

————— **Research Report** —————

**Predicting Community Employment for  
Federal Offenders on Conditional Release**

Ce rapport est également disponible en français. Pour obtenir des exemplaires supplémentaires, veuillez vous adresser à la Direction de la recherche, Service Correctionnel du Canada, 340, av. Laurier, Ouest, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0P9. This report is also available in English. Should additional copies be required, they can be obtained from the Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, 340 Laurier Ave., West, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0P9.

**2005 N° R-159**

Predicting Community Employment for Federal Offenders on Conditional Release

Christa A. Gillis  
&  
D. A. Andrews

Research Branch  
Correctional Service Canada

**January 2005**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

Special appreciation is offered to the research assistants who conducted the interviews with offenders: Judy Palmer in the Atlantic Region; Miriam Tator, Justine Kotlarz, and Angela Beecher in Ontario; and Hal Friesen, Pat Walker, Michelle Hampton, Randa, and Meredith Evans in the Prairie region. Thanks, as well, to all District Directors, area managers, parole supervisors and officers who contributed to the refinement of the questionnaire at the front-end of the study, and who facilitated the data collection process. Andrew Shepherd entered the data, and Chris Beal provided assistance in cleaning the data. Mike Muirhead, through his involvement in the data analysis process, provided a significant contribution to the project.

Dr. Larry Motiuk was extremely supportive of this research, and provided important contributions to the study. Additionally, thanks to Dr. Ralph Serin for his support in the final stages of the process, and for helpful comments on the draft version of this paper.

Sincere appreciation is offered to offenders who graciously volunteered their time to participate in this study, particularly during this early stage of transition to the community. It is hoped that this information will serve them through the enhancement and development of employment interventions that will meet their employment needs.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Employment has played a key role in the operation of institutions (Funke, Wayson, & Miller, 1982; Gaes, Flanagan, Motiuk, & Stewart, 1999; Guynes & Greiser, 1986; Miller & Greiser, 1986; Townsend, 1996), both historically and currently, yet little is known about the processes and factors associated with offender employment in the community (Gillis, 2000, 2001, 2002; Ryan, 1998). This research was conducted to explore community-based employment outcomes for federal offenders on conditional release. A total of 302 offenders from six selected cities in the Atlantic, Ontario and Prairies regions participated in this longitudinal study designed to assess factors related to employment outcomes (status, quality and retention) during the first six months of release. It was hypothesized that personal (employment history, work attitudes, values and beliefs, occupational self efficacy, and intention to find work), interpersonal (social support for employment), and broad social (unemployment rate) factors would contribute to employment outcomes.

Correlational and regression analyses were performed to explore relationships between the predictor variables and employment outcomes. As hypothesized, most predictor variables were significantly correlated with the employment outcomes: status, quality and number of weeks employed. Results of the regression analyses consistently demonstrated relationships between social support for employment and offenders' intention to find work, and employment outcomes. Moreover, unemployment rate, a broad social factor, was also found to contribute to offender employment outcomes during the first month of release. Implications for employment assessment and treatment are discussed.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b> .....	<b>I</b>
<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b> .....	<b>II</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b> .....	<b>III</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b> .....	<b>V</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>HYPOTHESES</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>METHOD</b> .....	<b>5</b>
Participants .....	5
Measures .....	6
Predictor Variables.....	6
<b>Personal Factors</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>Interpersonal Factors</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>Broad Social Factor</b> .....	<b>12</b>
<b>Social Desirability</b> .....	<b>12</b>
Outcome Variables .....	13
Procedure .....	14
<b>RESULTS</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>ONE MONTH</b> .....	<b>18</b>
Descriptive Analyses.....	18
<b>Interpersonal Factors</b> .....	<b>21</b>
<b>Broad Social Factor</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b>Social Desirability</b> .....	<b>22</b>
<b>Outcome Variables</b> .....	<b>23</b>
Correlational Analyses .....	24
Regression Analyses .....	26
<b>SIX MONTHS</b> .....	<b>28</b>
Descriptive Analyses.....	28
<b>Interpersonal Factors</b> .....	<b>31</b>
<b>Outcome Variables</b> .....	<b>31</b>
<b>Correlational Analyses</b> .....	<b>32</b>

Regression Analyses .....	33
<b>DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS.....</b>	<b>37</b>
Limitations.....	39
Practical Applications and Future Directions.....	40
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: COMMUNITY EMPLOYMENT CHECKLIST .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: WORK ATTITUDES QUESTIONNAIRE .....</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: EMPLOYMENT DOMAIN INDICATORS .....</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>APPENDIX D: INFORMED CONSENT FORM .....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>APPENDIX E: DEBRIEFING .....</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>APPENDIX F: INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG PREDICTOR VARIABLES     AT ONE MONTH.....</b>	<b>98</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Type of Employment Reported Before Incarceration.....	18
Table 2:	Type of Work Experience/Training During Incarceration .....	19
Table 3:	Employment Need Levels.....	19
Table 4:	Means and Alphas for the Attitude and Self Efficacy Measures: One Month.....	20
Table 5:	Distribution of the Chance of Finding / Maintaining Employment Variable: One Month.....	21
Table 6:	Frequency of Unemployment Rate by City .....	22
Table 7:	Means and Alphas for Covariates: One Month.....	23
Table 8:	Type of Employment at One Month.....	23
Table 9:	Correlations between One Month Predictor Variables and Employment Outcomes at One Month .....	25
Table 10:	Summary of Stepwise Regression Analysis for One Month Variables Predicting Employment Status at One Month ( $N = 302$ ).....	26
Table 11:	Summary of Stepwise Regression Analysis for One Month Variables Predicting Quality of Employment at One Month ( $N = 302$ ).....	27
Table 12:	Type of Work Experience Before Incarceration .....	28
Table 13:	Type of Work Experience/Training During Incarceration .....	29
Table 14:	Employment Need Levels.....	30
Table 15:	Means and Alphas for the Attitude and Self Efficacy Measures: Six Months.....	30
Table 16:	Distribution of the Chance of Finding/Maintaining Employment Variable: Six Months.....	31
Table 17:	Correlations Between Six Month Predictor Variables and Employment Outcomes at Six Months .....	33
Table 18:	Summary of Hierarchical Stepwise Regression Analysis for Six Month Variables Predicting Employment Status at Six Months ( $N = 106$ ).....	34
Table 19:	Summary of Hierarchical Stepwise Regression Analysis for Six Month Variables Predicting Quality of Employment at Six Months ( $N = 106$ ) .....	35

Table 20: Summary of Hierarchical Stepwise Regression Analysis for Six Month  
Variables Predicting Number of Weeks Employed at Six Months  
(*N* = 106) .....36

## INTRODUCTION

Employment has played a prominent role in the operation of institutions (Funke et al., 1982; Gaes et al., 1999; Guynes & Greiser, 1986; Miller & Greiser, 1986; Townsend, 1996), and has long been a topic of interest within criminological and correctional theory and practice (Andrews, Pirs, Walker, & Hurge, 1980).

The importance assigned to employment is reflected in the Correctional Service Canada's (CSC) approach to the assessment of offender needs. As federal offenders (those sentenced to two years or more) enter the correctional system, they participate in an extensive intake assessment process, designed to identify factors that contribute to their criminality. The focus is on dynamic attributes--criminogenic needs--that when effectively addressed, decrease the likelihood of future involvement in crime (Andrews, Bonta, & Hoge, 1990; Andrews & Bonta, 1998). The CSC has identified 7 of these need areas, or deficits, assessed through the Offender Intake Assessment process (OIA); these areas are subsequently targeted, as required, for intervention during the offenders' period of incarceration. These need areas include: employment, marital / family, associates / social interaction, substance abuse, community functioning, personal / emotional, and attitude (Motiuk, 1997a). Each of these needs has received considerable empirical support for its association with criminality (see Forum on Corrections Research, 1998, Volume 10, Number 3 for details). Approximately 75% of offenders are identified with employment needs upon entry to federal institutions (Motiuk, 1997a).

Empirical substantiation of the specific link between offender employment deficits and recidivism was provided in a meta-analytic review conducted by Gendreau, Little, and Goggin (1996). Gendreau, Goggin, & Grey (1998) extended the earlier meta-analysis by exploring specific employment indicators from the Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) protocol, a component of the OIA process. In their meta-analysis, Gendreau et al. (1998) reported education / employment ( $r = .26$ ), employment needs at discharge ( $r = .15$ ) and employment history ( $r = .14$ ) as some of the most powerful predictors of recidivism within the employment domain. The average correlation with recidivism of the 200 effect sizes from 67 studies was  $r = .13$ .

Another risk / needs instrument that has been used extensively in classifying offenders and in predicting various outcomes for offenders and probationers is the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R; Andrews & Bonta, 1995). A number of studies have reported interrelationships between the employment subscale of the LSI-R and various outcomes. Motiuk (1991) identified employment as one of the dynamic items from the LSI-R that significantly and consistently predicted community adjustment in a sample of provincial offenders on day parole. Rowe (1995) examined the association between the education/employment subscale from the LSI-R and: a) revocations, b) violent recidivism, and c) re-incarceration within a sample of 389 provincial offenders over a one-year follow-up period. Although no significant correlations were obtained for revocation, relationships were obtained for violent recidivism ( $r = .16$ ) and reincarceration ( $r = .21$ ). Moreover, he used a measure derived from parole officer ratings to examine the relationship between employment and the three outcome measures. Offenders with a positive outlook were those with concrete job opportunities upon release, those with a mixed outlook had some chance of obtaining employment in the community, while offenders with a negative (i.e., unstable) outlook had no potential employment opportunities available prior to release. Rowe reported a significant relationship between employment instability and all three outcome measures: revocations ( $r = .21$ ), violent offending ( $r = .15$ ), and reincarceration ( $r = .18$ ).

Burke (1997) conducted a study exploring factors that contribute to community adjustment in a sample of 58 federal offenders on conditional release. Her study was directed specifically toward the assessment of offenders' perceptions of factors that contribute to outcome (successful and unsuccessful performance) on conditional release. She reported a correlation of  $r = .56$  between the employment / education subscale and outcome. Moreover, employment was mentioned by offenders who were unsuccessful on release as one of the more influential factors affecting their release outcome.

The aforementioned research corroborates previous findings and the subsequent identification of unstable employment and lack of conventional ambition as important need factors among offenders (Andrews & Bonta, 1998; Dowden, 1998; Enocksson, 1981; Finn, 1998; Gendreau et al., 1996; Gendreau et al., 1998; Glaser, 1964; Hodanish, 1976; McDonald, 1998; Motiuk, 1996; Motiuk, 1997b; Ryan, 1998).

Furthermore, researchers have reported the reintegrative effect of skilled employment, or a history of employment prior to incarceration, for offenders released to the community (Enocksson, 1981; Glaser, 1964; Markley, Flynn, & Bercaw-Dooen, 1983). These findings illustrate the importance of assessing factors construed as employment deficits (e.g., lack of employment skills) and competencies (e.g., strong employment history prior to incarceration) for their contributions to community-based outcomes for offenders.

Although research clearly demonstrates an association between employment and community-based outcomes for offenders, little is known about the processes and specific factors that contribute to these outcomes (Gillis, 2000, 2001, 2002; Ryan, 1998). Furthermore, research has overlooked more proximal outcomes, such as employment status and retention. Given this, various authors have advocated looking beyond recidivism as the sole outcome measure of interest, to include more proximal measures related to employment (Andrews et al., 1980; Enocksson, 1981; Gillis, 2000, 2001, 2002; Hodanish, 1976; Markley et al., 1983; Ryan, 1998; Uggen, 1999).

This study was conducted to explore the contributions of various factors to employment outcomes for offenders. The research was structured according to Andrews' and Bonta's theoretical perspective on criminal behaviour, the Personal Interpersonal Community-Reinforcement perspective (PIC-R; Andrews, 1982; Andrews & Bonta, 1998). This framework postulates the combined influence of personal factors (e.g., antisocial attitudes, values and beliefs; history of antisocial behaviour; and antisocial personality complex, focusing on self regulation), interpersonal factors (e.g., antisocial associates and social support for crime) and broad social factors (e.g., neighbourhood of origin) in contributing to the manner in which an individual perceives the costs and rewards for crime. Ultimately, these factors influence whether an individual will commit crime. Thus, although formulated prior to meta-analytic findings on the most prevalent risk factors for recidivism, the PIC-R perspective successfully identified the factors most strongly linked to crime--the "Big Four", consisting of antisocial attitudes, associates, history and personality (Andrews & Bonta, 1998; Gendreau et al., 1996). The present study used the PIC-R perspective as a guiding framework, re-orienting the theory to incorporate relevant work attitudes, with the objective of predicting employment, rather than criminal, outcomes.

## **HYPOTHESES**

This study is exploratory, designed to gain a better understanding of factors related to employment outcomes for federal offenders on conditional release. As such, the hypothesis is broad in orientation, namely, that the predictor variables subsumed under the personal (e.g., employment history, attitudes, self efficacy and intention), interpersonal (social support for employment), and broad social (e.g., unemployment rate) categories adapted from the PIC-R perspective, will be associated with employment outcomes (status, quality and number of weeks employed).

## METHOD

### Participants

Participants were male federal offenders (those sentenced to serve two years or more) released from institutions to one of six urban Canadian centres. A total of 302 offenders volunteered to participate, of the initial 548 who were approached from December 1998 to September 1999, for a participation rate of 55%. Only information on the offenders who consented to participate is presented in this section, for ethical reasons.

The average age of participants, calculated on the basis of pre-test (i.e., one-month) administration, was 33.7 years ( $SD = 10.3$  years), with age ranging from 19 to 66 years. One half of the sample was Caucasian (50.8%); the remaining offenders were Innu (1.0%), Inuit (0.3%), Metis (5.4%), North American Indian (8.0%), Hispanic (4.0%), Arabic (14.4%), Black (10.0%), Asiatic (4.0%), East Indian (1.3%) and other (0.7%). To facilitate analyses, ethnicity was collapsed into a two-level measure: Aboriginal (14.7%) and non-Aboriginal (85.2%). Marital status, derived from CSC's automated database, was collapsed to yield two categories: involved in a relationship (38.2%) or single (61.8%).

One half (53.0%) of the study participants were released to cities in the Prairie region; the remaining participants were released to the Atlantic (22.5%) and Ontario (24.5%) regions. Nearly two-thirds of the sample (64.2%) were released on day parole, the earliest form of release. Only 8.3% were released on full parole, a less restrictive form of conditional release and 27.5% were released on statutory release, which is mandatory release to the community (for most offenders) after serving two-thirds of the sentence.

A participation rate of 50% was obtained for the six month assessment phase, with 106 of the eligible 213 offenders completing this second phase (17 offenders had moved from the study sites and 72 had their conditional release suspended or revoked since the first assessment period). The average age of participants from the six month assessment phase was 35.9 years ( $SD = 10.7$ ), with age ranging from 20 to 63 years. Less than one-tenth (8.6%) were Aboriginal; the remaining 91.4% were non-Aboriginal.

The majority of offenders who participated in the six month assessment were not married (60.3%).

## **Measures**

Data were collected at two points in time (during the first and sixth month of release), in order to explore change over time. A multi-method approach to data collection was used, including an interview, paper-and-pencil questionnaire, and file review. The file review examined information contained within the Offender Management System (OMS), CSC's automated database containing historical employment and criminal involvement information, and dynamic variables such as offender needs. The *Community Employment Checklist* (see Appendix A) was developed for research assistants' use. The instrument, consisting of a short number of community employment-related variables, examined static factors such as institutional program participation, and dynamic variables, such as number of job interviews attended during the first six months of release. The *Work Attitudes Questionnaire* (see Appendix B) consisted of standardized scales designed to assess the attitude, motivation, and efficacy-related constructs detailed within the PIC-R perspective (Andrews, 1982; Andrews & Bonta, 1998).

## **Predictor Variables**

Predictor variables are described in relation to the PIC-R perspective: personal factors, interpersonal factors, and broad community factors.

### ***Personal Factors***

*Employment history.* Research has demonstrated the link between offender employment experience prior to incarceration and subsequent community readjustment (Andrews & Bonta, 1998; Gendreau et al., 1996; Gendreau et al., 1998; Glaser, 1964; Motiuk, 1997b). Various components of offenders' employment history were explored in this study, including type of employment in the year prior to incarceration, which was collapsed into *skilled* (i.e., skilled labour, sales, supervisory, and managerial / professional positions) and *unskilled* work categories (unskilled / semi-skilled and "other").

Another variable reflective of employment experience is the composite employment stability variable, derived from the employment domain within the OIA (see Appendix C for a listing of the individual employment indicators). Whereas items are typically added together to reflect the extent of employment need (i.e., each item that reflects an employment deficit is allocated one "point"), in the present study, the reverse approach was adopted to reflect stability or competency in the employment domain. Individual indicators that were not endorsed at intake (i.e., the indicator did not reflect the offender's need) was given a score of one, so that the fewer items initially endorsed at intake, the more stable the employment history. The same approach was used with the education-based indicators from the employment domain (e.g., has less than grade 8) to create a strength-based education variable.

To account for change in employment need that might accrue due to work or vocational training during incarceration, offenders were asked if they had worked for Corcan, or participated in one of the following: vocational training, skills for employment training, or work release. If offenders reported participating in any of these areas, they were given a score of one on the *training* variable. Otherwise, offenders who did not participate in work / vocational training during incarceration were given a score of zero on the composite training variable.

The final variables assessed in the employment history category were employment need ratings from the OIA. A total of 35 indicators in the employment domain are dichotomously rated, with a point allocated to each item that applies to the offender. The employment need domain is given a rating (*Asset, No problem, Some problems, or Considerable problems*) following interviews with the offender and systematic review of the offender's file and collateral information. Thus, the overall need rating for the domain is derived through clinical judgment of the correctional professional (directed by rating guidelines and the dichotomously-rated employment indicators). A similar process is used by CSC to assess offender needs upon release to the community, and every six months following release via the Community Intervention Scale (CIS)<sup>1</sup>, a dynamic needs assessment scale comprised of the same seven need areas evaluated in the Offender Intake Assessment. For the present study, information

---

<sup>1</sup> The content of the CIS is now reflected in the Correctional Plan Progress Report and Community Strategy.

from the first CIS assessment (conducted during the first six months of release) was used to evaluate employment needs in the community.

*Attitudes, values and beliefs.* The extent to which offenders ascribe value to employment and their attitudes toward employment, were assessed using a variety of standardized measures compiled in the *Work Attitudes Questionnaire*. Kanungo's (1982) *Work Involvement* scale was used to assess the individual's generalized cognitive identification with work and beliefs regarding the value of work. The scale, consisting of six items rated on a seven-point scale, has demonstrated adequate internal consistency ( $\alpha = .75$ ) and test-retest reliability ( $r = .67$ ). In an initial examination of the psychometric properties of the scale, Kanungo reported a mean of 20.70 ( $SD = 5.97$ ) for a sample of 900 English- and French-speaking full-time industrial and governmental employees who were enrolled in evening extension courses. The *Job Involvement* scale, also developed by Kanungo (1982) measures the cognitive identification associated with a specific job, versus the generalized work context assessed by the *Work Involvement Scale*. Comprised of 10 items evaluated on a seven-point scale, the *Job Involvement* measure has good internal consistency ( $\alpha = .80$ ) and test-retest reliability ( $r = .85$ ). Kanungo reported a mean of 31.31 ( $SD = 10.61$ ) for the sample of 900 industrial and governmental employees.

Work ethic, which evaluates the significance of work and the belief that effort contributes to success, was measured using Ho & Lloyd's (1984) 7-item *Australian Work Ethic* scale. Evaluated on a 4-point scale, the measure has consistently displayed adequate to good internal reliability (range,  $\alpha = .71$  to  $.84$ ) (Furnham et al., 1991; Ho & Lloyd, 1984; Niles, 1993; Paterson & O'Driscoll, 1989), concurrent validity, and test-retest reliability (Paterson & O'Driscoll, 1989). In analyses of the psychometric properties of the scale, Ho and Lloyd reported means of 18.38 ( $SD = 4.16$ ) and 17.77 ( $SD = 3.58$ ) for males and females, respectively.

The *Intrinsic Job Motivation* scale (Warr, Cook, & Wall, 1979), comprised of six items rated on a seven-point scale, has good internal consistency ( $\alpha = .82$ ) and adequate test-retest reliability. The scale evaluates the extent to which an individual wants to perform well in his or her job to achieve intrinsic satisfaction. Warr and

colleagues reported a mean of 36.25 ( $SD = 5.51$ ) for a sample of blue-collar male employees in a manufacturing industry.

The *Value of Employment* measure used by Andrews and colleagues (1985) has good internal reliability ( $\alpha = .82$ ). Andrews et al. reported a mean of 60.85 ( $SD = 6.56$ ) on intake assessment for a sample of probationers on the 18-item measure, anchored on a 5-point Likert scale. Additionally, Harris' (1975) *Expected Value of Crime* measure was modified to evaluate offenders' perceived advantages and disadvantages of employment. Offenders were asked to list the benefits associated with employment, the likelihood that they would achieve these benefits (on a scale ranging from 0 to 100), and how happy attainment of these outcomes would make them (on a scale ranging from 0 to 100).

*Occupational self efficacy.* An individual's level of self efficacy, the belief in one's ability to successfully perform a particular action or set of actions (Bandura, 1977), is closely tied to the individual's perceived behavioural control (Ajzen, 1985, 1988). Given the association between self efficacy and behaviour, it is important to evaluate offenders' employment-related self efficacy perceptions. The *Occupational Self Efficacy* scale (Fletcher, Hansson, & Bailey, 1992) measures adults' beliefs in their continued ability to learn, adapt, and be productive in a changing workplace. Three components of the scale assess performance ability, learning ability and organizational skills. This 29-item measure, scored on a 4-point scale, demonstrated very good internal reliability ( $\alpha = .94$ ) and construct validity when piloted within a sample of 136 adults employed at two manufacturing companies and an energy-related company (with both professional and non-professional job categories represented).

*Intention.* One question in the *Community Employment Checklist* refers to offenders' intention (i.e., likelihood) of acquiring / maintaining work. Offenders were asked to indicate their "chances" of finding a job (or keeping a job, if they were currently employed) in the next six months, with response options ranging from *Poor*, to *OK*, to *Good*.

## ***Interpersonal Factors***

*Social support for employment.* Azrin, Flores, and Kaplan (1975) explored the role of social support in contributing to employment outcomes for unemployed individuals. Their job club training, premised on the idea that working in a group is more effective than individual job-seeking, consisted of a "buddy procedure" designed to facilitate transportation to job interviews, role-playing, supervision of phone interactions with potential employers, résumé review, sharing job leads, and mutual encouragement. This multifaceted method to job-seeking advocated, at its core, the principle that job search was a process that could be learned through a structured approach involving group counseling in addition to the aforementioned components.

In their exploration of the hypothesis that job club training would be superior to individual job search efforts, Azrin and colleagues (1975) conducted a matched control design study to explore the effectiveness of the approach relative to the traditional individual job-seeking tactic. Participants were unemployed individuals who expressed an interest in finding work, recruited through various techniques, including newspaper advertisements, referrals from a state employment agency, personnel departments, and word-of-mouth. Potential study participants were matched, as closely as possible, on "probable employability", comprised of age, sex, race, education, marital status, desired type of position and salary level, number of dependents, and current financial resources. One person of each pair was allocated to the job club group, and the other to the control group, on the basis of a coin toss. A total of 60 individuals (28 male, 32 female) received a minimum of 5 counseling sessions; they were young (average age of 25 years), with an average of 14 years of education, and had been employed 6 months in the prior year. The majority (approximately 85%) of the participants were Caucasian. The control group was comparable on each of the measures. Their study indicated, as hypothesized, that the Job Club approach was more effective. Two months following the program, 90% of the participants were employed, whereas only 55% of the control group had found a job. Moreover, participants received a higher starting salary than their counterparts who did not use the Job Club services, and were more likely to obtain professional positions than the control clients (20% versus 5%, respectively).

The Job Club concept (Azrin & Besalel, 1980; as cited in Cellini & Lorenz, 1983) was adapted and offered to young (between 16 and 26), African American, male

offenders by Chicago's Safer foundation. Cellini and Lorenz (1983) found that of the 65 offenders who participated in this program, 46% were employed one month following program completion. This employment rate, significantly less than the percentage employed (ranging from 87 to 100 percent) reported in previous examinations of the impact of job club involvement with non-offenders (e.g., Azrin et al., 1975) was attributed to a less vibrant economy, coupled with participants' lack of marketable skills and the stigma of a criminal record (Cellini & Lorenz, 1983). Unfortunately, no comparative statistics on non-participants were available, as the study was descriptive in nature.

Although limited empirical research exists regarding the relationship between social support for employment and offender employment outcomes, the link is one that is intuitively appealing. Soothill and his colleagues (Soothill, Francis, & Ackerley, 1997; Soothill, Francis, & Escarela, 1999; Soothill & Holmes, 1981) conducted a series of follow-up studies exploring outcomes for offenders who received the services of a specialist employment agency (APEX) in the early 1970s. They found that offenders who received intensive services and who had three or more previous offenses benefited more (i.e., recidivated less) from APEX services than their counterparts who received less intensive services, and even compared to offenders with two or fewer offenses who received less intensive services. This finding held even for offenders who were not placed in jobs, but who maintained contact with the agency. The authors originally attributed this finding to motivation on the part of these offenders. Later conclusions derived from more sophisticated analyses were linked to the role of social support, and the risk principle elucidated by Andrews and colleagues (Andrews et al., 1990). Soothill et al. (1999) postulated that offenders with two or fewer offenses (i.e., low risk offenders) are more likely to maintain their social contacts than offenders who are more heavily involved in crime (i.e., high risk offenders with three or more offenses). The authors hypothesized that the intensive services provided by APEX to these higher risk offenders provided the ongoing support that might otherwise not exist for this group of offenders (Soothill et al., 1999). Thus, these findings corroborate the risk principle in the context of employment intervention and also demonstrate the potential influence of social support in contributing to offenders' community reintegration.

The degree to which an individual has support for employment was assessed by modifying the *Social Support for Crime* scale, adapted by Andrews (1985), from Short (1957) and Hackler and Hagan (1975). The scale, which measures *Criminal Resources / Models* (7 items) and *Affective Ties to Crime* (4 items), was reoriented to reflect support for employment in the present study.

### ***Broad Social Factor***

*Unemployment rate.* Andrews and Bonta (1998) assert the importance of considering broad contextual factors (e.g., political climate) for their indirect influence on offenders' behaviour. Unemployment rate may be construed as a broad social factor for its contribution to the availability of work, and its potential to impact offenders' ability to acquire a job. Regional unemployment rates (unemployment rates per 100,000 people in each city participating in the study) for 1999 were derived from data accompanying Statistics Canada's *Labour Market and Income Data Guide* (1999).

### ***Social Desirability***

The *Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding* (BIDR; Paulhus, 1994) was included in the work attitudes battery to provide an assessment of offenders' tendency to respond in a socially desirable manner. The two-factor scale is comprised of *Self Deceptive Enhancement* (SDE), the tendency to unconsciously distort self-reports in an exaggeratedly positive manner, and *Impression Management* (IM), the purposeful attempt to impress others by responding in a socially desirable fashion. Each of the subscales is comprised of 20 items, scored using a 7-point response format ranging from *Not True* to *Very True*. Paulhus (1994) presented norms from a variety of sources, including undergraduate students and offenders. Interestingly, the data indicate virtually no differences on means between the students (Paulhus, Reid, & De Longis, 1989) and non-psychopathic offenders (Harper & Hare, 1988; cited in Paulhus, 1994) (SDE = 86.4, IM = 72.3 and SDE = 83.3, IM = 74.9, respectively), indicating its utility for the assessment of socially desirable responding among offender populations. For the present research, the BIDR was modified by deleting items "I have sometimes doubted my ability as a lover" and "I never read sexy books or magazines" from each of the Self Deceptive Enhancement and Impression Management scales, respectively, as

offenders had expressed discomfort with these items in previous employment research (see Gillis, 1994). Additionally, item 13 "The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference" was deleted from the Self Deceptive Enhancement scale, as federal offenders were not permitted to vote at the time of the study.

### **Outcome Variables**

Three employment outcomes were assessed to accurately depict offenders' employment situation following release: employment status, quality of employment and number of weeks employed.

*Employment status.* Job attainment was simply a dichotomous measure of whether the offender was employed (yes / no) at the time of the assessment (at one month and at six months).

*Quality of employment.* The following components were used to assess quality of employment at one month: (a) type of occupation (skilled / unskilled), (b) salary meeting needs (meets needs / does not meet needs), (c) satisfaction with income (satisfied / not satisfied). Each component of the composite score was calculated on a three point scale, with 2 representing the highest score attainable. If the offender was not employed since release, he was allocated a score of 0 on each of the measures. If he was not currently employed but had been employed since release, his possible score for each of the three dimensions was calculated out of 1. If he was currently employed, each component was calculated out of 2. For example, for type of occupation at one month, if the offender had not been employed since release, he was given a score of 0; if he had been employed since release in a skilled occupation, he was given a score of 1 (*unskilled* = 0); and if he was currently employed in a skilled occupation, he was given a score of 2. Each of the three components of the quality of employment composite was scored using these criteria, to account for changes that may have occurred in the quality of employment since release. The same process was used to assess quality of employment during the second assessment at six months.

*Number of weeks employed.* At six months, employment retention was assessed by evaluating the number of weeks employed since release. Thus, the six month behavioural criterion accounted for frequent job changes evidenced by the offender. It is

anticipated that this measures the *extent* to which the offender is employed, and avoids strict reliance on dichotomous assessment (employed / unemployed) that does not necessarily reflect change in employment status over time. These indicators were obtained from the *Community Employment Checklist*, administered verbally by the research assistant to the offender.

## **Procedure**

Before finalizing the selection of data collection sites, the researcher contacted district parole directors and parole managers from six major centres in three regions (Atlantic, Ontario, and Prairies) to explain the project. Each representative indicated interest in pursuing the study in his respective office. The researcher followed up by providing each manager with a comprehensive information package describing the objectives and methodology of the study. Subsequent to receiving the package, each manager was contacted by the investigator and given the opportunity to ask questions about the study. Once managers discussed the study with the researcher, they were asked to assist in selecting a research assistant to conduct interviews at the parole office. More specifically, the investigator requested research assistants who were familiar with parole office procedures and who had experience working with offenders.

Once research assistants were selected, packages were supplied to both parole officers and research assistants. This information was supplemented with site visits at each selected parole office to facilitate communication between the researcher, parole officers and research assistants, and to allow for responses to any questions about the study rationale and procedure. Furthermore, this contact provided parole officers and research assistants with the opportunity to suggest any modifications to the employment instrument and work attitudes battery. After the general meeting explaining the purpose and procedure of the study, the researcher trained research assistants in application of the measures. After procedural and ethical issues were addressed, the researcher provided research assistants with a final version of all relevant materials.

The target group for the study included all male offenders who were released to each of the parole offices between December 1998 and September 1999 and who had a minimum of six months remaining before their sentence expiry date. Research assistants obtained a list of offenders released to the office and examined the list to

ensure that offenders had a minimum of six months remaining on their sentence to be served in the community. Once this process was complete, research assistants contacted each offender who met this criteria, requesting to meet with him once he had been in the community for a minimum of three weeks (and maximum of six weeks). Offenders who initially agreed to meet with the research assistant were first asked to read an informed consent form (see Appendix D), and requested to participate by the research assistant. They were assured that their participation was strictly voluntary (i.e., no remuneration) and would not impact on their release status or status within CSC. Additionally, they were informed that the study involved responding to employment- and crime-related questions posed by the research assistant and completion of the self-report work attitude measures. They were then provided with the opportunity to ask questions about the procedure and purpose of the study. Finally, offenders were informed that the third component of the study involved completion of the work attitudes battery and employment checklist when they had been in the community for six months. Offenders who consented were interviewed by the research assistant and completed the work attitudes questionnaire. Six months later, offenders who remained in the community were contacted by the research assistant and requested to complete the post-tests. Again, the purpose and procedure were explained, informed consent completed, and the post-test interview conducted and questionnaire completed. After the post-tests were completed, offenders were provided with a debriefing form (see Appendix E) which supplied them with additional information about the study, and contact numbers in the event that any questions or concerns should arise.

Data were sent on a monthly basis to the principal researcher at CSC's National Headquarters in Ottawa and were entered into a SAS (1990) database by a research assistant. All participants were assigned a subject number and names were not entered into the database, in order to ensure their confidentiality. Because there was a substantial amount of missing data, scale total scores were prorated for predictor variables with less than 50% missing data. Further, mean scores were substituted for the few variables remaining with missing total scores so equal *ns* would be available for each of the predictor variables. Raw scale scores are presented in the frequency analyses and mean substitution scores were used in the correlational and regression

analyses presented in the subsequent section. A series of analyses were also conducted using the original variables, and results were consistent with those found using the mean substitution variables.

## **RESULTS**

The primary purpose of this research was to explore different factors that contribute to employment outcomes for offenders released to the community. A series of correlational and regression analyses were performed to examine the relationships between predictor variables (e.g., work attitudes, employment history) and outcomes (employment status, quality of employment, number of weeks employed). This section presents descriptive analyses, and results from the one-month assessment phase, followed by analyses for the six-month assessment.

## ONE MONTH

### Descriptive Analyses

*Employment history.* As employment history is associated with offenders' community performance (Enocksson, 1981; Glaser, 1964; Markley et al., 1983), it is important to evaluate various components of employment prior to the incarceration period.

Offenders were asked to report on the type of job they had in the year before incarceration. As illustrated in Table 1, almost two-thirds indicated they had worked in unskilled or semi-skilled jobs. However, one-fifth reported working in a skilled position. These job categories were dichotomized to reflect either skilled (29.8%) or unskilled (70.2%) work.<sup>2</sup>

**Table 1: Type of Employment Reported Before Incarceration**

Type of employment	Frequency	Percentage
Unskilled or semi-skilled	168	62.0
Skilled	54	19.9
Sales	12	4.4
Supervisor	15	5.5
Manager/Professional	9	3.3
Other	13	4.8
Total	271	100.0

*Note:* 31 offenders reported not working in the year prior to incarceration.

Offenders were also asked about employment / training experiences during the current period of incarceration (see Table 2). Slightly more than one-third reported working for CORCAN (38.4%) or having participated in vocational training (35.4%), whereas only about one-tenth (11.9%) participated in work release. Very few offenders (4.5%) took part in the Skills for Employment program, offered only in the Prairie region. If offenders reported working for Corcan, or participating in either vocational training, the Skills for Employment program, or work release, they were allocated one point (i.e., "yes"). Conversely, offenders who did not partake in any of these programs were given

a zero on this variable (i.e., "no"). Sixty percent of offenders reported some type of employment training / experience during the present period of incarceration.

**Table 2: Type of Work Experience/Training During Incarceration**

Work experience/training	Frequency	Percentage
CORCAN	116	38.4
Vocational training	107	35.4
Skills for employment	13	4.5
Work release	36	11.9

*Note:* The work experience/training categories are not mutually exclusive and do not total 100%.

As previously described, offenders participate in an extensive evaluation of their criminogenic needs as they enter the institution. The need area of primary interest in this study was employment, and almost two-thirds (62.2%) of offenders were identified with some to considerable employment needs at the time of entry to the institution (see Table 3). These needs are re-assessed as offenders are released to the community, using the CIS. Table 3 shows a reduction in employment needs assessed in the community, with 55.7% of offenders manifesting some to considerable problems in the area of employment (compared to 62.2% at intake).

**Table 3: Employment Need Levels**

Need level	Frequency	Percentage
Needs at intake		
Asset	20	6.8
No need	91	31.0
Some need	133	45.2
Considerable need	50	17.0
Total	294	100.0
Needs at release		
Asset	16	7.0
No need	86	37.4
Some need	103	44.8
Considerable need	25	10.9
Total	230	100.0

*Note:* Employment need ratings at intake were not available for 8 offenders. Employment need ratings at release were not available for 72 offenders.

<sup>2</sup> The *skilled* category was comprised of: skilled labour, sales, supervisory, and managerial / professional positions and *unskilled* consisted of the unskilled / semi-skilled and 'other' categories. Offenders who were unemployed (n = 31) in the year prior to incarceration were included in the *unskilled* group.

*Attitudes, values and beliefs.* Attitudes, values and beliefs figure prominently in the correctional psychology literature for their relationship to criminal behaviour (Andrews & Bonta, 1998; Gendreau et al., 1996; Gendreau et al., 1998). Likewise, in this study, employment-related attitudes, values and beliefs are postulated to play an important role in contributing to employment outcomes for offenders. Table 4 presents descriptive information on the measures of work attitudes, values and beliefs and self efficacy.

**Table 4: Means and Alphas for the Attitude and Self Efficacy Measures: One Month**

Attitudes and Self Efficacy	n	M	SD	$\alpha$
<b>Attitudes</b>				
Expectations about job: Chance	285	82.3	17.0	
Expectations about job: Happy	285	84.3	45.4	
Work ethic	297	23.4	2.8	.70
Value of employment	299	61.5	6.3	.69
Work Involvement	291	18.2	3.8	.72
Job Involvement	281	30.7	6.3	.83
Intrinsic Job Motivation	286	33.9	4.4	.70
<b>Self efficacy</b>				
Occupational Self Efficacy	297	111.1	16.8	.95

*Note:* Alphas were not computed for the first two measures, as they were comprised of only two items.

High mean values were obtained for the outcome expectancies associated with employment (i.e., chance of good things happening with employment, and the extent to which it would cause happiness). Means on the remaining work scales were similar to those reported in the literature. The mean score on work ethic was higher than the mean of 18.38 ( $SD = 4.26$ ) reported by Ho and Lloyd (1984), as was the mean score on value of employment, compared to that reported by Andrews 60.85 ( $SD = 6.56$ ) in 1985. The mean score on work involvement was slightly lower than that reported by Kanungo (1982) (20.70,  $SD = 5.97$ ). The mean values on the remaining employment attitudinal measures are similar to those reported in the literature; Kanungo (1982) obtained a mean score of 31.31 ( $SD = 10.61$ ) on the job involvement scale, and Warr et al. (1979) reported a mean of 36.25 ( $SD = 5.51$ ) on the intrinsic job motivation scale. Alphas were

in the acceptable range for each of the employment scales, although the internal consistency for value of employment was considerably lower than that reported by Andrews ( $\alpha = .82$ ).

*Occupational self efficacy.* Occupational self efficacy was assessed to evaluate offenders' beliefs in their performance ability, learning ability, and organizational skills. Consistent with results from Fletcher et al. (1992), and as shown in Table 4, the scale showed high internal consistency. The mean score was slightly lower than that reported by Fletcher and her colleagues (120.8).

*Intention.* Offenders were asked to report their perception of the likelihood (i.e., their "chance") of finding work in the next six months (or of keeping work, if they were employed at the time of the first interview). As depicted in Table 5, very few offenders (7.1%) reported that they had a poor chance, slightly more than one-tenth (13.9%) said they had an "OK" chance, and the majority (78.9%) indicated that they felt they had a good chance of finding/keeping a job.

**Table 5: Distribution of the Chance of Finding / Maintaining Employment  
Variable: One Month**

Chance	Frequency	Percent
Poor	21	7.1
OK	41	13.9
Good	232	78.9
Total	294	100.0

*Note:* Information on chance of finding/maintaining employment variable was missing for 8 offenders

### ***Interpersonal Factors***

*Social support for employment.* In this study, social support for employment is conceptualized as a potentially important factor contributing to an individual's employment outcomes. The internal reliability of the scale was good, as indicated by the alpha level of .83. No comparative data are available for the scale mean of 12.4 ( $SD = 3.1$ ), as the *Social Support for Employment* scale was created for this study.

### **Broad Social Factor**

*Unemployment rate.* Unemployment rate is a broad social factor that influences the availability of work. Table 6 shows the distribution of employment rates across the various cities involved in the study. Regina had the lowest rate of unemployment, at 3.9%, whereas Winnipeg had the highest rate (5.3%).

**Table 6: Frequency of Unemployment Rate by City**

City	Unemployment rate	Frequency
Halifax	5.1	62
Toronto	4.5	80
Winnipeg	5.3	47
Regina	3.9	18
Calgary	4.3	70
Edmonton	4.6	25

*Note:*  $n = 302$ .

### **Social Desirability**

Given that a large portion of the data in this study were self-report, it is important to evaluate the degree to which offenders may be responding in a socially desirable manner. Paulhus' (1994) *Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding* scale was used to assess the degree to which offenders want to present themselves in a good light (i.e., the *Impression Management* subscale) and the extent to which they unconsciously distort self-report information in a positive manner (i.e., the *Self Deceptive Enhancement* subscale). Table 7 presents the descriptive information for the scales. The means for the scales are lower than those typically found among inmate samples, but this is likely due to the modifications to the scale for the present study (i.e., the deletion of particular items, as described in the Method section). Although the internal reliability of the Self Deceptive Enhancement Scale falls within an acceptable range, that of the Impression Management Scale is low (less than .60), indicating that it is unreliable.

**Table 7: Means and Alphas for Covariates: One Month**

Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding	n	M	SD	$\alpha$
Self deceptive enhancement	295	71.8	12.0	.66
Impression management	295	68.4	11.0	.49

**Outcome Variables**

*Employment status.* Offenders were asked to report their employment status when they had been in the community for one month. At that time, almost one-half (43.7%) of the sample of 302 offenders indicated that they were employed.

Table 8 presents information on the type of job offenders reported at one month. Comparable to the distribution for type of work prior to incarceration, two-thirds of offenders (64.4%) reported working in unskilled jobs following release from prison.

**Table 8: Type of Employment at One Month**

Type of employment	Frequency	Percent
Unskilled or semi-skilled	85	64.4
Skilled	27	20.5
Sales	8	6.1
Supervisor	6	4.6
Manager/Professional	3	2.2
Other	3	2.2
Total	132	100.0

*Quality of employment.* The other outcome measure at one month is quality of employment, the composite variable comprised of the following items: type of occupation since release (skilled / unskilled), salary meets needs (e.g., housing costs, bill payment), and satisfaction with salary. Scores ranged from 0 to 3, with a mean score of 0.78 ( $SD = 1.1$ ).

## Correlational Analyses

A series of correlational analyses were conducted to explore interrelationships between predictor variables (see Appendix F) and relationships between predictor variables (e.g., work attitudes) and employment outcomes at one month (status and quality). Results for the first series for correlational analyses, exploring relationships between predictor variables and employment outcomes at one month, are presented in Table 9.

Low positive correlations were obtained between ethnicity and outcome, indicating that non-Aboriginal offenders were more likely to be employed, and to be employed in higher quality jobs. Similar positive relationships were found between age and marital status with quality of employment (but not status), with older and married offenders reporting a higher quality of employment.

Among the work attitudes, values and beliefs measures, only value of employment was associated with employment status. Similarly, low positive correlations were found between quality of employment and the following attitudinal variables: work ethic, value of employment, job involvement and intrinsic job motivation. Slightly higher correlations were found between the historical set of employment predictor variables and outcomes. A more stable employment and education history, as well as skilled job experience prior to incarceration, were associated with more positive employment outcomes, with higher correlations obtained between stable employment and skill with quality of employment ( $r = .21$  and  $.23$ , respectively). Employment need was consistently negatively associated with outcome; higher levels of need were related to unemployment and a lower quality of employment. Employment training during incarceration was unrelated to either status or quality of employment<sup>3</sup>.

The highest (and virtually identical) correlations, although still in the moderate range, were found between the following predictor variables: intention, social support for employment and unemployment rate, and each of the outcome measures. Intention and social support were each positively correlated with status and quality, whereas unemployment rate was consistently negatively associated with outcome ( $r = -.28$ ).

---

<sup>3</sup> Note that the employment training variable is dichotomous (participated or did not participate in training) and does not reflect either the content, quality of participation or completion status of training.

Correlational analyses were conducted to explore whether any relationships existed between the predictor variables and socially desirable responding. Given that no significant relationships existed between the employment predictors and the BIDR subscales (see Gillis, 2002), they were not retained in further analyses.

**Table 9: Correlations between One Month Predictor Variables and Employment Outcomes at One Month**

Predictor variables	Employment status	Quality of employment
Demographic factors		
Age	.08	.12*
Ethnicity	.12*	.17**
Marital status	.07	.12*
Personal factors		
Employment history		
Stable employment	.14*	.21***
Education	.13*	.10
Skill level	.17**	.23****
Training	-.08	-.09
Employment need	-.18**	-.21***
Attitudes, values and beliefs		
Expectations about job: Chance	.08	.10
Expectations about job: Happy	.07	.10
Work involvement	.00	-.01
Work ethic	.09	.11*
Value of employment	.15*	.17**
Job involvement	.05	.11*
Intrinsic job motivation	.03	.13*
Self efficacy		
Occupational self efficacy	.16**	.21***
Intention		
Intention	.28****	.28****
Interpersonal factors		
Social support for employment	.28****	.29****
Broad social factor		
Unemployment rate	-.28****	-.28****

Note:  $n = 302$ .

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ , \*\*\*\*  $p \leq .0001$ .

## Regression Analyses

Regression analyses were run to further explore relationships between sets of predictor variables and each of the outcome measures at one month: status and quality of employment. Stepwise regression was used to explore the unique contributions of the predictor variables to each of these outcome measures.

First, predictor variables that had significant univariate correlations with employment status were entered into a stepwise regression analysis. Results of this analysis, presented in Table 10, show the influence of personal, interpersonal and broad social factors in contributing to employment status. Unemployment rate, the first variable to enter the equation, was negatively associated with employment status, whereas social support and intention were positively related to status. The final variable to enter the equation, employment need at intake, was negatively linked to status, indicating that offenders with higher levels of need were less likely to find employment. These four variables explained one-fifth of the variance in employment status.

**Table 10: Summary of Stepwise Regression Analysis for One Month Variables Predicting Employment Status at One Month (N = 302)**

Variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Step 1			
Unemployment rate	-.34	.07	-.28****
Step 2			
Unemployment rate	-.28	.07	-.24****
Social support for employment	.02	.01	.24****
Step 3			
Unemployment rate	-.27	.06	-.23****
Social support for employment	.02	.01	.23****
Intention	.17	.05	.17**
Step 4			
Unemployment rate	-.28	.06	-.24****
Social support for employment	.02	.01	.19***
Intention	.18	.05	.18***
Employment need at intake	-.08	.03	-.13*

Note:  $R^2 = .08$  for Step 1;  $R^2 = .13$  for Step 2 ( $p < .0001$ );  $R^2 = .16$  for Step 3 ( $p < .0001$ );  $R^2 = .18$  for Step 4 ( $p < .0001$ ). No other variable met the .10 significance level for entry into the model.

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ , \*\*\*\*  $p \leq .0001$ .

Results of the stepwise regression analysis predicting quality of employment, presented in Table 11, are comparable to those obtained in predicting status. Again, personal (intention), interpersonal (social support for employment) and broad social factors (unemployment rate) are represented. Skilled employment prior to incarceration was the fourth factor to enter the equation in predicting quality of employment following release. Not surprisingly, a higher level of skill is associated with a higher quality of employment in the community. These measures explained approximately 20% of the variance in quality of employment.

**Table 11: Summary of Stepwise Regression Analysis for One Month Variables Predicting Quality of Employment at One Month (N = 302)**

Variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Step 1			
Social support for employment	.06	.01	.29****
Step 2			
Social support for employment	.05	.01	.24****
Unemployment rate	-.59	.14	-.24****
Step 3			
Social support for employment	.04	.01	.21****
Unemployment rate	-.51	.14	-.21****
Intention	-.34	.10	.19***
Step 4			
Social support for employment	.04	.01	.18***
Unemployment rate	-.49	.14	-.19****
Intention	.33	.10	.19***
Skill level	.35	.12	.15**

Note:  $R^2 = .08$  for Step 1;  $R^2 = .14$  for Step 2 ( $p < .0001$ );  $R^2 = .17$  for Step 3 ( $p < .0001$ );  $R^2 = .19$  for Step 4 ( $p < .0001$ ). No other variable met the .10 significance level for entry into the model.

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ , \*\*\*\*  $p \leq .0001$ .

## SIX MONTHS

### Descriptive Analyses

Descriptive analyses for the 106 offenders who participated in the six-month assessment are presented in the following section. Given the high attrition rate, it is important to explore whether there are differences between offenders who participated at one month and those who remained for the six-month testing period. A series of t-tests were performed to test for differences in mean scores on the continuous variables. Offenders who participated in both assessment phases were significantly older ( $p \leq .001$ ) and lower risk as measured by SIR-R1 score ( $p \leq .0001$ ), total number of previous offenses ( $p \leq .01$ ), and total number of current offenses ( $p \leq .0001$ ). These offenders also had significantly lower scores on the social support for crime ( $p \leq .001$ ) and criminal self efficacy scales ( $p \leq .001$ ). Offenders who participated in the six month assessment also had higher mean scores on stable employment prior to incarceration ( $p \leq .05$ ).

A similar trend was noted when chi square analyses were conducted on categorical variables. Significant differences were noted between the groups of offenders on overall need at intake ( $\chi (2) = 8.2, p \leq .05$ ), need at release ( $\chi (2) = 13.0, p \leq .01$ ), employment need level at intake ( $\chi (3) = 12.5, p \leq .01$ ), and employment need at release ( $\chi (3) = 23.6, p \leq .0001$ ).

*Employment history.* The percentage of offenders who reported having worked in a skilled job prior to incarceration was slightly higher for offenders who participated in the six-month assessment than at one month (34.9% versus 29.8%) (see Table 12).

**Table 12: Type of Work Experience Before Incarceration**

Type of work	Frequency	Percentage
Unskilled	69	65.1
Skilled	37	34.9
Total	106	100.0

*Note:* 31 offenders who did not work in the year prior to incarceration were included in the unskilled category.

The percentage distribution of offenders who obtained training and/or work experience during their incarceration period was very similar to that reported by the full sample of offenders at one month. The highest percentage of offenders (37.7%) reported having taken vocational training, whereas slightly fewer (31.1%) indicated that they had worked for Corcan (see Table 13). Not surprisingly, the dichotomous training / employment experience variable has virtually the same distribution as that for the entire sample at one month, with 57.6% of offenders reporting some type of training during the incarceration period.

**Table 13: Type of Work Experience/Training During Incarceration**

Work experience/training	Frequency	Percentage
CORCAN	33	31.1
Vocational training	40	37.7
Skills for employment	6	5.8
Work release	13	12.3

*Note:* The percentages do not total 100%.

Offenders in the sub-sample had fewer employment needs than offenders in the entire sample. As illustrated in Table 14, one-half of the sub-sample of offenders were identified with medium to high employment needs at intake, compared to 62% of the entire sample. This difference is even more pronounced when offenders are released to the community. A significant reduction in the percentage of offenders identified with medium to high needs is noted (from 50% at intake to 35.7% at release) for the sub-sample, far below the 55% in the entire sample identified with medium to high needs at release.

**Table 14: Employment Need Levels**

Need level	Frequency	Percentage
Need levels at intake		
Asset	12	11.5
No need	40	38.5
Some need	36	34.6
Considerable need	16	15.4
Total	104	100.0
Need levels at release		
Asset	11	13.1
No need	43	51.2
Some need	23	27.4
Considerable need	7	8.3
Total	84	100.0

*Note:* Employment need ratings at intake were not available for 2 offenders. Employment need ratings at release were not available for 22 offenders.

*Attitudes, values and beliefs.* Table 15 presents descriptive information on the measures of work attitudes, values and beliefs, which is almost identical to that obtained for the full sample at one month.

**Table 15: Means and Alphas for the Attitude and Self Efficacy Measures: Six Months**

Attitudes and self efficacy	N	M	SD	$\alpha$
Attitude measures				
Expectations about job: Chance	95	85.6	16.3	
Expectations about job: Happy	95	84.3	15.8	
Work ethic	101	23.0	3.5	.85
Value of employment	100	60.7	6.8	.73
Work involvement	101	18.1	3.5	.71
Job Involvement	97	30.7	6.7	.85
Intrinsic Job Motivation	100	33.7	5.0	.83
Self efficacy				
Occupational Self Efficacy	101	111.1	18.9	.97

*Self efficacy.* The mean score on the occupational self efficacy measure was identical to that obtained at one month. Likewise, the scale was internally reliable, as evidenced by the very high alpha level.

*Intention.* Offenders' perception of the likelihood (i.e., their "chance") of finding work in the next six months (or of keeping work, if they were employed at the time of the first interview) is presented in Table 16. A slightly higher percentage of offenders (10.4%) were concentrated in the *Poor* category, compared to the percentage for the entire sample (7.1%). Very few offenders reported having an *OK* chance, and almost 90% said they had a *Good* chance of finding / keeping a job (versus 78.9% at one month). This change in the distribution is likely due to offenders' improved ability to accurately assess their likelihood of finding work, given their experience in the community since release.

**Table 16: Distribution of the Chance of Finding/Maintaining Employment  
Variable: Six Months**

Chance	Frequency	Percent
Poor	15	10.4
OK	15	2.8
Good	75	86.8
Total	105	100.0

*Note:* Information on the chance of finding/maintaining employment variable was missing for 1 offender.

### ***Interpersonal Factors***

*Social support for employment.* The mean score on the *Social Support for Employment* scale was markedly higher (35.4, *SD* = 5.1) than that obtained for the full sample at one month (12.4) and the internal reliability of the scale ( $\alpha = .84$ ) is the same as that of the entire sample.

### ***Outcome Variables***

*Employment status.* Employment status was radically different for offenders who participated in the six month assessment. Whereas only two-fifths of the entire sample indicated that they were employed at one month, 69.8% of the 106 offenders in the subsample were working at six months.

*Quality of employment.* The second outcome measure at six months, quality of employment, is the composite variable comprised of the following items: type of occupation at six months (skilled / unskilled), salary meets needs (e.g., housing costs,

bill payment), and satisfaction with salary. Scores ranged from 0 to 3, with a mean score of 1.4 ( $SD = 1.1$ ).

*Number of weeks employed.* The final outcome variable measured at six months is the total number of weeks employed since release. The average number of weeks employed was 14.1 ( $SD = 10.0$ ), with a range of 0 to 32 weeks.

## **Correlational Analyses**

Correlational analyses were conducted to explore relationships between predictor variables and employment outcomes (status, quality, number of weeks employed) at six months. A pattern comparable to that obtained at one month was observed for the relationships between the employment predictor variables and outcome measures. However, given the substantial participant attrition rate (with only 106 offenders participating in the six month assessment), many of these relationships did not attain statistical significance.

Table 17 presents results from these correlational analyses. Marital status was positively related to each of the employment outcome measures, with correlations in the moderate range ( $r = .20$  to  $.25$ ). Stable employment ( $r = .20$ ), education ( $r = .19$ ) and skill level ( $r = .32$ ) were significantly related to quality of employment, whereas employment need was the only historical employment variable associated with the number of weeks employed ( $r = -.21$ ).

The attitudinal measures, with the exception of work involvement and intrinsic job motivation, were positively associated with quality of employment at six months, with correlations in the  $.19$  to  $.28$  range. Intention, social support and unemployment rate were associated with each of the employment outcome measures, demonstrating the influence of personal, interpersonal, and broad social factors. Moderate positive relationships were obtained between social support for employment, and outcomes, and strong positive correlations found between intention and the criterion employment measures. Unemployment rate was consistently negatively related to each of the employment outcome measures, with correlations ranging from  $r = -.21$  to  $-.28$ .

**Table 17: Correlations Between Six Month Predictor Variables and Employment Outcomes at Six Months**

Predictor Variables	Employment status	Quality of employment	Number of weeks employed
<b>Demographic factors</b>			
Age	-.16	-.05	-.07
Ethnicity	.09	.04	.12
Marital status	.20*	.22*	.25*
<b>Personal factors</b>			
<b>Employment history</b>			
Stable employment	.13	.20*	.17
Education	.15	.19*	.17
Skill level	.05	.32***	.09
Training	.02	-.14	-.06
Employment need	-.15	-.12	-.21*
<b>Attitudes, values, and beliefs</b>			
Expectations about job: Chance	.15	.19*	.11
Expectations about job: Happy	.15	.27**	.14
Work involvement	-.00	.09	.01
Work ethic	.11	.28**	.12
Value of employment	.06	.21*	.11
Job involvement	.10	.21*	.17
Intrinsic job motivation	-.11	.02	-.00
<b>Self efficacy</b>			
Occupational self efficacy	.14	.18	.23*
<b>Intention</b>			
Intention	.69****	.57****	.58****
<b>Interpersonal factors</b>			
Social support for employment	.27**	.33***	.33***
<b>Broad social factor</b>			
Unemployment rate	-.27**	-.24*	-.21*

Note:  $n = 106$ .

\*  $p \leq .05$ . \*\*  $p \leq .01$ \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ . \*\*\*\*  $p \leq .0001$ .

### Regression Analyses

A series of hierarchical stepwise regression analyses were conducted to explore relationships between sets of predictor variables and each of the employment outcome measures at six months: status, quality of employment, and number of weeks employed. Those predictor variables assessed at six months with significant

correlations with the outcome variables were entered into the stepwise regression. Hierarchical stepwise analysis was used to statistically control for the effects of the corresponding predictor variables assessed at one month (e.g., if intention at six months entered into the regression equation, the first step in the regression equation contained intention assessed at one month). Results for the first regression equation predicting employment status are depicted in Table 18.

**Table 18: Summary of Hierarchical Stepwise Regression Analysis for Six Month Variables Predicting Employment Status at Six Months (N = 106)**

Variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Step 1			
Intention	.23	.07	.31***
Step 2			
Intention	.20	.07	.27**
Unemployment rate	-.24	.10	-.21*
Step 3			
Intention	.03	.06	.04
Unemployment rate	-.18	.08	-.17*
Intention (six months)	.41	.05	.66****

Note:  $R^2 = .10$  for Step 1;  $R^2 = .14$  for Step 2 ( $p < .0001$ );  $R^2 = .50$  for Step 3 ( $p < .0001$ ). No other variable met the .10 significance level for entry into the model.

\*  $p \leq .05$ . \*\*  $p \leq .01$ . \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ . \*\*\*\*  $p \leq .0001$ .

As illustrated in Table 18, intention (evaluated at one month) was the first variable to enter the equation predicting employment status at six months. Unemployment rate was the second variable to enter the equation, with a negative relationship with status. In the third and final step of the equation, intention assessed at six months replaced intention evaluated at one month, and unemployment rate remained as a significant predictor variable. Thus, intention (at six-months) and unemployment rate were the only factors to contribute significantly to the prediction of employment status at six months. Notably, intention was highly correlated with status, and together with employment rate, accounted for one-half of the variance in outcome.

Table 19 displays results from the hierarchical stepwise regression analysis predicting quality of employment at six months. Results were similar to those obtained in predicting quality at one month. Skill level prior to incarceration was the first variable to enter the equation, and was positively associated with quality of employment.

Intention assessed at one month was the second variable to enter the equation, but was replaced in Step 3 by the more proximally measured six-month intention variable. The final variable to enter the equation was offenders' expectancy that good things would happen to them as a function of obtaining employment. Thus, only personal factors (skill, and intention and expectancy assessed at six months) contributed to the prediction of quality of employment at six months, explaining one-half of the proportion of variance in quality of employment.

**Table 19: Summary of Hierarchical Stepwise Regression Analysis for Six Month Variables Predicting Quality of Employment at Six Months (N = 106)**

Variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Step 1			
Skill level before incarceration	.76	.22	.32***
Step 3			
Skill level before incarceration	.80	.21	.34****
Intention	.53	.16	.29**
Step 4			
Skill level before incarceration	.83	.17	.35****
Intention	.16	.14	.09
Intention (six months)	.85	.12	.55****
Step 5			
Skill level before incarceration	.78	.17	.33****
Intention	.26	.14	.14
Intention (six months)	.79	.12	.52****
Good job: Happy (six months)	.02	.01	.23**

Note:  $R^2 = .10$  for Step 1;  $R^2 = .19$  for Step 2 ( $p < .0001$ );  $R^2 = .45$  for Step 3 ( $p < .0001$ );  $R^2 = .50$  for Step 4 ( $p < .0001$ ). No other variable met the .10 significance level for entry into the model.

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ , \*\*\*\*  $p \leq .0001$ .

Results of the regression equation predicting number of weeks employed are presented in Table 20. Both measures of intention (one-month and six-month assessments) contributed, with the six-month intention variable contributing a significant proportion of variance to the overall regression equation. Social support for employment, evaluated at six months, was also associated with the number of weeks employed; higher levels of social support were predictive of a higher number of weeks employed. Thus, personal (intention) and interpersonal (social support) factors appear in the prediction of the length of time working in the community.

**Table 20: Summary of Hierarchical Stepwise Regression Analysis for Six Month Variables Predicting Number of Weeks Employed at Six Months (N = 106)**

Variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	$\beta$
Step 1			
Intention	6.58	1.45	.41****
Step 2			
Intention	3.64	1.35	.23**
Intention (post)	6.69	1.13	.50****
Step 3			
Intention	3.94	1.30	.24**
Intention (post)	5.94	1.11	.44****
Social support for employ. (post)	.48	.15	.24**

Note.  $R^2 = .17$  for Step 1;  $R^2 = .38$  for Step 2 ( $p < .0001$ );  $R^2 = .43$  for Step 3 ( $p < .0001$ ). No other variable met the .10 significance level for entry into the model.

\*  $p \leq .05$ . \*\*  $p \leq .01$ . \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ . \*\*\*\*  $p \leq .0001$ .

## DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study is one of the first to use a longitudinal approach to comprehensively assess the contributions of various factors to employment outcomes for offenders. Results demonstrate the influence of personal factors, such as intention, the interpersonal factor of social support, and unemployment rate, a broad community-level factor, consistent with the PIC-R perspective (Andrews, 1982; Andrews & Bonta, 1998). The following elaborates on the implications of these specific findings, specifically with respect to employment assessment and intervention.

Unemployment rate consistently appears in the prediction of outcomes (status and quality of employment) at one month. The influence of unemployment rate in contributing to employment outcomes for offenders is hardly surprising, and illustrates the importance of considering factors beyond the individual, when exploring employment interventions for offenders. This is particularly relevant in the context of employment counseling for offenders, which is timely, given Corcan's (a special operating agency within CSC tasked with offender employment training) recent development and expansion of their community-based Worksites, designed to facilitate the transition into employment of offenders on conditional release. This finding illustrates that employment counselors must be aware of the broader social context in their local areas, and of the availability of particular employment occupations, in order to best meet the employment needs of offenders.

At the individual level, the offender's intention to find work is strongly linked to his ability to find and keep a job. This finding shows that offenders are capable of accurately assessing their potential for acquiring and maintaining work. Consequently, employability assessments (e.g., job readiness evaluations) should attend to offenders' perceptions of the likelihood that they will be able to find work. Furthermore, these self evaluations are likely based on a combination of factors, including previous employment experience and skills acquisition, enhancement, and retention. As a service, CSC has the capacity to ensure that offenders have the opportunity to develop the skills that ultimately contribute to their competencies and sense of self efficacy, thus facilitating offenders' transition to the community, and specifically to community-based work.

In order to accomplish this goal, however, employment must be reinstated as an important intervention requiring intensive and systematic consideration. Findings from the present research can be used to complement our existing knowledge of program effectiveness as a gateway to the development, implementation and evaluation of effective employment strategies (i.e., employment placement and/or programs) for offenders with identified employment needs. Existing programs such as cognitive skills can be used to supplement core employment interventions, thus meeting the specific needs of offenders. It is only by providing offenders with effective programming that allows for skills development and work experience (provided in accordance with their level of identified employment need), that they will be given a legitimate opportunity to successfully reintegrate into the community. An important component of this transitional process is social support.

One of the strongest findings in the study was the role of social support in contributing to employment outcomes for offenders. This finding is significant, in that social support is a concrete factor readily amenable to intervention. For instance, the Corcan Worksites offer the potential to provide the type of support that will enable offenders to find and keep work in the community. Some of the sites currently offer access to an automated databank comprised of names of community-based employers and businesses willing to hire offenders. This provides concrete and accessible support for offenders, and eliminates the need to decide whether they should report their criminal record to potential employers, thereby facilitating the job-seeking and interviewing process.

The importance of social support, uncovered in this study, reiterates previous findings from Azrin et al. (1975) and Soothill and his colleagues (1997, 1999), who found that offenders who maintained consistent contact with an employment agency based in the UK (APEX), were less likely to recidivate. These findings were not dependent upon employment status; rather, the authors attribute this impact to offenders' perception of social support. Moreover, the findings are intuitive, in that most offenders and correctional staff would report that social support facilitates offenders' job search, and more generally, their community reintegration.

Employment counselors play a critical role in the process of employment programming, including assessment of clients' needs, competencies and vocational /

employment interests; liaison with community employers and agencies; employment counseling; and follow-up. It is critical that an effective and ongoing employment counseling process is established, as this study illustrates the important role of social support in contributing to employment outcomes for offenders. Authors (e.g., Braithwaite, 1980; Pryor & Ward, 1985) have cautioned against over-reliance on insufficient counseling / placement services, as they may raise expectations, thereby engendering a sense of despair in offenders when these are not met. They have also warned that although the role of job counselor is to facilitate finding work, simply placing individuals into "any job" is an insufficient and unacceptable response. Counselors should not only assist individuals in finding a job, but extend their role to helping them retain the job, thus facilitating the transition from unemployment to work (Pryor & Ward, 1985).

Pryor and Ward (1985) describe concrete techniques to be employed by counselors in preparing clients for job searches and interviews. These include: relaxation training, systematic desensitization, assertiveness training, modeling, and video role play as ways to decrease the anxiety associated with approaching prospective employers and for dealing with the interview situation. Moreover, they provide suggestions for acquiring and retaining employment, including strategies for coping with frustration in the workplace and avoiding confrontation.

Finally, the role of fellow offenders in job search should not be overlooked, as research by Azrin et al. (1975) shows that a mutually supportive job-seeking approach (e.g., sharing job leads, feedback on mock interview role plays) is more effective than individual efforts at job search.

## **Limitations**

A number of limitations are associated with this study. Both the participation rates and attrition rates were problematic. Due to the voluntary nature of this research, it is possible that only the most motivated offenders initially agreed to participate. However, comparison of risk and need profiles of the sample with the population profiles showed that the full sample ( $n = 302$ ) was representative of the release population on those variables. Additionally, this was a study of employment among federal offenders on

conditional release. This represents a high-risk, high-need group of offenders; results may thus be relevant only for federal offenders on conditional release.

Furthermore, due to study attrition (i.e., refusals) and suspension / revocation, only one-third of the original sample participated in the second assessment phase (at six months). It is suggested for future research involving offenders in the community, that researchers attempt to involve relevant staff (e.g., parole officers, employment counselors) in describing the study and in recruiting participants. Although this approach was attempted in the current study, the researcher was unable to gain "buy in" from all parole officers, which may have impacted the research assistants' ability to recruit offenders. In future, considerations should include further exploration of the research with individuals with the most contact with offenders to ensure better buy in. As for attrition rates, it is difficult to involve offenders in research as they become increasingly busy as they settle into the community. Unfortunately, researchers are unable to offer compensation to offenders for participating in research, which may result in a lower participation rate than if such inducements were available. One potential approach to increasing the consent rate and decreasing the attrition rate is to minimize the length of questionnaires by streamlining the assessment protocol and procedures.

### **Practical Applications and Future Directions**

A noteworthy finding is the incremental contribution of dynamic variables to the prediction of employment outcomes. Use of a longitudinal research design contributed to an enhanced understanding of factors that contribute to job acquisition and retention. Thus, the findings support the contention of Gendreau and colleagues (1998) that a dynamic assessment approach (Andrews & Bonta, 1998) should be used in evaluating employment deficits and competencies among offenders. The CSC currently uses a dynamic assessment approach, beginning at intake, and continuing throughout the incarceration process (Motiuk, 1997a). These findings suggest that expansion of an employment-specific dynamic assessment protocol may contribute to a better understanding of factors linked to community employment outcomes. For instance, a more intensive systematic exploration of CORCAN, vocational training and other institutional employment experiences would contribute to a better understanding of the impact of institutional employment programs on various outcomes (particularly as the

“training” variable used in the study was not dynamic in nature, thus not necessarily reflective of an individual’s training experience). Future research should measure and evaluate proximal factors linked to employment training / experience obtained during incarceration, including: institutional adjustment, and the development and enhancement of both generic skills and specific skills / skill sets (Gillis, 2000, 2001, 2002). This information should be collected through multi-source, multi-method assessment techniques involving offender perceptions of skills and self efficacy prior to, during and following training, and instructors’ perceptions of the same. Moreover, behavioural indicators of skills acquisition would provide a concrete measure of the impact of employment programming.

Moreover, given that meta-analytic results support the increased efficacy of community-based treatment over institutional intervention (Andrews et al., 1990; Lipsey, 1990), more focus should be placed on community-based employment initiatives for offenders. Although institutional employment opportunities may contribute to an offender's potential for safe reintegration (Pearson & Lipton, 1998; Saylor & Gaes, 1996), more intensive effort should focus on community-based initiatives that offer job readiness training, job placement strategies and on-the-job training opportunities. Additionally, there is need for follow-up sessions and systematic intervention at the community level. More specifically, community employment placement and training opportunities are required to: facilitate the linkage and ease the transition to the community, provide financial support and promote peer support and effective prosocial models to offenders upon release. This approach would be an intervention that follows naturally from the finding that social support for employment is one of the key factors in contributing to positive employment-based outcomes for offenders during their first month of release, as well as number of weeks employed during the first six months of release.

Federal offenders enter and leave the institution with significant employment needs, which are associated with their ability to successfully reintegrate into the community following release. It is imperative, given the link between employment deficits and recidivism, to effectively address offender employment needs by exploring the concrete dynamic factors uncovered in this research. To facilitate offenders' ability

to acquire and retain employment is to provide them with one (of several) necessary components which may ultimately contribute to their successful community adjustment.

## REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (1985). From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behavior. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckman (Eds.), *Action control: From cognition to behavior* (pp. 11-39). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Ajzen, I. (1988). *Attitudes, personality, and behavior*. Chicago: Dorsey.
- Andrews, D. A. (1982). *A personal, interpersonal and community-reinforcement perspective on deviant behavior (PIC-R)*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services.
- Andrews, D. A. (1985). *Notes on a battery of paper-and-pencil instruments: Part I - Assessments of attitudes and personality in corrections*. Unpublished manuscript, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.
- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (1998). *The psychology of criminal conduct* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Cincinnati: Anderson.
- Andrews, D. A., & Bonta, J. (1995). *LSI-R: The Level of Service Inventory - Revised*. Toronto, ON: Multi-Health Systems, Inc.
- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Hoge, R. D. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17, 19-52.
- Andrews, D. A., Pirs, S., Walker, J., & Hurge, A. (1980). *A theoretical, research and program framework for employment-oriented services in probation and parole (An interim report)*. Parts I, II, III, IV, and VI. Ontario: Ministry of Correctional Services.
- Andrews, D. A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R. D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. J. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 28, 369-404.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Braithwaite, J. (1980). *Prisons, education and work: Towards a national employment strategy for prisoners*. Queensland, Australia: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Burke, H. C. (1997). *Perceived factors related to conditional release outcome by successful and unsuccessful male offenders*. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.
- Cellini, H. R., & Lorenz, J. R. (1983). Job Club group training with unemployed offenders. *Federal Probation*, 46(3), 46-50.

- Dowden, C. (1998). *A meta-analytic examination of the risk, need and responsivity principles and their importance within the rehabilitation debate*. Unpublished master's thesis, Department of Psychology, Carleton University, Ottawa.
- Enocksson, K. (1981). Correctional programs: A review of the value of education and training in penal institutions. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services & Rehabilitation, 5*(1), 5-18.
- Finn, P. (1998). Job placement for offenders in relation to recidivism. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 28*(1/2), 89-106.
- Fletcher, W. L., Hansson, R. O., & Bailey, L. (1992). Assessing occupational self-efficacy among middle-aged and older adults. *Journal of Applied Gerontology, 11*, 489-501.
- Funke, G. S., Wayson, B. L., & Miller, N. (1982). *Assets and liabilities of correctional industries*. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.
- Furnham, A., Bond, M., Heaven, P., Hilton, D., Lobel, T., Masters, J., Payne, M., Rajamanikam, R., Stacey, B., & Van Daalen, H. (1991). A comparison of Protestant Work Ethic beliefs in thirteen nations. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 133*, 185-197.
- Gaes, G. G., Flanagan, T. J., Motiuk, L. L., & Stewart, L. (1999). Adult correctional treatment. In M. Tonry and J. Petersilia (Eds.), *Prisons* (pp. 361-426). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C., & Gray, G. (1998). Case need domain: "Employment." *Forum on Corrections Research, 10*(3), 16-19.
- Gendreau, P., Little, T., & Goggin, C. (1996). A meta-analysis of the predictors of adult offender recidivism: What works! *Criminology, 34*, 575-607.
- Gillis, C. A. (1994). *The influence of shop supervisor characteristics on employee-reported work attitudes in a prison industry setting*. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.
- Gillis, C. A. (2000). Reconceptualizing offender employment. *Forum on Corrections Research, 12*(2), 32-35.
- Gillis, C. A. (2001). Offender employment programming. In Correctional Service Canada (Ed.), *Compendium 2000 on effective correctional programming* (pp. 64-74). Ottawa: Research Branch, Correctional Service Canada.
- Gillis, C. A. (2002). Understanding employment: A prospective exploration of factors linked to community-based employment among federal offenders. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.

- Glaser, D. (1964). *The effectiveness of a prison and parole system*. Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Guynes, R., & Grieser, R. C. (1986). Contemporary prison industry goals. In American Correctional Association (Ed.), *A study of prison industry: History, components, and goals* (pp. 19-29). College Park, Maryland.
- Hackler, J. C., & Hagan, J. L. (1975). Work and teaching machines as delinquency prevention tools: A four-year follow-up. *Social Services Review, 49*, 92-106.
- Harris, A. R. (1975). Imprisonment and the expected value of criminal choice. *American Sociological Review, 40*, 71-87.
- Ho, R., & Lloyd, J. (1984). Development of an Australian work ethic scale. *Australian Psychologist, 19*, 321-332.
- Hodanish, M. J. (1976). Rehabilitation through employment: Proceed with caution. *Offender Rehabilitation, 1*, 147-161.
- Lipsey, M. (1990). *Juvenile delinquency treatment: A meta-analytic inquiry into the variability of effects*. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kanungo, R. N. (1982). Measurement of job and work involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 67*, 341-349.
- Markley, H., Flynn, K., & Bercaw-Dooen, S. (1983). Offender skills training and employment success: An evaluation of outcomes. *Corrective and Social Psychiatry and Journal of Behavior Technology Methods and Therapy, 29*, 1-11.
- McDonald, D. C. (1998). Employment and training programs: A review of the research. In B. J. Auerbach and T. C. Castellano (Eds.), *Successful community sanctions and services for special offenders* (pp. 233-250). Lanham, MD: American Correctional Association.
- Motiuk, L. L. (1991). *Antecedents and consequences of prison adjustment: A systematic assessment and reassessment approach*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Carleton University, Ottawa, Ontario.
- Motiuk, L. (1996). Targeting employment patterns to reduce offender risk and need. *Forum on Corrections Research, 8*(1), 22-24.
- Motiuk, L. (1997a). Classification for correctional programming: The Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process. *Forum on Corrections Research, 9*(1), 18-22.
- Motiuk, L. (1997b). The Community Risk/Needs Management Scale: An effective supervision tool. *Forum on Corrections Research, 9*(1), 8-12.

- Niles, F. S. (1993). The work ethic in Australia and Sri Lanka. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 134*, 55-59.
- Paterson, J. M., & O'Driscoll, M. P. (1989). Utility of the Australian work ethic scale: Reliability and validity comparisons. *Australian Journal of Psychology, 41*, 285-290.
- Paulhus, D. L., Reid, D., & De Longis, A. (1989). *Omnibus study of desirable responding in Big Five and coping measures*. Unpublished data, University of British Columbia.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1994). *Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding: Reference Manual for BIDR Version 6*. Unpublished manual, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Pryor, R. G., & Ward, R. T. (1985). Unemployment: What counselors can do about it. *Journal of Employment Counseling, 22*(1), 3-17.
- Rowe, R. C. (1995). *The utilization of an interview-based classification instrument of parole board decision-making in Ontario*. Unpublished master's thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa.
- Ryan, T. A. (1998). *Job retention of offenders and ex-offenders: Review and synthesis of the literature*. Unpublished manuscript, College of Criminal Justice, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.
- SAS Institute Inc (1990). *SAS Version 6.11*. Cary, NC: SAS Institute Inc.
- Saylor, W. G., & Gaes, G. G. (1996). The effect of prison employment and vocational/apprenticeship training on long-term recidivism. *Forum on Corrections Research, 8*(1), 12-14.
- Short, J. F. Jr. (1957). Differential association and delinquency. *Social Problems, 4*, 233-239.
- Statistics Canada (1999). *Guide to the Labour Force Survey*. Catalogue no. 71-543-GIE. Ottawa, Statistics Canada.
- Soothill, K., & Holmes, J. (1981). Finding employment for ex-prisoners: A ten-year follow-up study. *The Howard Journal, 20*, 29-36.
- Soothill, K., Francis, B., & Ackerley, E. (1997). The value of finding employment for white-collar ex-offenders: A 20-year criminological follow-up. *British Journal of Criminology, 37*(4), 581-591.

- Soothill, K., Francis, B., & Escarela, G.. (1999). White-collars and black sheep: A twenty-year criminological follow-up of white-collar ex-offenders. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 32(3), 303-314.
- Townsend, T. (1996). Offenders and work in the Correctional Service of Canada: A historical evolution. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 8(1), 35-38.
- Uggen, C. (1999). Ex-offenders and the conformist alternative: A job quality model of work and crime. *Social Problems*, 46(1), 127-151.
- Warr, P. B., Cook, J., & Wall, T. D. (1979). Scales for the measurement of some work attitudes and aspects of psychological well-being. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 52, 129-148.

**APPENDIX A**  
**COMMUNITY EMPLOYMENT CHECKLIST**

**For completion at the end of the 1st month of offender's release  
(from the third to sixth week)**

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**FPS:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Date released:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Rel. Institution:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Releasing region:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Type of release:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Administration site:** \_\_\_\_\_  
**Date administered:** \_\_\_\_\_

Appendix A (cont'd)

<p>PRE-INCARCERATION:</p>	<p>Did you have work experience before incarceration?  <input type="checkbox"/> No  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p>	<p><i>If yes,</i>  Occupation in year prior to incarceration:  <input type="checkbox"/> Student  <input type="checkbox"/> Homemaker/caretaker  <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-skilled or unskilled labour (construction, factory, cashier)  <input type="checkbox"/> Skilled labour (mechanic, plumber, machinist)  <input type="checkbox"/> Clerical, sales (insurance, auto dealer, computer)  <input type="checkbox"/> Lower management/supervisory (foreman, store manager, self employed, small businessman)  <input type="checkbox"/> Managerial/professional (executive, teacher, doctor, lawyer)  <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):  _____</p>
<p><i>DURING INCARCERATION:</i></p>	<p>Did you participate in vocational training during incarceration?  <input type="checkbox"/> No  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p>	<p><i>If yes,</i>  Type of vocational training during incarceration (check all that apply):  <input type="checkbox"/> Aquaculture-fish hatchery  <input type="checkbox"/> Autobody  <input type="checkbox"/> Basic skills  <input type="checkbox"/> Cabinet making  <input type="checkbox"/> Carpentry  <input type="checkbox"/> Cell study  <input type="checkbox"/> Computers  <input type="checkbox"/> Cooking  <input type="checkbox"/> DEP accountancy  <input type="checkbox"/> Electronics  <input type="checkbox"/> Gas engines  <input type="checkbox"/> General  <input type="checkbox"/> Hairdressing/barbering  <input type="checkbox"/> Horticulture  <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial cleaning certificate program (FSW)  <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial drawing  <input type="checkbox"/> Industrial services  <input type="checkbox"/> Machine shop  <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanical  <input type="checkbox"/> Photography  <input type="checkbox"/> Plumbing  <input type="checkbox"/> Printing  <input type="checkbox"/> Sewage treatment  <input type="checkbox"/> Technological studies  <input type="checkbox"/> Upholstery</p>

		<p>_____ Vocational training in the community</p> <p>_____ Welding/metal trades</p> <p>Did you complete the program(s)?</p> <p>_____ No (specify which program[s]):</p> <p>_____</p> <p>_____ Yes (specify which program[s]):</p> <p>_____</p> <p><i>If no,</i></p> <p>Reason for not completing any of the above program(s):</p> <p>_____ Participation in other program(s)</p> <p>_____ Transfer to another institution</p> <p>_____ Released</p> <p>_____ Lack of job prospects in this area</p> <p>_____ Changed/lost interest</p> <p>_____ Conflict with instructor</p> <p>_____ Dropped out</p> <p>_____ Other (specify):</p> <p>_____</p>
	<p>Did you work for CORCAN during incarceration?</p> <p>_____ No</p> <p>_____ Yes</p>	<p><i>If yes,</i></p> <p>Type of CORCAN shop (check all that apply):</p> <p>_____ Agribusiness (farming, meat processing and baked products, forestry and environmental services)</p> <p>_____ Construction (on-the-job construction training and/or certification on construction projects)</p> <p>_____ Manufacturing (shops, including wood/cabinetry, metal and upholstery operations)</p> <p>_____ Services (printing and graphic services; imaging, microfilm and CD-ROM; data entry and data base creation; telemarketing and distribution)</p> <p>_____ Textiles (manufactured clothing; textiles products [canvas, upholstery]; laundry services)</p> <p>Length of time working for CORCAN:</p> <p>_____ Less than three months</p>

		<input type="checkbox"/> Three to six months <input type="checkbox"/> Six months to one year <input type="checkbox"/> One year or more  Reason for leaving CORCAN: <input type="checkbox"/> Participation in other program(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Transfer to another institution <input type="checkbox"/> Released <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of job prospects in this area <input type="checkbox"/> Changed/lost interest <input type="checkbox"/> Conflict with instructor <input type="checkbox"/> Dropped out <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____
	Did you participate in the Employment and Career Planning Program* (3-week program) or other employment training program specify: _____ _____? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A: Not available in this region  * Program currently offered at: Saskatchewan Penitentiary Drumheller Institution Stoney Mountain Bowden	<i>If yes,</i> Did s/he complete the program? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes  <i>If no,</i> Reason for not completing program: <input type="checkbox"/> Participation in other program(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Transfer to another institution <input type="checkbox"/> Released <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of job prospects in this area <input type="checkbox"/> Changed/lost interest <input type="checkbox"/> Conflict with instructor <input type="checkbox"/> Dropped out <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____
	Did you participate in the Skills for Employment Program (3 month program)? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> N/A: Not available in this region  * Program currently offered at: Saskatchewan Penitentiary Drumheller Institution Stoney Mountain Bowden  Move to p. 6, "work release" question if N/A	<i>If yes,</i> Area of concentration (check all that apply): <input type="checkbox"/> Auto body <input type="checkbox"/> Baker <input type="checkbox"/> Beef herdsman <input type="checkbox"/> Boiler technician <input type="checkbox"/> Bricklayer <input type="checkbox"/> Building maintenance worker <input type="checkbox"/> Bullet/sign painter <input type="checkbox"/> Cabinet maker/carpentry <input type="checkbox"/> Cleaner <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete product fabricator <input type="checkbox"/> Electrician <input type="checkbox"/> Farm equipment operator <input type="checkbox"/> Farm hand <input type="checkbox"/> Farm repair person <input type="checkbox"/> Field crop worker <input type="checkbox"/> Food preparation worker



	<p>Did you participate in work release (offered through the temporary absence program) while in the institution?</p> <p>_____ No _____ Yes</p>	<p><i>If yes,</i> Did you successfully complete the work release? _____ No _____ Yes</p> <p><i>If no, reason for unsuccessful completion:</i>          _____ Participation in other program(s)          _____ Transfer to another institution          _____ Released          _____ Lack of job prospects in this area          _____ Changed/lost interest          _____ Other (specify):          _____</p>
<p><b>COMMUNITY STATUS</b></p> <p>Are you currently employed? _____ No _____ Yes</p>	<p><i>If yes,</i> When did you obtain employment? _____ / _____ / _____ (Y/M/D)</p>	
	<p>Employment status:          _____ Part-time          _____ Full-time          _____ Self-employed          _____ Other (specify):          _____</p>	<p>Number of hours worked per week (on average):          _____ hours</p> <p>Salary earned per week (take home):          _____</p> <p>Does your salary meet your basic needs (e.g., rent, bills, food, etc.)?          _____ No          _____ Yes</p> <p>Are you satisfied with this income?          _____ No          _____ Yes</p>

	<p>Type of occupation:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Student <input type="checkbox"/> Homemaker / caretaker <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-skilled or unskilled labour (construction, factory, cashier) <input type="checkbox"/> Skilled labour (mechanic, plumber, machinist) <input type="checkbox"/> Clerical, sales (insurance, auto dealer, computer) <input type="checkbox"/> Lower management / supervisory (foreman, store manager, self employed, small businessman) <input type="checkbox"/> Managerial / professional (executive, teacher, doctor, lawyer) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____	<p>Is your current employment related to work experience before incarceration:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable (not employed before incarceration) <p>Is your current employment related to vocational training:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable (haven't taken vocational training) <p>Is your current employment related to CORCAN work:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable (did not work for CORCAN) <p>Is your current employment related to Skills for Employment training:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable (did not take program)
<p>If you are unemployed now, were you employed since release?</p> <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable (retired, disability)	<p><i>If yes,</i>  Employment status:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Part-time <input type="checkbox"/> Full-time <p><input type="checkbox"/> Self employed  <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):  _____</p>	<p>Number of hours worked per week (on average):  _____ hours</p> <p>Salary earned per week (take home):  _____ Take home</p> <p>Did your salary meet your basic needs (e.g., rent, bills, food, etc.)?  <input type="checkbox"/> No  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>Were you satisfied with this income?  <input type="checkbox"/> No  <input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p>
	<p>Type of occupation:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Student <input type="checkbox"/> Homemaker / caretaker <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-skilled or unskilled labour (construction, factory, cashier)	

	<input type="checkbox"/> Skilled labour (mechanic, plumber, machinist) <input type="checkbox"/> Clerical, sales (insurance, auto dealer, computer) <input type="checkbox"/> Lower management / supervisory (foreman, store manager, self employed, mall businessman) <input type="checkbox"/> Managerial / Professional (executive, teacher, doctor, lawyer) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____	
	Why are you no longer employed? <input type="checkbox"/> Seasonal / temporary work <input type="checkbox"/> Contract ended <input type="checkbox"/> Quit <input type="checkbox"/> Fired <input type="checkbox"/> Left for school / training <input type="checkbox"/> Suspended <input type="checkbox"/> Revoked <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	
If you were unemployed at any time since release.	Source of income/financial support: <input type="checkbox"/> Social support (welfare) <input type="checkbox"/> Partner/family <input type="checkbox"/> Other family members <input type="checkbox"/> Friends / acquaintances <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____	
Have you been refused employment due to your criminal record? <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<i>If yes,</i> Reason given by employer: <input type="checkbox"/> Nature of offence <input type="checkbox"/> Does not want ex- offenders working for him/her <input type="checkbox"/> Nature of the job <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____	How many times did this happen? <input type="checkbox"/> Once <input type="checkbox"/> Twice <input type="checkbox"/> Three or more times

**NOTE: IF THE OFFENDER IS CURRENTLY UNEMPLOYED, COMPLETE THIS PAGE. INTERVIEW THE OFFENDER FOR THE SECTION BELOW.**

***Instructions: Please provide the answer that you think corresponds with your work behaviours.***

Is finding a job on your correctional plan?	No		Yes
Is job training/school on your correctional plan?	No		Yes
Do you follow the employment condition of your correctional plan?	No N/A	Somewhat	Yes
Is job search a condition of release?	No		Yes
Were you referred to an employment counsellor?	No		Yes
Do you have regular contact with an employment counsellor?	No	Somewhat	Yes
Have you been referred to any community employment/training programs?	None	Some	Several
Have you participated in job training programs/workshops since release?	None	Some	Several
Do you have a regular job search routine?	No	Somewhat	Yes
Do you have a résumé?	No		Yes
Have you handed out any résumés since release?	None	Some	Many
Have you gone to any job interviews since release?	None	Some	Many
How satisfied are you with your job search to date?	Not Very	Somewhat	Satisfied
Do you think your criminal record holds you back from finding a job?	No	A little	A lot
Do you avoid job interviews because of your criminal record?	No	Sometimes	Often
How confident are you in your ability to work?	Not Very	Somewhat	Confident
How would you rate your level of motivation to find a job?	A little	Somewhat	Motivated
Do you intend to find a job?	No	Maybe	Yes
How would you rate your chances of finding a job in the next 6 months?	Poor	OK	Good
How important do you think having a job is?	Not Very	Somewhat	Important
How would you rate your work ethic?	Poor	Average	Strong
How much support do you have from your spouse/ significant other(s) for finding work?	Not Much	A little	Good Support
How much does your spouse/important other(s) believe that having a job is important?	Not Very	Somewhat	Important

**INTERVIEW IS COMPLETE**

***Thank-you for your participation.***

**NOTE: IF THE OFFENDER IS CURRENTLY EMPLOYED, COMPLETE THIS PAGE.  
INTERVIEW THE OFFENDER FOR THE SECTION BELOW.**

***Instructions: Please provide the answer that you think corresponds with your work behaviours.***

Is finding a job on your correctional plan?	No	Yes	
Is job training/school on your correctional plan?	No	Yes	
Is job search a condition of release?	No	Yes	
Were you referred to an employment counsellor?	No	Yes	
Did you have regular contact with an employment counsellor?	No	Somewhat	Yes
Were you referred to any community employment/training programs?	None	Some	Several
Did you participate in job training programs/workshops since release?	None	Some	Several
Did you have a regular job search routine?	No	Somewhat	Yes
Do you have a résumé?	No	Yes	
Did you hand out any résumés since release?	None	Some	Many
Did you go to any job interviews since release?	None	Some	Many
How satisfied were you with your job search?	Not Very	Somewhat	Satisfied
Did you think your criminal record would hold you back from finding a job?	No	A little	A lot
Did you avoid job interviews because of your criminal record?	No	Sometimes	Often
How confident are you in your ability to work?	Not Very	Somewhat	Confident
How would you rate your level of motivation to find a job (before you found one)?	A little	Somewhat	Motivated
Did you intend to find a job?	No	Maybe	Yes
How would you rate your chances of keeping your job in the next 6 months?	Poor	OK	Good
How important do you think having a job is?	Not Very	Somewhat	Important
How would you rate your work ethic?	Poor	Average	Strong
How much support do you have from your spouse/ significant other(s) for keeping work?	Not Much	A little	Good Support
How much does your spouse/important other(s) believe that having a job is important?	Not Very	Somewhat	Important

**INTERVIEW IS COMPLETE**

***Thank-you for your participation***

**NOTE: IF THE OFFENDER IS CURRENTLY UNEMPLOYED, COMPLETE THIS PAGE.**

**PROVIDE YOUR PERCEPTIONS FOR THE SECTION BELOW.**

***Instructions: Please provide the answer that you think corresponds with the offender's work-related attitudes and behaviours.***

How confident are you in her/his ability to work?	Not Very	Somewhat	Confident
How would you rate her/his level of motivation to find a job?	A little	Somewhat	Motivated
Does s/he intend to find a job?	No	Maybe	Yes
How would you rate her/his chances of finding a job in the next 6 months?	Poor	OK	Good
How important does s/he think having a job is?	Not Very	Somewhat	Important
How would you rate her/his work ethic?	Poor	Average	Strong
How much support does s/he have from spouse/significant other(s) for finding work?	Not Much	A little	Good Support
How much does her/his spouse/important other(s) believe that having a job is important?	Not Very	Somewhat	Important

**CHECKLIST IS COMPLETE**

**NOTE: IF THE OFFENDER IS CURRENTLY EMPLOYED, COMPLETE THIS PAGE.**

**PROVIDE YOUR PERCEPTIONS FOR THE SECTION BELOW.**

***Instructions: Please provide the answer that you think corresponds with the offender's work-related attitudes and behaviours.***

How confident are you in her/his ability to work?	Not Very	Somewhat	Confident
How would you rate her/his level of motivation to find a job (before s/he found one)?	A little	Somewhat	Motivated
Did s/he intend to find a job?	No	Maybe	Yes
How would you rate her/his chances of keeping your job in the next 6 months?	Poor	OK	Good
How important does s/he think having a job is?	Not Very	Somewhat	Important
How would you rate her/his work ethic?	Poor	Average	Strong
How much support does s/he have from spouse/significant other(s) for keeping work?	Not Much	A little	Good Support
How much does her/his spouse/important other(s) believe that having a job is important?	Not Very	Somewhat	Important

**CHECKLIST IS COMPLETE**

## Community Employment Checklist

For completion during the 6<sup>th</sup> month of offender's release

**Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**FPS:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of release:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Administration site:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date administered:** \_\_\_\_\_

<p>In the last six months, how many weeks have you been employed?  _____ weeks  <i>(Indicate 0, if unemployed since release)</i></p>		
<p>In the last six months, how many jobs have you held?  _____ jobs  <i>(All jobs, including any mentioned during the first interview).</i></p>	<p>Type of job(s): <i>(Check all that apply)</i></p> <p>_____ Student</p> <p>_____ Homemaker / caretaker</p> <p>_____ Semi-skilled or unskilled labour (construction, factory, cashier)</p> <p>_____ Skilled labour (mechanic, plumber, machinist)</p> <p>_____ Clerical, sales (insurance, auto dealer, computer)</p> <p>_____ Lower management / supervisory (foreman, store manager, self employed, small businessman)</p> <p>_____ Managerial / professional (executive, teacher, doctor, lawyer)</p> <p>_____ Other (specify):  _____</p>	<p>Length of time in each job: <i>(Check each corresponding job)</i></p> <p>_____ weeks</p>
<p>What is the longest continuous period of time you have been employed since release?  _____ weeks  <i>(List number of weeks of uninterrupted work, including moving from one job to another, if less than one week of unemployment in between two jobs).</i></p>		

<p>Are you currently employed?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable (retired, disability)</p>	<p>If yes, When did you obtain employment?</p> <p>____/____/____ (Y/M/D)</p>	
	<p>Current employment status:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Part-time</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Full-time</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Self-employed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Number of hours worked per week (on average):</p> <p>_____ hours</p> <p>Salary earned per week (take home):</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Does your salary meet your basic needs (e.g., rent, bills, food, etc.)?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>Are you satisfied with this income?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p>
	<p>Type of occupation:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Student</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Homemaker / caretaker</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Semi-skilled or unskilled labour (construction, factory, cashier)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Skilled labour (mechanic, plumber, machinist)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clerical, sales (insurance, auto dealer, computer)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Lower management / supervisory (foreman, store manager, self employed, small businessman)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Managerial / professional (executive, teacher, doctor, lawyer)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify):</p> <p>_____</p>	<p>Is your current employment related to work experience before incarceration:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable (not employed before incarceration)</p> <p>Is your current employment related to vocational training:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable (haven't taken vocational training)</p> <p>Is your current employment related to CORCAN work:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable (did not work for CORCAN)</p> <p>Is your current employment related to Skills for Employment training:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable (did not take program)</p>

<p>If you are unemployed now, were you employed since release?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable (retired, disability)</p>	<p>If yes, Employment status:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Part-time</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Full-time</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Self employed</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____</p>	<p>Number of hours worked per week (on average): _____ hours</p> <p>Salary earned per week (take home): _____ Take home</p> <p>Did your salary meet your basic needs (e.g., rent, bills, food, etc)?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p>Were you satisfied with this income?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p>
	<p>Type of occupation:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Student</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Homemaker / caretaker</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Semi-skilled or unskilled labour (construction, factory, cashier)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Skilled labour (mechanic, lumber, machinist)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clerical, sales (insurance, auto dealer, computer)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Lower management / supervisory (foreman, store manager, self employed, small businessman)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Managerial / professional (executive, teacher, doctor, lawyer)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____</p>	
	<p>Why are you no longer employed?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Seasonal / temporary work</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Contract ended</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Quit</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Fired</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Left for school / training</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Suspended</p>	

	<input type="checkbox"/> Revoked <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	
If you were unemployed at any time since release:	Source of income/financial support: <input type="checkbox"/> Social support (welfare) <input type="checkbox"/> Partner/family <input type="checkbox"/> Other family members <input type="checkbox"/> Friends / acquaintances <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____	
	Why were you unemployed? <input type="checkbox"/> No work available in my field <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of work experience <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of job skills/training <input type="checkbox"/> Criminal record held me back <input type="checkbox"/> Not that interested in working <input type="checkbox"/> Too busy with other programs <input type="checkbox"/> Family responsibilities <input type="checkbox"/> On disability <input type="checkbox"/> Retired <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	
Since your interview during your first month of release:	How many jobs have you applied for? _____ jobs	What type of jobs have you applied for (check all that apply)? <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-skilled or unskilled labour (construction, factory, cashier) <input type="checkbox"/> Skilled labour (mechanic, plumber, machinist) <input type="checkbox"/> Clerical, sales (insurance, auto dealer, computer) <input type="checkbox"/> Lower management / supervisory (foreman, store manager, self employed, small businessman) <input type="checkbox"/> Managerial/professional (executive, teacher, doctor, lawyer) <input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify): _____

	<p>How many interviews have you attended?  _____ interviews</p>	
	<p>How many job offers did you receive?  _____ None  _____ One  _____ Two  _____ Three or more</p>	
	<p>How many job offers did you accept?  _____ None  _____ One  _____ Two  _____ Three or more  _____ N/A (no jobs were offered)</p>	<p><i>If none,</i>  Why did you not accept?  _____ Not interested in this type of work  _____ Pay was inadequate  _____ Too busy with other programs  _____ Family responsibilities  _____ Other:  _____</p>
<p>Have you been refused employment due to your criminal record during the past six months?  _____ No  _____ Yes</p>	<p><i>If yes,</i>  Reason given by employer:  _____ Nature of offence  _____ Does not want ex-offenders working for him/her  _____ Nature of the job  _____ Other (specify):  _____</p>	<p>How many times did this happen?  _____ Once  _____ Twice  _____ Three or more times</p>



**PLACE THE NUMBER FROM THE FOLLOWING LIST IN THE SECOND COLUMN IN THE TABLE ON PREVIOUS PAGE (TYPE OF PROGRAM):**

1. Cognitive Skills Training
2. Living Without Violence
3. Family Life/Parenting Skills
4. Leisure Education
5. Community Integration
6. Anger/Emotion Management
7. Substance Abuse Programming
8. Sex Offender Treatment
9. Literacy
10. Family Violence
11. Other Violence Programming
12. Counterpoint (attitudes program)
13. Education
14. Vocational Training
15. Employment Programs (e.g., offered through HRDC or through CSC)
16. Other

**NOTE: IF THE OFFENDER IS CURRENTLY UNEMPLOYED, COMPLETE THIS PAGE.  
INTERVIEW THE OFFENDER FOR THE SECTION BELOW.**

*Instructions: Please provide the answer that you think corresponds with your work behaviours.*

Is finding a job on your correctional plan?	No		Yes
Is job training/school on your correctional plan?	No		Yes
Do you follow the employment condition of your correctional plan?	No	Somewhat	Yes N/A
Is job search a condition of release?	No		Yes
Were you referred to an employment counsellor?	No		Yes
Do you have regular contact with an employment counsellor?	No	Somewhat	Yes
Have you been referred to any community employment/training programs?	None	Some	Several
Have you participated in job training programs/workshops since release?	None	Some	Several
Do you have a regular job search routine?	No	Somewhat	Yes
Do you have a résumé?	No		Yes
Have you handed out any résumés since release?	None	Some	Many
Have you gone to any job interviews since release?	None	Some	Many
How satisfied are you with your job search to date?	Not Very	Somewhat	Satisfied
Do you think your criminal record holds you back from finding a job?	No	A little	A lot
Do you avoid job interviews because of your criminal record?	No	Sometimes	Often
How confident are you in your ability to work?	Not Very	Somewhat	Confident
How would you rate your level of motivation to find a job?	A little	Somewhat	Motivated
Do you intend to find a job?	No	Maybe	Yes
How would you rate your chances of finding a job in the next 6 months?	Poor	OK	Good
How important do you think having a job is?	Not Very	Somewhat	Important
How would you rate your work ethic?	Poor	Average	Strong
How much support do you have from your spouse/significant other(s) for finding work?	Not Much	A little	Good Support
How much does your spouse/important other(s) believe that having a job is important?	Not Very	Somewhat	Important
What percentage of the past six months have you worked?	Less than 25%	25-49%	50-74% More than 75%

**INTERVIEW IS COMPLETE**

**NOTE: IF THE OFFENDER IS CURRENTLY EMPLOYED, COMPLETE THIS PAGE.  
INTERVIEW THE OFFENDER FOR THE SECTION BELOW.**

*Instructions: Please provide the answer that you think corresponds with your work behaviours.*

Is finding a job on your correctional plan?	No	Yes		
Is job training/school on your correctional plan?	No	Yes		
Is job search a condition of release?	No	Yes		
Were you referred to an employment counsellor?	No	Yes		
Did you have regular contact with an employment counsellor?	No	Somewhat	Yes	
Were you referred to any community employment/training programs?	None	Some	Several	
Did you participate in job training programs/workshops since release?	None	Some	Several	
Did you have a regular job search routine?	No	Somewhat	Yes	
Do you have a résumé?	No	Yes		
Did you hand out any résumés since release?	None	Some	Many	
Did you go to any job interviews since release?	None	Some	Many	
How satisfied were you with your job search?	Not Very	Somewhat	Satisfied	
Did you think your criminal record would hold you back from finding a job?	No	A little	A lot	
Did you avoid job interviews because of your criminal record?	No	Sometimes	Often	
How confident are you in your ability to work?	Not Very	Somewhat	Confident	
How would you rate your level of motivation to find a job (before you found one)?	A little	Somewhat	Motivated	
Did you intend to find a job?	No	Maybe	Yes	
How would you rate your chances of keeping your job in the next 6 months?	Poor	OK	Good	
How important do you think having a job is?	Not Very	Somewhat	Important	
How would you rate your work ethic?	Poor	Average	Strong	
How much support do you have from your spouse/significant other(s) for keeping work?	Not Much	A little	Good Support	
How much does your spouse/important other(s) believe that having a job is important?	Not Very	Somewhat	Important	
What percentage of the past six months have you worked?	Less than 25%	25-49%	50-74%	More than 75%

**INTERVIEW IS COMPLETE**

**NOTE: IF THE OFFENDER IS CURRENTLY UNEMPLOYED, COMPLETE THIS PAGE. PROVIDE YOUR PERCEPTIONS FOR THE SECTION BELOW.**

*Instructions: Please provide the answer that you think corresponds with the offender's work-related attitudes and behaviours.*

How confident are you in her/his ability to work?	Not Very	Somewhat	Confident
How would you rate her/his level of motivation to find a job?	A little	Somewhat	Motivated
Does s/he intend to find a job?	No	Maybe	Yes
How would you rate her/his chances of finding a job in the next 6 months?	Poor	OK	Good
How important does s/he think having a job is?	Not Very	Somewhat	Important
How would you rate her/his work ethic?	Poor	Average	Strong
How much support does s/he have from spouse/significant other(s) for finding work?	Not Much	A little	Good Support
How much does her/his spouse/important other(s) believe that having a job is important?	Not Very	Somewhat	Important

**CHECKLIST IS COMPLETE**

**NOTE: IF THE OFFENDER IS CURRENTLY EMPLOYED, COMPLETE THIS PAGE.  
 PROVIDE YOUR PERCEPTIONS FOR THE SECTION BELOW.**

*Instructions: Please provide the answer that you think corresponds with the offender's work-related attitudes and behaviours.*

How confident are you in her/his ability to work?	Not Very	Somewhat	Confident
How would you rate her/his level of motivation to find a job (before s/he found one)?	A little	Somewhat	Motivated
Did s/he intend to find a job?	No	Maybe	Yes
How would you rate her/his chances of keeping your job in the next 6 months?	Poor	OK	Good
How important does s/he think having a job is?	Not Very	Somewhat	Important
How would you rate her/his work ethic?	Poor	Average	Strong
How much support does s/he have from spouse/significant other(s) for keeping work?	Not Much	A little Support	Good
How much does her/his spouse/important other(s) believe that having a job is important?	Not Very	Somewhat	Important

**CHECKLIST IS COMPLETE**

## APPENDIX B

### Work Attitudes Questionnaire

**Instructions:** This is not a test and there are no “right” or “wrong” answers. We are interested in your ideas and opinions about work and life in the community. Your answers will give us a better idea of some of the things that help inmates on release to find and keep a job.

Please indicate your feelings about all the questions by circling one of the answers.

Example:

<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>

1. The most important things that happen to me involve my job.      1    2    3    4    5

For this question, if you **Agree** that the most important things that happen to you involve your job, you would circle **4**.

1. The most important things that happen to me involve my job.      1    2    3    ④    5

If you **Disagree** with the statement, you would circle **2**.

1. The most important things that happen to me involve my job.      1    ②    3    4    5

If you **Did Not Agree and Did Not Disagree** with this statement, you would circle **3**.

1. The most important things that happen to me involve my job.      1    2    ③    4    5

*Please ask if you have any questions before you begin. If you are not sure what a question means when you are filling out the questionnaire, feel free to ask for help*

## Australian Work Ethic

Instructions: Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following items, using the scale provided.

	<b>Strongly Disagree</b> <b>1</b>	<b>Disagree</b> <b>2</b>	<b>Agree</b> <b>3</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b> <b>4</b>
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				

## Social Support for Employment

Instructions: Please indicate the response that best describes your position since release.

<b>None</b> <b>1</b>	<b>Few</b> <b>2</b>	<b>Several</b> <b>3</b>	<b>Most</b> <b>4</b>	
1. Think of your best friends: that is, those close friends who you have seen most frequently since release:				
a. Do any of them have full-time jobs?	1	2	3	4
b. Are any of them the type of person who enjoys working for a living?	1	2	3	4
2. Think of the people you know and have been associating with since release.				
a. Do any of them have full-time jobs?	1	2	3	4
b. Are any of them the type of person who enjoys working for a living?	1	2	3	4

Table continued

	<b>No 1</b>	<b>Not Sure 2</b>	<b>Yes 3</b>	<b>Definitely Yes 4</b>
3.				
If I want to find a job, I'd know where to go or who to see.	1	2	3	4
4.				
If I want to get some information about finding work, I'd know where to go, or who to see.	1	2	3	4
5.				
If I was planning to find a job, I know some people who could and would help me to find one.	1	2	3	4
6.				
While I might not call them friends and I might not see them very often, I know some people who have full-time jobs.	1	2	3	4
7.				
I know of at least one person in my neighbourhood or area of town who appears to be doing "just fine" as a result of his/her employment.	1	2	3	4
8.				
In my neighbourhood or area of town, there are people who have jobs and are liked and respected by others in the neighbourhood.	1	2	3	4
9.				
In my neighbourhood or area of town, there are people who have jobs and they are disliked and not respected by others in the neighbourhood.	1	2	3	4

## Job Involvement

Instructions: Please answer the following questions, thinking about your job right now. If you are not working right now, think back to your last job and answer these questions in relation to that job.

Please indicate whether the next 10 questions refer to: \_\_\_\_\_ Your job now  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Your last job  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Never employed

Note: If never employed, then do not complete the scale on this page and move to the scale on the next page.

<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>		
1.	The most important things that happen to me involve my present job.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	To me, my job is only a small part of who I am.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	I am very much involved personally in my job.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	I live, eat and breathe my job.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	Most of my interests are centred around my job.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	I have very strong ties with my present job which would be very difficult to break.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	Usually I feel detached from my job.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	Most of my personal life goals are job-oriented.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	I consider my job to be very central to my existence.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	I like to be absorbed in my job most of the time.	1	2	3	4	5

## Work Involvement

Instructions: These next questions ask about work in general. Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with these questions, using the scale below.

<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Neither Agree nor Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 11. The most important things that happen in life involve work.              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. Work is something people should get involved in most of the time.        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. Work should be only a small part of one's life.                          | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. Work should be considered central to life.                               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. In my view, an individual's personal life goals should be work-oriented. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. Life is worth living only when people get absorbed in work.              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

## Value of Employment

Instructions: Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with these statements, using the following scale.

<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Undecided</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>		
1.	If a person doesn't want to work, it is his/her own business.	1	2	3	4	5
2.	Work is a good character builder.	1	2	3	4	5
3.	Work is a way of being of service to God.	1	2	3	4	5
4.	Work helps you forget about your personal problems.	1	2	3	4	5
5.	To work is to be worthwhile to society.	1	2	3	4	5
6.	A person can only earn the respect of family and friends if he/she is working.	1	2	3	4	5
7.	For most people, work is being told what to do and making a profit for someone else.	1	2	3	4	5
8.	I work only because I am compelled to.	1	2	3	4	5
9.	An employable person who is not working is not a good citizen.	1	2	3	4	5
10.	I see no value in work except the pay cheque.	1	2	3	4	5
11.	Lack of work is the source of all evil.	1	2	3	4	5
12.	Work is a good learning experience.	1	2	3	4	5
13.	A person is foolish to keep working if s/he doesn't have to.	1	2	3	4	5
14.	I believe a person needs to work in order to feel that s/he has a real place in the world.	1	2	3	4	5
15.	A regular job is good for one.	1	2	3	4	5
16.	The happiest persons are those who work only when they need money.	1	2	3	4	5
17.	Every person should have a job that gives him/her a steady income.	1	2	3	4	5
18.	Work can be a tremendous source of satisfaction.	1	2	3	4	5

## Occupational Self Efficacy

Instructions: For the following items, indicate how you would compare yourself to the average worker your own age, using the rating scale provided. If you are not working right now, imagine how you think you would compare to other workers.

<b>Worse than most workers</b>		<b>Same as most workers</b>		<b>Better than most workers</b>			
<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>			
1. Dependability			1	2	3	4	5
2. Pride in a job well done			1	2	3	4	5
3. Contribution to the company			1	2	3	4	5
4. Efforts to continually learn more about my job			1	2	3	4	5
5. Interest in further career growth			1	2	3	4	5
6. Judgment			1	2	3	4	5
7. Ability to deal with people			1	2	3	4	5
8. Co-workers can trust me			1	2	3	4	5
9. Ability to help co-workers with job-related problems			1	2	3	4	5
10. Energy level (endurance)			1	2	3	4	5
11. Perseverance on difficult jobs			1	2	3	4	5
12. Ability to remember job details			1	2	3	4	5
13. Ability to be retrained for new jobs			1	2	3	4	5
14. Ability to handle complex jobs			1	2	3	4	5
15. Ability to adapt to changes in work group			1	2	3	4	5
16. Ability to communicate clearly on the job			1	2	3	4	5
17. Ability to support co-workers with personal problems			1	2	3	4	5

Table continued

	<b>Worse than most workers</b>		<b>Same as most workers</b>		<b>Better than most workers</b>	
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	
18. Ability to get along with “difficult” co-workers	1	2	3	4	5	
19. Relevant experience	1	2	3	4	5	
20. Ability to control quality of my work	1	2	3	4	5	
21. Job safety habits/record	1	2	3	4	5	
22. Ability to meet my work goals	1	2	3	4	5	
23. Current skills	1	2	3	4	5	
24. Ability to plan effectively	1	2	3	4	5	
25. Knowledge of the latest technologies	1	2	3	4	5	
26. Ability to learn from experienced workers	1	2	3	4	5	
27. Ability to teach/manage others	1	2	3	4	5	
28. Knowing where to go in company for most kinds of help	1	2	3	4	5	
29. Knowing how to get cooperation from other departments, co-workers	1	2	3	4	5	

## Intrinsic Job Motivation

**Instructions:** Please answer the following questions, thinking about your job right now. If you are not working right now, think back to your last job and answer these questions in relation to that job.

Please indicate whether the next 6 questions refer to: \_\_\_\_\_ Your job now  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Your last job  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Never employed

*Note: If never employed, then do not complete the scale on this page and move to the scale on the following page.*

	Disagree Strongly	Disagree	Disagree slightly	Neutral	Agree Slightly	Agree	Agree strongly
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

- |    |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|----|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | I feel a sense of personal satisfaction when I do this job well.       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. | My opinion of myself goes down when I do this job badly.               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. | I take pride in doing my job as well as I can.                         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 4. | I feel unhappy when my work is not up to my usual standard.            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 5. | I like to look back on the day's work with a sense of a job well done. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 6. | I try to think of ways of doing my job effectively.                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

## Social Support for Crime

Instructions: Please circle the number that best describes your situation since release.

None 1	Few 2	Several 3	Most 4
-----------	----------	--------------	-----------

1. Think of your best friends: that is, those close friends who you have seen most frequently since release:

a. Are any of them involved in activities such as stealing (cars, money, property) or fraud?	1	2	3	4
--	---	---	---	---

b. Are any of them the type of person who enjoys fighting and/or destroying things and/or gets into fights whether they enjoy it or not?	1	2	3	4
--	---	---	---	---

2. Think of the people you know and have been associating with since release.

a. Are any of them involved in activities such as stealing (cars, money, property) or fraud?	1	2	3	4
--	---	---	---	---

b. Are any of them the type of person who enjoys fighting and/or destroying things and/or gets into fights whether they enjoy it or not?	1	2	3	4
--	---	---	---	---

	<b>No 1</b>	<b>Not Sure 2</b>	<b>Yes 3</b>	<b>Definitely Yes 4</b>
3.				
If I want to purchase some stolen goods at a reduced price, I'd know where to go or who to see.	1	2	3	4
4.				
If I want to get some money for some stolen goods, I'd know where to go, or who to see.	1	2	3	4
5.				
If I was planning to commit a crime, I know some people who could and would help me plan it.	1	2	3	4
6.				
While I might not call them friends and I might not see them very often, I know some people who are involved in criminal activity.	1	2	3	4
7.				
I know of at least one person in my neighbourhood or area of town who appears to be doing "just fine" as a result of his/her criminal activity.	1	2	3	4
8.				
In my neighbourhood or area of town, there are people who are involved in criminal activity and are liked and respected by others in the neighbourhood.	1	2	3	4
9.				
In my neighbourhood or area of town, there are people who are involved in criminal activity and they are disliked and not respected by others in the neighbourhood.	1	2	3	4

## Mechanisms of Moral Disengagement

Instructions: Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following items.

	<b>Strongly Disagree 1</b>	<b>Disagree 2</b>	<b>Agree 3</b>	<b>Strongly Agree 4</b>
1. It is okay to fight if you are protecting your friends.	1	2	3	4
2. Slapping and shoving someone is just a way of joking.	1	2	3	4
3. Damaging property is no big deal when you consider that others are beating people up.	1	2	3	4
4. One person in a group should not be blamed for any trouble that the group causes.	1	2	3	4
5. If a person is living under bad conditions, he/she should not be blamed for being aggressive.	1	2	3	4
6. It is okay to tell small lies because they are not harmful.	1	2	3	4
7. Some people deserve to be treated like animals.	1	2	3	4
8. When people get in trouble, it is usually someone else's fault.	1	2	3	4
9. It is okay to beat someone up who bad mouths your family.	1	2	3	4
10. It is okay to hit someone who bothers you because it is just teaching them 'a lesson'.	1	2	3	4
11. Stealing a little money is not too serious compared to those who steal a lot of money.	1	2	3	4
12. A person who only suggests doing something illegal should not be blamed if others go ahead and do it.	1	2	3	4
13. People should not be blamed for causing trouble if they have not been raised properly.	1	2	3	4
14. People do not mind being teased because it gives them attention.	1	2	3	4

	<b>Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Disagree</b>	<b>Agree</b>	<b>Strongly Agree</b>	
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	
15.	It is okay to mistreat someone who behaves like 'a jerk'.	1	2	3	4
16.	It is okay to fight when your friend's honour is threatened.	1	2	3	4
17.	Taking someone's car without their permission is just 'borrowing it'.	1	2	3	4
18.	It is okay to insult someone because beating him/her is worse.	1	2	3	4
19.	If a whole group decides to do something illegal, it is unfair to blame any one person in the group for it.	1	2	3	4
20.	A person should not be blamed for having a foul mouth if all their friends do too.	1	2	3	4
21.	Teasing someone does not really harm them.	1	2	3	4
22.	Someone who is really annoying does not deserve to be treated like a human being.	1	2	3	4
23.	People who get mistreated usually deserve it.	1	2	3	4
24.	It is okay to lie to keep your friends out of trouble.	1	2	3	4
25.	It is not a bad thing to 'get high' once in a while.	1	2	3	4
26.	Taking some things from a store is not very serious when compared to some of the illegal things other people do.	1	2	3	4
27.	It is unfair to blame a person who only had a small part in the harm caused by a group.	1	2	3	4
28.	People should not be blamed for misbehaving if their friends pressured them.	1	2	3	4
29.	Insults do not really hurt anyone.	1	2	3	4
30.	Some people have to be treated roughly because they do not have feelings that can be hurt.	1	2	3	4
31.	People should not be blamed for misbehaving if their parents were hard on them.	1	2	3	4

## Tolerance for Law Violations and Identification with Criminal Others

Instructions: Following are some statements with which you may agree or disagree. Circle the answer that best fits the way you feel about the statement.

	<b>Strongly Disagree</b> 1	<b>Disagree</b> 2	<b>Undecided</b> 3	<b>Agree</b> 4	<b>Strongly Agree</b> 5
1. Sometimes a person like me has to break the law in order to get ahead.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Most successful people used illegal means to become successful.	1	2	3	4	5
3. People who have been in trouble with the law have the same sort of ideas about life as I have.	1	2	3	4	5
4. People should always obey the law no matter how much it interferes with their personal ambition.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I would rather associate with people who obey the law than those who don't.	1	2	3	4	5
6. It's all right for a person to break the law if s/he doesn't get caught.	1	2	3	4	5
7. I'm more like the people who can make a living outside the law than I am like those who only break the law occasionally.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Most people would commit crimes if they know they wouldn't get caught.	1	2	3	4	5
9. People who have been in trouble with the law are more like me than people who don't have trouble with the law.	1	2	3	4	5
10. There is never good cause for breaking the law.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I don't have much in common with people who never break the law.	1	2	3	4	5
12. A hungry person has the right to steal.	1	2	3	4	5
13. It's all right to evade the law if you don't actually violate it.	1	2	3	4	5
14. No person can violate the law and be my friend.	1	2	3	4	5
15. A person should obey only those laws which seem reasonable.	1	2	3	4	5
16. A person is a fool to work for a living if s/he can get by some easier way; even if it means violating the law.	1	2	3	4	5

## Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding

Instructions: Using the scale below as a guide, circle the number beside each statement to indicate how true it is.

	Not true 1	2	3	Somewhat true 4	5	6	Very true 7
1.	My first impressions of people usually turn out to be right.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2.	It would be hard for me to break any of my bad habits.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3.	I don't care to know what other people really think of me.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4.	I have not always been honest with myself.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5.	I always like to know why I like things.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6.	When my emotions are aroused, it biases my thinking.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7.	Once I've made up my mind, other people can seldom change my opinion.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8.	I am not a safe driver when I exceed the speed limit.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9.	I am fully in control of my own fate.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10.	It's hard for me to shut off a disturbing thought.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11.	I never regret my decisions.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12.	I sometimes lose out on things because I can't make up my mind soon enough.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13.	The reason I vote is because my vote can make a difference.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14.	My parents were not always fair when they punished me.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15.	I am a completely rational person.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16.	I rarely appreciate criticism.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17.	I am very confident of my judgments.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18.	It's all right with me if some people happen to dislike me.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19.	I don't always know the reasons why I do the things I do.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7

	<b>Not true</b>			<b>Somewhat true</b>				<b>Very true</b>				
	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>				
20.	I sometimes tell lies if I have to.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21.	I never cover up my mistakes.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22.	There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23.	I never swear.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24.	I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25.	I always obey laws, even if I'm unlikely to get caught.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26.	I have said something bad about a friend behind his/her back.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27.	When I hear people talking privately, I avoid listening.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28.	I have received too much change from a salesperson without telling him or her.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29.	I always declare everything at customs.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30.	When I was young I sometimes stole things.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31.	I have never dropped litter on the street.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32.	I sometimes drive faster than the speed limit.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33.	I have done things that I don't tell other people about.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34.	I never take things that don't belong to me.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35.	I have taken sick leave from work or school even though I wasn't really sick.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36.	I have never damaged a library book or store merchandise without reporting it.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37.	I have some pretty awful habits.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38.	I don't gossip about other people's business.					1	2	3	4	5	6	7

## Advantages of Employment

Instructions: Now I'd like you to imagine having a steady job (if you don't already have one). People say that certain good things can go along with this. Like a nice house, a good car, and good money.

What are some good things you associate with having a steady job? List as many as you can think of:


What do you think the *chances* would be of getting things like these if you had a steady job?

No Chance		Low Chance		Some Chance		Good Chance		High Chance		Completely Certain
0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

How *happy* do you think you would be if you got things like these?

Not Happy At All		A Little Happy		Somewhat Happy		Pretty Happy		Very Happy		Completely Happy
0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

## Disadvantages of Employment

Instructions: Again, imagine having a steady job (if you don't already have one). People say that some bad things can go along with having a steady job. Like no free time, working for someone else, etc.

What are some bad things you associate with having a steady job? List as many as you can think of:


What do you think the *chances* would be of having things like this happen if you had a steady job?

No Chance	Low Chance	Some Chance	Good Chance	High Chance	Completely Certain					
0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

How *unhappy* do you think you would be if you got things like these?

Not Unhappy At All	A Little Unhappy	Somewhat Unhappy	Pretty Unhappy	Very Unhappy	Completely Unhappy					
0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%



## Disadvantages of Crime

Instructions: Now we're going to do the same thing, but this time think about your committing crime. People say that certain bad things can go along with this. Like being in jail, bad nerves, shame and a record.

What are some bad things you associate with committing crime? List as many as you can think of:


What do you think the *chances* are of things like these happening to you when you commit crime?

No Chance	Low Chance	Some Chance	Good Chance	High Chance	Completely Certain					
0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

How *unhappy* do you think you would be if things like these happened to you?

Not Unhappy At All	A Little Unhappy	Somewhat Unhappy	Pretty Unhappy	Very Unhappy	Completely Unhappy					
0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

## Criminal Self Efficacy

Instructions: The following questions refer to your life on the outside. Circle F (for false) if it is not correct for you when you are living on the outside; circle T (for true) if it is correct for you when you are living on the outside.

- |     |   |       |      |
|-----|---|-------|------|
| 1.  | If someone I knew wanted a score done, they would probably ask for my help.                 | False | True |
| 2.  | I do not have much experience breaking into cars.   | False | True |
| 3.  | I would probably get caught if I tried to shoplift.   | False | True |
| 4.  | I could get just about anything I would want on the street.                                 | False | True |
| 5.  | I am not sure I could break into a store without setting off the alarm.                     | False | True |
| 6.  | I know where to find guns that can not be traced.   | False | True |
| 7.  | If I was on the run, the police would find me in no time.                                   | False | True |
| 8.  | I am not a very good street fighter.  | False | True |
| 9.  | If I stole a car, I would know where to find the nearest 'chop shop'.                       | False | True |
| 10. | If someone gave me a stolen check I would have no trouble faking the signature.             | False | True |
| 11. | I do not see myself as a professional criminal.   | False | True |
| 12. | If I wanted to sell some stolen goods, it would take a while to make the right connections. | False | True |
| 13. | If I was ever shot or stabbed I would know where to get help without going to the hospital. | False | True |
| 14. | I could fast talk just about anyone out of a few bucks.                                     | False | True |
| 15. | I do not think I am physically capable of killing a man with my bare hands.                 | False | True |
| 16. | Guys on the street know not to mess with me.  | False | True |
| 17. | Certain drugs would be hard for me to find on the street.                                   | False | True |
| 18. | I could not support myself by crime alone.  | False | True |

## APPENDIX C

### EMPLOYMENT DOMAIN INDICATORS

1. Has less than grade 8
2. Has less than grade 10
3. Has no high school diploma
4. Finds learning difficult
5. Has learning disabilities
6. Has physical problems which interfere with learning
7. Has memory problems
8. Has concentration problems
9. Has problems with reading
10. Has problems with writing
11. Has problems with numeracy
12. Has difficulty comprehending instructions
13. Lacks a skill area/trade/profession
14. Dissatisfied with skill area/trade/profession
15. Has physical problems that interfere with work
16. Unemployed at the time of arrest
17. Unemployed 90% or more
18. Unemployed 50% or more
19. Has an unstable job history
20. Often shows up late for work
21. Has poor attendance record
22. Has no employment history
23. Has difficulty meeting workload requirements
24. Lacks initiative
25. Has quit a job without another
26. Has been laid off from work
27. Has been fired from a job
28. Salary has been insufficient
29. Lacks employment benefits
30. Job lacks security
31. Has difficulty with co-workers
32. Has difficulty with superiors
33. Prior vocational assessment(s)
34. Has participated in employment programs
35. Has completed an occupational development program

## APPENDIX D

### INFORMED CONSENT FORM

The purpose of an informed consent is to make sure that you understand the purpose of the study and how you will be involved in the project. The informed consent provides enough information so you have the chance to decide if you want to participate in the study.

**Research title:**

Predicting employment status in a sample of federal offenders on conditional release.

**Research personnel:**

The following people are involved in this study and may be contacted at any time: Christa Gillis (Main Researcher, 613 995-3340), Dr. D. Andrews (Faculty Sponsor, 613 520-2600, ext. 2662), or Dr. Brian Grant (Research Branch, CSC, 613 943-8871). If you have any ethical concerns about this study then please contact Dr. M. Gick (Chair, Dept. of Psychology Ethics Committee, 520-2600, ext. 2664) or Dr. K. Matheson (Chair, Dept. of Psychology, 520-2600, ext. 2648).

**Purpose and requirements:**

The purpose of the study is to examine different factors that may help offenders on conditional release find employment. If you participate, you will complete two sets of questionnaires. First, it will take about 20 minutes to answer employment questions asked by the research assistant. Also, it will take about one hour to complete the second questionnaire, which asks your opinions about work and crime. The questionnaires will be completed at the parole office. Another part of the study involves looking at your intake (e.g., identified need areas) and community files. Also, your performance on release will be followed, to examine how employment relates to success on release.

**Right to withdraw:**

There is no reward for participating, and no penalty for not participating in the study. You may withdraw at any time from the study. This means you may refuse to participate or answer any of the questions.

**Anonymity/Confidentiality:**

Your participation is completely voluntary and information gathered in the study will be kept confidential. All information will be coded so that your name is not associated with the data. In addition, the coded data will be made available only to the researchers involved in this project. Individual offenders will not be identified in any reports on this study.

**Signatures:**

I have read the above description of research on employment status for offenders on conditional release. I give my permission to the researcher to make use of the information gathered in the study. I also give permission to do a file review and to obtain follow-up information about my performance on release for research purposes only.

Full Name (Print): \_\_\_\_\_

Participant Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Researcher Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Researcher Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

## **APPENDIX E**

### **Debriefing**

Thank you for your participation in this study. The purpose of the study was to gain an understanding of what factors help offenders find and keep jobs in the community. The checklist administered by the researcher examined different behaviours related to finding a job upon release to the community. The questionnaire you completed examined different attitudes about working and attitudes about crime. The purpose of completing the questionnaire and job checklist was to gain a better understanding of the factors that may help you in finding work in the community. Also, you were asked to complete the checklist and questionnaire twice, so we can examine if there were any changes in your employment situation, and also if any of your attitudes about crime and employment changed during the first 6 months of your release. Your answers will be examined to determine if any change in these factors influenced your ability to find work in the community.

This study was carried out by Christa Gillis, through the Research Branch of the Correctional Service of Canada, as part of a requirement for her Doctoral thesis at Carleton University.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, you can contact Christa Gillis, Research Officer, at (613) 995-3340, Dr. Brian Grant, Director of Operations, at (613) 943-8871 or Dr. Don Andrews, Professor, Carleton University, at (613) 520-2600 Ext. 2662. If you have any ethical concerns about this research then please contact Dr. M. Gick (Chair, Department of Psychology Ethics Committee, 520-2600, ext. 2664) or Dr. K. Matheson (Chair, Department of Psychology, 520-2600, ext. 2548). Also, if you have any concerns about employment, you can contact your parole officer, or local employment counselor.

Thank you for the time and effort you took to participate in this research.

## APPENDIX F

### INTERCORRELATIONS AMONG PREDICTOR VARIABLES AT ONE MONTH

Table continues

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Age	--	.06	.08	.33****	.01	.32****	-.01	-.26****	.02	-.01
2. Ethnicity		--	.07	.08	.01	.15**	-.07	-.02	.06	.03
3. Marital			--	.14*	.02	.07	-.10	-.01	.10	.09
4. Stable Employment				--	.33****	.33****	-.12*	-.50****	.05	.04
5. Education					--	.16**	.07	-.29****	.03	.05
6. Skill level						--	-.04	-.31****	.05	.07
7. Training							--	.13*	.02	.03
8. Employment need								--	-.11*	-.05
9. Expectations About job: Chance									--	.20***
10. Expectations About job: Happy										--
11. Work involvement										
12. Work Ethic										
13. Value of employment										
14. Job involvement										
15. Intrinsic job motivation										
16. Occupational self efficacy										
17. Intention										
18. Social support for employment										
19. Unemployment rate										

	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1. Age	.07	.00	.28****	.13*	.22****	.22****	-.14*	.12*	-.08
2. Ethnicity	-.03	.01	.00	-.01	.03	.04	-.03	.15**	-.16**
3. Marital	-.06	-.07	.01	-.01	.01	.06	.10	.03	-.08
4. Stable Employment	.00	.05	.15**	.11	.12*	.27****	-.09	.24****	-.06
5. Education	-.05	-.02	.02	-.13*	.00	.25****	.10	.20***	-.10
6. Skill level	.01	.07	.20****	.18**	.11	.23****	.01	.23****	-.12*
7. Training	-.04	-.00	.03	-.04	-.04	.02	.08	-.05	.04
8. Employment need	-.01	-.06	-.14*	-.05	-.11	-.24****	.06	-.30****	.02
9. Expectations About job: Chance	.12*	.23****	.23****	.05	.09	.25****	.01	.25****	-.07
10. Expectations About job: Happy	.06	.07	.06	.09	.08	.04	.04	.12*	-.04
11. Work involvement	--	.19***	.39****	.57****	.26****	.14*	.01	.02	.09
12. Work Ethic		--	.33****	.29****	.26****	.23****	-.01	.21****	-.01
13. Value of employment			--	.33****	.36****	.38****	.10	.21****	-.08
14. Job involvement				--	.32****	.20****	-.07	.04	.01
15. Intrinsic job motivation					--	.43****	-.07	.20***	-.03
16. Occupational self efficacy						--	.03	.40****	-.17**
17. Intention								.04	-.06
18. Social support for employment								--	-.19***
19. Unemployment rate									--

Note:  $n = 302$ .

\*  $p \leq .05$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ , \*\*\*\*  $p \leq .0001$ .