_____ Research Report _____

Offenders' Perceptions on their Quality of Work and Reintegration: A Preliminary Investigation Using Qualitative Inquiry

Ce rapport est également disponible en français. Pour en obtenir un exemplaire, veuillez vous adresser à la Direction de la recherche, Service correctionnel du Canada, 340, avenue Laurier Ouest, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0P9.

This report is also available in French. 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.

2014 Nº R-310

Offenders' Perceptions on their Quality of Work and Reintegration: A Preliminary Investigation Using Qualitative Inquiry

Jenelle Power

&

Amanda Nolan

Correctional Service Canada

May 2014

Acknowledgements

We would like to send sincere thanks to Jaya Patni, Matt Rose, Jan Goatcher, and Susan Love for their help with recruitment of offenders for interviews. Thank you also to Janelle Beaudette for her assistance with conducting the interviews. We would also like to thank Lynn Stewart and Brian Grant for their helpful feedback on earlier drafts of this report. Finally, we would like to extend our gratitude to the men in the community who gave us their time and shared their experiences with us.

Executive Summary

Key words: *quality of employment, reintegration, community employment*

The role that employment plays in successful reintegration and reducing recidivism has been widely supported. However, much remains to be known about the specific aspects of employment that promote offenders' successful reintegration. In the present study, we used the quality of work literature to shed light on the ways that released offenders benefit from community employment. Through qualitative inquiry, a purposeful sampling strategy was employed to conduct preliminary analysis on a select number of offenders' perceptions of their quality of work and how it affects their reintegration.

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 10 male federal offenders in the community. Interviewees were nominated by staff members of Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) stakeholders/partners in the Ottawa region. Nominees were employed offenders for whom employment was thought to be a contributing factor in their successful reintegration. Interviews were analyzed using content analysis and relevant themes were identified.

The majority of offenders (80%) reported working for CORCAN while in the institution. Benefits of CORCAN described included higher wages, positive references, opportunities to be certified, and more appealing jobs. However, less than half (40%) of the offenders felt their institutional work experience prepared them for community employment. Over half of the offenders (60%) indicated that they received assistance in obtaining their job from a community organization such as the John Howard Society or the CSC Community Employment Coordinator, while a third indicated that they conducted their job searches independently.

Overall, the results suggested that intrinsic rewards were of primary importance in the offenders' assessment of the quality of their work on release. Although extrinsic rewards such as pay were considered beneficial, offenders most valued that their jobs were interesting, meaningful, and provided them with a sense of achievement. Relationships at work, especially with managers, were also found to be highly valued and contributed to increased self-esteem. Offenders generally attributed their current work success to a positive attitude and strong work ethic. The majority agreed that their employment helped them desist from further criminal activity by providing them with a productive and pro-social way to spend their time.

Caution should be taken when interpreting the results given the small number of interviewees from only one geographical region. Results are not representative of the offender population. Despite this limitation, however, findings may help to elucidate the employment experiences of those who are perceived to be doing well in more depth than has been previously conducted.

Table of Contents

List of Appendices

Introduction

A relationship between crime and unemployment has been supported by research for decades (e.g., Glueck & Glueck, 1930; Sampson & Laub, 1993; Wolfgang, Figlio, & Sellin, 1972). Employment is considered by many to be a key factor in successful community reintegration for offenders upon release from correctional facilities (e.g., Brown & Motiuk, 2005; Gillis & Nafekh, 2005; Liddle, Feloy, & Solanki, 2000; Motiuk & Vuong, 2005). Indeed, lack of employment at the time of arrest is common among federal offenders, with 65% of men (Boe, 2005) and 72% of women (Delveaux & Blanchette, 2005) found to be unemployed at the time of their arrest. Furthermore, employment has been found to be an important factor in successful reintegration into the community after incarceration. Research has demonstrated a relationship between attainment of community employment post-release and a decreased likelihood of recidivism (Brews, Luong, & Nafekh, 2010; Gillis & Nafekh, 2005; Lockwood, Nally, Ho, & Knutson, 2012; Nolan, Wilton, Cousineau, & Stewart, under review; Taylor et al., 2008). Few individuals would dispute the value of meaningful employment in successful reintegration, allowing offenders to financially support themselves and others via legal means, develop self-worth, value society and conformity, build pro-social relationships, and experience a sense of community (Latessa, 2012). Community employment is also one of the greatest challenges facing offenders upon their release to the community (Visher & Kachnowski, 2007).

Although considerable research has examined the effect of having a job on reducing the likelihood of recidivism, it remains less clear why this is the case or what impact the quality of the work may have on further criminality. The relationship between employment and offending is a complex one; risk for recidivism cannot be eliminated simply by giving an offender a job. While employment is clearly important for offenders, conceptualizing employment as simply something one has or does not have is certainly an over simplification of the situation. Many different factors can be considered in rating or assessing employment (often referred to as "quality of employment") and there is a body of research that has been conducted on this topic in the general non-offender population. One useful way of parsing the labour market is the use of the terms "primary" and "secondary" labour markets. Jobs within the primary labour market are characterized by higher wages, good benefits, safe working conditions, advancement prospects,

stability, and opportunities for learning and development (Doeringer & Piore, 1971). In comparison, secondary labour market jobs are low paying, low in status, have unpleasant or unsafe working conditions, and lack developmental and promotional opportunities, resulting in a much higher turnover rate compared to the primary labour market (Gordon 1972; Osterman 1975; Parcel & Sickmeier, 1988). Generally, higher quality jobs would be part of the primary labour market and lower quality jobs are part of the secondary labour market.

Defining quality of work is a complicated task and many models have been proposed. Each model is influenced by the perspective of the authors, the data available, and the purpose of the model. At least 24 different factors have been used to measure job quality and only one factor – pay – is consistently included (McDonald, Bradley, & Brown, 2008). Cloutier-Villeneuve (2012) suggests that wages, stability, and hours of work are central to the study of quality of employment and are included in most definitions. Still, a wide variety of models and definitions have been used in the theoretical and empirical examination of employment quality. Some models use extremely narrow methods of examining quality of work, focusing exclusively on earnings (e.g., Mishel, Bernstein, & Allegretto, 2007) or the full- or part-time status of the employment (McDonald et al., 2008; Wilson, Brown, & Cregan, 2008). While such narrow definitions are useful in specific contexts, these narrow definitions fail to capture the entirety of the employment as experienced by employees. At the other end of the spectrum is the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe's (UNECE) proposed model which is perhaps the most comprehensive model of quality of work (Task Force on the Measurement of Quality of Employment, 2010). This thorough model includes: (1) safety and ethics (e.g., workplace safety, child and forced labour, and fair treatment); (2) income and benefits; (3) working hours and balance between work and non-work life; (4) security of employment and social protection; (5) social dialogue; (6) skills development and training; and (7) workplace relationships and work motivation. The authors of the paper suggest that not all aspects are relevant to all countries, but rather that only those elements that are considered to be an important issue should be used (i.e., each country should determine which factors of the model need to be included). This recommendation makes sense in the context of international comparisons on labour standards. For example, while child and forced labour are a serious concern in some countries, this factor is unlikely to an important issue in Canada.

A framework for assessing quality of work in Canada was used by Lowe (2007). In this

context, quality of work included: (1) labour market status (the type of employment relationship or employment contract); (2) training and skills (developing and using skills, knowledge, and abilities); (3) intrinsic rewards (the nature of the job itself, including autonomy, relationships with management and co-workers, interesting and challenging job content); (4) extrinsic rewards (the material rewards of a job, including pay, benefits, security, and advancement); (5) job satisfaction (overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with specific aspects of the job); and (6) well-being (positive employee outcomes such as low stress, work-life balance, health, and well-being). These aspects are all relevant to the general Canadian labour market, including some that are most relevant to jobs in the primary labour market. Other models provide additional dimensions that are particularly relevant for primary labour market employment. For example, the Meaningful Work Inventory (Fairlie, 2010) includes factors such as leadership and organizational features and organizational support, and the BHPS (Institute for Social & Economic Research, 2012) good promotion prospects and use of initiative. While these factors are likely important to comprehensively evaluate jobs within the primary labour market, they are unlikely to be relevant when assessing jobs in the secondary labour market, where offenders are most likely to find employment.

Some authors have attempted to operationalize quality of work in a much more prescribed manner. For example, Cloutier (2008) proposed a detailed typology with four dimensions (i.e., remuneration, skills, stability, and working hours) that each have specific categories, resulting in 120 possible classifications. The authors suggest that the model can aggregate the available 120 categories into meaningful groupings for the research or evaluation being conducted. Detailed information on employment is required to use these specific categories.

Handel's (2005) model is particularly straight forward, well organized, and grounded in previous research. The four factors included in the model are: (1) extrinsic (material) rewards (e.g., pay, benefits, job stability); (2) intrinsic rewards (e.g., job autonomy, meaningful work, personal satisfaction); (3) working conditions (stress, workload, physical effort); and (4) quality of workplace interpersonal relationships (management-employee relationship, co-worker relationships). The four factors in this model are well-established in the literature and have been used in a variety of studies (e.g, Chalmers, Campbell & Charlesworth, 2005; Clark, 2005; Frey & Stutzer, 2002; Kalleberg, 1977; Gittleman & Howell, 1995; Kalleberg & Reynolds, 2001;

Meisenheimer, 1998; Quinn & Staines, 1979; Rosenthal, 1989; Rubery & Grimshaw, 2001).

Research on quality of employment with offenders is more limited, but some specific factors and aspects of employment that are encompassed within the quality of work literature more generally have been shown to be important. For example, job stability has been found to be related to recidivism. In a longitudinal study, Sampson and Laub (1993) found that job instability was associated with future criminality for individuals who had previous delinquency and those who did not. Stable employment was found to be associated with desistance from criminal behaviour even in the most seriously delinquent adolescents. Moreover, Uggen (1999) attempted to quantitatively test the relationship between job quality (satisfaction-based) and criminal behaviour among offenders. He found that higher job quality reduced the likelihood of criminal behaviour among a sample of high-risk offenders, even when statistically accounting for other important variables related to prior criminality and those concerning wage and tenure. A limitation of this study was the use of self-report offending. Uggen (1999) suggested that future research identify the distinctive features of high-quality jobs and assess the impact they have on criminality, as well as determine more detailed information on the social-psychological mechanisms connecting job quality and crime.

Quality of employment is related to pro-social behaviour even in non-offender populations. For instance, Huiras, Uggen, and McMorris (2000) examined the relationship between investment in employment and employee deviance, which included behaviours such as stealing from employer or coworkers, being drunk or high at work, or showing up late without good reason. They found that young adults who obtained "career jobs" (i.e., jobs that matched their long-term career goals) and had higher job satisfaction were less likely to commit workplace deviance than those who had "survival jobs" (i.e., jobs that were not linked to long-term career objectives) and lower job satisfaction.

Gillis and Andrews (2005) did include a measure of quality of employment in their research on predicting community employment outcomes for Canadian offenders. To assess quality of employment, they included the composite score of three dichotomous variables: (1) skilled or unskilled employment, (2) salary did or did not meet their needs, and (3) satisfied or not satisfied with salary. The duration of employment was also included as a separate variable. Results revealed that offenders who were older, married, and non-Aboriginal had a higher quality of employment, although the correlations were weak. Additionally, significant, although

not strong, relationships were found between quality of employment and a history of stable employment, skill level, social support for employment, work ethic, value of employment, job involvement, occupational self-efficacy (i.e., belief in continued ability to learn, adapt, and be productive in a changing workplace), intention to acquire/maintain work, and intrinsic job motivation (i.e., the extent to which an individual wants to perform well on the job to achieve personal satisfaction). The primary purpose of their study was to explore the contributions of these various factors to employment outcomes for offenders (including job quality). Due to the nature of the methods employed, the study did not examine whether higher quality of employment was associated with likelihood of recidivism.

Expanding upon the findings of Gillis and Andrews (2005), Scott (2010) investigated offender perceptions on the value of employment and crime. Offenders were asked about the advantages and disadvantages of employment versus those of crime. Overall, financial security and materialistic gain were the most common themes identified as advantages by the offenders. However, they also discussed the importance of employment for self-development and enhancement, physical/mental health and well-being, and personal satisfaction and fulfillment.

The Present Study

The role that employment plays in successful reintegration and reducing recidivism has been widely supported. However, much remains to be investigated about the specific aspects of employment that help offenders to be more or less successful in their reintegration efforts. The quality of work literature may help to shed some light on the ways that released offenders benefit from community employment. The primary purpose of the present study was to gain insight into what constitutes "good" quality of work for federal offenders employed in the community, and how this employment contributes to post-release success, from the perspective of the offenders themselves. Also of interest were how offenders considered their institutional work experiences to have contributed to their community employment, and what strategies they used to obtain and maintain their current employment.

Due to the dearth of information pertaining to quality of work in offenders, the research conducted here was exploratory in nature. Qualitative inquiry was chosen to conduct preliminary analysis on offenders' perceptions of their quality of work and how this affects their reintegration efforts. More specifically, a "purposeful sampling" strategy was employed. As

noted by Patton (2002), this type of sampling is aimed at insight about the phenomenon of interest and not an empirical generalization from a sample to a population. The main advantage of this approach is that it allows for the selection of "information rich" cases, which provides an in-depth understanding of the questions under study. In the context of the current research, it was anticipated that focusing on a select number of offenders employed in the community would help to elucidate the potential mechanisms connecting job quality and crime.

The areas to be explored were guided by the following research questions:

1. Do offenders perceive that institutional education and employment prepares them for the employment they obtain in the community?
2. Once released, what strategies did offenders use to obtain their community employment?
3. What aspects of employment do offenders value the most?
4. What effect, if any, does employment have on offender's well-being (e.g., sense of achievement, self-esteem)?
5. What factors do offenders believe contribute to their work success (e.g., job maintenance)?
6. Do offenders perceive community employment as assisting them in not reoffending?

Method

Procedure/Analytic Approach

Recruitment of participants for the present study was done with the help of CSC stakeholders and partners in the Ottawa region (Ottawa Parole Office, CSC's Community Employment Coordinator (CEC), John Howard Society, and Circles of Support and Accountability (CoSA)). Staff members from these organizations were asked to nominate current or past federal offenders employed in the community for whom they believed employment played a contributing factor in the offender's successful reintegration. This procedure resulted in 10 male offenders being interviewed. All interviews were conducted during the month of October 2012.

Consenting offenders participated in one-on-one semi-structured interviews, each taking approximately thirty minutes to an hour to complete. Interviews were audio recorded and later transcribed by research assistants. Notes were also taken as a back-up precaution.[1]

All transcripts were analyzed using NVivo 7, a qualitative data analysis software package that aids in the management and organization of narrative information. The interviews were analysed using content analysis, which allows for the systematic and objective quantification of text (Krippendorff, 1980; Downe-Wamboldt, 1992; Sandelowski, 1995). In content analysis, text classified into a given category is assumed to share the same meaning (Cavanagh, 1997). Inductive coding was used which allows for the creation of categories as the text is reviewed rather than in advance of coding (Elos & Kyngäs, 2008; Lauri & Kyngäs, 2005). All interviews were coded by the first author.

Measures/Material

The semi-structured interview protocol was developed for this study based on the research questions and the Handel (2005) model. The protocol was organized into six sections: (1) general employment information and CSC; (2) extrinsic rewards; (3) intrinsic rewards; (4) working conditions; (5) quality of workplace interpersonal relationships; and (6) overall rating (see Appendix A for the entire protocol).

[1] For one participant, the recorder malfunctioned and part of the interview was not recorded and notes had to be used. For this section of the interview, no direct quotes were included in this report, but information was counted as endorsing themes.

Offender demographic and sentence information was extracted from CSC's Offender Management System (OMS), a computerized file system maintained by CSC to manage information on all federally sentenced offenders.

Participants

The majority of the participants were non-Aboriginal (90%), single (60%), and had a current major admitting offence that was sexual in nature (60%)[2]. Two offenders had life sentences, while the average sentence length of those with determinate sentences was 5 years. The majority were rated high on overall criminal history risk and dynamic need at intake to federal custody (70% and 60%, respectively). In terms of crimonogenic need domains, all offenders had a need in the personal/emotional domain, 80% had a substance abuse need, 50% had an attitudes need, 50% had marital/family needs, 40% had a need in the area of associates, 40% had education/employment needs, and 10% had a need in the area of community functioning.

Half of the offenders were first released on their statutory release date. The average age at first release for all interviewees was 45 years (range of 28 to 56 years). Only two of the offenders had been readmitted to custody after their first release date, both for a revocation without a new offence. These individuals were subsequently re-released into the community on full parole.

In terms of the occupational areas in which they worked, three offenders worked in hazardous material removal, two worked in manufacturing, two had office jobs, two worked in construction, and one worked in shipping and receiving. All but one offender worked full-time.

[2] Please note that this high representation of offenders with a sexual offence may be in part due to the recruitment of participants from CoSA, which is a community-based organization that helps sex offenders to reintegrate into the community.

Results

Themes that were identified in the participants' responses are presented in this section, along with a description of each theme and, in many cases, illustrative quotes. In addition, the percentage of men who endorsed each theme is presented. However, given the small number of study participants (N = 10), the percentages should be interpreted with caution. Themes are organized based on the guiding questions that were used in the design of this study. As is generally the case with qualitative research, some unanticipated themes were found and the answers to the questions were not as discrete as anticipated. Therefore, some themes can be considered relevant to more than one question.

1. Do offenders perceive that institutional education and employment prepares them for the employment they obtain in the community?

Half of the offenders reported engaging in vocational training in the institution, although one of these participants reported not being able to complete his certificate. The majority (80%) reported working for CORCAN[3] while in the institution. While a couple of offenders reported that the higher wage was the primary reason they worked for CORCAN, some described additional benefits. For instance, a couple of participants found it helpful to have positive references from CORCAN after successfully working for them:

> P02: I used skills I already had at CORCAN, but what it did do was give me, you know, when I came out, I proved myself at CORCAN so the supervisors there had no problem issuing references and they handed me really nice letters of reference so when I went to my job interview I was able to put them on the table and say "here you go". And that right away, you know, qualified me to, to get into jobs.

One offender found it most appealing to be able to get certified as a welder through CORCAN, which he anticipated would provide him with more options upon release:

> P09: The only thing they had to offer for a trade at this time was to weld, and having a welding trade certificate would be using my time wisely and it's a huge bonus and a good, good wage when you get out. Having a certification for welding, you can go absolutely anywhere in Canada for it, and they certify you there and have the guy come

[3] CORCAN is a special operating agency within CSC which is mandated to aid in the safe reintegration of offenders into society by providing employment and employability skills training to offenders in federal penitentiaries. This is done through vocational training and on-the-job skills training via its production shops.

> in from outside and you do your test and then it's a stamp of approval… I didn't care about the money at all. No, I would work for free. But no, it wasn't the wages at all there is no incentive to make money in there.

Another offender reported that the type of job he could obtain at CORCAN was more appealing and offered him more freedom than other institutional jobs:

> P03: Well actually it was, uh, it was because I left the [institution]… I would walk through the front gate, I would walk across the highway, walk up the hill, and I would stay up there all day, it was air conditioned, um, and at the end of the day I would walk back and that would be it, you know, so I was basically on an escorted, or unescorted temporary absence every day,. .it was away from the institution, away from the institutional setting.

Less than half (40%) of the offenders felt their institutional work experience prepared them for community employment. All four of these offenders had worked for CORCAN for at least part of the time that they were incarcerated. They indicated that working a regular job in the institution was helpful in terms of establishing routine and developing transferable skills that could help with their jobs in the community:

> P02: It was nice because it kind of fit in well with some of the stuff I used to do and, um, there was, um, there was some really good transferable skills that I actually used in terms of when I got the job [in the community].

> P04: I did learn a bit, I'd be lying if I said I didn't learn anything. Mind you, inside the work that you do is not necessarily the same because you have so many restrictions and rules, and I'll be honest with you, when I was working for CORCAN construction, that was great, but most of the other times I was always working in the kitchen.

Other offenders, however, including four who had worked for CORCAN, did not feel that their institutional work experience helped them prepare for their reintegration:

> P01: Okay, I think it didn't help at all really... no, not necessarily; [institutional experience] didn't help me work-wise... I'll just make a very general statement, not to point fingers at anybody, but... there is a lot of good staff in there that, you know, really do try to help the guys, in, in the limited capacities that they have, but, uh, the system overall was really in need of an overhaul.

> P08: Work inside is pretty well useless I would say... Even some of the certificates that the guys have inside, some of the businesses out here don't recognize them. Like they say get your forklift certificate or diploma, the guys got their stuff inside there, I took the training inside and when presented to work out here they said nope, it's no good for us.

2. Once released, what strategies did offenders use to obtain their community employment?

Over half of the offenders (60%) indicated that they received assistance in obtaining their job from a community organization such as the John Howard Society or the CSC CEC[4], while a third indicated that they conducted their job searches independently. For instance, this individual notes the process of continuously handing out resumes to potential employers:

> P02: That was kind of all on my own . . . I just basically took advantage of every option I had and I had a lot of job interviews, um, it was just a question of mostly what I was interested in and of course was pushing paper and using my brain more than my brawn and it, it was a bit of a challenge I guess. So I ended up taking a job at, uh, [a grocery store] working over night, stocking shelves at least just to get working again right. And then while I was doing that I just continued to send out resumes and I eventually got an interview and it just turned out that this company didn't ask that question about criminal records and didn't do a required criminal record check so you know, don't ask, don't tell.

Related to the issue of criminal record, the majority of offenders (80%) stated that their employers were, in fact, aware of their criminal history. Only two of the participants had not informed their employers about their criminal history. The fear of having their employer find out about their history was "a constant source of stress" for these offenders. This fear of being found out also affected their ability to socialize with other employees. One offender described himself as a "little turtle in a shell" and the other, who had sexual offences, worried particularly about establishing relationships with women.

More than half of the participants (60%) reported that they did not have all the documentation and identification needed to gain employment in the community upon their release from the institution. One offender reported having the opportunity to renew his identification through an organized visit from the relevant government bodies; however, most reported that their documentation expired while incarcerated without the opportunity to renew it or that their documentation was put into storage when they went to the institution and they could not access it after release. While some offenders reported it was not a big challenge to have their identification renewed, a couple found this issue posed an additional challenge upon release:

P02: You know, my driver's licence had expired, I didn't have any valid ID, my health

[4] As part of CSC's Community Employment Services (CES) program, CECs provide offenders with support, referrals, and job opportunities to address their employment needs in the community.

> card had expired, all that stuff so I did have to go and make those arrangements and go to various offices and sort of rebuild. Um, but I didn't necessarily have any difficulty doing it other than to say it was a pain. It was troublesome and you are trying to balance your restrictions and trying to find employment and then trying to rebuild your life all at the same time so it makes it very difficult….

3. What aspects of employment do offenders value the most?

Participants were generally very satisfied with their jobs. Of the nine participants who rated their jobs on a scale of one (I dislike my job a lot) to five (I like my job a lot), one offender rated his job a three, two offenders rated it a four, and six offenders rated it a 4.5.

Positive relationships at work appeared to be highly valued by the respondents. All participants reported having positive relationships with their managers. It was unanticipated how interlinked these positive relationships were to the self-esteem of the participants (a theme addressed primarily in Question 4). However, it was clear that positive interactions with managers often led the participants to feel better about themselves:

> P04: It makes me feel good about myself at the same time, because like I said, I see my boss, he is a very hard guy to work for, but even though he is not one to give compliments, I can see that he is happy sometimes with me and all that, you know, so... he can rely on me, plus I got the strength to do more than, uh, most people, so he appreciates that, and I can see it, you know. Like sometimes he'll buy us [snacks]. . . even though he doesn't give compliments this is how he shows his appreciation.

> P05: There was three supervisors, and this one guy pats me on the back and recognizes my work and stuff and, you know, in the construction field, men are men and guys just don't share all that type of stuff sometimes, and they say it in their own way by calling you a name. I get good feelings from them I guess, and I am doing okay, I mean, they just, they want me back so I think that's good.

All participants also reported generally positive relationships with their co-workers, although one offender felt that some of his co-workers were "intimidated or worried" about him because they knew he had been incarcerated. Most offenders (70%) reported actively avoiding being friends with co-workers outside of work, deliberately trying to keep work and personal lives separate to avoid being tempted by behaviours that are not permitted on parole (e.g., drinking alcohol), associating with others who have offended in the past, or co-workers finding out about their criminal histories.

> P02: I keep a very solid line between work and outside relationships… the majority of the people are all very close, um, there's a lot of couples that work there, there is a lot of

> people that hang out evenings and weekends together, you know, and they have tried to invite me into that circle a number of times, you know. A lot of it has to do with the age demographic and drinking alcohol and whatever, I am not allowed to drink so it puts me in a bit of a position and also it's just, I can't risk anybody knowing especially in my new position, I, I can't risk what that would look like… So, I keep that very separate.
>
> P05: I prefer it that way and there is a reason, I mean, we all came from jail, I mean most of us, and, uh, I have a problem with having a relationship with dysfunctional people so I need to build up more relationships that are positive… it's best to avoid any chances of getting influences.
>
> P08: Right now, it's the same as absolutely every place you go no matter what it is, it's the people. You know, people make whether you are in a program, or whether it's a co-worker, people make a huge difference and you know, yeah. The daily thing is just, you know if you hate your job and you hate the people that are there, it's, you don't wanna, you don't want to get out of bed, you know. And I love getting [up]… I'm up at 4:00 in the morning sometimes to go out… People at work, like I said, are people that make it worth coming in. If they are a bunch of idiots then you don't want to, you know, you just do the job and you put up with it and I probably have an answer for you to say I don't like the attitude of the guys I don't like this or that, but they are pretty cool.

All offenders valued being appreciated and treated well at work. This feeling of being valued or recognized for doing a good job came through a variety of actions on the part of their employers. For example, participants discussed being recognized by a promotion or raise, receiving verbal praise or a monetary bonus, being provided additional safety equipment, and perks such as holiday parties or free lunches.

> P01: I got promoted to a shift supervisor, without a shift so far, but that's in anticipation of [job aspect]. Over and above people who had been there prior to me, so yeah, obviously they look at stuff like that. . . we all have a [holiday] dinner tonight... we broke some production records, they come up and handed us [a gift].
>
> P03: We had a visit from the vice president, so we spent two weeks getting the store ready for the vice president. I think somebody must have talked me up because when he left, the manager came out and said I have to go across the street and get you a [gift], so that was sort of nice, you know, I'm on minimum wage or pretty close to minimum wage...

One offender described avoiding getting a promotion and taking on more responsibility due to the associated increase in stress. This offender valued low stress working conditions because he recognized that stress was a negative influence in his life:

P03: I can probably get promotions there but I choose not to get promotions for the stress level... I don't want the stress. Stress is a factor in my life, so I could have probably become assistant manager, they would have recommended me for assistant manager but I don't need that.

4. What effect, if any, does employment have on offender's well-being (e.g., sense of achievement, self-esteem)?

The majority of offenders (80%) indicated that their jobs improved their self-esteem, which, in turn, increased their chances of success in the community. As mentioned previously, positive relationships with others – particularly managers – contributed to improved self-esteem in the participants. Other aspects of employment also contributed to self-perceptions, including viewing themselves as productive members of society rather than "criminals":

P05: It gives me more confidence knowing that I have a job and I am able to keep it and stuff like that, so with more confidence in myself I know and believe that I won't reoffend.

P04: Well like I said, personal satisfaction . . . I am feeling a lot better about myself, I mean like, you know. I'll be honest with you, when you are a criminal you don't really feel good about yourself because somewhere down the line I know I am making some woman cry. I, uh, you know, you think about these things . . . so sometimes you got, uh, low self-esteem, you feel like a piece of shit, I am not saying everyone feels that way, but me, I got values. I wasn't always a criminal, I became a criminal, so yeah, and that's probably one of the problems, one of the reasons why I fell into the drugs too, because I really didn't like myself, and what I was doing, and for years I've been trying to look for a way out, you know what I mean.

One offender specifically discussed that having what he considered to be a good job, one where he gets to wear "respectable looking clothes" and not "going to work wearing work boots with mud on them" and seeing that there are career opportunities in the field he is working in really improved his self-confidence:

P06: I wouldn't say it's essential, but I would say it is as important as anything. Because, well for me personally, when I did commit my offences . . . I had a part-time job, but it was the same job I had in high school and . . . I felt embarrassed because I just graduated from university and I thought, you know, here I am going back and working this Mickey Mouse part-time job again. So not having any meaningful work to do contributed to feelings of depression and jealousy, envy, and inadequacy, which were part of my, what do you call it, offense cycle, behavioural aggression. So having a decent job, that you actually look forward to, or at least one that offers some mode of self-respect, definitely helps with management of destructive emotions, there is no doubt about it. Which for me are, were probably my primary risk factors - emotional. I am much happier since I have

been working here. I feel much better about myself.

For two offenders, their increased self-esteem was related to a sense of belonging to the broader working community, or to the community of fellow co-workers:

> P07: Well actually, you know what? It's, um, my job makes me feel like I am asomebody now... I'm not useless, I am needed somewhere, I am part of something. This is great, like it's really great. I feel useful... I'm needed and if I'm not there then they will be short somebody so something is going to be missing, so I am part of a chain and it's, it's great guys to work with, even the guys that work there, like they're not, we've got some... like I said we've got all kinds of people working in there and everybody is... good morning and have a good day and have a good weekend. Everybody sits together for breaks and for lunch...

> P10: When I am not working . . . you don't feel like you are part of anything you know, it's a big thing for me is to be able to work. It's not only keeping busy during the day, its fulfillment, right.

For one offender, his job only positively helped his self-esteem when he felt he really deserved the money he was being paid, that he genuinely earned it.

> P08: Because when I first was getting the money I was getting for that I says, uh, I found it unbelievable that people got that sort of money for doing what they did. Some days I hold open a bag while someone shovels some rubble in there and they are paying me over 27 bucks to do that. I said what the heck is this, anyone can do that stuff. I didn't feel that was, uh, warranted in that sense. And other times when I do some of the hazardous stuff in conditions where the heat is like 200 degrees plus, it's worth it then.

All offenders described obtaining a sense of personal satisfaction or accomplishment from their jobs:

> P05: Yes, personal achievement . . . because you see a progress, you see what is a big area that you need to clean and once it's done at the end of the job you say "holy" I did that. Because it's not just demolishing and tearing the stuff down and airing it, it's also making sure everything is clean and you have to have an air check at the end, so when you see that and you know that the air check has passed you feel good.

> P10: Well, I get fulfillment by doing the work I do. Its fulfilling on its own, building something together and seeing the end product... it's not only keeping busy during the day, its fulfillment, right.

For some, this satisfaction comes from being able to do well or help others through the type of work they are doing. One offender discussed feeling good about his work producing medical equipment that helped save lives and another discussed contributing to ensuring clean air in schools:

P09: We've done work at school so little kids are walking around breathing in [asbestos] right? And, uh, you know that, you can't have that. And, uh, I get a good sense of accomplishment. When we are done a good job they come in and test the air, every time they have to do a test, an air test. It makes you good knowing that, okay, kids aren't breathing this crap anymore. You feel better about it, right.

5. What factors do offenders believe contribute to their work success (e.g., job maintenance)?

The majority of participants (70%) discussed the importance of attitude in their success, either their personal commitment to succeed in the community or their commitment to doing a good job (i.e., "work ethic"). The perception of these internal factors as important for success likely contributed to the individual's self-esteem as they give credit to the person's efforts, rather than external factors. For some, the desire to succeed was for personal reasons, including being generally successful and also avoiding reincarceration. For others, it was a desire to succeed so as not to let down those who provide them with support (e.g., family, friends, and volunteers). Both motivators were often at play in a single individual:

P01: If truth be told, I think the driving factor is . . . that I did spend 15 years. Like, who the hell wants to go back? You would have to be an absolute idiot to want to go back to prison and I don't care who you are and for what reason.

P02: I am one of those please-type people. I like to have people proud of me, or I like to have people rely on me, and, you know, my mother's been a very significant part of my life when I got out and she was very supportive and doing things right for me, also meant doing things right for my partner, my mother, my family, to make sure they were, you know, they could see I was recovering from, you know, everything. And that to me was very key to making sure I didn't reoffend and to, um, you know, family endures a lot of expense when they have somebody that's been incarcerated so, you know, to become as successful as I can to bring home some additional money and, you know, to play a significant role in, uh, the finances of the household, it was really important to me, so that was definitely a motivator.

P06: Well, I've approached this job really seriously. I have a lot to prove to myself and to people in my circle[5] now, and people in my family, and so I approach this job much more seriously. I make a real effort every day. I've made a determined effort to get to know all of the supervisors and all of the people in middle management, you know, individually, so that I have a good rapport with them, so that if something ever did come up maybe I would have some people to vouch for me.

[5] A "circle" refers to a group of volunteers the participant is working with through Circles of Support and Accountability, an organization that helps sexual offenders reintegrate successfully into the community.

6. Do offenders perceive community employment as assisting them in not reoffending?

The vast majority of offenders (90%) felt that having a job helped them avoid reoffending. One participant was unsure his job was related to avoiding recidivism and did not feel that the monetary aspect of working was important for his reintegration. The financial support provided by employment did come up in the interviews (e.g., "it helps pay the bills", working is a "necessity"); however, other aspects of the working experience were discussed much more in-depth by the participants.

For instance, the majority of offenders (80%) reported that their jobs helped them to not reoffend by providing them with a productive way to use their time (i.e., it "keeps them busy"). One participant aptly used the phrase "idle hands make the devils work", while another noted the opportunity for anti-social behaviour when not busy:

> P01: I am usually always a half-hour or 45 minutes early for shift so, I am usually one of the last people to leave at the end of the shift just making sure that paperwork is buttoned up and everybody coming on is aware of the problems or issues that we had during the night. So I think that's why I have gotten to move on so quickly, so, and I just enjoy working, I like keeping busy.

> P06: It's just the time aspect too, I mean like I'm busy. I'm working like 50 hours a week so, you just, if you have nothing to do all day but sit at home and wallow in your misery, or even just sit at home, the opportunities for mischief are greater.

Offenders also suggested that the need to accomplish or succeed in something helps them to prevent reoffending:

> P06: I sense a feeling of urgency, um, whether it is healthy or not, I don't know, but I feel like I am behind the eight ball a little bit because I have made some choices that resulted in me giving up three and a half years of my life, three and a half years of earning power and all that, and so, you have a lot of time to sit around and do nothing while you are incarcerated, and so I feel like I really need to be busy, I really need to be active, I really need to be out accomplishing things, taking work seriously, even if they are medial tasks. It doesn't matter.

> P04: What motivates me the most, I'll be honest with you, is the need to succeed in something, I really got this need, like I'm [age] so I am really scared for my future, you know what I mean . . .

Discussion

Employment is widely considered to be an important factor in the successful reintegration of offenders, with research supporting the link between community employment and reductions in recidivism (Gillis & Nafekh, 2005; Nolan et al., under review; Taylor et al., 2008). Nonetheless, little research has examined the specific ways that released offenders benefit from community employment, particularly from the perspectives of the offenders themselves. In an effort to better understand how employment contributes to post-release success, the present study recruited offenders known to members of their case management teams to be successful in the community in terms of being involved in stable employment. Of primary interest was an investigation of what constitutes "good" quality of work for these offenders and how they consider their work to contribute to their reintegration efforts.

Some research has suggested that institutional work experience (including prison industries and vocational/technical programs) positively contributes to successful reintegration, including job obtainment (Nolan et al, in press; Taylor et al., 2008) and reductions in recidivism (Bouffard et al., 2000; Wilson et al., 2000). Little research, however, has approached this question qualitatively by asking offenders to describe in their own words if and how institutional work programs have helped them to reintegrate. For that reason, we asked whether offenders perceived their institutional employment activities to have prepared them for their current work situation. Interestingly, we found that the majority of offenders did not feel they obtained valuable community job skills through institutional work, but rather, they chose to participate in these activities mainly for monetary gain. Despite this finding, many still felt that they benefited from the institutional work experience through such things as: being productive, maintaining a daily routine, and obtaining reference letters for future employers. Such factors may be useful for encouraging offender participation in institutional employment and job readiness activities. It is important to note that participants in the current study were considered to be doing well in the employment domain, and only 40% had an education/employment need upon entering the institution. Future research should examine what aspects of institutional work are most beneficial to offenders in more detail, while also taking into consideration which offenders are most likely to benefit from institutional employment.

With regard to what strategies they used to obtain their community employment, many of the offenders received help from a CEC (via CSC or the John Howard Society). For these individuals, the job search and attainment process appeared to be a smooth process, particularly since their potential future employers were aware of their offender status. For those who chose to conduct their job search independently, barriers were sometimes encountered if an employer required a criminal record check. Even once hired, the worry of discovery remained a considerable stressor for those offenders whose employers did not ask for a criminal record check and who were unaware of the offender's history. Feedback from these offenders highlights the importance of post-release community employment support given by CSC and other community organizations (e.g., the CEC). When jobs are obtained through the assistance of an organization, employers are aware of criminal history and the offenders have assistance in navigating this issue. However, when offenders seek employment on their own, they may have additional stress due to the anxiety of discovery of their criminal past.

The study also sought to explore what aspects of their community employment offenders value the most and how their jobs affect their sense of well-being. A particularly salient theme was that of workplace relationships. Participants placed considerable emphasis on their positive relationships with both managers and co-workers, suggesting that it is one of the most important aspects of the job. This finding is consistent with previous research with community samples in Canada which found that helpful and friendly co-workers were an important factor related to work satisfaction (Lowe & Schellenberg, 2001). Additionally, Handel (2005) lists "quality of workplace interpersonal relationship" as one of the four factors related to quality of work, finding a positive correlation between job satisfaction and relationships with management and relationships with co-workers.

Positive relationships at work not only increased offenders' job satisfaction, but also appeared to have positive effects on their self-esteem. It is likely that the pro-social relationships formed at work allowed the offenders to acquire a sense of belonging to the community and this, in turn, increased how positively they felt about themselves. Bonta and Andrews (2007) have suggested that the probability of criminal behaviour may or may not change as a function of self-esteem. However, they also note that it is important to increase self-esteem while also changing prociminal attitudes in order to prevent "confident criminals". The results of the present study suggest that having quality employment, particularly via positive relationships with peers,

provided offenders with a viable method of obtaining a sense of achievement and, therefore, increased self-esteem in a way that was earned.

Also of interest in the present study was exploring which factors offenders believed contributed the most to their work success in the community and how they felt they were able to maintain their jobs for as long as they have. Job maintenance is important given the value of job stability in successful reintegration (Sampson & Laub, 1993). The majority of offenders discussed the importance of attitude and work ethic in their success. It is possible that this expression of personal commitment to succeed is related to having a high internal locus of control, or the extent to which one feels that one has control over one's life and the tendency to attribute outcomes as a result of one's own actions. In fact, the locus of control literature suggests that those with a more internal locus of control may engage in more adaptive behaviours (Huntley, Palmer, & Wakeling, 2012). Thus, the offenders we interviewed may be doing well in terms of employment (in comparison to those not able to maintain community employment) because they have taken responsibility for their current situation and hold themselves accountable for their work lives and future success. It would be of interest for research to further examine the link between locus of control and other personality characteristics of offenders and their job stability/maintenance.

The final area of interest examined if and how offenders perceived their community employment in assisting them to not reoffend. Offenders focused on the benefits of having a productive and pro-social way to spend their time rather than the monetary benefits of employment. Although the obvious benefits of wages were noted, this was not the primary reason offenders felt their jobs helped them remain crime-free. This finding may imply that having a job that the offender is willing to attend regularly is the most important factor, and is not directly related to the salary or level of skill at the job.

The main limitations of the present study are the small number of offenders interviewed and that all interviewees were from one geographical (urban) location. It should be noted, however, that the goal of the study was not to examine the effects of work on the broader offender population, but rather, to examine in-depth the employment experiences of those who are perceived to be doing well in the community. In so doing, we believe that the information acquired from the selected offender cases provides direction for future research on the meaning of work for offenders and its link to desistance from crime.

Conclusion

Overall, the results of the present study provide initial evidence that intrinsic rewards were of primary importance in defining the quality of work for the select number of offenders who were interviewed. Although extrinsic rewards such as pay were considered beneficial, offenders most valued that their jobs were interesting, meaningful, and provided them with a sense of achievement. Relationships at work, especially with managers, were also found to be highly valued and contributed to increased self-esteem. The value placed on intrinsic rewards and its interactions with workplace relationships seemed to provide offenders with benefits that assisted them in remaining in the community crime-free.

References

Boe, R. (2005). Unemployment risk trends and the implications for Canadian federal offenders. *Forum on Corrections Research, 17*(1), 3-5.

Bonta, J., & Andrews, D. A. (2007). *Risk-Need-Responsivity model for offender assessment and rehabilitation 2007-06*. Ottawa, ON: Public Safety Canada.

Bouffard, J. A., MacKenzie, D. L., & Hickman, L. J. (2000). Effectiveness of vocational education and employment programs for adult offenders: A methodology-based analysis of the literature. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 31,* 1-41.

Brews, A., Luong, D., & Nafekh, M. (2010). *Evaluation report: Community Employment Centres Initiative* (File # 394-2-82). Ottawa, ON: Evaluation Branch, Correctional Service Canada.

Brown, S. L., & Motiuk, L. L. (2005). *The Dynamic Factor Identification and Analysis (DFIA) component of the Offender Intake Assessment (01 A} Process: A meta-analytic, psychometric and consultative review.* Ottawa, ON: Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada.

Cavanagh, S. (1997). Content analysis: Concepts, methods and applications. *Nurse Researcher, 4*, 5-16.

Chalmers, J., Campbell. I., & Charlesworth, S. (2005). Part-time work and caring responsibilities in Australia: Towards an assessment of job quality. *Labour & Industry, 15*, 41-66.

Clark, A. E. (2005). Your money or your life: Changing Job Quality in OEDC countries. *British Journal of Industrial Relations, 43,* 377-400.

Cloutier, L. (2008). *La qualité de l'emploi au Québec, développements conceptuels et création d'une typologie. État actuel de la réflexion*. Québec: Institut de la statistique du Québec.

Cloutier-Villeneuve, L. (2012). Job quality in Quebec and the United Kingdom: Trends by sex and family status, 1998-2008. *International Labour Review, 151,* 61-84.

Delveaux, K., & Blanchette, K. (2005). Women offenders' employment needs: Research for a gender-informed employment strategy. *Forum on Corrections Research, 17,* 25-28.

Doeringer, P. B., & Piore, M. J. (1971). *Internal labour markets and manpower analysis*. NY: M. E. Sharpe, Inc.

Downe-Wamboldt, B. (1992). Content analysis: Method, applications, and issues. *Health Care for Women International, 13,* 313-321.

Elos, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 62,* 107-115.

Fairlie, P. (2010). *The Meaningful Work Inventory Technical Monograph*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Author.

Frey, B. S., & Stutzer, A. (2002). *Happiness and economics: How the economy and institutions affect human well-being*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Gillis, C. A., & Andrews, D. A. (2005). *Predicting community employment for federal offenders on conditional release* ((Research Report R-159). Ottawa, ON: Research Branch, Correctional Service Canada.

Gillis, C, A., & Nafekh, M. (2005). The impact of community-based employment on offender reintegration. *Forum on Corrections Research, 17,* 10-14.

Gittleman, M. B., & Howell, D. R. (1995). Changes in the structure and quality of jobs in the United States: Effects by race and gender, 1973-1990. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 48,* 420-440.

Glueck, S., & Glueck, E. (1930). *500 Criminal Careers*. New York, NY: Knopf.

Gordon, D. (1972). *Theories of poverty and underemployment: Orthodox, radical and dual labour market perspectives*. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Co.

Handel, M. J. (2005). Trends in Perceived Job Quality, 1989 to 1998. *Work and Occupations, 32*(1), 66-94.

Huiras, J., Uggen, C., & McMorris, B. (2000). Career jobs, survival jobs, and employed deviance: A social investment model of workplace misconduct. *The Sociological Quarterly, 41*, 245-263.

Huntley, F. L., Palmer, E. J., & Wakeling, H. C. (2012). Validation of an adaptation of Levenson's Locus of Control Scale with adult male incarcerated sexual offenders. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment, 24,* 46-63.

Institute for Social & Economic Research. (2012). *British Household Panel Survey*. Retrieved July 4, 2012, from https://www.iser.essex.ac.uk/bhps.

Kalleberg, A. L. (1977).Work values and job rewards: A theory of job satisfaction. *American Sociological Review, 42,* 124-143.

Kalleberg, A. L., & Reynolds, J. (2001). "Work attitudes and nonstandard work arrangements in the United States, Japan, and Europe" in S. N. Houseman & M. Osawa (Eds.), *Growth of nonstandard work arrangements*. Kalamazoo, MI: W. E. Upjohn Institute.

Krippendorff, K. (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Newbury, CA: Sage.

Latessa, E. (2012). Why work is important, and how to improve the effectiveness of correctional re-entry programs that target employment. *Criminology & Public Policy, 11*, 87-91.

Lauri, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2005). *Developing nursing theories*. Werner Söderström, Dark Oy, Vantaa.

Liddle, M., Feloy, M., & Solanki, A-R. (2000). *NACRO crime and social policy: Offending and employment in greater London.* NACRO Research Report: London, England.

Lockwood, S., Nally, J. M., Ho, T., & Knutson, K. (2012). The effect of correctional education on postrelease employment and recidivism: A 5-year follow-up study in the state of Indiana. *Crime & Deliquency, 58*, 380-396.

Lowe, G. (2007). *21st century job quality: Achieving what Canadians want*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Policy Research Networks.

Lowe, G. S., & Schellenberg, G. (2001). *What's a good job? The importance of employment relationships*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Policy Research Networks.

McDonald, P., Bradley, L., & Brown, K. (2008). "Full-time is a given here": Part-time versus full-time job quality. *British Journal of Management, 20*, 143-157.

Meisenheimer, J. R. II. (1998). The services industry in the 'good' versus 'bad' jobs debate. *Monthly Labor Review, 121*, 22-47.

Mishel, L., Bernstein, J., & Allegretto, S. (2007). *The State of Working America 2006/2007.* Ithaca, NY: ILR Press and Economic Policy Institute.

Motiuk, L L., & Vuong, B. (2005). Offender employment: What the research tells us. *Forum on Corrections Research. 17*, 21-24.

Nolan, A., Wilton, G., Cousineau, C., & Stewart, L. (under review). *Outcomes for offender employment programs: The impact of CORCAN participation*. Ottawa, ON: Research Branch, Correctional Service Canada.

Osterman, P. (1975). An empirical study of labor market segmentation. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 28*, 33-51.

Parcel, T., & Sickmeier, B. (1988). One firm, two labor markets: The case of McDonald's in the fast-food industry. *The Sociological Quarterly, 29*, 29-46.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Quinn, R. P., & Staines, G. L. (1979). *The 1977 quality of employment survey*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Institute for Social Research, Survey Research Center.

Rosenthal, N. H. (1989). More than wages at issue in job quality debate. *Monthly Labor Review, 112*, 4-8.

Rubery, J., & Grimshaw, D. (2001). ICTs and employment: The problem of job quality. *International Labour Review, 140*, 165-192.

Sampson, R., & Laub, J. (1993). *Crime in the making: Pathways and turning points through life*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sandelowski, M. (1995). Qualitative analysis: What it is and how to begin? *Research in Nursing and Health*, *18*, 371-375.

Scott, T. (2010). Offender perceptions on the value of employment. *The Journal of Correctional Education, 61*, 46-67.

Task Force on the Measurement of Quality of Employment. (2010). *Measuring quality of employment: Country pilot reports*. Geneva: United Nations Economic Commission for Europe.

Taylor, K. et al. (2008). *Evaluation Report: Correctional Service of Canada's Employment Strategy: Institutional Component* (File # 394-2-74). Ottawa, ON: Evaluation Branch, Correctional Service Canada.

Uggen, C. (1999). Ex-offenders and the conformist alternative: A job quality model of work and crime. *Social Problems, 46*, 127-151.

Wilson, D.B., Gallagher, C.A., & MacKenzie, D.L. (2000). A meta-analysis of corrections-based education, vocation, and work programs for adult offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 37*, 347-368.

Wilson, K., Brown, M., & Cregan, C. (2008). Job quality and flexible practices: An investigation of employee perceptions. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 19*, 473-486.

Wolfgang, M. E., Figlio, R., & Sellin, T. (1972). *Delinquency in a birth cohort*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Appendix A: Semi-Structured Interview Protocol

General and CSC-Specific

What type of work do you do?

How did you get the job?

- Did you have any assistance from an organization (e.g., CSC, John Howard's Society)?
- Did you have any assistance from friends and/or family?

How long have you had this job for?

What type of work experience and/or education did you have before entering the institution?

What type of work experience or education did you get in the institution?

- Did your work or education in the institution help prepare you for your job? (e.g., skills, expectations)?
- How did your work or education help prepare you?
- What helped prepare you most (i.e., CORCAN, other CSC work assignment, education, vocational courses)?
- How prepared were you to enter the labour market when you were released?
- What skills or abilities that you learned in the institution do you use in your current job?

Do you/or have you ever worked for CORCAN?

- How did you hear about CORCAN?
- What made you decide to work for CORCAN? (e.g., higher wage, experience etc.)?
- Did CORCAN help you to get your current job?

Did you have any challenges obtaining employment (i.e., did you have all necessary documents to obtain employment such as a SIN card, etc.)?

Does your employer know about your offending history?

- Did your history affect your ability to get a job (i.e., having a criminal record)?

What do you like about your job?

What do you dislike about your job?

What do you think has helped you to keep this job for as long as you have?

Does your job help you avoid reoffending?

- If yes, how does it do that?
- Would another job help you more?

Extrinsic Rewards

Do you work full-time or part-time?

- Do you work the number of hours you would like to work?

How stable or secure is your job?

Are you satisfied with the pay?

- Do you have the opportunity to move up or get a raise?
- Do you get any benefits?

Intrinsic Rewards

Do you find your job interesting?

Do you find your job meaningful?

- Do you help other people? Feel like you're doing important work?

Does your job provide the opportunity to learn and develop skills and abilities?

- Does it allow you to use the skills and qualifications that you have?

Does your job make you feel good about yourself? (e.g., get a sense of achievement, personal satisfaction, etc)?

Working Conditions

Is your job stressful?

- If yes, how so?
- What is the workload like?
- Is your job physically difficult? Dangerous?

Does your job affect your physical health?

- If yes, in what way?

What type of schedule or hours do you have?

- Do you like the schedule?

How does your job affect your life outside work?

Quality of workplace interpersonal relationships

Can you tell me about your relationship with your manager or supervisor?

- Is your boss strict?
- Does he or she recognize when you have done a good job?
- Are you treated fairly when something goes wrong?

Can you tell me about your relationships with your co-workers?

- Do you work well as a team?
- Have the people you work with ever been in trouble with the law?
- Are you friends with any of the people you work with outside work?

Overall Rating

Overall, thinking about everything -- including the pay, the type of work you do, the people you work with -- do you like your job?

1	2	3	4	5
I dislike my job a lot	I dislike my job a little	I do not like nor dislike my job	I like my job a little	I like my job a lot