

Final Report

“Performance Appraisal in New Generation Jails”

Model Performance Appraisal Processes and Forms
and Training Materials for New Generation Jail
Facilities

Don Manning, Jail Commander
Spokane County Sheriff-Jail Division

Ben A. Menke, Director
Criminal Justice Program
Washington State University

Linda L. Zupan, Assistant Professor
Department of Criminal Justice
University of Alabama at Birmingham

Mary K. Stohr-Gillmore, Graduate Assistant
Department of Political Science
Washington State University

Michael W. Stohr-Gillmore, Graduate Assistant
Department of Political Science
Washington State University

Nicholas P. Lovrich, Director
Division of Governmental Studies and Services
Washington State University-Spokane

September, 1988

Table of Contents

Introduction 2

Training. 3

 Training in Spokane County 4

The Development of the Job Related Evaluation Criteria 3

 Correctional Officer Evaluative Criteria 6

 First-Line Supervisor Evaluative Criteria 14

 Concluding Remarks 23

References 25

4. Spokane Jail - Correctional Officer Performance Evaluation 26

B. Spokane County Jail - Supervisor (Sergeant) Performance Evaluation 27

C. Validating Situational Interviews: Predicting Performance in One, New Generation Jail 28

D. Personnel Selection and Performance Appraisal in Correctional Institutions: An Annotated Bibliography 29

E Performance Appraisal Training Manual: Spokane County Sheriff-Jail Division 30

Introduction

The architectural design and style of inmate management in podular/direct supervision New Generation jails introduces complexity to both the environment and the work performed by correctional officers, supervisors and managers. This complexity has important implications for personnel management practices in direct supervision facilities. Our previous work for the Spokane County Detention Facility and for the National Institute of Corrections (Zupan, et al., 1986) demonstrates that the success of direct supervision is contingent on several factors. These factors include the articulation and inculcation of the direct supervision philosophy, the development of specific leadership skills and abilities, and the development of appropriate supervisory strategies for the daily coaching, counseling and monitoring of module officers' job performance.

Of vital importance for the linkage between, mission, operations and performance are initial employee recruitment, selection and training programs which introduce and emphasize the mission of the facility and its operations. However, once the training has ended and employees assume their duties, other mechanisms are necessary to provide continuous feedback that at once reinforces and monitors job performance. A well-designed **performance appraisal system** can provide this necessary feedback and reinforcement (Lovrich, et al., 1981; 1983).

This project is a follow-up to an earlier grant which focussed on the development of a model selection process for podular/direct supervision New Generation jails. Our goal in this project was to develop a model behaviorally-based performance appraisal instrument and performance feedback process for the Spokane County Detention Facility and for use in other podular/direct supervision facilities. This goal was realized through

the use of the “critical incident technique” to identify effective behaviors associated with the correctional officer and first-line supervisory jobs at several on-line! direct supervision-facilities. The second project (development of performance appraisal processes), then! builds on the first (development of selection processes) to form a more complete model for management of personnel in podular/direct supervision Sew Generation jails.

This report includes a description of the field research conducted at several correctional facilities around the country: Clark County, Nevada; Pima County, Arizona; Middlesex County, New Jersey; Prince George’s County, Maryland; Dade County, Florida; Spokane County, Washington. In addition, included in this document is a follow-up report on the selection process,¹ copies of the Model Performance Appraisal forms for both correctional officers and for first-line supervisors* an up-to-date Annotated Bibliography on the relevant literature³ and a Model Performance Appraisal Training Manual.⁴

Training

Several personnel scholars have advocated the use of training as a means to minimize bias in selection and performance appraisals systems (Latham et al., 1973; Latham et al., 1980; Silverman and Wexley, 1987). These authors feel that the training of raters may well have some effect on the validity coefficients. That is, training raters may minimize rating errors and thus increase the validity coefficients of predictors in selection processes

1. See Appendix C “Validating Situational Interviews: Predicting Performance in One New Generation Jail.”

2. See Appendices A and B “Spokane Jail-Correction Officer Performance Evaluation” and “Spokane County Jail-Supervisor (Sergeant) Performance Evaluation.”

3. See Appendix D “Employee Selection and Performance Appraisal in Correctional Institutions: An Annotated Bibliography.”

4. See Appendix E “Performance Appraisal Training Manual: Spokane County Sheriff-Jail Division.

and increase the reliability in the observation of behavior in performance appraisal processes. Moreover, Napier and Latham (1986) suggest that progress cannot be made in performance appraisal systems if the practical needs of organizations are not taken into account. Training sessions which include the opportunity for supervisors and managers to give feedback and thus “customize” a selection or performance appraisal instrument to the practical needs and environment of a given facility may be one means to address this problem.

Training in Spokane County

Training in the use of the correctional officer and first-line supervisor performance appraisal instrument in Spokane County involved three sessions. In the first session: the correctional supervisors and managers were briefed on the background of the model selection and performance appraisal projects, the importance of performance appraisal in the public sector and the legal incentives for development of a valid and reliable performance appraisal system. In addition, some guidelines for avoiding common mistakes in performance appraisal were shared. Finally, the correctional officer performance appraisal forms were distributed and the staff were given the opportunity to make general comments on the form. They were asked to use the forms to make a “trial run” appraisal of those officers under their supervision. Several weeks later, after the supervisors had the opportunity to complete the appraisals, the second session of the training was scheduled. In this session, the supervisors and managers specifically critiqued portions of the form that appeared impractical for their facility. A third session was scheduled to allow for extended discussion on both **the** correctional officer and first-line supervisory form;

appropriate deletions, additions and modifications were made to the forms to allow them to "fit" the needs of the Spokane jail.⁵

It was clear after discussion with the correctional personnel, that some modification of the forms was in order. For instance, most personnel thought the forms were too lengthy and that some behaviors were similar enough that they could be deleted without detracting from the basic integrity of the form. In general, most personnel viewed the instruments, as modified, in a positive light, as teaching devices on "ideal behaviors" to be exemplified by correctional personnel.⁶

The Development of the Job Related Evaluation Criteria

The first stage in the development of any comprehensive personnel process-be it recruitment, selection, training or evaluation-requires that the important elements of a job be identified through a systematic job analysis. The most common form of job analysis focuses on the enumeration of job-specific tasks. The major criticisms, however, of traditional task-based job analyses are that they do not take into account the full complexity of a job or how tasks are successfully performed. Behaviorally-based job analyses, on the other hand, focus on the actual behaviors necessary for effective job performance. Not only do behaviorally-based job analyses identify the critical job tasks, but they also describe the particular behaviors required for the successful completion of tasks as well.

The critical incident technique, a behaviorally-based job analysis method developed

5. Per the request of Captain Don Manning, specialized forms for those officers working in Booking, Transport and the Control Rooms were also developed.

6. For advise/assistance on the correctional officer or supervisory forms contact Captain Don Alarming at the Spokane County Jail or the Criminal Justice Program at Washington State University.

by Flanagan (19%) and commonly used in personnel-related research (Latham. et al., 1980; Latham and Wesley, 1981), was employed in this study to identify first-line supervisor behaviors which are crucial for the effective supervision of correctional officers in podular/direct supervision facilities. Each participant in the research reported on here was asked to describe actual incidents of both effective and ineffective job performance observed within the past 6 to 12 months. They were asked to describe, in detail. 1) the situation, circumstances, or background of the incident, 2) the effective or ineffective behavior exhibited by the correctional officer or the first-line supervisor, and, 3) the outcome of the incident or reasons why the behavior was an example of effective or ineffective behavior. The advantage of the critical incident technique over other methods of job analysis is that it provides behaviorally-based information about what employees are actually doing and what they should be doing, and focuses on the behaviors associated with successful and unsuccessful task performance.

Correctional Officer Evaluative Criteria

At each facility, subjects were selected from the following groups: (1) correctional officers with more than one year of experience in a podular/direct supervision facility, (2) officers identified by supervisors as particularly effective in performance of their job (“waterwalkers”), and (3) first-line supervisors. Eighteen interviews (12 officers, 3 waterwalkers: 3 supervisors) were conducted at Las Vegas Detention Facility while ten (6 officers: 2 waterwalkers, 2 supervisors) were conducted at Pima County Detention Center. In addition to the interviews, a sample of officers from each facility were given detailed instructions and asked to provide examples of critical incidents and behaviors in writing.

Twenty-three officers in Las Vegas and 28 in Pima County provided written incidents and behaviors. A total of 346 incidents were collected; 177 from interviews and 169 self-reported.

After all the incidents were collected, those that were similar: if not identical, were grouped together and ambiguous incidents were eliminated. In this stage, the incidents were synthesized into 70 behavioral items. The items were then categorized according to the similarities in the effective and ineffective behavior exhibited by the officer. The analysis yielded seven descriptive categories or dimensions of critical correctional officer behavior, each associated with 6 to 15 behavioral items. The seven dimensions represent the universe or totality of the podular/direct supervisor correctional officer's job. The items associated with the dimensions are the behaviors defined by practitioners as critical to effective direct supervision correctional officer job performance.

Content analysis of the items and dimensions was assessed by withholding 10% of the incidents prior to the editing stage (Latham and Wesley, 1981). These incidents were examined after development of the dimensions and were found to describe behaviors already represented in the established items and dimensions.

A final analysis was conducted to assess the degree to which the behaviors and dimensions were common to both facilities. A problem associated with conducting a job analysis at two different locations is that the differences between facilities may produce behaviors or dimensions which are specific to only one of the facilities. To address this issue, the original 346 incidents were redistributed amongst the dimensions and tabulated as to the source of the incident. The results of such a sorting indicate that these behaviors are uniformly distributed between the two facilities. The results indicate that none of the

seven dimensions are specific to only one of the facilities.

The Critical Dimensions of Correctional Officer Performance

The following section presents the seven critical dimensions of podular/ direct supervision correctional officer job performance, a formal description of the dimensions, and the critical behaviors associated with the dimensions.⁷

Dimension 1: Managing the Living Unit to Assure a Safe and Humane Environment-

The extent to which the correctional officer used observation and communication to maximize compliant inmate behavior and minimize the occurrence of disruptive inmate behavior in the living unit; clearly communicated facility rules and expectations to inmates and immediately responded to all incidents of inmate misbehavior.

1. When observing a pattern of minor rule violations the officer calls a living unit meeting to discuss the problem.
2. Sever delegates authority to an inmate.
3. Maintains an informal written record of important information about inmates.
4. Initiates frequent discussions of facility rules and expectations with inmates.
5. Explains to inmates facility rules, personal expectations and answers inmates' questions about those inmates.
6. Aside from appropriate emergency restraint techniques, the officer never shoves, grabs, pushes, hits or physically touches an inmate.
7. Responds to all incidents of inmate rule violations regardless of their seriousness.

7. See Appendix A for the Correctional Officer Performance Evaluation.

8. Makes certain that inmates have timely and complete access to formal grievance procedures.
9. Recognizes medical emergencies (e.g., mental, medical) and is prompt in calling for appropriate assistance.
10. At the beginning of each shift the officer solicits information from inmates. makes announcements, explains the schedule and shares information.
11. Closely monitors the behavior and conditions of an inmate with special problems (e.g., suicidal, mental, medical).
12. Engages in continual visual observation of inmates and investigates any activities or changes in inmate behavior appearing out of the ordinary.
13. Gathers as much information as possible (records, conversation) about inmates in order to effectively supervise them.
14. Continually moves throughout the living unit observing, listening to and talking with inmates.
15. Is quick to recognize potential problems between inmates and moves swiftly to resolve them.

Dimension 2: Handling Inmate Discipline-The extent to which an officer responded fairly and effectively when disciplining inmates for disruptive behavior or rule violations.

1. Consistently enforces facility rules.
2. Follows all rules (hearings, grievance procedures, written reports) when formally disciplining an inmate (lock down, segregation, etc.).

3. When administering discipline to inmates who violate a facility rule, the officer explains to the inmate the rule he/she violated and the reason for the discipline.
4. Evaluates reasons for rule violations to insure that inmates are not unjustly disciplined.
5. Delivers on warnings to discipline inmates for misconduct or rule violations.
6. When an inmate violates a minor facility rule, the officer warns the inmate once before taking disciplinary action.
7. Recognizes the difference between minor and serious rule violations; repeated and occasional violations, and takes corrective action accordingly.
8. When responding to inmates' misbehavior, the officer disciplines only the responsible inmate rather than all inmates in the living unit.
9. Punishment or counseling of an inmate is handled "one-to-one" rather than in front of other inmates.
10. When disciplining an inmate for misbehavior the officer provides the inmate with the opportunity to explain his/her conduct.

Dimension 3: Responding to Inmate Requests-The extent to which an officer effectively responded to inmate requests and demands in a fair and balanced fashion; avoided inmate manipulation.

1. The officer never grants inmate privileges out of fear.
- 2.** The officer says "No" to inappropriate inmate requests.
3. Whenever appropriate, the officer responds to inmate requests for information in writing.

4. In response to an inmate request, an officer never makes a promise he/she can't keep.
5. When responding to an inmate request, the officer always indicates: (1) that he/she doesn't know; (2) will find out and get back; or (3) refers inmate to appropriate source.
6. Treats all inmate requests the same; does not play favorites with inmates by fulfilling some requests and denying requests to others.
7. In response to inmate requests for information the officer links the inmate to specialists or sources (lawyers, etc.) who have the answers.
8. The officer, while acknowledging all requests, does not run every inmate errand.
9. When an inmate makes a request the officer always explains in a courteous fashion what action he/she will take in response to the request.

Dimension 4: Building Positive Rapport and Personal Credibility with Inmates-The extent to which the correctional officer created an environment of mutual respect by demonstrating consistency and a courteous manner.

1. In daily contacts with inmates, the officer avoids doing or saying anything with degrades or belittles the inmates.
2. In day-to-day communications with inmates the officer is polite and courteous, but always firm.
3. When dealing with inmates the officer never swears.
4. Demonstrates common courtesy by using "please," "thank you," and by being an active listener.

5. Treats all inmates the same regardless of race: gender, appearance, or the offense for which they are incarcerated.
6. Except in emergency situations, the officer never communicates with an inmate by yelling across the living unit.

Dimension 5: Supervising in a Clear, Well-Organized and Attention-Getting Manner-

The extent to which the officer exhibited effective skill in organizing, supervising and motivating inmates in their activities.

1. Whenever appropriate, the officer consults with inmates before making changes in work routines.
2. Gives prompt feedback to inmates which allows self assessment and self correction.
3. Employs a variety of techniques (e.g., praise, granting of privileges, humor) to motivate and reward inmate compliance and cooperation.
4. When giving an order, the officer sees to it that the inmate carries it out.
5. When giving an order or making a request, the officer makes sure that the circumstances permit the inmate to comply and that the inmate understands the directions.
6. Evaluates inmates' work performance promptly.
7. Issues orders in a polite and courteous manner.
8. Assigns inmate work tasks in an even-handed manner to avoid the appearance of favoritism.

Dimension 6: Resolving Inmate Problems and Conflicts-The extent to which correc-

tional officers provided guidance for the solution of inmate problems; recognized the

steps involved in resolution of inmate conflicts; dealt with inmates in confrontational situations.

1. When resolving disputes between inmates, the officer separates the inmates by ordering both to their rooms and then speaks with each individually.
2. Gathers as much information as possible about inmate problems or confrontations before taking action.
3. Holds a meeting with all inmates in the living unit to resolve misunderstandings or tensions between the officer and inmates.
4. Whenever possible offers inmates face-saving alternatives to resolve problems.
5. Negotiates agreements to solve inmate problems.
6. Recognizes that inmate problems are different and initiates innovative actions to solve them.
7. When dealing with an irate inmate, the officer asks the inmate to go to his/her room to allow the inmate to calm down before discussing the matter.
8. Exhibits patience when resolving problems with inmates.
9. Uses casual conversation to calm agitated inmates.
10. When called an obscene name by an inmate, the officer remains calm and in control while dealing with the behavior.
11. When responding to inmate problems, an officer explains the alternatives to the inmate in resolving the problem.
12. When confronted by an agitated inmate, the officer talks with the inmate in a calm and controlled manner.

Dimension 7: Maintaining Effective Administrative and Staff Relations-The extent to which the correctional officer had knowledge of and consistently applied facility rules-and procedures; coordinated activities with co-workers; supported the authority of staff members; communicated with supervisors and other administrators.

1. Promptly reports critical information (e.g., confessions to a crime, plans for escape. inmate set up) to appropriate staff members.
2. Refrains from expressing criticism of another staff member in the presence of inmates.
3. Maintains consistency of the living unit supervision by regularly consulting with other shift officers.
4. Supports the appropriate efforts of other officers in dealing with inmates.
3. Promptly calls for emergency back-up when necessary to prevent the escalation of inmate disturbances or protect own safety.
6. Coordinates with other staff on specific inmate discipline matters.

First-Line Supervisor Evaluative Criteria

At each facility studied interview subjects were randomly selected from the following groups: (1) first-line supervisors with more than one year supervisory experience; and, (2) mid-managers responsible for the supervision of first-line supervisors. Ten interviews (7 first-line supervisors, 3 mid-managers) were conducted at the Middlesex County (New Jersey) Detention Facility; twelve interviews (9 first-line supervisors, 3 mid-managers) were conducted at the Prince George's County (Maryland) Detention Facility; eleven interviews (7 first-line supervisors: 4 mid-managers) were conducted at the Dade County

(Florida) Detention Facility; eleven interviews (8 first-line supervisors, 3 mid-managers) were conducted at the Clark County (Nevada) Detention Facility; and, 10 interviews (8 first-line supervisors, 2 mid-managers) were conducted at Spokane County (Washington) Detention Facility. A total of 493 incidents were collected from the interview subjects (92 at Middlesex County; 83 at Prince George County; 80 at Dade County; 101 at Clark County; 137 at Spokane County).

After all the incidents were collected, those that were similar (if not identical) were grouped together and ambiguous incidents were eliminated. In this stage, the incidents were synthesized into 80 behavioral items. The items were then categorized according to the similarities in the effective and ineffective behavior exhibited by the first-line supervisor. This analysis yielded 7 descriptive categories or dimensions of critical first-line supervisor behavior, each associated with 11 to 12 behavioral items. The dimensions represent the universe or totality of the podular/direct supervision first-line supervisor's job. The items associated with the dimensions are behaviors defined by practitioners as critical to effective first-line supervisors' job performance in podular/direct supervision facilities.

Content analysis of the items and dimensions was assessed by withholding 10% of the incidents prior to the editing stage (Latham and Wesley, 1981). These incidents were examined after development of the dimensions, and all but five were found to describe behaviors already represented in the established items and dimensions.

A final research step was conducted to assess the degree to which the behaviors and dimensions were common to all facilities (to minimize sampling bias) and to ensure the content validity of the performance appraisal instrument (Latham and Wesley, 1982).

A group of supervisors and mid-level managers were contacted from each of the jails sampled to assist in this next phase of the instrument development. First, they were asked to assign a relative weight to each of the 7 performance dimensions; secondly, they were asked to categorize the behavioral items under their most appropriate performance dimension; and, finally, they were asked to indicate how important (critical) each behavior is (on an “importance scale”) relative to the other behaviors associated with being an effective supervisor.⁸ The responses indicated that the behaviors were, for the most part, appropriately weighted (in terms of number of behaviors) and allocated to dimensions. Analysis of the responses indicated that 43 behaviors were rated as “very important” or “critical” by 65% of the correctional personnel; these behaviors were retained. In addition, the researchers added 8 more behaviors that were borderline (e.g., 62.5% of correctional personnel rated them highly) and/or they appeared essential to the performance of the first-line supervisor’s job. Moreover, one of the seven dimensions was not retained because it received the lowest weighting by the correctional personnel, and also because none of its associated behaviors were retained.⁹

The Critical Dimensions of First-Line Supervisor Performance

The following section presents the six critical dimensions of podular/direct supervision first-line supervisor job performance, a formal description of the dimensions, and the critical behaviors associated with the dimensions.¹⁰

8. The importance scale was structured as follows: 1=unimportant-this behavior is in no way associated with being an effective supervisor; 2=minor importance-this behavior is only slightly associated with being an effective supervisor; 3=important-this behavior is associated with being an effective supervisor; 4=very important-a supervisor may not be very effective without this behavior; 3=critical - it is absolutely essential that a supervisor exhibit this behavior in order to be effective.

9. This dimension was: Maintaining Police Officer, Attorney and Public Relations.

10. See Appendix B for the Supervisor (Sergeant) Performance Evaluation.

Dimension 1: Acting As a Leader/Decision Maker- -The extent to which the supervisor fulfills a leadership and decision-making role; behaves in a professional manner; sets a good example for others; displays confidence; is innovative; uses organizational and goal setting skills; plans and schedules events; directs activity; carries out programs; conducts effective meetings; identifies problems; considers possible consequences of action; considers alternatives; gives authoritative orders when needed; follows up on decisions; is consistent in application of rules, procedures and discipline; audits and enforces adherence to procedures, regulations and laws on a consistent basis; knows and follows the necessary steps to resolve emergencies.

1. The supervisor ensures that command posts are covered during an emergency.
2. The supervisor sets an example for subordinates by coming to work on time, meeting deadlines, not abusing lunch or coffee breaks and maintaining a professional appearance and attitude.
3. The supervisor responds to an emergency by directing correctional officer and inmate behavior; takes action to address the emergency, advises his/her superior, protects evidence, stays calm and follows appropriate rules.
4. The supervisor uses physical force only when an inmate disturbance warrants it.
5. The supervisor formally disciplines correctional officers only in private, and only when the officer's behavior warrants it.
6. The supervisor, when appropriate, issues verbal warnings and explains acceptable behavior before writing up correctional officers for unacceptable behavior.
7. The supervisor does not ignore correctional officers' behavior which violates the rules.

8. The supervisor enforces rules and procedures without favoritism.
9. The supervisor, when issuing orders and making requests, ensures that the instructions are clear, specific and understood.
10. The supervisor takes responsibility for decisions made on his/her shift.
11. The supervisor recognizes situations where direct orders are more appropriate than group decision making.

Dimension 2: Anticipating Institutional Problems- -The extent to which the supervisor anticipates and provides direction for the resolution of possible problems involving correctional officers, inmates or the institution; clearly explains to those involved the reasons for the action taken to resolve problems.

1. The supervisor inspects areas of the facility that present safety problems and potential escape routes for inmates.
2. The supervisor arrives at work promptly in order to be briefed on any pertinent prior occurrences.
3. The supervisor anticipates scheduling problems and acts to solve them, thus averting staff shortages on shifts.
4. The supervisor briefs correctional officers in advance on the handling of potentially difficult incidents and inmates.
5. The supervisor ensures he/she can be easily reached during emergencies or problems at any time during the shift.

Dimension 3: Acting As a Mediator/Negotiator- -The extent to which the supervisor recognizes and addresses correctional officer, inmate and institutional problems in a

fair, expedient and controlled manner; investigates problems; listens to correctional officers and inmates; counsels correctional officers on the appropriate response in a given situation; avoids inmate manipulation; avoids confrontational situations when possible, but responds to them when they arise; explains rules and procedures.

1. The supervisor explains to correctional officers that verbally abusing an inmate usually worsens a disturbance and often leads to staff and inmate violence.
2. The supervisor speaks calmly to defuse the anger of irate inmates or officers.
3. When appropriate, the supervisor separates fighting inmates and places them in separate pods or maximum security.
4. The supervisor is careful to guard against injury to staff or inmates when dealing with volatile inmates.
5. The supervisor resolves racial or other inmate conflicts by listening to both sides and responding in a fair and consistent manner.
6. The supervisor listens to subordinate complaints or problems with co-workers and suggests alternatives to resolve them.

Dimension 4: Supervising in a Flexible Manner- -The extent to which the supervisor supports correctional officer authority; compliments good work; provides the correctional officer with the necessary direction, materials and staff support to facilitate supervision of the pod; monitors knowledge and understanding of rules and procedures; uses daily occurrences to train correctional officers; teaches the consequences of actions; suggests constructive behavior to the correctional officer; conducts research; presents information; develops training, knows institutional policies, procedures and

related laws; uses interpersonal communication skills, listens to correctional officers, counsels correctional officers in private; solicits feedback from fellow workers: attends meetings; refrains from undercutting fellow workers and supervisors.

1. The supervisor supports the appropriate efforts of his/her superiors by refraining from criticizing them in the presence of subordinates.
2. The supervisor identifies officer work-related deficiencies and takes action (e.g., training) to correct them.
3. The supervisor visits the pod daily to look for tension or signs of disrepair, and to ensure that the officer has enough supplies to manage effectively.
4. The supervisor follows through on promises made to correctional officers.
3. The supervisors uses a variety of techniques (e.g., verbal or written commendations) to compliment subordinates for exceptional job performance.
6. The supervisor uses non-accusatory counseling in discussions with correctional officers about their inappropriate behavior.
7. The supervisor refrains from intervening in situations which subordinates have under control and are handling appropriately.
8. The supervisor regularly trains correctional officers to behave in accordance with the facility's rules and procedures.
9. The supervisor gives physical support to correctional officers when they are dealing with unruly inmates.
10. The supervisor regularly explains expectations for behavior to both new and experienced officers.
11. The supervisor investigates, documents and reports all subordinate complaints

about racial discrimination and sexual harassment.

12. The supervisor supports and follows the policies and procedures of the facility.

Dimension 5: Performing Administrative and Routine Supervisory Tasks- -The extent

to which the supervisor responds to administrative orders and completes routine supervisory tasks in a timely and decisive fashion; writes clear and concise reports; properly routes and correctly files paperwork; reviews correctional officers' report writing; performs evaluations; follows the chain of command; performs inspections; communicates important information to the next shift or the proper authority; disciplines effectively.

1. When writing reports, the supervisor cites the pertinent procedures and constructs reports that are clear and concise.
2. The supervisor supports the chain of command (e.g., refers employee complaints to the appropriate supervisor).
3. The supervisor communicates important information to the next shift supervisor to ensure consistency between shifts.
4. The supervisor acknowledges and investigates all inmate, public and departmental complaints about subordinates.
3. The supervisor relays important information about inmates to the officers who supervise them.
6. The supervisor ensures that correctional officers' paperwork/reports conform to departmental policy, are accurate, complete, well-organized, well written, and are completed on time.

7. When conducting performance evaluations, the supervisor thoroughly documents both effective and ineffective behaviors of officers.
8. The supervisor examines log books and reports for errors and omissions.
9. The supervisor effectively uses roll call to provide important information to officers concerning institutional operation, changes in policies and procedures, changes in the law, etc.
10. The supervisor maintains confidentiality about personnel problems.
11. The supervisor maintains detailed records of work performance for purposes of evaluating subordinate effectiveness.
12. The supervisor conducts unannounced security checks and inspections of the pods.

Dimension 6: Responding to Inmate Needs and Disturbances and Investigating Inmate

Requests- -The extent to which the supervisor effectively responds to inmate requests in a fair and thorough manner; solicits inmate feedback; confirms inmate information; explains policies; investigates inmate complaints; follows through on promises; is consistent and fair in treatment and discipline of inmates.

1. The supervisor follows through on promises made to inmates.
2. The supervisor treats inmates with equity and consistency.
3. The supervisor uses respectful language when conversing with officers and inmates.
4. The supervisor counsels inmates in private: never in front of other inmates.
3. The supervisor consistently enforces inmate compliance with rules.

Concluding Remarks

Human resource development for podular/direct supervision detention facilities remains in its infancy. Direct supervision personnel systems such as job analyses, selection and performance appraisal processes have been developed on a site-by-site basis and are designed to meet the unique environmental and operational needs of each respective facility. Our goal in this project was to identify critical correctional officer and supervisor behaviors required for successful implementation of the direct supervision philosophy regardless of environmental and operational variates. By using a behaviorally-based method of job analysis at several on-line, direct supervision facilities an effective evaluatory link has been established between the podular/direct supervision philosophy and the actual day-to-day implementation of that philosophy by correctional officers and supervisors. Thus, we believe that the results of the job analysis are generalizable, with some limitations: to other podular/direct supervision facilities.

While we are confident that the results of this job analysis describe the important elements of the podular/direct supervision correctional officer and supervisor job: facilities are cautioned in using them without careful and thorough review. For on-line supervision facilities this review may include a supplemental job analysis and/or an “iteration survey”.

To ensure that all critical elements of the supervisor job have been identified, the facility can undertake a supplemental job analysis. To accomplish this, we recommend that facilities use the critical incident technique, and interview a small sample of supervisors “waterwalkers” (both first-line supervisors and mid-managers) employed within the facility. The data gathered through this job analysis can be compared to our findings to identify facility-specific unique behaviors included among those dimensions of performance

common to all Sew Generation jails.

To precisely identify any specific environmental or operational features that may be present the facility can conduct an “iteration survey” using the behaviors and dimensions reported here (Latham and Wesley, 1981). The self-administered survey, as described in the above, is distributed to a sample of first-line supervisors and mid-managers; it consists of two major sections.¹¹ Once the respondents’ have assigned a weight to each performance dimension, evaluated the importance of each behavior, and indicated which performance dimension the behavior is associated with, the results are analyzed as to agreement about performance dimensions and behavior importance.¹²

Once these two steps have been completed, dimensions and behaviors can be added, deleted or modified. Facilities are cautioned, however, in assuming that differences in the job analysis presented here and their own review findings are the product of environmental and operational uniqueness. Instead, the differences may be the result of problems with the facility’s training or operating procedures. Careful attention must be focused on why differences occur and whether the unique feature of the facility which produced the difference is consistent or inconsistent with the Sew Generation philosophy.

Facilities still in the planning stages may wish to use these results as a general guide in the development of their human resources. The dimensions and behaviors should, however, be reviewed by a facility’s personnel specialist for their applicability in a specific instance.

11. See "Supervisor (Sergeant) Critical Incident Surrey (1988)" in Appendix B

12. For advice and/or assistance in such efforts, please contact the Criminal Justice Program at Washington State University- (309)333-2544.

References

- Latham, G.P., C.H. Fay, and L.M. Saari (1979) "The Development of Behavioral Observation Scales For Appraising the Performance of Foremen." *Personnel Psychology*. 32(2): 299-311.
- Latham, G.P., L.M. Saari, E.D. Pursell, and M.A. Campion (1980) "The Situational Interview." *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 65(4): 422-427.
- Latham, G.P. and K. W. Wexley (1977) "Behavioral Observation Scales For Performance Appraisal Purposes." *Personnel Psychology*. 30(2): 255-268.
- Latham, G.P. and K.N. Wesley (1982) *Increasing Productivity Through Performance Appraisal*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Latham, G.P., K.X. Wesley, and E.D. Purse11 (1975) "Training Managers to Minimize Rating Errors in the Observation of Behavior." *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 60(5): 350-335.
- Lovrich, S.P., Hopkins, R.H., Shaffer, P.L. and Yale, D.A. (1981) "Participative Performance Appraisal Effects Upon Job Satisfaction, Agency Climate, and Work Values: Results of a Quasi-Experimental Study in Six State Agencies." *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. Summer.
- Lovrich, S.P., Bishop, D.J., Hopkins, R.H. and Shaffer, P.L. (1983) "Participative Performance Appraisal in a Municipal Setting: A Pre- and Post-Implementation Study." *State and Local Government Review*. Winter.
- Silverman, S.B. and K.S. Wesley (1987) "The Selection Interview: Some Reasons for Optimism." *Personnel Assessment Monograph*. Published by the Assessment Council of the International Personnel Management Association.
- Zupan: L.L., Menke, B.A. and Lovrich, N.P. "Podular/Direct Supervision Facilities: Challenges for Human Resource Development," J. Farbstein and R. Wener, eds. *Proceedings of the First Annual Symposium on New Generation Jails*. Boulder, Colorado: National Institute of Corrections.
- Zupan, L. "The New Generation Correctional Philosophy: An Implementation Analysis and Impact Evaluation," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Washington State University, August 1987.
- Zupan, L. and B. Menke (1988) "implementing Organizational Change: From Traditional to Sew Generation Jail Operations." *Policy Studies Review*. 7(3):615-626.

APPENDIX A

Spokane County Jail

Correctional Officer Performance Evaluation

SPOKANE JAIL - CORRECTION OFFICER

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Employee _____

Evaluator _____

For evaluation period beginning _____ and ending _____

This checklist contains key job behaviors that have been reported as critical for assessing the contribution of the correction officer to the effectiveness and efficiency of the services provided by the Spokane Jail.

Please consider this person's behavior on the job for the past evaluation period. Read each statement carefully. Circle the letter that indicates the frequency that this person has engaged in this behavior.

For each behavior:

A represents almost always or 95 to 100 percent of the time

B represents frequently or 85 to 94 percent of the time

C represents sometimes or 75 to 84 percent of the time

D represents seldom or 65 to 74 percent of the time

E represents almost never or 0 to 64 percent of the time

An example of an item is shown below. If a correction officer is courteous and polite when responding to public or other department inquiries 95 to 100 percent of the time you would circle A.

Example: Is courteous and polite when responding to public or other department inquiries.

A B C D E

If the correction officer is almost never (0 to 64 percent of the time) courteous and polite when responding to public or other department inquiries, you would circle an E.

Your evaluations are to be based on the employee's behavior during this evaluation period.

Instructions: Please circle the letter that **represents** the frequency with which the employee engaged in the following behaviors:

100-95% of the time	94-85% of the time	84-75% of the time	74-65% of the time	64-0% of the time
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------

RESOLVING INMATE PROBLEMS AND CONFLICTS

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. When resolving disputes between inmates, the officer separates the inmates by ordering both to their (rooms) and then speaks with each individually. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 2. Gathers as much information as possible about inmate problems or confrontations before taking action. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 3. Holds meetings with inmates in the living unit to resolve misunderstandings or tensions between the officer and inmates. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 4. Whenever possible offers inmates face-saving alternatives to resolve problems. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 5. When appropriate, the officer asks an irate inmate to go to his/her room to allow the inmate to calm down before discussing the matter. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 6. Exhibits patience when resolving problems with inmates. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 7. When called an obscene name by an inmate, the officer remains calm and in control while dealing with the behavior. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 8. When responding to inmate problems, an officer explains the alternatives available to the inmate in resolving the problem. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 9. When confronted by an aggitated inmate, the officer talks with the inmate in a calm and controlled manner. | A | B | C | D | E |

100-95%	94-85%	84-75%	74-65%	64-0%
of the	'of the	of the	of the	of the
time	time	time	time	time

BUILDING POSITIVE RAPPORT AND PERSONAL CREDIBILITY WITH INMATES

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10. | In daily contacts with inmates, the officer avoids doing or saying anything which degrades or belittles the inmates. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 11. | In day to day communications with inmates the officer is polite and courteous but firm. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 12. | When dealing with inmates the officer never swears. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 13. | Demonstrates common courtesy by using 'please', 'thank you' and by being an active listener. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 14. | Treats all inmates the same regardless of race, gender, appearance, or the offense for which they are in jail. | A | B | C | D | E |

MAINTAINING EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATIVE AND STAFF RELATIONS

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 15. | Promptly reports critical information (e.g. confession to a crime, plans for escape, inmate set up) to appropriate staff members. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 16. | Refrains from expressing criticism of another staff member in the presence of inmates. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 17. | Maintains consistency of living unit supervision by regularly consulting with other shift officers. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 18. | Supports the appropriate efforts of other officers in dealing with inmates. | A | B | | D | E |
| 19. | Promptly calls for emergency back-up when necessary to prevent the escalation of inmate disturbances or protect own safety. | A | B | | D | E |

		100-95% of the time	94-85% of the time	84-75% of the time	74-65% of the time	64-0% of the time
20.	Regularly coordinates with other staff on specific living unit matters.	A	B	C	D	E
21.	Supports the rules and regulations of the facility by not criticizing them in the presence of inmates.	A	B	C	D	
22.	Follows all facility rules and procedures even when inconvenient or when it makes the job more difficult.	A	B	C	D	E
23.	Provides pertinent information to relieving shift officers.	A	B	C	D	E
MANAGING THE LIVING UNIT TO ASSURE A SAFE AND HUMANE ENVIRONMENT						
24.	Never delegates authority to an inmate.	A	B	C	D	E
25.	Regularly explains to inmates facility rules, personal expectations and answers inmates questions about those issues.	A	B	C	D	E
26.	Aside from appropriate emergency restraint techniques the officer never shoves, grabs, pushes, hits or physically touches an inmate.	A	B	C	D	E
27.	Responds to all incidents of inmate rule violations regardless of their seriousness.	A	B	C	D	E
28.	Makes certain that inmates have timely and complete access to formal grievance procedures.	A	B	C	D	E
29.	Recognizes medical emergencies (e.g., mental, medical) and is prompt in calling for appropriate assistance.	A	B	C	D	E
30.	At the beginning of each shift the officer solicits information from inmates, makes announcements, explains schedule and shares information.	A	B		D	E

	100-95% of the time	94-85% of the time	84-75% of the time	74-65% of the time	64-0% of the time
31. Closely monitors the behavior and condition of an inmate with special problems (e.g., suicidal, mental, medical).	A	B	C	D	E
32. Engages in continual visual observation of inmates and investigates any activities or changes in inmate behavior appearing out of the ordinary.	A	B	C	D	E
33. Gathers as much information as possible (records, conversation) about inmates in order to effectively supervise them.	A	B	C	D	E
34. Continually moves throughout the living unit observing, listening to and talking with the inmates.	A	B	C	D	E
35. Is quick to recognize potential problems between inmates and moves swiftly to resolve them.	A	B	C	D	E

RESPONDING TO INMATE REQUESTS

36. The officer never grants inmate priviledges out of fear.	A	B	C	D	E
37. The officer says "No" to inappropriate inmate requests.	A	B	C	D	E
38. In response to an inmate request, an officer never makes a promise he/she can't keep.	A	B	C	D	E
39. When responding to an inmate request, the officer always indicates, 1) that he/she doesn't know; 2) will find out and get back; or 3) refers inmate to appropriate source.	A	B	C	D	E
40. Treats all inmate requests the same, does not play favorites with inmates by fulfilling some requests and denying similar ones.	A	B	C	D	E

	100-95% of the time	94-85% of the time	84-75% of the time	74-65% of the time	64-0% of the time
41. In response to inmate requests for information the officer links the inmate to specialists or sources (lawyers, etc.) who have the answers.	A	B	C	D	E
HANDLING INMATE DISCIPLINE					
42. Consistently enforces facility rules.	A	B	C	D	E
43. Follows all rules (hearings, grievance procedures, written reports) when formally disciplining an inmate (lock down, segregation, etc.).	A	B	C	D	E
44. When administering discipline to an inmate who violates a facility rule, the officer explains to the inmate the rule he/she violated and the reason for the discipline.	A	B	C	D	E
45. Evaluates reasons for rule violations to insure that inmates are not unjustly disciplined.	A	B	C	D	E
46. Delivers on warnings to discipline inmates for misconduct or rule violations.	A	B	C	D	E
47. Recognizes the difference between minor and serious rule violations; repeated and occasional violations, and takes corrective action accordingly.	A	B	C	D	E
48. When responding to inmates misbehavior, the officer disciplines only the responsible inmate rather than all inmates in the living unit.	A	B	C	D	E
49. Punishment or counseling of an inmate is handled "one-to-one" rather than in front of other inmates.	A	B	C	D	E

	100-95% of the time	94-85% of the time	84-75% of the time	74-65% of the time	64-0% of the time
50. When disciplining an inmate for misbehavior the officer provides the inmate with the opportunity to explain his/her conduct.	A	B	C	D	E
SUPERVISING IN A CLEAR, WELL-ORGANIZED AND ATTENTION-GETTING MANNER					
51. Whenever appropriate the officer consults with inmates before making changes in work routines.	A	B	C	D	E
52. Gives prompt feedback to inmates which allows self assessment and self correction.	A	B	C	D	E
53. Employs a variety of techniques (e.g., praise, granting of privileges, humor) to motivate and reward inmate compliance and cooperation.	A	B	C	D	E
54. When giving an order the officer sees to it that the inmate carries it out.	A	B	C	D	E
55. When giving an order or making a request, the officer makes sure that the circumstances permit the inmate to comply and that the inmate understands the directions.	A	B	C	D	E
56. Assigns inmate work tasks in an even-handed manner to avoid the appearance of favoritism.	A	B	C	D	E

GENERAL COMMENTS

In this section, list any pertinent facts that should be known about the employee or the employee's development. List any special skills or talents. List any incidents, not covered on this form, of outstanding performance, or any critical incidents that merit special attention.

REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENTS

Please list all behaviors from the last performance review session that were designated as areas for improvement. Provide specific information about the steps taken and progress made for improvement.

Employee Selection and Performance Appraisal
in Correctional Institutions: An Annotated Bibliography

Disclaimer: None of the views or conclusions contained here necessarily reflect the opinions of the National Institute of Corrections. The authors are responsible for all views, opinions, errors and omissions.

September, 1988

EMPLOYEE COMMENTS

In this section the employee should state what s/he will do to maintain or improve performance. Note any areas of disagreement or incidents of importance not covered above.

Evaluator's Signature _____ Date _____

Reviewer's Signature _____ Date _____

Employee's Signature _____ Date _____

(Your signature does not necessarily mean that you agree with the ratings.)

I would like to discuss this report or other matters with someone other than my rating supervisor.

_____ Yes _____ No

APPENDIX B

Spokane County Jail

Supervisor (Sergeant) Performance Evaluation

SPOKANE COUNTY JAIL - SUPERVISOR (SERGEANT)
PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Employee _____

Evaluator _____

For evaluation period beginning _____ and ending _____

This checklist contains key job behaviors that have been reported as critical for assessing the contribution of the supervisor to the effectiveness and efficiency of the services provided by the Spokane County Jail.

Please consider this employee's behavior on the job for the past evaluation period. Read each statement carefully. Circle the letter that indicates the frequency that this supervisor has engaged in this behavior.

For each behavior:

A represents almost always or 95 to 100 percent of the time

B represents frequently or 85 to 94 percent of the time

C represents sometimes or 75 to 84 percent of the time

D represents seldom or 65 to 74 percent of the time

E represents almost never or 0 to 64 percent of the time

An example of an item is shown below. If a supervisor takes responsibility for decisions made on his/her shift 95 to 100 percent of the time you would circle A.

Example: The supervisor takes responsibility for decisions made on his/her shift.

A B C D E

If the supervisor almost never (0 to 64 percent of the time) takes responsibility for decisions made on his/her shift, you would circle an E.

Your evaluations are to be based on the employee's behavior during this evaluation period.

Instructions: Please circle the letter that represents the frequency with which the employee engaged in the following behaviors:

100-95% of the time	94-85% of the time	84-75% of the time	74-65% of the time	64-0% of the time
---------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------

ACTING AS A LEADER/DECISION MAKER

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------|---|---|---|
| 1. The supervisor ensures that command posts are covered during an emergency. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 2. The supervisor sets an example for subordinates by coming to work on time, meeting deadlines, not abusing lunch or coffee breaks and maintaining a professional appearance and attitude. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 3. The supervisor responds to an emergency by directing correctional officer and inmate behavior; takes action to address the emergency, advises his/her superior, protects evidence, stays calm and follows appropriate rules. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 4. The supervisor uses physical force only when an inmate disturbance warrants it. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 5. The supervisor formally disciplines correctional officers only in private, and only when the officer's behavior warrants it. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 6. The supervisor, when appropriate, issues verbal warnings and explains acceptable behavior before writing up correctional officers for unacceptable behavior. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 7. The supervisor does not ignore correctional officers' behavior which violates the rules. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 8. The supervisor enforces rules and procedures without favoritism. | A | B | C | D | E |
| 9. The supervisor, when issuing orders and making requests, ensures that the instructions are clear, specific and understood. | A | B | C | D | E |

	100-95% of the time	94-85% of the time	84-75% of the time	74-65% of the time	64-0% of the time
10. The supervisor takes responsibility for decisions made on his/her shift.	A	B	C	D	E
11. The supervisor recognizes situations where direct orders are more appropriate than group decision making.	A	B	C	D	E

ANTICIPATING INSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS

12. The supervisor inspects areas of the facility that present safety problems and potential escape routes for inmates.	A	B	C	D	E
13. The supervisor arrives at work promptly in order to be briefed on any pertinent prior occurrences.	A	B	C	D	E
14. The supervisor anticipates scheduling problems and acts to solve them, thus averting staff shortages on shifts.	A	B	C	D	E
15. The supervisor briefs correctional officers in advance on the handling of potentially difficult incidents and inmates.	A	B	C	D	E
16. The supervisor ensures he/she can be easily reached during emergencies or problems at any time during the shift.	A	B	C	D	E

ACTING AS A MEDIATOR/NEGOTIATOR

17. The supervisor explains to correctional officers that verbally abusing an inmate usually worsens a disturbance and often leads to staff and inmate violence.	A	B	C	D	E
18. The supervisor speaks calmly to defuse the anger of irate inmates or officers.	A	B	C	D	E
19. When appropriate, the supervisor separates fighting inmates and places them in separate pods or maximum security.	A	B	C	D	E

	100-95% of the time	94-85% of the time	84-75% of the time	74-65% of the time	64-0% of the time
20. The supervisor is careful to guard against injury to staff or inmates when dealing with volatile inmates.	A	B	C	D	E
21. The supervisor resolves racial or other inmate conflicts by listening to both sides and responding in a fair and consistent manner.	A	B	C	D	E
22. The supervisor listens to subordinate complaints or problems with co-workers and suggests alternatives to resolve them.	A	B	C	D	E
SUPERVISING IN A FLEXIBLE MANNER					
23. The supervisor supports the appropriate efforts of his/her superiors by refraining from criticizing them in the presence of subordinates.	A	B	C	D	E
24. The supervisor identifies officer work-related deficiencies and takes action (e.g., training) to correct them.	A		C	D	E
25. The supervisor visits the pod daily to look for tension or signs of disrepair, and to ensure that the officer has enough supplies to manage effectively.	A	B	C	D	E
26. The supervisor follows through on A promises made to correctional officers.	A	B	C	D	E
27. The supervisor uses a variety of techniques (e.g., verbal or written commendations) to compliment subordinates for exceptional job performance.	A	B	C	D	E
28. The supervisor uses nonaccusatory counseling in discussions with correctional officers about their inappropriate behavior.	A	B	C	D	

	100-95% of the time	94-85% of the time	84-75% of the time	74-65% of the time	64-0% of the time
29. The supervisor refrains from intervening in situations which subordinates have under control and are handling appropriately.	A	B	C	D	E
30. The supervisor regularly trains correctional officers to behave in accordance with the facility's rules and procedures.	A	B	C		E
31. The supervisor gives physical support to correctional officers when they are dealing with unruly inmates.	A	B	C	D	E
32. The supervisor regularly explains expectations for behavior to both new and experienced officers.	A	B	C	D	E
33. The supervisor investigates, documents and reports all subordinate complaints about racial and sexual harassment.	A	B	C	D	E
34. The supervisor supports and follows the policies and procedures of the facility.	A	B	C	D	E
PERFORMING ADMINISTRATIVE AND ROUTINE SUPERVISORY TASKS					
35. When writing reports, the supervisor cites the pertinent procedures and constructs reports that are clear and concise.	A	B	C	D	E
36. The supervisor supports the chain of command (e.g., refers employee complaints to the appropriate supervisor).	A	B	C		E
37. The supervisor communicates important information to the next shift supervisor to ensure consistency between shifts.	A	B	C	D	E
38. The supervisor acknowledges and investigates all inmate, public and departmental complaints about subordinates.	A	B	C	D	E

		100-95% of the time	94-85% of the time	84-75% of the time	74-65% of the time	64-0% of the time
39.	The supervisor relays important information about inmates to the officers who supervise them.	A	B	C	D	E
40.	The supervisor ensures that correctional officers' paper-work/reports conform to departmental policy, are accurate, complete, well-organized, well written, and are completed on time.	A	B	C		E
41.	When conducting performance evaluations, the supervisor thoroughly documents both effective and ineffective behaviors of officers.	A	B	C	D	E
42.	The supervisor examines log books and reports for errors and omissions.	A	B	C	D	E
43.	The supervisor effectively uses roll call to provide important information to officers concerning institutional operation, changes in policies and procedures, changes in the law, etc.	A	B	C	D	E
44.	The supervisor maintains confidentiality about personnel problems.	A	B	C	D	E
45.	The supervisor maintains detailed records of work performance for purposes of evaluating subordinate effectiveness.	A	B	C	D	E
46.	The supervisor conducts unannounced security checks and inspections of the pods.	A	B	C	D	E
RESPONDING TO INMATE NEEDS AND DISTURBANCES AND INVESTIGATING INMATE REQUESTS						
47.	The supervisor follows through on promises made to inmates.	A	B	C	D	E
48.	The supervisor treats inmates with equity and consistency.	A	B	C	D	E

	100-95% of the time	94-85% of the time	84-75% of the time	74-65% of the time	64-0% of the time
49. The supervisor uses respectful language when conversing with officers and inmates.	A	B	C	D	E
50. The supervisor counsels inmates in private, never in front of other inmates.	A	B	C	D	E
51. The supervisor consistently enforces inmate compliance with rules.	A	B	C	D	

GENERAL COMMENTS

In this section, list any pertinent facts that should be known about the employee or the employee's development. List any special skills or talents. List any incidents, not covered on this form, of outstanding performance, or any critical incidents that merit special attention.

REVIEW OF PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENTS

Please list all behaviors from the last performance review session that were designated as areas for improvement. Provide specific information about the steps taken and progress made for improvement.

EMPLOYEE COMMENTS

In this section the employee should state what s/he will do to maintain or improve performance. Note any areas of disagreement or incidents of importance not covered above.

Evaluator's Signature _____ Date _____

Reviewer's Signature _____ Date _____

Employee's Signature _____ Date _____

(Your signature does not necessarily mean that you agree with the ratings.)

I would like to discuss this report or other matters with someone other than my rating supervisor.

_____ Yes _____ No

APPENDIX C

Validating Situational Interviews:
Predicting Performance in One New Generation Jail

Validating Situational Interviews: Predicting Performance in One
New Generation Jail

Disclaimer: None of the views or conclusions contained here necessarily reflect the opinions of the National Institute of Corrections. The authors are responsible for all views, opinions, errors and omissions.

September, 1988

Introduction

The Supreme Court ruled in **Griggs v. Duke Power Company** (1971) that “...an employer could not use a selection technique having an adverse impact on minorities unless that technique had been shown to measure job-related skills” (Thomas and Heisel, 1983).¹ Because of the **Griggs** ruling, public managers are faced with a selection process dilemma: (1) continue with use of standardized but unvalidated tests and risk lawsuits if it can be shown that those tests have an adverse impact on minority groups; or, (2) resort to unstructured interviews that have no adverse impact, but which are also likely to represent poor selection practice for the identification of quality personnel. Students of selection processes make note that many public managers have chosen the latter course of action in the interest of meeting affirmative action goals. Instead of developing selection tests that can be validated, these employers have elected to take the “course of least resistance” and have returned to the interview format for employee selection to the detriment of employee quality (Daniel, 1986).

The courts’ and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s (EEOC) stringent requirements have reduced employment testing efforts in the United States without necessarily improving the position of women and minorities in the labor force. The argument that EEO standards have upgraded selection by stimulating increased validation may be true for a few organizations, but for others the strict requirements have had a chilling effect leading to the abandonment of old tests and an unwillingness to develop new ones. (Daniel, 1986: I)

As a consequence of the widespread return to the old unstructured interviews: some

1. Under the new guidelines (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission’s), a selection rate for any minority group which is less than 80 percent of the rate for the group with the highest rate will generally be regarded as evidence of **adverse impact** (Robertson, 1981).

authors (e.g., Dyer, 1981) argue that the quality of the workforce will deteriorate primarily because interviews are not very good in discriminating between those applicants who prove to be good and those who prove to be poor employees. Specifically, scholars are skeptical of the utility of interview for predicting applicant success on most kinds of jobs (Wagner, 1949; Mayfield: 1964; Ghiselli, 1966; Latham and Saari, 1980; Silverman and Wesley, 1987), they question the utility of face-to-face interviews for gathering true impressions of personality characteristics (Urich and Trumbo, 1963), and they decry the generally “nebulous and intangible character” of most interview processes (Ghiselli, 1966: 389; Dyer: 1981).

As should be clear from the foregoing, the **Griggs** ruling clearly placed public personnel managers in a fix. If they continued to use unvalidated tests they risked discrimination charges: but if they returned to subjective interviewing techniques they risked hiring persons who would be incapable of performing well on the job. It is in this contest of an unenviable choice between a rock and a hard place that the proponents of the “situational interview” process laud their technique as the solution to this personnel dilemma. According to Latham and Wesley (1982), a proper selection procedure is important both because it alleviates concerns about adverse impact (it can be validated) and because it assists organizations in screening for quality employees. Before a proper situational interview can be constructed! however, the effective behaviors for a particular job must first be identified.

A valid selection test cannot be developed until the organization agrees upon an acceptable definition (i.e., measure) of employee behavior. This is because the validity of a test is determined by measuring the performance of people on the test and measuring the performance of the same people on important aspects of the job. If there is a significant correlation between these two measures the selection procedure is valid (Latham and Wexley, 1982: 3).

The Critical Incident Technique

The critical incident technique was developed by Flanagan (1934) and is utilized in the job analysis process by personnel specialists to identify the effective and ineffective behaviors associated with a given job (Flanagan, 1954; Latham and Wesley, 1982). In this technique those persons (job incumbents and supervisors) who currently perform or have recently observed the performance of the job in question are asked to give examples of **effective** and **ineffective** behaviors related to that job. Upon collection of these critical job behaviors, researchers distribute the-behaviors under logical dimensions- -such as “Managing the living unit to assure a safe and humane environment”² in New Generation Jails (Latham and Wexley, 1982). In order to minimize sampling bias, a new representative group of job incumbents and supervisors are then contacted and asked to assign relative weights of importance to the dimensions specified, to categorize the effective and ineffective behaviors into the several dimensions, and to indicate the relative importance of each behavior under each job dimension (Latham and Wexley, 1982). From these weightings and categorizations the job analyst is able to construct a “situational interview” and a performance appraisal instrument which are intrinsically related to effective behavior on the job.

Development of the Situational Interview Instrument

The situational interview is devised as a structured and standardized procedure. That is, the same questions are asked of all applicants, the questions posed to applicants are job-

2. This is an actual dimension developed for correctional officers under a grant from the National Institute of Corrections for Spokane County, Washington under the title, “Personnel Administration in Sew Generation Jails.”

related, and the applicants' answers are benchmarked (Spokane County Sheriff's Office, 1986). This regimented process is followed in order to avoid the wide range of problems associated with unstructured interviews (e.g., rambling, digression, failure to cover all important material, lack of uniform treatment of applicants, etc.), to exclude legally prohibited discriminatory questions that are unrelated to job performance, to include "real life" decisions to be made on the job in the interview process, and to increase the likelihood of achieving a high degree of the interobserver reliability between raters (Wagner, 1949; Mayfield, 1964; Latham and Saari, 1980; Spokane County Sheriff's Office: 1986; Silverman and Wexley, 1987; Maurer and Fay, 1988). The candidates are asked how they would react to several critical incidents; their answers are then compared to the most effective and least effective behaviors for dealing with those incidents identified by job occupants and supervisors. The situational interview technique is premised on the assumption that intentions are related to behavior (Silverman and Wexley, 1987)- -that is, that what an applicant says s/he will do in the selection interview is "predictive" of actual subsequent job behavior.

Development of the Situational Questions

The situational questions and the benchmarked answers for each dimension were created through a three-stage group process developed by Latham et al. (1980: 422-427; Spokane County Sheriff's Office, 1986).³ In the first stage of the process participants

3. The correctional facility personnel involved in this three-stage process included one lieutenant, sergeant and correctional officer at the Las Vegas Detention Center; one captain, lieutenant and sergeant at the Pima County Detention Center; and; one director and deputy chief at the Contra Costa Detention Center. "All of the participants had experience working as or supervising direct supervision correctional officers and most had experience interviewing correctional officer applicants. The inclusion of administrators,

individually reviewed the dimensions and behaviors developed through the critical incident job analysis, and each one selected the three behaviors they personally felt best represented the dimension in question. The group then reviewed the individual selections and came to a consensus on the one behavior which best represented each dimension. Participants then described actual situations on the job where they had observed the critical behavior selected for each dimension. One situation was then selected by the group of participants which they felt best exemplified the critical behavior. The situation was then translated into a question like the ones shown in Appendix A. In order to construct the benchmarked answers, the group described responses to the situation that would be considered outstanding, tolerable and poor; consensus was achieved by the group of correctional personnel on each benchmarked answer.

New Generation Jails

Since its inception, the American jail has been plagued by innumerable difficulties. The American jail as a public institution has demonstrated a poor track record regarding the ability to incarcerate citizens suspected and convicted of crimes without overcrowding, without noise, without rampant violence, without abuse of power by staff, without the development of a collateral inmate subculture, and without mind-numbing boredom. This systematic failure to incarcerate in a safe and humane fashion reached a point where the federal and state courts intervened in the internal affairs of executive branch law enforcement and correctional agency affairs- -a step seldom taken by the American bench (Reid, 1976; Clear and Cole, 1986; Stohr-Gillmore, 1987).

supervisors and line personnel ensured that a variety of perceptions and perspectives were represented in the interview questions and answers” (Spokane County Sheriff’s Office, 1986: 36).

Given this backdrop, the evolution of the podular/direct supervision “New Generation” jail represents a watershed in institutional corrections. The innovative concepts of podular architecture and direct supervision management of inmates are the basic components of these jails, making them far different in operation from the traditional jail’s linear architecture and intermittent supervision of inmates. In fact, some proponents of the New Generation jail concept claim that the podular/direct supervision jail’s underlying philosophy may in time revolutionize incarceration. In place of the violent, degrading crowded, boring, dilapidated and poorly supervised traditional jail, the podular/direct supervision jail gives hope of a humane, safe and secure domicile for inmates (Gettinger, 1984).

The traditional jail setting is characterized by fear and its companion hatred. Staff are fearful of inmates because they lack the ability to garner inmate compliance via either coercive, remunerative or normative power (Etzioni, 1961). The use of coercive power is both inefficient and restricted by law in the jail setting (Cloward, 1968), and the use of normative power (the allocation and manipulation of symbolic rewards) and remunerative power (based on the manipulation and allocation of material resources and rewards) is restricted by the nature of the institution and the low status of the inmate (Etzioni, 1961). Due to their inability to manage or control inmates, staff may be less than confident of their own safety. In the traditional jail inmates are fearful of the institutional staff because of the threat of degradation that such jails have over their residents (Sykes, 1938; Goffman, 1966). Inmates recognize that their protection from each other, given the lack of direct supervision by staff, is less than assured. As a consequence of this fear between and among staff and inmates, hatred develops and flourishes, inasmuch as people tend to hate

those they fear (Gettinger, 1984). This pervasive fear interferes with the communication and interaction of both the kept and the keepers.

Through direct proactive supervision of inmates, the podular/direct supervision jail, in contrast to the traditional facility, seeks as a main objective to insure the safety of staff and inmates (Gettinger, 1984). The threat of and actual wielding of physical coercion, while still available, is rarely resorted to as compliance is gained through persuasion and remuneration. Inmates in podular/direct supervision jails have more to “lose” by failing to comply in terms of the benefits of autonomy within their living unit, recreation, easy access to telephones, visitors and T.V. Therefore, one would expect that inmates in podular/direct supervision jails would tend, in their own self-interest, to incite fewer disturbances.⁴

The Sew Generation jail concept does, then, signify a new role for the correctional officer. Instead of dealing with inmates in a removed and intermittent fashion, a correctional officer in the Sew Generation jail is in the same “pod” (secure dormitory-like area containing approximately forty inmates) with the inmates 24 hours a day. Rather than a job that is routine: fragmented and menial, the correctional officer’s job in the Sew Generation jail requires considerable supervisory, leadership and communication skills (Zupan, 1987). In fact, the job of the correctional officer in the New Generation jail might be termed “enriched” by the standards set by Hackman et al. (1981). That is, the correctional officer in the Sew Generation jail may find more satisfaction in his/her job than the correctional officer in a traditional jail because the Sew Generation jail correctional officer’s job is meaningful, provides direct responsibility for outcomes, and gives regular

4. Much of the information in the above on the Sew Generation Jails was taken from the unpublished thesis of Stohr-Gillmore (1987).

feedback about performance on the job (Zupan and Menke, 1987). Because of the new job responsibilities and skills required of correctional officers in New Generation jails, it is imperative that correctional managers have a selection process that screens effectively for such talented individuals.

Methodology

The data for this study were collected from a New Generation jail in Spokane, Washington. The data is longitudinal in that the first group of applicants (collected in late 1985) includes job applicants selected for the correctional officer job before the situational interview was included in the selection process; the second group (collected in early 1987) includes job applicants selected with the assistance of the situational interview technique. All applicants included in this study were hired and represent the population of applicants hired during 1983, 1986 and 1987. In addition, each of these applicants were sent through the state correctional officers' academy, completed a 13-day on-the-job training routine, and were evaluated on their job performance in June 1988. The number of hires in the first group is 36, and the number of successful applicants in the second group is 33.

The Selection Process Without the Situational Interview

The job screening process at the Spokane facility consisted of three general phases. In the first phase relevant background information was gathered on each applicant to screen out those individuals who did not meet the legal and ethical standards for work in a correctional facility. The second phase consisted of a written civil service exam and a physical fitness test. Both of these tests are intended to be job related and nondiscrimi-

natory toward protected groups (Spokane County Sheriff's Office, 1986). The third phase of the selection process is the interview phase. During this final stage a board of three interviewers makes the summary hiring recommendation to the civil service commission on the remaining applicants. The selection process for the two groups included in this study was very nearly identical, except, of course, for the interview phase.

In the first group interview condition, applicants were asked questions and rated by a board of three interviewers concerning some personal traits of the applicants thought important to the successful mastery and conduct of the position of correctional officer. The 11 rating categories of this phase included scores on the following: appearance and grooming, personality projection, temperament, poise, maturity, judgment, employment experience: police aptitude, military experience, career preparation and self confidence. In addition, a total rating was obtained by aggregating over all of the categories. Appended to each category were a few brief phrases describing the criteria for rating an applicant. For instance: the phrases "appears neat and well groomed" (high criteria score) and "spends little time on appearance" (low criteria score) were appended to the appearance and grooming category. The interviewer was instructed to consider these criteria as the extremes for a category, with a low criteria score warranting a rating of "one" and a high criteria score a "ten." The interviewers were instructed to rate the applicant between the one and ten extremes, using a five as the "average" individual standard.³

The Selection Process With the Situational Interview

The second group interview condition required that the interviewers rate the appli-

3. See Appendix B for all of the categories and their appended criteria.

cant on six factors at several points in the interview- -(1) after a review of the applicant folder. (2) after asking the applicant general questions, (3) during and (4) after asking the applicant five situational questions, (5) after the applicant has asked questions. and (6) after a discussion of the applicant among the interviewers and consensus is reached.⁶ The rating scale employed was a seven-point scale, with the “one?” endpoint meaning unacceptable and the “seven” endpoint meaning outstanding. The six rating criteria used at five rating points were: communication skills, reasoning ability/judgment, interpersonal skills, relevant experience and education, interest in the position: and appearance. The questions employed at each point in the interview were structured, uniform and specific

6. Training of the interviewers in how to use the situational questions was conducted in the month prior to the the actual hiring process. The training workshop consisted of several phases: (1) overview of the workshop objectives; (2) discussion of problems with interviewer bias; (3) discussion of effective interviewing guidelines; (4) instruction on Equal Employment Opportunity guidelines; (5) discussion of research on the use of situational questions; (6) A skill building exercise; and (7) a discussion and wrap-up. As part of the skill building exercise prospective interviewers practiced the use of the situational questions in a “mock interview format” on a recent correctional officer hire. After a practice reading of each of the original seven situational questions, each question was read aloud to the role play applicant. Responses were independently scored by the trainees and scores were shared and discussed to aid in the interpretation of each response against the behavioral anchors provided. Five of the seven questions were then chosen for use in the initial experimental use of this type of questioning. A follow-up training session was conducted six months later, after the interviewers had the chance to use the situational questions in “real life” selection situations, in order to identify any difficulties encountered when using the situational questions in the selection interview. During this session, the trainees raised three positive and two negative points. On the positive side: (1) the trainees felt that the situational question helped them spot “disciplinarian types” of applicants who lack effective interpersonal and “parenting skills” and who would be more likely to resort to one-on-one physical force; (2) the trainees felt that they were in better control of the interview content and were more likely to delay a positive recommendation to hire until the applicant had performed favorably on the situational questions; (3) the trainees also regarded the situational questions as explicit justification for rejecting a candidate. However, on the negative side: (1) the trainees felt the placement of the situational questions in the first section of the interview was awkward in that it didn’t allow for an “ice breaking period” (this was resolved by rearranging the interview format); (2) the trainees pointed out that some of the applicants might be receiving some coaching on the situational questions (this was resolved by expanding the pool of situational questions).

to jail work.

The rating scale for the situational questions was based on five points rather than the seven points utilized in the other scales. A five indicated that the applicant had given an outstanding response: a three indicated a mediocre or tolerable response, and a one indicated that the response was poor. The five situational questions used in each interview were related to a specific job situation that a correctional officer in a New Generation jail might encounter. Each question was “benchmarked” with possible answers that the correctional officer candidates might give: for some questions more than one answer might be benchmarked with the same number because the answers are different, but they have the same approximate value in the eyes of correctional personnel who participated in the creation of the questions. For example the following question had two responses that were benchmarked with a value of one.

Question # 1: A facility rule states that inmates will be out of bed at 7:00 A.M. in the morning. in making your morning inspection of the module you notice that an inmate is still in bed. When you order him to get up he states that an officer on another shift has given him permission to stay in bed because he has a cold. What would you do?

- 5 = Verify the claim of the inmate by looking for documentation or contacting the officer.**
- 3 = Call your supervisor and ask him/her whether its okay for the inmate to stay in bed or ask him/her what to do.**
- 1 = Follow the rule of the facility without checking the inmate’s claim (make him get up).**
- 1 = Don’t verify ‘the claim and allow the inmate to stay in bed.’⁷**

Measures of Behavior

Each group of hires in this study participated in a 15-day on-the-job training course, an academy training course, and a performance evaluation. In the academy training the new hire was scored and evaluated on the following: competency in first aid, competency in interpersonal communication: report writing in the academy notebook, punctuality.

7. See Appendix A for the situational questions used in this process

interactions, attentiveness and appearance. In the on-the-job training the new hire was rated by one training officer on the following factors: personal appearance, personality, interest in work, quantity of work, quality of work, dependability, attitude, know-ledge of job, and leadership qualities. An overall additive index score was calculated for both the academy training and for the on-the-job training.

The third measure of job performance was obtained by rating all participants on their job performance in June of 1988. Each participant was rated by a reviewing correctional supervisor on seven dimensions which were developed through the use of the critical incident technique. The reviewing supervisor was asked to rate each correctional officer on a scale of one to five on each dimension; one indicated a "poor" performance on the dimension, and five indicated "outstanding" performance.⁸

Research Questions

As established in the above, the correctional officer in the Sew Generation jail must possess skills commensurate with the requirements of an enriched and demanding job. Consequently! it is quite imperative that the selection process for such correctional facilities be tailored to select persons who possess the critical abilities demanded of the correctional officer job which requires the performance of continuous and prolonged direct supervision of forty or more inmates. Our main research, of course, is determining the degree to which the critical incident-based situational questions add to our ability to predict the scores of candidates in the academy, in the 15-day on-the-job evaluation, and in the performance rating earned after a year in service. We would expect to find evidence

8. See Appendix C for the seven dimensions used in this performance rating.

Introduction

Material contained in the annotated bibliography, "Employee Selection and Performance Appraisal" constitutes an up-to-date collection of scholarly work in the personnel field. The types of materials covered include journal articles, books and a dissertation. The topics of all of these entries converged loosely around the three subject areas of **personnel selection, performance appraisal** and **correctional institution personnel**.

Personnel literature has, as one author put it, gone through several brief stages. In this its current stage, scholars are involved in re-examining some past research and long-held beliefs concerning selection and performance appraisal techniques. For instance, much research pertains to the examination of the impact of regulatory guidelines wrought by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972, the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, and by related court cases in which employee rights and management prerogatives were litigated.

The bibliographic entries were organized in alphabetical order by author within these three subject **areas**. The reasons for this arrangement are two-fold-convention and ease of location. Alphabetical ordering is the mode for most reference and bibliographical materials, so convention was followed here as well. Moreover, assuming that the name of the author is known, authors and articles can be easily located when the annotated bibliography is alphabetically ordered by author. Secondly, placement of the entries under the three general subject areas allows the reader to see a congruence of thought and

research by several authors in one subject area.

Overview

As to its recent focus: the state of the literature on personnel selection, performance appraisal and personnel in corrections would appear to be somewhat in flux. Some scholars are highly critical of the regression in selection techniques-back to interviews-that some organizations have chosen in order to avoid being in the precarious legal position of having to validate their selection tests. At the same time, other scholars urge continued attempts to validate those tests. In addition, some scholars are very critical of performance appraisal systems, while others sing their praises as the only viable means of improving the performance of employees over the long run. The direct effect for public organizations (such as correctional institutions) of this lack of consensus in the literature is that until further research settles some of the more basic questions of legal obligation and efficacy in application, public sector managers will be well advised to keep abreast of the most recent developments in this important area.

Personnel Selection

Daniel: C. (1986) Science, System, Or Hunch: Alternative Approaches.” *Public Personnel Management. 13:* 1-10.

Contemporary employee selection processes are a reflection of the work of those who have followed in the tradition of the scientific management movement of the earlier part of this century. In the tradition of that movement, managers and social scientists have been developing a wide array of creative selection techniques. However, with the application of the federal government’s Equal Employment Opportunity validation standards to these selection techniques (requiring the assessment of the ultimate validity of such techniques) there has been a return to the use of the even less “scientific” interview to assess the relative likely ability of applicants. The author believes this return to interview techniques in the place of innovative testing techniques has been highly detrimental to the selection process, and consequently that this tendency should be reassessed by managers of organizations.

Dyer, F.J. (1981) “An Alternative to Validating Selection Tests.” In Klingner, D.E., ed., *Public Personnel Management*. Palo Alto, California: Slay-field Publishing Company. According to Dyer, in order to avoid any charges of having discriminatory testing programs some organizations have dropped their objective tests and replaced them with interviews; as a result, the quality of employees hired has declined. The problem with interviews is that they cannot accurately assess clerical, mechanical or computational skills; tests are needed for this kind of assessment. The author contends that in order to comply with Title VII, all an employer need do is ensure that the “total

selection procedure” does not adversely impact protected groups in the community: if the “bottom line” is in order, testing procedures need not be validated. In measuring the “adverse impact on protected group?” the employer needs to pay attention to the percent of each of those groups in the community and bring the percentage of those groups in his/her employment up to the community percentages. Although the validation of tests is not required to stay within the law as long as the total selection procedure does not adversely impact protected groups, the author recommends that validation still be carried out when possible. The use of a valid test, however, is the only certain means of making-sure that an organization is in fact hiring the most qualified applicants.

Farrell, B.M. (1986) “The Art and Science of Employment Interviews.” *Personnel Journal*. **63**: 91.

There are some (mainly academic researchers) who assert that interviews tend to be based heavily on subjective, gut-level reactions to applicants rather than on objective criteria; others (primarily practitioners) see the interview as the most effective practical way of assessing the ability of applicants. In order to address these conflicting point, of view in a constructive fashion, the author proposes standardization of interviews in a careful manner.

Frank, E.J. (1980) “Reviewing the Obvious of Content Validation.” *Public Personnel Management*. **9**: 278-281.

Frank confronts some of the common problems faced by jurisdictions wishing to develop job analysis devices that can be utilized to construct and validate selection

of a positive association between our dependent variables (**On-the-job, Academy and Performance**) and our independent variables **Situational** and **After Situational** (abbreviated as sit and aftersit in the tables). More importantly, we would expect that the addition of the situational questions to the interview would result in an improvement in prediction of success in the academy, success on early job placement: and success on the job one year or more later. We expect to find that a comparison of overall board ratings for the two types of interviews (labeled **Total** for the first group and **Final** for the second group) would show that the second group produces a stronger positive relationship with the dependent performance variables.⁹ Finally, research indicates that ratings based on discussion of the applicant among the panel of selection interviewers where consensus is reached yields higher validities (Silverman and Wexley, 1987). Therefore, we expected that the rating given after discussion and consensus is reached by the interviewers (in the second group only) would positively correlate with the dependent variables.

Discussion and Analysis

Findings

Table 1 sets forth a comparison of personal and background characteristics for correctional officers in the group selected without the situational interview and the group selected with the situational interview. As illustrated by this table, the two groups are highly similar in composition, with only slight percentage differences on a few factors.

9. The independent variable Final represents cumulative ratings for the second group where the interviewer is asked to rate the applicant after the rest of the interview is completed. The first group cumulative rating is also arrived at by the interviewers after the interview has been completed.

Table 1
Distribution of Correctional Officer Characteristics

<i>Characteristic</i>	<i>First Group</i> Without Questions	<i>Second Group</i> <i>With Questions</i>
NUMBER OF CASES:		
N	36	33
AGE:		
Mean	33.9	34.0
Standard Deviation	6.8	10.4
SEX:		
Female	22.6%	27.6
Male	77.4	72.4
RACE:		
White	90.3%	93.1
Black	0.0	6.9
Hispanic	3.2	0.0
Other	6.5	0.0
EDUCATION:		
Less than high school	3.2%	0.0
High school or GED	16.1	34.5
Some college, technical school or AA	38.1	38.6
Four year degree	19.4	6.9
Masters degree or above	3.2	0.0
RELEVANT EXPERIENCE:		
Military	16.1%	24.1
Law enforcement	12.9	3.4
Security Officer	22.6	13.8
Correctional Experience	3.2	6.9
None	45.2	31.7

The relationship between the independent variables in the first group and the dependent variables is delineated in Table 2.¹⁰ While only military experience appears

¹⁰. The Pearson's Correlation Coefficient (r) is used here to determine the degree of association. The reader should bear in mind when perusing these correlations that the range of applicants included in this study is necessarily restricted. The hiring process for the Spokane jail, as in most organizations, is a sifting process; those applicants who

strongly related (though not statistically significant) to success at the academy, temperament and poise are significantly correlated to the 15-day on-the-job evaluations and the appearance variable is significantly correlated with the performance variable. The latter relationship is particularly troubling inasmuch as out of all of the independent variables included in the first group selection process, appearance is the **most vulnerable** to **legal challenge**. Despite the stated criteria for rating appearance ("appears neat and well groomed" or "spends little time on appearance") use of the measure necessarily entails ratings based on attributes that individual applicants have relatively little control over—namely: their race: gender? age or physical impairment. The nebulous qualities of what constitutes "good looks" undoubtedly include those personal likes and dislikes that make us all unique individuals, but which likely have little to do with doing a good job. Consequently, the need to develop a selection process that does not assign a major role to appearance becomes a matter of consequence.

survive the first two phases of the process are graduated to the interviewer phase and, of course: only those who were hired were sent to the academy, trained on the job and given a performance evaluation. Therefore, since those persons who were hired ostensibly represent the "best" of those who applied for the job of correctional officer in Spokane, the correlations presented here may be correspondingly attenuated.

Table 2
Without-the-Situational-Interview Group Correlations

		<i>Academy</i>	<i>On-the-job Performance</i>
Appearance	-.136	.017	.455‡
Personality	.071	.279	.267
Temperament	.002	.329‡	.209
Poise	-.004	.354‡	.295
Maturity	.039	.245	.165
Judgement	.227	.194	.283
Experience	.217	.179	.076
Aptitude	.029	.195	.123
Military*	.369	.200	-.187
Preparation	-.038	.003	.084
Confidence	.131	.138	.294
Total	.114	.144	.148

++Statistically significant at .03 level.

*There were only 13 applicants with military experience.

The third table reports the strength of the linear relationships between the dependent Variables used to assess performance with the situational interview group independent Variables. These findings suggest that the individual situational question answers are far less important than the composite after situational ratings¹¹ in predicting high academy performance, and they are also less important than the file, general. final or discussion ratings in predicting success on the 15-day initial job placement (On-the-job).¹² However, **the situational questions are more strongly related to success on the job a year or more later (Performance) than any other independent variable in this**

II. The after situational ratings are post-session perceptions gained by the interviewers as a result of hearing applicants respond to the entire set of five situational questions.

12. None of the independent variables are significantly correlated with the academy variable: the file and discussion variables are significantly correlated with the on-the-job variable. and only the situational variable is significantly correlated with the one-year-plus performance variable.

group. In fact, of all of the independent variables in this group, the situational ratings are the only ones whose correlation with measures of job performance grew over time: the other independent variable correlations with the dependent variable decreased.

Table 3
Situational Interview Group Correlations

	<i>Academy</i>	<i>On-the-job</i>	<i>Performance</i>
N=33			
File	.133	.312++	-.129
General	.133	.305	.125
Sit	.184	.00-1	.373++
Aftersit	.249	.304	.227
Final	.156	.353	.189
Discussion	.197	.380++	.154

Statistically significant at .05 level.

A comparison between the cumulative ratings' (Total and Final) predictive quality is presented in Table 4. As illustrated by this table, the Final rating was more highly correlated with all of the dependent variables than was the comparison Total ratings, indicating that the inclusion of the situational questions likely improves the overall predictability of the selection instrument for each of these performance measures employed.

Table 4
Summary Comparison of Interview Score Predictive Quality for With and Without Situational Questions

	<i>Academy</i>	<i>On-the- Job</i>	<i>Performance</i>
First Group			
Total	.114	.144	.148
Second Group			
Final	.156	.353	.189

Tables 3 and 6 report the inter-rater agreement reliability coefficients (Pearson's cor-

relation coefficient r) for the three raters in the first and second group interview conditions. The inter-rater agreement reliability measure is assessed in order to determine the degree of consistency between raters achieved in evaluating all thirty-three applicants. Low levels of agreement among raters is considered to constitute evidence that an assortment of interviewer biases might be operating (e.g., contrast error, similar to me:” first impression. and halo) (Maurer and Fay, 1988). If this were the case, interview ratings likely would be reflective of something related to the interview structure or the interviewer as opposed to reflecting the ability of the applicant to do the job. When appraising an incumbent employee, a correlation of .60 is considered respectable; on this point Latham and Wexley argue that when “the agreement is less than .60...it is likely that the appraisal is not measuring the employee’s performance, but rather the different attitudes and biases of the appraisers” (1982: 66). Given that the raters in this case were evaluating a job applicant based on a short interview rather than a history of employment spanning-months or years. a correlation perhaps as low as .31 (correlation between Raters 2 and 3 in Table 3) should be considered acceptable.

Table 5

Inter-rater Agreement Reliability Coefficients For the Without-the-Situational-Interview Group

	<i>Rater 1</i>	<i>Rater 2</i>	<i>Rater 3</i>
Rater 1	—	.680‡	.632‡
Rater 2	.680‡	—	.511‡
Rater 3	.632‡	.511‡	—

++Statistically significant at .05 level.

Table 6

Inter-rater Agreement Reliability Coefficients For the Situational Interview Group

	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3
Rater 1	- -	-.696 t	-.111, t
Rater 2	.653++		.548++
Rater 3	.711++	.548++	

++Statistically significant at .05 level.

The inter-rater agreement reliability coefficients for select second group independent variables are displayed in Tables 7 through 10.¹³ By comparison, the situational question raters (Table i) and the discussion raters (Table 10) have the highest overall level of inter-rater agreement. One would expect high agreement scores between the discussion raters inasmuch as they are instructed to reach consensus on their final ratings. However, high agreement between the situational raters is a more unexpected finding, and may be indicative of the power of such questions to channel agreement between raters on applicant ability to perform the job.¹⁴

Table 7

Inter-rater Agreement Reliability Coefficients For the Situational Questions

	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3
Rater 1		.639++	.645++
Rater 2	.639++	- -	.146++
Rater 3	.645++	.416++	

++Statistically significant at .03 level.

13. These variables were selected solely because they have the most relevance in terms of the impact of the situational questions on the interview process.

14. Maurer and Fay (1988: 339) made a similar discovery when they found that the situational interview is " ...more effective than conventional structured interview in producing agreement about job applicants among raters..."

Table 8
Inter-rater Reliability Coefficients For the After Situational Ratings

	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3
Rater 1	- -	.361++	.643++
Rater 2	.361++		.261
Rater. 3	.643++	.261	- -

++Statistically significant at .03 level.

Table 9
Inter-rater Agreement Reliability Coefficients For the Final Ratings

	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3
Rater 1	- -	.461++	.665++
Rater 2	.467:		.321
Rater 3	.663++	.321	- -

++Statistically significant at .05 level.

Table 10
Inter-rater Agreement Reliability Coefficients For the Discussion Ratings

	Rater 1	Rater 2	Rater 3
Rater 1	—	.758++†	.696++†
Rater 2	.758++	- -	.632:
Rater 3	.696++	.632++	

++Statistically significant at .05 level.

In Table 11 the average intercorrelations among the composite elements composing several second group independent variables is reported. A clear difference is in evidence between the mean intercorrelation of the five situational questions and the mean intercor-

relations of the other second group multi-item index variables; the high intercorrelations of the other variables indicates the presence of a single hidden dimension of variance underlying each particular measure. Low intercorrelations between the composite rating criteria, however, are traditionally considered in a positive light-as demonstrating evidence of a lack of halo error and as providing evidence that applicants are being rated on several different, independent job dimensions (Latham and Wexley, 1982).

Table 11

Average Intercorrelations For Select Multi-item Index Variables for the Situational Interview Group

	<i>Sit</i>	<i>Aftersit</i>	<i>Final</i>	<i>Discussion</i>
Situational Questions	.090			
After Situational Ratings		.728		
Final Rating			.760	
Discussion Ratings				.741

Table 12 reports the correlations between each of the situational questions and the dependent variables. It is evident from this table that questions one and four have the strongest linear relationship with the job performance evaluation taken a year or more after placement. Such a finding has potential for practical application in directing the performance specialist in how to hone the selection instrument to its most predictive and valid elements.

Table 12
Dependent Variable Correlation Coefficients With the Five Situational Questions

<i>Variable</i>	1	2	3	4	5
On-The-Job	-.093	.064	-.038	.256	-.126
Academy	.184	-.094	.194	-.046	.166
Performance	.468‡	-.060	.038	.332	.214

‡Statistically significant at .05 level.

In sum, the findings from this analysis indicate that the situational interview technique is better at predicting long term job performance than at predicting success on initial job placement for correctional officers in a Sew Generation jail. Since the situational question ratings are job-based and do not hinge on the attribution of traits (e.g., appearance) to applicants as our comparison selection procedures did, they are less vulnerable to legal challenge. Moreover: we found that inclusion of the situational questions improves, in a cumulative sense: the ability of a selection instrument to predict effective behavior at the academy, on-the-job, and on a year+ evaluation. Finally, there is some indication that the situational questions are measuring several distinct dimensions of job behavior, creating confidence that content validity is being served by the addition of the five situational questions to the standardized interview process.

Implications and Recommendations For Further Analysis

The situational interview questions employed in this study appear to have content validity because they were created via a systematic job analysis and were judged as appropriate and related to effective job behaviors by a panel of Sew Generation jail correctional personnel. Furthermore, psychometric analysis of the five situational questions suggests

that each question gets at a distinct dimension of performance- -as would be expected from the critical incident methodology employed. In addition, analysis of criterion validity data indicates that the situational interview process, particularly the situational questions themselves, have some predictive validity over the long term. That is, high scores on the situational question ratings were correlated (.37) with high performance on the job after a year of service.

The job of the correctional officer in a Sew Generation Jail can be both demanding and enriching. The ability to lead, supervise and interact with inmates in the confines of a pod requires that a correctional officer possess substantial “people” skills. In order to screen for these skills among applicants, and in order to forestall legal charges for discriminatory hiring practices, the selection process should be demonstrably job-related and subject to validation. The findings from this analysis demonstrate that the situational interview instrument has the potential to meet the twin challenges of creating a validated, job-related selection device for the correctional officer position in Sew Generation jails. However, it is necessary that more data at different sites be collected to further document the predictive validity of situational interviews. A single location study is instructive, but it cannot provide the level of confirmation required for broader generalizations. This analysis will also be greatly strengthened by the addition of more long term performance appraisal information to the existing data available on Spokane County correctional officers.

The findings presented here are particularly timely given the recent Supreme Court ruling in **Watson v. Fort Worth Bank and Trust**, 108 S. Ct. 2777 (1988). In this unanimous opinion, the court agreed with the plaintiff that a disparate impact analysis may

be applied “...to a subjective or discretionary promotion system in claims of a violation of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act” (Adams, 1988). Although the court did not go so far as to say all promotional practices must be validated to the same degree as formal selection and promotion tests: it did hold that informal selection tests such as the oft-used interview must be standardized and uniformly administered to avoid discrimination charges made on the basis of disparate impact in protected classes of applicants and/or employees. The situational interview may well represent a highly useful middle ground for public employers- -providing some of the much needed flexibility to assess the more intangible aspects of fitness for service and- -at the same time- providing enough standardization and uniformity of process to pass muster with the courts in the case of contested outcomes. At the very least, the findings reported here indicate the wisdom of further research in this area of newly immediate concern to public sector managers.

References

- Adams. J. (1988) "Legal Developments Supreme Court Decides Status of Subjective Procedures: Watson Prevails." In ***International Personnel Management Association Assessment Council News***. **12(2): 7-8**.
- Clear. T.D. and G.F. Cole (1986) American ***Corrections***. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Cloward, R.A. (1968) "Social Control in the Prison." In Hazelrigg, L., eds., ***Prison Within Society***. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc.
- Daniel, C. (1986) "Science, System, or Hunch: Alternative Approaches to Improving Employee Selection." ***Public Personnel Management***. **15(1): 1-10**.
- Davey, B.W. (1984) "Personnel Testing and the Search for Alternatives." ***Public Personnel Management***. **13(-1): 361-374**.
- Dyer, F.J. (1981) "An Alternative to Validating Selection Tests." In Klingner, D.E., eds., ***Public Personnel Management***. Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing Co.
- Etzioni. A. (1961) A ***Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations***. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc.
- Flanagan. J.C. (1934) "The Critical Incident Technique." ***Psychological Bulletin***. **51(4): 327-358**.
- Frank. E.J. Dr. (1980) "Reviewing the Obvious of Content Validation." ***Public Personnel Management***. **9(4): 278-281**.
- Green, S.B. and T. Stutzman, (1986) "An Evaluation of Methods to Select Respondents to Structured Job-Analysis." ***Personnel Psychology***. **39(3): 543-364**.
- Gettinger, S.H. (1984) ***New Generation Jails: An Innovative Approach to an Age-Old Problem***. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Corrections.
- Ghiselli, E.E. (1966) "The Validity of a Personnel Interview." ***Personnel Psychology***. **19(4): 389-395**.
- Goffman, E. (1961) ***Asylums***. Garden City, N.Y.: .Anchor Books.
- Guion. R.N. (1987) "Changing Views for Personnel Selection Research." ***Personnel Psychology***. **40(2): 199-213**.

- Hackman, J.R., and G.R. Oldham (1974) ***The Job Diagnostic Survey: An Instrument for the Diagnosis of Jobs and the Evaluation of Job Redesign*** Projects. Technical Report So. 4, Department of Administrative Sciences, Yale University.
- Hackman, J.R., G.R. Oldham, R. Janson and K. Purdy (1981) "A New Strategy, for Job Enrichment." In Klingner, D.E., eds., ***Public Personnel Management***. Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Latham, G.P., C.H. Fay, and L.M. Saari (1979) "The Development of Behavioral Observation Scales For Appraising the Performance of Foremen." ***Personnel Psychology***. **32(2)**: 299-311.
- Latham, G.P., L.M. Saari, E.D. Pursell and M.A. Campion (1980) "The Situational Interview." ***Journal of Applied Psychology***. **65(4)**: 422-427.
- Latham, G.P. and K. W. Wexley (1982) "Behavioral Observation Scales For Performance Appraisal Purposes." ***Personnel Psychology***. **30(2)**: 253-268.
- Latham, G.P. and K.S. Wexley (1982) ***Increasing Productivity Through Performance Appraisal***. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wexley Publishing Company.
- Latham, G.P., K.S. Wexley, and E.D. Purcell (1973) "Training Managers to Minimize Rating Errors in the Observation of Behavior." ***Journal of Applied Psychology***. **60(s)**: 550-553.
- Maas, J.B. (1963) "Patterned Scaled Expectation Interview: Reliability Studies on a New Technique." ***Journal of Applied Psychology***. 49(6):431-433.
- Maurer, S.D. and C. Fay (1988) "Effect of Situational Interviews, Conventional Structured Interviews, and Training On Interview Rating Agreement: An Experimental Analysis." ***Personnel Psychology***. **41(2)**: 329-344.
- Mayfield, E.C. (1964) "The Selection Interview- A Re-Evaluation of Published Research." ***Personnel Psychology***. 17(3): 239-260.
- O'Hara, K. and K.G. Love (1987) "Accurate Selection of Police Officers Within Small Municipalities: 'Et tu Assessment Center?'" ***Public Personnel Management***. 16(1): 9- 14.
- Reid, S.T. (1976) ***Crime and Criminology***. Hinsdale, Illinois: The Dryden Press.
- Robertson, D.E. (1981) "New Directions in EEO Guidelines." In Klingner, D.E., eds., ***Public Personnel Management***. Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing Company.

- Schmidt, F.L., B.P. Ocasio, J.M. Hillery, and J.E. Hunter (1983) "Further Within-Setting Empirical Tests of the Situational Specificity Hypothesis in Personnel Selection." ***Personnel Psychology***. **38(3): 309-324.**
- Silverman, S.B. and K.S. Wexley (1987) "The Selection Interview: Some Reasons for Optimism." ***Personnel Assessment Monograph***. Published by the Assessment Council of the International Personnel Management Association.
- Smith, P.C. and L.M. Kendall (1963) "Retranslation of Expectations: An Approach to the Construction of Unambiguous Anchors for Rating Scales." ***Journal of Applied Psychology***. **47(2): 149-135.**
- Spokane Sheriff's Office, Jail Division (1986) "Personnel Administration in New Generation Jails." Grant #GD-9 from the National Institute of Corrections.
- Springer, J.P. (1982) "The Importance of Selection in Public Sector Administration." ***Public Personnel Management***. 11(1): 9- 12.
- Sproule. C.F. (1984) "Should Personnel Tests Be Used on a Pass-Fail, Grouping, or Ranking Basis?" ***Public Personnel Management***. 13(4): 313-394.
- Stohr-Gillmore, U.K. "Inmate Perceptions of Sew Generation Jails," Unpublished M.A.. Washington State University, May 1987.
- Sykes, **G-11. (1958) *The Society of Captives***. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Thomas, J.C. and W.D. Heisel (1983) "The Modernization of Recruitment and Selection in Local Governments." In Hays, S.W. and R.C. Kearney, eds., ***Public Personnel Administration***. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Ulrich. L. and D. Trumbo (1965) "The Selection Interview Since 1949." ***Psychological Bulletin***. **63(2): 100-116.**
- Wagner, R. (1949) "The Employment Interview: A Critical Summary." ***Personnel Psychology***. **2(1): 17-46.**
- Wernimont, P.F. and J.P. Campbell (1968) "Signs, Samples, and Criteria." ***Journal of Applied Psychology***. **52(j): 372-376.**
- Zupan, L. "The Sew Generation Correctional Philosophy: An Implementation Analysis and Impact Evaluation," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Washington State University, August 1987.
- Zupan. L. and B. Menke "Implementing Organizational Change: From Traditional to Sew Generation Jail Operations." Scheduled for publication the ***Policy Studies Journal***.

Appendix A The Situational Questions

Question #1: A facility- rule states that inmates will be out of bed at 7:00 a.m. in the morning. In making your morning inspection of the module you notice that an inmate is still in bed. When you order him to get up he states that an officer on another shift has given him permission to stay in bed because he has a cold. What would you do:
5=Verify the claim of the inmate by looking for documentation (paperwork) or contacting the officer.

3=Call your supervisor and ask him/her whether it's okay for the inmate to stay in bed or ask him/her what to do.

1=Follow the rule of the facility without checking on the inmate's claim (make him get up).

OR

1=Don't verify the claim and allow the inmate to stay in bed.

Question #2: During your morning inspection with breakfast about to arrive, you notice that an inmate's bed is unmade. This is a violation of the facility rules. You believe it's a new inmate's cell. What would you do?

3=I would stop immediately and call the inmate over. Because it is the inmate's first day in the module, I would explain the rule to the inmate. give him/her a verbal warning, document the violation and ensure that s/he complies immediately and in the the future with the rule.

3=1 would wait until after breakfast or later to order the inmate to make his/her bed. (.Applicant gives no indication that s/he would explain the rule or the violation to the inmate.)

OR

3=After breakfast I would tell the inmate that I would let it pass this one time-after all. s/he is new to the module. (Applicant gives no indication the s/he would explain the rule or the violation to the inmate.)

1=I would ignore the rule violation-after all, s/he is new to the module.

OR

1=I would punish him/her. (Applicant indicates some excessive form of punishment such as lockdown.)

Question #3: An inmate in your module who has been charged with rape of a 10-year old girl asks to speak with you in private. When you meet he tells you that other inmates have threatened him and that he fears for his safety. What would you do?

3=Verify the claim; communicate and demonstrate a willingness to protect the inmate. Remove him from the module if necessary.

3=Tell the inmate that you'll keep an eye open to any signs of trouble, but wait until something actually happens before taking action.

1=Ignore the inmate or lie to him (tell him you'll watch out for any trouble but then ignore him. After all, he deserves whatever he gets).

Question #4: A facility rule states that inmate telephone calls are limited to 10 minutes. An inmate in your module has been on the telephone talking with his girlfriend for 15 minutes. Other inmates are waiting impatiently to use the telephone. When you order him to hang up he asks to see a supervisor before he will do so. What do you

do?

5=Say "no" to the inmate's request to see the supervisor, **AND** explain the facilities rule limiting the duration of telephone calls and why the rule is necessary.

3=Negotiate with the inmate (example-If you get off the telephone. I'll call the supervisor").

1=Call the supervisor as the inmate requests, allow him to continue the call until the supervisor arrives.

OR

1=Let the inmate continue with his conversation; do nothing.

Question #5: Inmates in the module you supervise are committing numerous **minor** rule violations. For example, they are not keeping the module clean, they are slow to get up in the morning, etc. How would you **correct** these minor violations?

5=Hold a meeting with all inmates in the module. Communicate your expectations. Advise them of the consequences of continued problems.

3=Communicate your dissatisfaction with only a few inmates-they will pass the word to other inmates.

1=Discipline all inmates in the module for these rule violations.

Appendix B

Categories and Criteria For the Selection Process Without the Situational Interview

1. Appearance, Grooming: (appears neat and well groomed), (spends little time on appearance)
2. Personality Projection: (projects a strong personality), (personality is weak)
3. Temperament: (cool and calm under pressure), (easily angered-little self-control)
4. Poise: (well poised under pressure). (nervous: lacks self-confidence)
3. Maturity: (very mature for his/her age): (lacks maturity? needs to grow up more)
6. Judgment: (appears to use good judgment in answers to situation questions)! (appears to lack good judgment)
7. Employment Experience: (has previous law enforcement experience), (work experience does not relate to law enforcement)
8. Police Aptitude: (appears to be good future officer material), (does not appear to be good officer material)
9. Military Experience: (if the applicant has military experience, does it relate to law enforcement), (may be n/a- -no military experience)
10. Career Preparation: (formal education and experience related to law enforcement), (no preparation toward law enforcement career)
11. Self-Confidence: (appears self-confident and able to handle self in critical situations), (lacks confidence in ability to adapt to and handle critical situations)

Appendix C

Correctional Officer Performance Rating Form

Rating Scale: 1=Poor. 2=Below Average, 3=Average, 4=Above Average, 5=Outstanding

1. **Resolving Inmate Problems and Conflicts:** The extent to which the corrections officer provides guidance for the solution of inmate problems.
2. **Building Positive Rapport and Personal Credibility With Inmates:** The extent to which the corrections officer creates an environment of mutual respect by being consistent and courteous.
3. **Maintaining Effective Administrative and Staff Relations:** The extent to which the corrections officer consistently applies facility rules and procedures. coordinates activity with co-workers, supports staff authority and communicates with supervisors.
4. **Managing the Living Unit to Assure a Safe and Humane Environment:** The extent to which the corrections officer uses observation and communication to maximize compliant inmate behavior.
5. **Responding to Inmate Requests:** The extent to which the corrections officer effectively responds to inmate requests and demands in a fair and balanced fashion while avoiding inmate manipulation.
6. **Handling Inmate Discipline:** The extent to which the corrections officer responds fairly and effectively when disciplining inmates for disruptive behavior or rule violations.
7. **Supervising in a Clear, Well-Organized and Attention-Getting Manner:** The extent to which the corrections officer exhibits effective skill in organizing, supervising and motivating inmates in their activities.

APPENDIX D

Employee Selection and Performance Appraisal in Correctional Institutions:
An Annotated Bibliography

procedures. For instance, when faced with small sample sizes for job analysis, and in order to avoid the inherent validity and reliability problems associated with small sample sizes, Frank suggests that a jurisdiction use those persons who-while the) may be “tangential” to the job-are also well versed in what it requires. Therefore, persons involved in job analysis research might include not only those employees who do the job and their immediate supervisor, but also the supervisor’s superior and others (e.g. peers, those with like duties, etc.). Frank also suggests that in order to improve sampling methodology when doing a job analysis for the development of selection techniques, a variety of persons or panel members should participate rather than the same group of persons throughout the research. Moreover, the sample should be representative of the entire population; that is, samples that are convenient to take (e.g., geographically or in terms of cooperation) may not necessarily be valid. Beyond addressing the problems involved in sampling when doing a job analysis, Frank describes the various phases of the job analysis and a sample format for the final report.

Ghiselli, E.E. (1966) “The Validity of a Personnel Interview.” *Personnel Psychology*. 19: 389-395.

The author describes the ridicule that the personnel interview has faced in the past, primarily because studies conducted more than a half-century ago indicated that the selection interview had little if any reliability or validity. In addition, many involved in personnel selection have regarded the selection interview with suspicion because of its “nebulous and intangible character”-that is, the selection interview is generally unstandardized, with variation in content from one applicant to the next

(p. 389). It was the author's contention, however, that the ordinary personnel interview- -when properly structured by similar relevant questions-could be made valid. What the author demonstrated with his research was that "...it can be said that the ordinary personnel interview is not necessarily and invariably invalid. but rather that its validity may be at least equal to, if not greater than, the validity of tests" (p. 394).

Green, S.B. and T. Stutzman (1986) "An Evaluation of Methods to Select Respondents to Structured Job-Analysis Questionnaires." *Personnel Psychology*. **39: 543-364.**

This article focuses on the job-analysis respondent. The authors challenge the assumption that when doing a job-analysis with incumbent job holders the errors are random, and when averaged over many employees cancel each other out. Instead the authors claim that the errors may be systematic rather than random.

Job incumbents have, to some extent, different formal and/or informal requirements associated with their jobs. Depending on their knowledge, skills, and abilities, these incumbents may perform the job differently to optimize their benefits. Also, incumbents with certain backgrounds may perform a job better than others. Job raters are supposed to be able to synthesize all this information so they can make accurate judgements about jobs. Undoubtedly they produce not only random errors within this complex context, but also constant errors by having shared, distorted perceptions about the rated jobs. Therefore, until empirically demonstrated, researchers should not assume that job descriptions based on a broad range of data are accurate, even if the job-analysis ratings are obtained from the entire population of job incumbents and/or supervisors (p. 344).

Faced with this potential bias by job incumbents, the authors engaged in research to specify methods that "...could be used to select job-analysis respondents" (p. 547).

One method explored involved the use of background information, performance and other organizational information to select job-analysis respondents. Another method involved collection of job-analysis data from all potential job-analysis respondents: and on the basis of indices computed from this data selecting only a subsample of

these respondents. Based on the results of their research, the authors propose the following four postulates: “(1) different selection measures yield somewhat different job-analysis respondents; (2) respondents are not equally accurate and may be screened for the tendency to make errors using a carelessness index; (3) in some applications, the number of sampled respondents needs to be greater than three in order to obtain reliable results; (4) to the degree that the job is ill-defined and unstable, the selection of job-analysis respondents assumes greater importance and is riskier” (p. 358).

Latham, G.P., Saari, L.M., Pursell, E.D. and M.A. Campion (1980) “The Situational Interview.” *Journal of Applied Psychology*. **63: 422-427**.

In this article the authors explain that selection interviews are used by most employers in the United States despite widespread knowledge that they typically lack validity and reliability. Interviews often lack reliability because questions are not standardized from one applicant to the next. The authors assert, however, that there is hope for the selection interview if it can be fashioned so that it elicits a sample of likely reactions to actual job behaviors required of employees. The underlying assumption is that what a person says (intentions) is related to actual behavior if s/he is hired for the job in question.

The authors contend that the “situational interview,” which is based on the “critical incident technique” method of job analysis, is an answer to the problems inherent in the typical selection interview. That is, with this technique job applicants are asked standard questions about how they would behave in a given job situation. The answers are benchmarked in advance of the interview and rated independently by two

or more interviewers on a Likert-type scale. Based on their findings from the three studies conducted using the situational interview which is described in this article. the authors conclude that the situational interview is both valid and reliable based on the following (p. -426):

1. **First, the interview questions are derived from the results of a systematic job analysis. A representative sampling of job situations is incorporated in the interview questions. Thus, the content validity of the procedure appears to be satisfactory as judged by job experts.**
2. **Second, the face validity of the procedure is ensured by asking only job-related questions.**
3. **Third, focusing on the interviewers' experience with a wide range of interviewee responses, and choosing among these responses to develop a scoring key to anchor 1, 3, and 5 answers, may have increased the interobserver reliability and validity of the procedure.**
4. **Fourth, both the selection and the performance appraisal instruments were based on overt employee behavior rather than traits or economic constructs.**

In addition, the authors state that the training of raters may well have some effect on the validity coefficients. That is! training raters may minimize rating errors and thus increase the validity coefficients of predictors.

Maas, J.B. (1965) "Patterned Scaled Expectation Interview: Reliability Studies On a New Technique." *Journal of Applied Psychology*. **49: 43** 1-433.

In this research the author describes attempts to increase the reliability of the patterned interview by "...developing a meaningful, consistent rating scale" (p. 431).¹ Comparison between the rating of traits appropriate to a given job was made between a patterned scaled expectation technique (where the levels of the trait were numerically weighted with a high, low and average examples of the degree of a trait) and a patterned adjective rating scale (where the rating scale for each trait included Very Good, Good, Average, Poor, and Very Poor). The former method of interviewing

1. The patterned interview is defined as "...one with well-defined criteria for selection an interview guide based on questions that might predict how well the candidate rates on these criteria, well-trained interviewers, and a suitable rating scale for assessing information obtained from candidates" (p. 431).

was found significantly more reliable in producing agreement between raters.

Nayfield, E.C. (1964) "The Selection Interview-A Re-Evaluation of Published Research."

Personnel Psychology. 17: 239-260.

The author presents an overview of previous research on the selection interview. He concludes that there is much evidence that the selection interview is considered in many quarters as unreliable and invalid. He notes, however, that actual research done on the selection interview is rather sparse, and the results of the available studies are often not cumulative. The author concludes with the following points (p. 248):

1. The interview can be divided into various types of units, and this can be done reliably.
2. The intra-rater reliability of the interview appears to be satisfactory.
3. An interviewer is consistent in his approach to different interviewees; the techniques he uses remain fairly constant.
4. A general suitability rating based on an unstructured interview with no prior information provided has extremely low inter-rater reliability, especially in an employment situation.
5. In an unstructured interview, material is not consistently answered.
6. When interviewers obtain the same information, they are likely to interpret or weight it differently.
7. Structured interviews, in general, provide a higher inter-rater reliability than do unstructured interviews.
8. Although the reliabilities of interviews may be high in given situations, the validities obtained are usually of a low magnitude.
9. When an individual interviewer has tests of proven validity available, his predictions based on the interview and the test scores are generally no more (and frequently less) accurate than those based on the test scores alone.
10. With respect to traits or characteristics which can be estimated reliably and validly from interviews, it seems that only the intelligence or mental ability of the interviewee can be judged satisfactorily.
11. The form of the question does affect the answer obtained.
12. The attitudes of interviewers do affect their interpretation of what the interviewee says.
13. In the usual unstructured employment interview, the interviewer talks more than does the interviewee.
14. Interviewers appear to be influenced more by unfavorable than favorable information.
15. Interviewers tend to make their decision early in an unstructured interview.

Prien, E.P. (1981) "The Function of Job Analysis in Content Validation." In Klingner, D.E., ed., **Public Personnel Management**. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Company.

The importance of careful attention to "systematic and precise methods" in job analysis is exhorted by the author (p. 149). Prien is concerned with the fact that although there are several methods of job analysis, the content validity of these methods is rarely challenged. In particular, the author is anxious about the content validity of personnel selection procedures. The author makes the tentative observation that worker-orientated job analysis data (including critical incident techniques) is more subject to contamination than is task-orientated data. The author summarizes his findings with the statement that at this point there doesn't appear to be any particular method of job analysis that is markedly superior to any other method. In order to control for possible contamination of worker-orientated data, however, the author recommends that multiple methods of job analysis be used and that the task-orientated approach be used in selection research.

Schmidt, F.L., Ocasio, B.P., and Hillery, J.N. and J.E. Hunter (1985) "Further Within-Setting Empirical Tests of the Situational Specificity Hypothesis in Personnel Selection." **Personnel Psychology**. **38**: 509-32-1.

The authors dispute the "Situational Specificity Hypothesis" which holds that "...variation in observed validity coefficients across studies for the same test and job is due to subtle variations from setting to setting in what constitutes job performance" (p. 309). Therefore, this hypothesis forecasts that if the setting of the job analysis does not vary, then the validity coefficients do not vary. The authors, however, re-

port findings that directly dispute the specificity hypothesis. By using meta-analysis to cumulate diverse research findings, the authors found that the variation between studies in validity coefficients for similar jobs is explained by artifacts such as sampling error rather than the differences, between settings of the studies. Simply put, the authors believe that the small samples (30 to 50) condoned by the proponents of the specificity hypothesis were the cause of the sampling error.

Silverman, S.B. and K.S. **Wexley** (1987) *Personnel Assessment Monographs*. Assessment Council of the International Personnel Management Association.

Although the authors acknowledge some legitimacy to criticism of the traditional selection interview as unreliable and invalid, they offer alternative evidence that the unstructured selection interview's reliability and validity can be improved greatly over their customary levels. First, Silverman and Wexley present the findings of other scholars which indicate that panel interviews structured interviews, and interviews whose content is job-related have higher validity coefficients than those interviews conducted by one person, that are unstructured, and whose content is psychologically oriented. Secondly, they identify 12 common sources of bias in the selection interview, and suggest how they might be mitigated by attending to the content of the interview and the proper training of interviewers.² The authors recommend that the interview content be developed via use of the critical incident technique (see the Flanagan, 1954 annotation). Use of such a technique would assist in the identification of effective and ineffective behaviors that are critical to job performance. Once

2. The 12 sources of bias identified by the authors include: halo, first-impressions, similar-to-me, contrast, stereotyping, trait attributions, interviewer experience, unfavorable information, interviewer accountability, pressure to hire, last impressions and non-verbal behavior (pp. 6-7).

identified, these job behaviors are converted by job experts into interview questions expressed as hypothetical job situations. The experts also provide benchmarked answers on a 5-point rating scale, with 5 being “good,” 3 being “minimally acceptable,” and 1 being “poor.” These scales are used as a scoring guide for the interviewers in rating the applicant’s responses. Interviews whose content is structured in this way are found to be more valid and reliable than those interview processes lacking these characteristics.

Training to improve the rating practices of interviewers is also recommended as a productive means to reduce interviewer bias. The authors found that a workshop method of training in which trainees rate videotaped job applicants during an interview is the most successful method for reducing selection bias.

Smith, P.C. and L.M. Kendall (1963) “Retranslation of Expectations: An Approach to the Construction of Unambiguous Anchors For Rating Scales.” *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 47: 149-135.

The authors tested an evaluative rating scale which was anchored by examples of expected behavior. The expectations were based on past similar behavior and were allocated to a given dimension and retained if the supervisors (head nurses) deemed them appropriate examples of subordinate (nurses) behavior. They found agreement on the allocation of examples and high scale reliability. The authors recommend the use of this procedure whenever job behaviors are comparable from one situation to another.

Springer, J.P. (1982) "The Importance of Selection in Public Sector Administration.

Public Personnel Management. 11: 9-12.

The author discusses the importance of selection for the administration of the public sector. He notes that the selection process in the public sector is not of paramount interest to most elected officials unless and until a crisis in selection (e.g., a EEO class action suit with large monetary settlements involved) occurs. Yet Springer argues that the monetary cost of poor selection decisions for the public agency over the work life of the hiree can be astronomical. Therefore, he contends that "...there is a critical need for translating validation research into dollar benefit; that is, demonstrate to the policymakers using their language, that the time and money needed to develop quality examinations is a prudent expenditure of public funds...an expenditure which can be clearly justified on a dollar basis" (p. 10). For instance, in Springer's own research it was found that high selection test scorers (top 10%) required less disciplinary action. Similarly, he found that high test scorers tended to be absent less often. Considering just these two factors (disciplinary action and absenteeism) and leaving out a consideration of quality and quantity of work, Springer found that the jurisdiction under study (City of Milwaukee) that hired 217 people in 1976 could save as much as \$100,000 per year with a quality selection process. A follow-up study three years later on these same 217 employees yielded the same results-namely, fewer disciplinary actions and less absenteeism for those who scored high on the selection test. From this evidence Springer concludes that a public jurisdiction continues to save over the work life of those high scorers, adding further to the wisdom of investing in sound selection practices.

Sproule, C.F. (1981) "Should Personnel Selection Tests Be Used on a Pass-Fail, Grouping, or Ranking Basis." *Public Personnel Management Journal*. **13**: 313-391.

In this article the author review the legal requirements and professional standards related to the use of pass-fail, grouping and ranking methods with selection tests, and provides some guidance for their proper use. The author notes that the "Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures" (1978) allow a variety of selection methods (pass/fail, categorization or ranking), but that when there is an **adverse** impact the employer must have validity evidence to support the selection procedure. The author states that there is ". . .no one best method of test use which is appropriate in all situations" (p. 392). However, he does conclude that:

Regardless of the method of use (e.g., ranking or grouping), those making final hiring decisions should be provided with procedures, training and guidance on how to make final selections by the merit system. For employment decisions to be as fair and job-related as possible, there should be a structured and planned procedure to evaluate candidates in the final phase of the selection process (i.e., after examining and certification) (p. 393).

Taylor, M.S. and T.J. Bergman (1987) "Organizational Recruitment Activities and Applicants' Reactions at Different Stages of the Recruitment Process." *Personnel Psychology*. **40**: 261-284.

Organizational recruitment is a time-consuming and costly enterprise. Studies have shown that applicants react favorably to friendly but professional recruiters, unfavorably to unprofessional recruiters. This study utilized both a field setting and a cross-sectional correlation to test "...relationships of recruitment activities and job attributes to applicants' organizational reactions" (p. 281). The findings indicate that, contrary to expectations, recruitment practices were only predictive of applicants' reactions at the initial interview. The most significant relationships with applicants' overall reactions to recruitment experiences were in fact the attributes of the job.

Thomas, J.C. and V.D. Heisel (1983) "The Modernization of Recruitment and Selection in Local Governments." In Hays, S.W., and Kearney, R.C., ed., *Public Personnel Administration*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

In this chapter the authors describe contemporary developments in the area of employee recruitment and selection, and they provide suggestions for optimal practices in local governments. They note that the predominate direction of change has been from a "traditional" civil service to a "professional" service model in the last couple decades. As a result of this movement to a professional model, the recruitment and selection processes for local governments have correspondingly changed for the better in the view of Thomas and Heisel. The authors advocate that three basic principles should be considered in any contemporary recruitment or selection process: test validity, workforce responsiveness, and ample flexibility or discretion at the point of final decisions on hiring.

Ulrich, L. and D. Trumbo (1963) "The Selection Interview Since 1949." *Psychological Bulletin*, 63: 100-116.

The authors review the research literature on the selection interview since 1949. One major finding is that the interview is most successful when it is structured and limited in scope. "Generally, it was true that both the highest validities and the greatest gains in validity over other predictors involved interviews described as systematic, designed, structured, or guided" (p. 112).

Performance Appraisal

Berger. L. (1983) "The Promise of Criterion-Referenced Performance Appraisal (CRPA):'
Review of Public Personnel Administration. 3: 21-32.

Because of criticisms of traditional performance appraisal instruments, the author advocates the use of "criterion-referenced performance appraisal"-that is, an appraisal instrument that ties the most important tasks to the measurement criteria for that job. The criterion-referenced performance appraisal instrument is intended to tie the organization's mission to performance standards for critical job elements. Berger advocates the use of the criterion-referenced performance technique **because** it is legally defensible and amenable to validation and, of course, it is of invaluable **use** to the organization.

Brown. D.G. (1987) . 'Development of Performance Standards: A Practical Guide.' ***Public Personnel Management. 16:*** 93 - 114.

This article presents the training format developed by the Denver Career Service Authority for the development of performance standards. Standards should not **be** employee based and evaluations should not **be** based on how employees compare to one **another**. Rather, "Standards allow you to separate various levels of performance **by** individuals, but your evaluation is based on **job** requirements, not individual abilities" (p.94). The author asserts that standards must be: realistic, specific, measurable, consistent with **agency goals**, challenging, dynamic and understandable. In order to tailor the performance standard process, non-supervisory staff employees should be encouraged to participate.

Clement, R.W. and E.K. Aranda (1984) "Performance Appraisal in the Public Sector: Truth or Consequences'?" *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. 3: 34-42.

In general, empirical studies have found evidence of positive expectations about performance appraisal on the part of both supervisors and employees. The authors wonder, however, if these expectations of performance appraisal are warranted: perhaps performance appraisal systems cannot be all things to all people. A survey of employees in a university was undertaken to determine if supervisors and employees agree on the proper purposes of performance appraisal. The findings indicated that there was a high level of agreement on the perceived importance of the performance appraisal objectives. These findings are compatible with other studies which have found agreement between employees and supervisors on performance appraisal objectives in the public sector. One problem identified by the survey, however, is the high level of expectation on the part of both employees and supervisors (but particularly on the part of employees) that the performance appraisal session could meet above average expectations on each objective: the researchers caution that these expectations may be unrealistic.

Flanagan, J.C. (1954) "The Critical Incident Technique." *Psychological Bulletin*. 7: 327-355.

Flanagan describes the development, fundamental principles and status of the "critical incident technique." The technique consists of "...a set of procedures for collecting direct observations of human behavior in such a way as to facilitate their potential usefulness in solving practical problems and developing broad psychological principles" (p. 327). The procedures for collecting observed significant incidents that meet

defined criteria are outlined within the critical incident technique. **"By an incident is** meant any observable human activity that is sufficiently complete in itself to permit inferences and predictions to be made about the person performing the act. To be critical, an incident must occur in a situation where the purpose or intent of the act seems fairly clear to the observer and where its consequences are sufficiently definite to leave little doubt concerning its effects? (p. 327).

The technique requires that observers be aware of the objectives of a job, and that they be in a position to observe people performing the job on a frequent enough basis so that they can describe recent incidents of job performance that were particularly effective or ineffective. With each incident the observer must specify: (1) the situation in which the incident occurred, (2) the ineffective or effective behavior which occurred and (3) why the observer thought the behavior was effective or ineffective. After the incidents are collected they are categorized into overall job categories. A group of job incumbents is then asked to allocate the incidents to the job category that they think is appropriate. Those incidents that are not allocated to the same category by 80% of the incumbents are eliminated due to ambiguity. Yet another group of individuals is given the categories and the related incidents (as determined by the job incumbents) to rate on a 7-point scale as good, average or poor performance for the job under analysis. Those items with a high degree of interjudge agreement are retained. These items are commonly referred to as anchors or benchmarks. This article is one of the baseline articles employed by those utilizing the critical incident technique for job analysis. In the research at hand, of course, the critical incident technique was used to develop both selection and performance appraisal instruments

for correctional officers in podular, direct supervision (New Generation) jails.³

Fried, Y. and G.R. Ferris (1987) "The Validity of the Job Characteristics Model: A Review and Meta-Analysis." *Personnel Psychology*. **40**: 287-322.

The authors cite scholarship by Hackman and Oldham (1973, 1976, 1980) that 'has spurred research into enriched or enlarged jobs which were hypothesized. via the Job Characteristics Model, to be associated with increased job satisfaction, motivation, and work performance.⁴ The authors sought to test whether the empirical data supports the **use** of the Job Characteristics Model. The results indicate modest support for Hackman and Oldham's Job Characteristics Model. For instance, "...the **data** clearly suggest that objective and perceived job characteristics are related" and results of the meta-analysis lend further support to the relationships between **job** characteristics and employee responses suggested b the JCSI" (p. 309).

Gabris. G.T. and WA. Giles (1983) "Level of Management, Performance Appraisal, and Productivity Reform in Complex Public Organizations." *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. **3**: 43-61.

In an attempt to improve productivity, many local, state and federal government agencies are attempting to create more effective performance appraisal instruments.

However, many questions have been raised as to the ability of these appraisal in-

3. For further information on the critical incident technique see the Latham et al., listed below.

4. Hackman J.R. and G.R. Oldham (1973). "Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey." *Journal of Applied Psychology*. **60**: 159-170. Hackman, J.R. and G.R. Oldham (1976) "Motivation Through the Design of Work: Test of a Theory." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. **16**:250-279. Hackman, J.R. and G.R. Oldham (1980). *Work Redesign* Reading, 51.4: Addison-Wesley.

struments to increase productivity. The study found that there is some potential for success of performance appraisal, but there was little evidence that performance appraisal would in fact increase productivity. The authors caution that performance appraisal is differentially regarded by those in top management and those they supervise; that is, the top management were more “open system” oriented whereas lower-management were more “closed system” oriented in their respective interpretations of how performance appraisal was to work in practice.

Gaertner, K.S. and G.H. Gaertner (1984) “Performance Appraisal and Merit Pay in the Federal Government: Reactions After the First Year.” *Administration and Policy Journal*. **3: 113- 129.**

The authors assess the benefits of performance appraisal and merit pay (features of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978) in two federal agencies. The findings indicate that most employees did not see merit pay as very useful in terms of motivation. That is, merit pay is not seen as equitable, nor is it seen as worth the effort to obtain it. However, the conclusions regarding performance appraisal and work standards are much different; generally, these were regarded as moderately successful when the emphasis was placed upon improvement-oriented appraisal.

Hackman, J.R. and G.R. Oldham (1974) “The Job Diagnostic Survey: An Instrument For the Diagnosis of Jobs and the Evaluation of Job Redesign Projects.” Technical Report #4, Department of Administrative Sciences, Yale University.

In this report the Job Diagnostic Survey instrument is described in considerable detail. Specifically, this instrument is designed to measure three classes of variables:

“(1) the objective characteristics of jobs, particularly the degree to which jobs are designed so that they enhance the internal work motivation and the job satisfaction of people who do them; (2) the personal affective reactions of individuals to their jobs and to the broader work setting; (3) the readiness of individuals to respond positively to “enriched” jobs-i.e., jobs which have high measured potential for generating internal work motivation” (p. 2). According to the authors, the JDS’s usefulness lies in diagnosing whether and how existing jobs can be redesigned to improve employee productivity and satisfaction. Relatedly, the JDS is also useful in evaluating whether contemporary job changes in post-industrial society have the deliberate “enriching” effects for employees widely believed to exist, or whether they are instead merely the result of technological change which is not promoting Maslovian “self-actualization” in the workplace.

Hackman, J.R., G. Oldham, R. Janson and K. Purdy (1981) “A New Strategy for Job Enrichment.” In D.E. Klingner, ed., ***Public Personnel Management: Readings in Contexts and Strategies***. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Company.

The authors present “a new strategy for going about the redesign of work” (p. 231). They base their strategy on empirical research into the field of job design. They claim **that** behavioral scientists have identified three basic psychological states that are very important in determining the motivation and satisfaction that a person gets from a job. Briefly, these psychological states are: experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility, and knowledge of results. Furthermore, the authors claim that for the three psychological states to exist the “core job dimensions” of skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback must first be in evidence in a

job. The authors contend that as a result of a job having these core dimensions, the three critical psychological states are high and the result of this is that the “personal and work outcomes” (internal work motivation, quality work performance, satisfaction with the work: **and** absenteeism and turnover) are also optimized. Moreover, the authors move beyond theory to practice when they outline the technology, and the strategy for the successful implementation of a job enrichment organizational intervention.

Holley W.H. and H.S. Feild (1981) "Performance Appraisal and the Law." In Klingner, D.E., ed., **Public Personnel Management**. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Company.

According to the authors performance appraisal systems in widespread use contribute to the objectives of productivity, cost efficiency and appropriate rewarding of employees in organizations. In addition, they have served as a criterion in test validation studies. Serious legal questions, however, have been raised regarding their violation of equal employment guidelines. That is, there have been problems in validation of the reliability of such tests which, of course, puts any employer who uses them on precarious legal footing. Therefore, the authors caution that performance appraisal systems should be validated, and that newer evaluation techniques which utilize legally defensible ratings on actual job behaviors should be developed.

Klingner, D.E. (1981) "When the Traditional Job Description Is Not Enough.!" In Klingner, D.E., ed., **Public Personnel Management**. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Company.

The author seeks to attach the job description to the improvement of productivity of the worker. The author criticizes the traditional methods of job analysis and evaluation because they do not adequately describe the performance expected of the employee. **and** they do not link that performance to standards, skills or qualifications. Given these problems, the author proposes that employers utilize “results-orientated job descriptions” which would allow him/her to define for each **job** the **task**. conditions. standards. skills. aspects of knowledge, abilities and the qualifications **needed**. As a function of using results-orientated **job** descriptions, the employer can **use** both traditional and performance-oriented job descriptions, thus maximizing the potential of job analysis.

Latham. G.P., Fay, C.H. and L.M. Saari (1979) “The Development of Behavioral Observation Scales for Appraising the Performance of Foremen.” *Personnel **Psychology***. **32: 299-311.**

The authors describe the development and usefulness of behavioral observation scales (BOS). These scales are part of the “critical incident technique” described in other annotations (see Flanagan). The BOS are similar to their close sibling the behaviorally anchored rating scales (BES) (also an offspring of the critical incident technique), in that the critical incidents are generated in the same manner. However, in the BOS method an item analysis or factor analysis (if the sample is large enough) is done to select the most “discriminating items.” In this way, it is claimed, the subjectivity in developing individual appraisal criteria which characterizes the BES method is eliminated, and a substantial number of critical incidents collected in step 1 are not discarded (another characteristic of the BES method). After analysis of their **data on**

the job of foremen, the authors make a strong recommendation for the BOS **method** over the BES method for appraising performance. Essentially, the authors assert five advantages to BOS appraisal (p. 308):

1. BOS are developed from data supplied by the users for the users.
2. The BOS are content valid.
3. The BOS can either serve alone or as a supplement to existing job descriptions in that they make explicit what behaviors are required of an employee in a given job.
4. The BOS can facilitate explicit performance feedback in that they **encourage** meaningful discussions **between the** supervisor and the employee of the latter's strengths and weaknesses.
5. The BOS satisfy EEOC Guidelines in terms of validity (relevance) and reliability.

Latham, G.P. and K.N. Wexley (1977) "Behavioral Observation Scales For Performance Appraisal Purposes." *Personnel Psychology*. **30: 253-268**.

The authors make the argument that performance appraisal based on traits and **attitudes** is not the best way to inform the employee what behavior is effective and what is ineffective.

A manager may tell an employee that he needs to show more initiative, become a better listener, and follow through on projects. This could be sage advice. But in its present form, the advice is not very helpful because it does not indicate what exactly the individual has to do differently. The employee may interpret the advice in ways in which the manager never intended or he may become hostile toward the manager, because he believes that he is already engaging in these behaviors (p. 236).

Latham and Wexley advocate the use of performance appraisal instruments that are constructed with the use of the critical incident technique.⁵ Similar incidents are generated through the use of this technique and clustered to form the behavioral observation scale (BOS). The purpose of the present **study** was to determine whether factor analysis would improve the development of BOS as opposed to the subjective clustering analysis commonly done with the critical incident technique. The researchers found that by using the quantitative BOS they were able to utilize fewer observations of behavioral items than the qualitative BES without losing reliability.

5. See Flannagan (1954) for more information on the critical incident technique.

Latham, G.P. and K.S. Wexley. (1981) *Increasing Productivity Through Performance Appraisal*. Menlo Park, California: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

This book is an overview of the history of and law pertaining to performance appraisal. It discusses various performance appraisal methods, and assesses the relation of those methods to fundamental assumptions underlying different approaches to human resource management. In addition, the text has a chapter on employee motivation that includes such topics as goal setting, changing behavior by changing the consequences of behavior? and employee participation in problem solving. In terms of the topic of this bibliography (Performance Appraisal in Correctional Institutions), Chapter Three on "The Development and Validation of Appraisal Systems" is the most salient. This chapter has sections on appraisals that are based on traits and cost-related outcomes, as well as appraisals based on behavior. Notably, this chapter includes a section on the critical incident technique for performance appraisal.

Latham: G.P., Wexley, K.N. and E.D. Purse¹¹ (1975) "Training Managers to Minimize Rating Errors in the Observation of Behavior." *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 60: 530-333.

According to the authors, a major problem in the development or use of selection or performance appraisal instruments is the lack of reliability in the observation of behavior. One possible means of mitigating this problem is to train the raters in how to rate. In the present study the researchers studied the effect of alternate training in rating observation on the common rating errors of contrast effects, halo effect, similarity, and first impressions. The alternate types of training studied was a workshop and a group discussion; there was also a control group included in the study

for comparison purposes. The researchers found that the control group committed the rating errors of “similar-to-me” and “contrast effects” considerably more often than either of the trained groups. They found that the group discussion raters committed a “last-impressions” error more often than the other groups, and that the workshop group committed the fewest rating errors of any type. The authors found that up to one third of the “performance-measurement” variance was a result of rater differences. Therefore, they conclude that this variance can be reduced by training those observing behavior to minimize rating errors.

Lovrich, S.P. and C.E. Jones (1983) "Affirmative Action, Women Managers and Performance Appraisal: Simultaneous Movement in Conflicting Directions?" Review of ***Public Personnel Administration***. 3: 3-20.

This study examines the relevancy of gender-based differences in administrative roles, including the use of performance appraisal instruments. What with the increase in awareness of affirmative action and non-discriminatory practices against women and the parallel concern for the appropriate use of performance appraisal systems, personnel programs are doubly challenged. Since women have not traditionally held supervisory or administrative jobs in the public sector, there is some concern that gender-based differences may preclude them from successfully functioning in such roles. The central issue to the authors is whether men and women differ in their confidence in the ability to conduct performance appraisal. Their conclusions indicate that there are no significant gender differences in such feelings of competence regarding performance appraisal. Therefore, the argument that women are likely to encounter greater difficulty in managing employees (of which performance appraisal

is but one facet) is' refuted by this study.

McGregor. Douglas (1981) "An Uneasy Look at Performance Appraisal." In Klingner. D.E., ed.: **Public Personnel Management**. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Company.

The author is uneasy with the growing use of performance appraisal systems which require managers to assess the worth of subordinates and proposes an alternate method of appraisal in its stead. Specifically, he proposes that the subordinate take primary responsibility in establishing goals and appraising progress towards those goals. The author notes that managers have traditionally been resistant to the traditional methods of appraisal, particularly the interview, because they feel it is close to "playing God" (p.182). Instead of traditional performance appraisal, then, the author proposes that organizations institute appraisal programs where the subordinate sets the short-term performance goals under the supervision of the supervisor. and the subordinate assesses progress toward those goals. The author believes that this new method of assessment, which places the responsibility for appraisal on the subordinate, will go far toward promoting the development of the subordinate and take an unfair burden off of the manager.

McNish. L.C. (1986) "A Critical Review of Performance Appraisal at the Federal Level: The Experience *of* the PHS." **Review of Public Personnel Administration**. 7: 42-36.

As a result of passage of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 the performance appraisal system at the Public Health Service was restructured. Prior to this change the appraisal system was not well regarded by employees inasmuch as it was not tied to

pay, promotion, job retention, and-consequently-was of little practical significance. The new appraisal program tied salary increases to the results of the appraisal. Based on research in other agencies and the Public Health Service, the author concludes that the reform has reaped little benefit in terms of flexibility or transferability of executives, productivity or reduction of paperwork. However, the author does note that the system has been beneficial in that it "...forces employees and supervisors TV sit down together and discuss the job."

Sapier, S.K. and G.P. Latham (1986) "Outcome Expectancies of People Who Conduct Performance Appraisals." *Personnel Psychology*. **39: 827-837.**

The authors assert that progress has not been made with performance appraisals because the fourth criterion (practicality), as established by Thorndike (1949). has not been properly investigated.⁶ In order to explore the criterion of practicality as it influences performance appraisals Sapier and Latham used interview and survey techniques to determine if appraisers see any practical value to performance appraisals. The results of the study were that appraisers did not see any practical value to performance appraisals, "...regardless of whether the feedback is primarily positive or negative" (p. 834). This finding is an indication, from the author's point of view. as to why relatively limited progress has been made with performance appraisals: it is possible that they are widely seen as being of little practical value by those who are crucial to their successful use-namely, by supervisors.

Sorton, S.D. and E.J. Dunne (1983) "A Development and Validation Strategy For Ap-

6. According to Thorndike, the first, second and third criteria for evaluating performance appraisals are reliability, validity and freedom from bias, respectively. Thorndike, R.L. (1949) *Personnel selection: Test and measurement techniques*. New York: Wiley.

praisals Used To Select Supervisors and Managers.” Review of **Public Personnel Administration**. 3: 94- 104.

This paper discusses the use of Behavioral Consistency and Behavior Anchored Rating Scale methodologies as applied to the promotion of personnel to supervisor-manager positions. Because of court cases challenging the validity of certain performance appraisal mechanisms, managers are rightly concerned with the content/construct validity of tests which seek to differentiate between high and low performers. The authors advocate the use of differentiating achievements (outcomes) in place of critical incidents, because they are based on factors occurring over a prolonged period of time. Unlike critical incident techniques which are based on solitary observable incidents. Such outcome factors may be termed “constructs,” and are likely to be more substantively important when the subject is administrative supervisors/managers rather than working supervisors.

Richards, B. (1984) "Is Your Performance--Appraisal Process Ready to Go to Court?" **Training**. August: 81-83.

The author explains that the only acceptable defense against legal claims of discrimination in performance appraisal is that the appraisal process is valid. According to the author, recent court cases indicate that validity can be claimed if the performance appraisal meets the following criteria: 1) the performance ratings are job-related; 2) the people who conduct the evaluations are in a position to observe job behavior being rated; 3) measurements are behaviorally related rather than trait related; 4) rater bias based on personal characteristics (e.g., race, gender, religion, appearance) is avoided; 3) performance data is held in confidence to protect the employee's right

to privacy. The author reports, however, that few organizations have performance appraisal systems that meet these criteria, rather they commonly suffer from major defects which in turn leave them vulnerable to legal challenge. Specifically, the author delineates the common defects as: 1) rating factors are not validated and related to specific jobs; 2) rating factors are not tied to observable job behavior; 3) ratings are multi-purpose (e.g., to justify salary increases, terminations, promotions or as feedback on performance) and, hence, can bias the rating; 4) employees receive insufficient training to ensure validity and privacy; 5) supervisors are not trained in the collection and reporting of job behavior; 6) ratings are not confidentially held. According to the author, the only way to ameliorate these common defects is to develop valid performance appraisal measures and to train managers in how to use them.

Saltzstein, A. (1983) "The Fate of Performance Appraisal: Another Death in the Bureaucracy?" *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. **3**: 129-132.

The author notes that there are egregious problems with performance appraisal that go beyond the purported value of one technique over another. Namely, there are assumptions about the existence of organizational goals and employee motivation which may have no basis in fact. Given these possibly faulty assumptions that underlie performance appraisal systems, the author advocates caution in their application in both the private and the public sector, and he urges more research into the effective use of group standards of performance rather than the individual level standards of performance currently in vogue.

Sims, R.R., Veres, J.G. III and S.M. Heninger (1987) "Training Appraisers: An Orientation Program for Improving Supervisory Performance Ratings." *Public Personnel Management*. 16: 37-43.

If performance appraisals are to be done effectively-that is. to address problems. motivate and set goals-the supervisory personnel conducting the appraisal need appropriate training. The authors include an outline for a one-day performance appraisal workshop designed to improve the quality of performance appraisal ratings. The outline discussion topics are: What is Performance Appraisal?; How Can Performance Appraisal Improve Performance?; Why is Performance Appraisal so Unpleasant?; How Can Performance Appraisal Systems Overcome Unpleasantness?; Performance Appraisal Documentation; and Creating Performance Appraisal Documentation.

Steel, B. (1985) "Participative Performance Appraisal in Washington: An Assessment of Post Implementation Receptivity." *Public Personnel Management*. 14: 153-169.

In response to the guidelines of the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978, the State of Washington instituted a new appraisal system which emphasized the combined use of employee evaluations and supervisor ratings- or the use of a "participatory" performance appraisal program. The findings from this study indicate that there is a base of support for the participatory performance appraisal program among employees, supervisors and personnel specialists in the State of Washington. All groups rated the new system as more fair and effective than the old system. However, there were some reservations expressed about the self-evaluation section of the new program.

Steel, B. (1983) "Implementing Performance Appraisal: Comparing Views Among Employees, Supervisors and Personnel Specialists." *Review of Public Personnel Administration*. **3: 73-93.**

A random survey of supervisors, employees and personnel specialists was done in the State of Washington to discover whether participatory types of performance appraisal systems were well regarded. Attitude toward performance appraisal per se is thought to be important in this regard, because the goodwill of all employees is required to ensure effective use of whatever types of instrument might be adopted. That is, if support for performance appraisal does not exist among those who must design the appraisal system, among those who must perform the appraisal, and among those who are appraised, any one of these groups could sabotage any new performance appraisal system. The findings of the survey indicated strong support for a "good" performance appraisal system among the three types of Washington state employees surveyed.

Woods? Kenneth (1981) "Job Evaluation: More than Just a Management Technique." In Klingner, D.E., *ed., Public Personnel Management*. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Company.

The **author** describes how job evaluation is useful in organizational development if attitudes are favorably disposed to it. It is useful in terms of matching personnel to appropriate positions, career development, performance evaluation, organizational analysis and justification of pay. In addition, the author believes that there is potential for job evaluation to positively influence the actual running of an organization. That is, it would serve to keep the organization and its employees " '...in some kind

of harmony of objectives' ” (p. 144). The author also sees some value in job evaluation in terms of determining what is a fair wage or salary for a given job. Finally, recognition of the forces resisting job evaluation (e.g., unions and some employees) is not ignored by the author. However, he feels that the questions as to purpose of any given job need to be asked, and could be answered well by means of job evaluation.

Correctional Personnel

Blau, P.M. and W.R. Scott (1962) *Formal Organizations*. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company.

For our purposes, Chapter Two of this book, entitled “The Nature and Types of Formal Organizations,” is the most salient. In this chapter the authors set out two criteria that must attend the exercise of authority in an organization: (1) voluntary compliance with legitimate commands; and (2) suspension of judgement in advance of commands. In addition, the authors note that commonweal organizations whose beneficiary is the larger society are faced with many problems, one of which is dealing with society’s outcasts (e.g., inmates). Because inmates have been labelled as social outcasts, they are outside society’s normal mechanisms of control and may not even recognize **society’s authority**. It is to be expected, then, that inmates will not give voluntary compliance or suspend judgement in advance of commands.

Bowker, Lee H. (1982) *Corrections: The Science and the Art*. Sew York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Although his scope is broad, Bowker’s text is an invaluable reference for correctional scholars because it contains much of the current nonspecialized research in correc-

tions to date. It is especially useful for the scholar interested in correctional personnel as it includes a chapter each on correctional officers and correctional administrators and administration. Of particular interest in the chapter on correctional officers are the sections on recruitment and training of correctional officers. In these two sections Bowker details the inadequate recruitment, selection and training practices that often exist in correctional institutions. He notes the difficulty faced by correctional managers in recruiting and selecting quality personnel because of the low pay and poor working conditions that characterize many correctional jobs, and also because of selection tests that are seldom job related. Similarly, according to Bowker, training for correctional officers usually involves only a short, on-the-job training period before the officer is given full responsibility for the supervision of inmate populations. The chapter on correctional administrators and administration includes important sections on middle-level correctional managers and management approaches. In the former of these sections Bowker laments the inadequate training in human relations or other specialized training given to new correctional supervisors. In the latter section Bowker outlines two competing management approaches utilized in correctional institutions-the military style and the participative management style. According to Bowker, the type of management style utilized in a given correctional setting may depend in large part on the type of correctional setting it is (e.g., a maximum security prison vs. a work release facility).

Breif, A.P., J. Munro and R.J. Aldag (1916) 'Correctional Employees' Reaction to Job Characteristics: A Data Based Argument for Job Enrichment." *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 4: 223-230.

The **authors** make an argument for job enlargement, which they define as a job with the following characteristics: skill variety, autonomy, task identity and feedback. The authors assert that job enlargement will reduce employee dissatisfaction, turnover, absenteeism and poor productivity. Moreover, the authors claim that research findings indicating the benefits of job enlargement in industrial settings can be generalized easily to correctional settings.

Correctional personnel **respond more positively to a job that offers them skill variety, autonomy, task identity and feedback than they do to a job that is perceived as dull and monotonous. From an administrative perspective, this more favorable response may ultimately translate into reduced rates of absenteeism and turnover and into enhanced levels of job performance (p. 228).**

Gettinger, S.H. (1984) ***New Generation Jails: An Innovative Approach to an Age-Old***

Problem. Washington D.C.: National Institute of Corrections.

This publication first details the problems in traditional jails, such as: tension and violence, noise, low staff morale and motivation idleness of inmates, inconveniences, costs, vandalism and lack of discipline. Secondly, it describes both the evolution of the concept of the New Generation jails in this country, and tracing their ultimate construction first at the federal level and subsequently at the local level in Contra Costa, California and elsewhere. Third, it delineates how New Generation jails address **the** psychologically stressful elements of jails (the fear-hate syndrome, predictable space, leadership vacuums, positive expectations, isolation) and it delineates the role of architecture in increasing the ability of staff to supervise inmates. Finally, this publication addresses the role of the jail administration in ensuring adequate training of staff for their new responsibilities and the role of management in ensuring the successful operation of the new facility.

Coffman, E. (1966) "On the Characteristics of Total Institutions: Staff-Inmate Relations."

In Cressey, D.R., ed.: ***The Prison: Studies in Institutional Organization and Change.***

New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

A "total institution:" according to Erving Goffman, is one where a confined person performs all of the necessary functions of living-sleep, play, work, and eating under the roof of one institution. In such facilities authority is central and vertical in nature; behavior is routinized and regulated; the classes are clearly defined and impregnable (e.g., staff and inmates); and communication flow is restricted and indefinite. Although they may appear to be rational organizations designed to accomplish some socially approved ends. it is the author's contention that total institutions are generally just dumping grounds for inmates. According to the author, in such institutions staff-inmate relationships are characterized by social distance, stereotyping of inmates expected deference to staff by inmates and implicit coercion.

Lipsky, M. (1980) ***Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services.*** New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Street-Level Bureaucracy is a book about those public servants (e.g., police, teachers, social workers) who are in continuous contact with citizens at the street level. Among other related topics, this book thoughtfully evaluates the work conditions and patterns of such bureaucrats. In terms of conditions, the book exposes the high level of demand, low level of resources and the relations with clients. In terms of the patterns of practice, the book examines the techniques used by bureaucrats to manage their excessive workload; rationing, controlling and client-processing are the primary mechanisms employed. Of particular interest in terms of the topic at hand

is the section on performance evaluations of “street-level bureaucrats” (jobs that approximate the work done by correctional staff). In this section, the author notes the difficulties in evaluating these bureaucrats given the kind of one-on-one services they provide and the necessarily discretionary nature of their position.

Nelson, W.R. (1984) “Isolation of Staff From Inmates: A Correctional Policy Issue for the 1980s.” *Corrections Today*. April: 106.

The traditional linear architectural design and removed management style commonly found in jails and prisons has ensured the isolation of staff from inmates. The author reports that new jails and prisons are still being built and managed in such a way that contact between staff and inmates is minimal. This is occurring despite the positive reports on the worth of jails built in a podular design utilizing direct supervision of inmates by staff. Such reports indicate that the podular/direct supervision jail produces the following: increased safety for staff and inmates, improved housing and amenities for inmates, enhanced satisfaction in the job for correctional officers, and cost effectiveness for the community.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (1987) “Jail Inmates 1986.” *Bulletin*. NCJ-107123 (October).

This bulletin presents findings from an annual survey of jails in the United States. Included in the bulletin is information on the demographics of jail inmates, the population counts of jails, the number of jails under court order for crowding or other poor conditions of confinement, and the number of inmate deaths due to suicide, natural causes or some other cause. Although, this bulletin provides no direct information on

personnel per se, it does provide some of the most recent information on problematic issues surrounding American jails.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (1986) "Historical Corrections Statistics in the United States, 1850- 1984." NCJ- 102529 (December). Rockville. Md. This government publication is a rich source of data on correctional facilities and inmates from 1830 to the present. Data is broken down by state, crime, demographics, type of sentence, type of institution and in a variety of other ways. In addition, there is some information on state and federal correctional staff that is more pertinent to the topic at hand. For instance, data is provided on the number of correctional staff in each state and the inmate-to-staff ratio from 1926 to 1979. In general, it is useful in that it gives a detailed yet comprehensible historical statistical picture of correctional institutions in this country.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (1984) "The 1983 Jail Census." Bulletin. NCJ-93336 (November). Washington D.C. This government bulletin provides a short synopsis of the state of American jails as of 1983. Demographic information (by region) about inmates is laid out in tables for easy perusal. In addition, the bulletin includes information on characteristics of jail populations, such as: population increases and decreases, the volume of jail admissions and the number of unconvicted versus convicted inmates. Furthermore, the bulletin describes the trend in institutional size (toward fewer but larger jails), bed space and occupancy rates, crowding and death rate figures. The most pertinent information in terms of the topic of this bibliography, however, is that which concerns

the census count of employees on duty, the inmate-to-staff ratio, and the annual spending on jails nationwide. This information is useful for analysis of personnel selection and evaluation because it gives the reader a sense of the correctional officers' supervisory function and job responsibilities, and how those functions are affected by high staff-inmate ratios and budget constraints.

Zupan, L.L. (1987) ***The New Generation Correctional Philosophy: An Implementation Analysis and Impact Evaluation.*** Ph.D. Dissertation,, Washington State University. Zupan investigates the assumptions underlying the New Generation Jail Philosophy, analyzes the implementation of said philosophy, and evaluates the impact of it on the quality of life for both inmates and staff in these new jail facilities. Zupan's dissertation reviews the current socio-psychological literature as it pertains to incarceration. In terms of relevance to personnel selection and evaluation, Zupan's dissertation is useful in that it explores the plethora of problems that jails face in attracting qualified personnel. Namely, problems which revolve around the poor pay and working conditions that are typical of American jails: Once hired, Zupan examines the inadequate systems that exist for training correctional officers and the unlikely prospects for career **advancement**. Moreover, in terms of the New Generation Jail, Zupan reports original **research** on correctional officers' perceptions of the organizational climate, job satisfaction and the motivating potential of the job.⁷

Zupan, L.L. and B.A. Menke (1987) "Implementing Organizational Change: From Traditional to New Generation Jail Operations." Originally presented at the Academy

7. This study and the following papers were made possible by a grant from the National Institute of Corrections in which the Spokane City/County Jail was the primary site for research.

of Criminal Sciences Conference in St. Louis, Missouri. Scheduled for publication in an upcoming issue of the *Policy Studies Journal*.

The authors explore whether correctional officers in an institution in transition, from a traditional jail to a New Generation jail, discern an enrichment in their jobs as a result of the transition, and whether their perceptions of the work and the organization change are positive as would be predicted by the advocates of job enrichment. What they found was that "...the podular/direct supervision architecture and inmate management style appears to increase the level of potential job enrichment experienced by correctional officers" and that "...officers report significantly higher levels of job satisfaction and a more positive organizational climate after the move to the podular/direct supervision facility" (p. 11). However, these results are tempered by the finding that the transition officers reported only modest improvement in enrichment, job satisfaction and organizational climate—a finding that the authors speculate may be attributable to the recency of the transition and the continued adherence to old managerial styles that may be frustrating "potential employee benefits" (p. 14).

Zupan, L.L. and M.K. Stohr-Gillmore (1987) "Doing Time in the New Generation Jail: Inmate Perceptions of Gains and Losses." Originally presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences Conference in St. Louis, Missouri. Scheduled for publication in an upcoming issue of the *Policy Studies Journal*.

The perceptions of inmates in traditional jails are compared with those in New Generation jails regarding the fulfillment of environmental needs, evaluations of the environment, and levels of stress. The findings indicate that podular/direct supervision facilities are better able to provide for the physical and socio-emotional needs of in-

mates than are traditional facilities. That is, inmates in podular/direct supervision “New Generation” jails were more positive in their evaluations of the jail environment, the jail climate, the jail staff, the jail itself and reported less psychological and physical stress than inmates in traditional jails. “Inmates in the podular/direct supervision facilities responded positively to a physical and organizational environment in which their needs are legitimately fulfilled” (p.17).