virgin Islands of the United States
Department of Justice

Bureau of Corrections
RR 1 Box 9955
Kingshill, VI 00850-9715

Rosaldo Horsford
Warden/Acting Director

DATE: January 9, 2007

TO: Staff

FROM: Mr. Gary Evans – Chief of Programs

RE: On-Site Interviews and Surveys

On January 10, 2007, Mr. Kenny Hendrickson has been approved to conduct brief group interviews with the Correctional Officers of the Bureau of Corrections; he is scheduled to arrive at the institution by 7:00am. His early arrival is to ensure that all arriving Correctional Officers would be made available for group one. Immediately following, would be the second group which would constitute the departing Correctional Officers. Each officer will be asked to complete a survey that should take approximately five minutes in the Conference Room. Please assist Mr. Hendrickson with his endeavors to obtain an analysis on an educational project that he is currently working on.

I appreciate your cooperation.

Thank you.
Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs
Akron, OH 44325-2102
(330) 972-7666 Office
(330) 972-8281 Fax

November 13, 2006

Kenny Hendrickson
PO Box 302
Akron, Ohio 44309

Mr. Hendrickson:

The University of Akron’s Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB) completed a review of the protocol entitled "Understanding Deviant Discretion: The Negative Effect of Emotional Dissonance on Correction Officer’s Discretionary Decision-Making". The IRB application number assigned to this project is 20061017.

The protocol was reviewed on November 13, 2006 and qualified for exemption from continuing IRB review. The protocol represents minimal risk to subjects and matches the following federal category for exemption:

(2) Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (i) information is recorded in such a manner that subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to subjects; AND (ii) any disclosure of responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of civil or criminal liability or be damaging to subjects’ financial standing, employability or reputation.

Enclosed is a copy of the informed consent document, which the IRB has approved for your use in this research. In addition, your request for a waiver of documentation of informed consent, as permitted under 45 CFR 46.117(c) and 45 CFR 46.117 (d), is also approved.

Annual continuation applications are not required for exempt projects. If you make any changes or modifications to the study’s design or procedures that either increase the risk to subjects or include activities that do not fall within one of the categories exempted from the regulations, please contact the IRB first, to discuss whether or not a request for change must be submitted. Any such changes or modifications must be reviewed and approved by the IRB prior to their implementation.

You are required to submit a Final Report to the IRB, upon completion of this research.

Please retain this letter for your files. If the research is being conducted for a master’s thesis or doctoral dissertation, the student must file a copy of this letter with the thesis or dissertation.

Sincerely,

Sharon McWhorter
Interim Director

Cc: Raymond Cox, Advisor
Rosalie Hall, IRB Chair

The University of Akron is an Equal Education and Employment Institution
March 9, 2007

Kenny A. Hendrickson
P.O. Box 302
Akron, OH 44309

Dear Mr. Hendrickson,

The Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction’s Human Subjects Research Review Committee has reviewed your proposal, “The Effect of Emotional Dissonance on Correctional Officer’s Discretionary Decision Making.” The committee reviewed your proposal for protection of human subjects and confidentiality, for methodology, and for efficiency with regard to the use of departmental resources. The committee has approved your proposal. Deputy Director Rhine (Office of Policy and Offender Reentry), Warden Hudson (Mansfield Correctional Institution), Warden Anderson (Grafton Correctional Institution), and Warden Thomas (North Coast Correctional Treatment Facility) have also approved the proposal.

Best wishes to you in your research efforts. Please remember to provide us with a copy of your study, once it is completed. We look forward to seeing the results. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me by phone at (614) 752-1267 or by e-mail at gayle.bickle@odrc.state.oh.us.

Sincerely,

Gaylé Bickle, Chair
Human Subjects Research Review Committee
Research Proposal Approval
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The individual submitting this research proposal has read and agrees to the following conditions:

- Confidentiality of subjects' identity will be maintained.
- Obtain the signature of subjects on Informed Consent Form, if needed.
- A copy of the results will be provided to the Human Subjects Research Review Committee.
- The signature of the research advisor will be obtained if research is part of an educational requirement.
- The research design is in accordance with accepted standards regarding human subjects' rights.
- No compensation of any kind will be given to inmates for their participation in the research.

Researcher: ____________________________ Doctoral Candidate
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SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Dear Respondent,

You are invited to participate in a dissertation research project to study the decision making process of the correctional officer. As a participant of this study you will be asked to complete three questionnaires that spotlight attitudes and perception of the correctional officers. Please look over the questionnaire and, if you choose to do so, complete it and send it back to me. Your participation in the dissertation research project is voluntary and will take 15 minutes of your time.

The results of this project will be in completion of my dissertation study. Through your participation I hope to understand correctional officer’s discretionary decision-making process. I also anticipate that the results of the survey will be useful for examining the cues that have an impact on correctional officer’s usage of discretion. There is some slight risk if you decide to participate in this survey. You might feel a minor discomfort in answering some of the questions. You need answer only those questions you want to answer, but it would assist my study if all questions were answered. All information that you are providing will be held in confidence. I promise not to share any information that identifies you with anyone outside my research group which consists of me and my dissertation committee members. To maintain privacy, please do not put your name on any of the following questionnaires. On completion of the survey packet, using the pre-stamped envelope provided with the survey packet, please mail to the following address: Kenny Hendrickson, P.O. Box 302, Akron OH, 44309.

I hope you will take the time to complete this questionnaire and return it. If you have any questions or concerns about completing the questionnaire or about being in this study, you may contact me at 330-972-8802. Any questions about your rights as a participant can be directed to the Office of Research Services and Sponsored Programs, The University of Akron, Akron, Ohio, 44325-2102, (330) 232-8790. This project has been approved by the Institutional Review Board at The University of Akron and the Institutional Review Board of the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction.

Sincerely,

Kenny Hendrickson, Doctoral Candidate
University of Akron
**Corrections Assessment**

Would you please provide the following information? (Please clearly check and fill in all questions as required in each section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age:</th>
<th>Gender:</th>
<th>○ Male  ○ Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race:</td>
<td>○ African American/Black  ○ American Indian  ○ Asian/Pacific Islander  ○ Hispanic/Latino/Latina  ○ White/Caucasian  ○ Other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure (years of employment):</td>
<td>Yrs:  ___ / Months:  ___</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility of Employment:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This assessment tool consists of five statements designed to measure inconsistency of behaviors for a given job or position. What are your opinions about the following?

1. The rules and regulations are clear enough here that I know specifically what I can and cannot do on my job.

   - [ ] 1 = Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 2 = Disagree
   - [ ] 3 = Uncertain
   - [ ] 4 = Agree
   - [ ] 5 = Strongly Agree

   — [ ] Strongly Disagree  [ ] Strongly Agree

2. I regularly receive conflicting requests at work from two or more people.

   - [ ] 1 = Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 2 = Disagree
   - [ ] 3 = Uncertain
   - [ ] 4 = Agree
   - [ ] 5 = Strongly Agree

   — [ ] Strongly Disagree  [ ] Strongly Agree

3. When a problem comes up here, people seldom agree on how it should be handled.

   - [ ] 1 = Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 2 = Disagree
   - [ ] 3 = Uncertain
   - [ ] 4 = Agree
   - [ ] 5 = Strongly Agree

   — [ ] Strongly Disagree  [ ] Strongly Agree

4. The rules that we’re supposed to follow seem to be very clear.

   - [ ] 1 = Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 2 = Disagree
   - [ ] 3 = Uncertain
   - [ ] 4 = Agree
   - [ ] 5 = Strongly Agree

   — [ ] Strongly Disagree  [ ] Strongly Agree

5. There is bickering between the various departments.

   - [ ] 1 = Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 2 = Disagree
   - [ ] 3 = Uncertain
   - [ ] 4 = Agree
   - [ ] 5 = Strongly Agree

   — [ ] Strongly Disagree  [ ] Strongly Agree

This assessment consists of seven statements designed to measure the extent to which custodial approach towards the treatment of inmates is supported by correctional officers. What are your opinions about the following?

1. Keeping the inmates from causing trouble is my major concern when I’m on the job.

   - [ ] 1 = Very Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 2 = Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 3 = Disagree
   - [ ] 4 = Uncertain
   - [ ] 5 = Agree
   - [ ] 6 = Strongly Agree
   - [ ] 7 = Very Strongly Agree

   — [ ] Very Strongly Disagree  [ ] Very Strongly Agree

2. Many People don’t realize it, but prisons are too soft on the inmates.

   - [ ] 1 = Very Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 2 = Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 3 = Disagree
   - [ ] 4 = Uncertain
   - [ ] 5 = Agree
   - [ ] 6 = Strongly Agree
   - [ ] 7 = Very Strongly Agree

   — [ ] Very Strongly Disagree  [ ] Very Strongly Agree

3. An inmate will go straight only when he/she finds that prison life is hard.

   - [ ] 1 = Very Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 2 = Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 3 = Disagree
   - [ ] 4 = Uncertain
   - [ ] 5 = Agree
   - [ ] 6 = Strongly Agree
   - [ ] 7 = Very Strongly Agree

   — [ ] Very Strongly Disagree  [ ] Very Strongly Agree

4. Sleep ‘em, feed ‘em, and work ‘em is the best way to handle inmates.

   - [ ] 1 = Very Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 2 = Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 3 = Disagree
   - [ ] 4 = Uncertain
   - [ ] 5 = Agree
   - [ ] 6 = Strongly Agree
   - [ ] 7 = Very Strongly Agree

   — [ ] Very Strongly Disagree  [ ] Very Strongly Agree

5. We would be successful even if all we taught inmates was a little respect for authority.

   - [ ] 1 = Very Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 2 = Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 3 = Disagree
   - [ ] 4 = Uncertain
   - [ ] 5 = Agree
   - [ ] 6 = Strongly Agree
   - [ ] 7 = Very Strongly Agree

   — [ ] Very Strongly Disagree  [ ] Very Strongly Agree

6. So long as the inmates I supervise stay quiet and don’t cause any trouble, I really don’t care if they are getting rehabilitated or cured while they are in here.

   - [ ] 1 = Very Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 2 = Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 3 = Disagree
   - [ ] 4 = Uncertain
   - [ ] 5 = Agree
   - [ ] 6 = Strongly Agree
   - [ ] 7 = Very Strongly Agree

   — [ ] Very Strongly Disagree  [ ] Very Strongly Agree

7. My job isn’t to help rehabilitate inmates; it’s to keep them orderly so that they don’t hurt anyone in here or tear this place apart.

   - [ ] 1 = Very Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 2 = Strongly Disagree
   - [ ] 3 = Disagree
   - [ ] 4 = Uncertain
   - [ ] 5 = Agree
   - [ ] 6 = Strongly Agree
   - [ ] 7 = Very Strongly Agree

   — [ ] Very Strongly Disagree  [ ] Very Strongly Agree
This scale consists of a number of words and phrases that describe a range of current feelings and emotions about your job or position. **Read each item, then for each item identified below circle the one number to the right that best fits your judgment of its quality.** Use the scale above to select the quality number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. interested</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>11. guilty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. irritable</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>12. determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. distressed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>13. scared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. alert</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>14. attentive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. excited</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>15. hostile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. ashamed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>16. jittery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. upset</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>17. enthusiastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. inspired</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>18. active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. strong</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>19. proud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. nervous</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>20. afraid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WILMAR B. SCHAUFELI, MICHAEL P. LEITER, CHRISTINA MASLACH, SUSAN E. JACKSON

MBI—General Survey

The purpose of this survey is to assess how staff members view their job and their reactions to their work.

On the following page there are 16 statements of job-related feelings. Please read each statement carefully and decide if you ever feel this way about your job. If you have never had this feeling, write a “0” (zero) in the space before the statement. If you have had this feeling, indicate how often you feel it by writing the number (from 1 to 6) that best describes how frequently you feel that way. An example is shown below.

Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often:</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a year or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

How Often 0–6 Statement:

1. _________ I feel depressed at work.

If you never feel depressed at work, you would write the number “0” (zero) under the heading “How often.” If you rarely feel depressed at work (a few times a year or less), you would write the number “1.” If your feelings of depression are fairly frequent (a few times a week, but not daily) you would write a “5.”

---

Note to Researchers

We would appreciate your contribution to establishing occupational and national norms for the MBI—GS. If you wish to contribute, please send survey data on computer disks. Include on the disks item by item data files on all subjects along with whatever demographic data you have collected. Include on the disk a text file identifying the researchers, describing the nature of the sample, and outlining the structure of the data file. Your contribution will be acknowledged in the next edition of the MBI Manual.

Send files to:
Michael P. Leiter, Ph.D.
Centre for Organizational Research & Development
Acadia University
Wolfville, NS, Canada BOP 1X0.

3803 East Bayshore Road, Palo Alto, CA 94303

Copyright © 1996 by CPP, Inc. All rights reserved. No portion of this material may be reproduced by any means without written permission of the publisher.
Printed in the U.S.A. 97 66 65 64 12 11 10 9 8
# MBI–Educators Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often:</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>A few times a year or less</td>
<td>Once a month or less</td>
<td>A few times a month</td>
<td>Once a week</td>
<td>A few times a week</td>
<td>Every day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How Often 0–6</th>
<th>Statements:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. __________</td>
<td>I feel emotionally drained from my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. __________</td>
<td>I feel used up at the end of the workday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. __________</td>
<td>I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. __________</td>
<td>I can easily understand how my students feel about things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. __________</td>
<td>I feel I treat some students as if they were impersonal objects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. __________</td>
<td>Working with people all day is really a strain for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. __________</td>
<td>I deal very effectively with the problems of my students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. __________</td>
<td>I feel burned out from my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. __________</td>
<td>I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. __________</td>
<td>I've become more callous toward people since I took this job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. __________</td>
<td>I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. __________</td>
<td>I feel very energetic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. __________</td>
<td>I feel frustrated by my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. __________</td>
<td>I feel I'm working too hard on my job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. __________</td>
<td>I don't really care what happens to some students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. __________</td>
<td>Working with people directly puts too much stress on me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. __________</td>
<td>I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with my students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. __________</td>
<td>I feel exhilarated after working closely with my students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. __________</td>
<td>I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. __________</td>
<td>I feel like I'm at the end of my rope.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. __________</td>
<td>In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. __________</td>
<td>I feel students blame me for some of their problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Administrative use only)  
EE: __________  
DP: __________  
PA: __________