

CANADIAN
POLICE
RESEARCH
CENTRE



CENTRE
CANADIEN DE
RECHERCHES
POLICIÈRES

Technical Report

TR-06-2002

The Perceived Characteristics of Holding Cell

Environments:

Report of a Pilot Study

**Lester Krames
Professor Emeritus, University of Toronto
and
Gordon L. Flett
Professor Psychology, York University**

For the

Canadian Police Research Centre

The Perceived Characteristics of Holding Cell Environments:

Report of a Pilot Study

Lester Krames and Gordon L. Flett

Introduction and Overview

Following a psychological audit of the literature (Krames & Flett, 1999) changes have been made to holding cell environments in Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) detachments throughout Canada in an attempt to provide a safer and more psychologically appealing environment. Such changes and research evaluating these changes are in keeping with calls for proactive interventions designed to decrease suicides and levels of self-injurious behaviors in jail and prison settings (see Bonner, 2000). Research from a number of locations around the world has documented the risk associated with the initial period of incarceration, especially for the first time offender (see Blanc, Lauwers, Telmon, & Rouge, 2001; Blaauw, Kerkhof, & Vermunt, 1997). One approach is to increase the assessment of suicide risk in detainees by evaluating psychological characteristics with standardized assessment batteries. A complementary approach is to retrofit the jail environment by making structural changes to the physical characteristics of the setting attempt to minimize the inherent risk.

The Krames & Flett, (1999) report reviewed the literature detailing a number of possible changes that research and /or experience suggest would have a beneficial effect. The report outlined a number of suggested changes that could be implemented in order to improve the holding cell environment. The report suggested a wide range of potential changes and suggested that rather implementing wholesale changes a better strategy would be to assess various changes to provide empirical evidence of the usefulness of changes. With this goal in mind, we designed a follow-up study with the RCMP and undertook a pilot study to evaluate perceptions of holding cell environments before and

after actual changes were made. This report summarizes the methods used to assess this issue and the findings of an initial pilot study.

We developed a series of four questionnaires that assessed perceptions of holding cell environments to add to the existing literature to assess inmates and guard evaluation of the holding cell environment-. The questionnaires tested two separate populations under two conditions (1) respondents were a prisoner or a guard/matron/officer; and (2) respondents referred to the holding cell environment before or after any changes took place. In essence, responses obtained prior to changes being implemented represent “baseline” or status quo assessments of holding cell environments.

The questionnaires that were included in the final surveys for this pilot study are shown in Appendix 1. It can be seen that each questionnaire begins with a demographic section that is designed to obtain background information about the respondents. Common questions across the four sets of questionnaires include such information as sex of the respondent, racial or ethnic background, marital status, age, and level of education. Specific questions for detainee participants include estimates of the length of time spent in the holding cell and whether it was the individual’s first time in a holding cell. Guards/matrons/officers were asked to indicate their degree of work experience, and they answered a series of questions about detainees in the holding cell at the time of questionnaire completion.

The first questionnaire for detainees is divided into seven sections. In addition to the demographic information we also focused on

- Detainee’s perception of the importance of aspects of the holding cell environment (i.e., Section 2)

- Detainee's evaluation of aspects of the holding cell environment (i.e., Section 3).
 - Four additional sections assessed levels of negative mood (Section 4),
 - Suicide intent (Section 5), the measure of suicide intent was a one-item scale that we developed for the purposes of this research.
 - Hopelessness (Section 6,) assessed with the Beck Hopelessness Scale (Beck, Weissman, Lester, & Trexler, 1974), which is a well-known measure that is a robust predictor of actual suicides (Beck, Steer, Kovacs, & Garrison, 1985).
 - Hopefulness (Section 7) assessed by slightly modifying and extending the Hope Scale created by Snyder and his associates (see Snyder et al., 1991). This measure of hope assesses both perceptions of the will to cope with problematic life situations and the perceived availability of ways to cope with these situations
 - Negative mood was assessed by the negative mood component of the Positive Affect Negative Affect Schedule (Watson & Clark, 1994). This assesses various components of negative mood, including anxiety, sadness, and hostility.
- Hopelessness was.
- Collectively, these measures are recognition of the fact that it is often possible to identify vulnerable individuals prior to an actual suicide attempt while being detained (see Blaauw, Arensman, Kraaij, Winkel, & Bout, 2002).

Accordingly, the final four sections of the initial questionnaire for detainees were included so that we could assess levels of self-destructive tendencies, since a concern about suicidal tendencies while in holding cells was a key factor that led to this development of this project in the first place. In addition, the inclusion of these measures

enabled us to determine whether there is any association between perceptions of the holding cell environment and psychological functioning.

The follow-up questionnaire for detainees was designed to assess perceptions after a retrofit has actually taken place. It is similar in structure to the first questionnaire. That is, once again, the detainees are asked to provide demographic information, ratings of the perceived importance of various aspects of the holding cell, and evaluations of the characteristics of the holding cell. They also complete the measures of negative affect, suicidal intent, hopelessness, and hopefulness. Most notably, the final section requires detainees who have been in the holding cell on a previous occasion to assess the physical changes made to the holding cell.

Two important caveats should be noted at this point. At the outset of this project, it was hoped that we would be able to match questionnaires for specific detainees in specific detachment holding cells so that we could evaluate ratings in a pre-test and post-test design. Unfortunately, this aspect of the project was not feasible due to valid concerns about maintaining the anonymity and confidentiality of the respondents. Note that respondents were not asked to indicate their names so that confidentiality could be assured.

Second, regarding the physical characteristics of the environment that were evaluated, we adopted an inclusive approach that involved assessing a wide variety of characteristics of the physical environment, based on the previous literature in this area and the findings described in our previous report. Questions were asked about such attributes as the adequacy of space, the available light, temperature, noise level, paint colour, and so on, as well as specific issues involving safety (i.e., the perceived

availability of drugs in the holding cell, the possibility of assault, and concerns about becoming ill while in the holding cell).

The questionnaires for guards/matrons/officers are also shown in Appendix 1. As noted earlier, they were asked to provide demographic information about themselves and background information about the detainee present when the questionnaire was completed. This included specific information about such issues as

- Detainee's level of intoxication,
- Attempts at self-harm,
- Degree of threat to others, and so on (see Section 2).
- In Section 3 of the questionnaire, guards/matrons/officers were asked to evaluate the holding cell environment by rating many of the same characteristics that detainees were asked to evaluate.

The pre-test and post-test questionnaires for guards/matrons/officers were quite similar, but the post-test questionnaire also included a section that assessed perceptions of change to the environment (see Section 4). The perceptions of change measure assessed four attributes:

- Need for the change,
- Satisfaction with the change,
- Importance of the change, and
- Degree of improvement.

The evaluations of change involved an overall assessment (see questions 1 to 4 in Section 4), as well as specific changes by adding windows (see questions 5 to 8), changes

in paint colour (see questions 9 to 12), and changes in visibility into the holding cell area (see questions 13 to 16).

One final caveat should be noted prior to our general description of the respondents and the summary of the findings. At the outset, we recognized that there are vast differences among locations in terms of the existing holding cell environments. This source of variance involving the different detachments that participated in this research is a factor that makes it difficult to make definitive statements, and there is no basis for making comparative statements that would pit one detachment versus another detachment. This report focuses on general evaluations of holding cell environments as a whole without the degree of specificity that would emerge if we had been able to focus on just one or two sites with many respondents at both time points. However, in a few locations, we obtained enough information of perceptions before and after changes were made, so we were able to obtain an initial assessment of the perceived changes. We now turn to a description of the respondents.

Participants

Detainee Respondents

In total, 18 detainees completed the Time 1 pre-test questionnaire package and 7 detainees completed the Time 2 post-test questionnaire package. The mean age of the detainees at Time 1 was 34.61 years old, while the mean age of the detainees at Time 2 was 32.0 years old. All of the detainees at Time 2 had been in a holding cell before, and 13 of the 18 detainees at Time 1 had been in a holding cell on a previous occasion.

Guard/Matron/Officer Respondents

Overall, 32 respondents completed the Time 1 pre-test questionnaire package and

9 respondents completed the Time 2 post-test questionnaire package. The 32 respondents at Time 1 consisted of 26 guards/matrons and 6 officers. This included 22 men and 10 women. Their mean age was 49.9 years old. The modal amount of work experience was 1 to 4 years, and this was similar for the guards/matrons and officers who participated in this study.

Analyses of the 9 respondents at Time 1 indicated that 8 guards/matrons and 1 officer were in the study. Overall, six of the 9 had 1 to 4 years experience, while the other three respondents each had 5 years or more experience.

Locations

The two main sites for this research study were the following RCMP detachment Naine in Labrador and Courtenay in British Columbia. Respondents from both sites provided questionnaires at both time periods. Other locations that took part included detachments in Wetaskiwin, McLennan, and St. Albert.

Summary of Results

Analyses of Data From Detainees

Table 1 provides a summary of the mean ratings given by the detainees of the importance of various environmental characteristics. For the purposes of these analyses, the pre-test and post-test evaluations were combined into a total sample of 25 respondents, since the importance level should not change substantially as a function of time period.

As can be seen in Section 2 of the questionnaires for detainees, respondents were asked to assess the importance of 16 characteristics. The responses could range from “1” (i.e., not important) to “5” (i.e., very important). The mean ratings for all 16 attributes

are shown in Table 1. It can be seen that 15 of the 16 characteristics were rated, at a minimum, as being at least somewhat important. The sole exception was the importance of the colour of the walls ($\underline{M} = 2.21$), which suggests that any benefits of having psychologically pleasing colours are more subtle and are not readily apparent to detainees.

The characteristics rated in terms of their importance in order were: (1) having access to medical care; (2) a clean holding cell area; (3) good ventilation; (4) comfortable temperature; (5) the odour of the cell; (6) the amount of noise in the cell; (7) having a window to the outside; (8) having enough room in the cell; (9) having a quiet holding cell area; and (10) having contact with other people. The overall mean rating given to the 16 characteristics as a whole was 3.62 ($\underline{SD} = 1.01$), indicating that more than moderate importance was attached to the environmental characteristics of the holding cells.

Table 2 provides a summary of the mean evaluations given by the detainees to the characteristics of the holding cell environments. Respondents were asked to rate on a five-point scale the extent of their disagreement with 23 statements (see Section 3). The results in Table 2 represent the combined ratings from the pre-test and post-test questionnaires. In general, it can be seen that decidedly positive evaluations were provided. There is little indication of the perception of a safety problem or undue concern about safety. This is reflected by the high mean rating of 4.44 given to the item “I feel safe in the holding cell”, as well as general agreement that good medical care is available to the detainee and it is difficult to bring in drugs, alcohol, or weapons. It was also indicated that the lighting is adequate ($\underline{M} = 4.00$), and the sleeping space is adequate

($M = 3.76$). Importantly, detainees disagreed with the statement that “The holding cell is crowded”, so space issues do not appear to be a significant problem.

Table 3 provides a summary of the views of detainees from Naine, both before and after the changes made to the holding cell area. Six detainees provided ratings before the changes and four provided ratings after the changes. It can be seen in Table 3 that the ratings indicate that there were substantial improvements following the changes in terms of several factors. The post-test ratings indicated improvements in feelings of safety, the adequacy of sleeping space, the adequacy of space in general, the difficulty of bringing in drugs/alcohol or weapons, the comfortableness of the temperature, the cleanliness, the attractiveness of the walls, the ability to tell the time of day, and the sense that a guard would address a noise problem.

However, the changes did not lead to universal improvements. The post-test environment was seen as more noisy with less fresh air and a bigger vandalism problem. The vandalism issue may have occurred in newly retrofitted cells where vandalism would stand out more than in an older less spotless cell. As might be expected, there were no changes in the perception that good medical care is available. Collectively, the ratings indicate that substantial improvements have taken place. However, the data would be stronger if it were possible to match the individuals who provided the pre-test ratings with those providing the post-test ratings.

Table 4 summarizes the detainees’ evaluations of the usefulness of the changes that were made. Recall that ratings involve assessments of the extent to which changes were needed, the satisfaction with changes, the importance of changes, and the degree to which the changes represented an improvement. Respondents here made 5-point ratings

with “5” indicating strong agreement, and “1” indicating strong disagreement with the statements. Overall, it is clear from Table 4 that the changes were well received. The overall need for changes was 4.43, with the need for changes to visibility receiving the highest rating ($M = 4.43$). The general trend that emerged from the data was that changes involving windows and visibility received high ratings, and favourable ratings, albeit to a lesser degree, were given to changes involving painting. This is in keeping with the results discussed earlier that indicated that less importance was given to painting the holding cell area.

Psychological Characteristics of the Detainees

Analyses indicated that of the 23 detainees who responded to the suicide intent item (see Section 5), only one indicated any thoughts of killing himself. Overall scores on the Beck Hopelessness Scale indicated that there were relatively low levels of hopelessness ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 3.49$), and this was in keeping with the low levels of suicide intent. However, it should be noted that two detainees had Beck Hopelessness Scale scores of 10 or more, and this signifies that these individuals have significant long-term risk of eventually committing suicide. This is in keeping with concerns that some prisoners may indicate verbally that they have no intent to kill themselves but their true level of intent may be much higher (see Hayes, 2001).

Comparisons of levels of psychological adjustment for detainees in cells before and after retrofit yielded little evidence of differences. There were no differences whatsoever in levels of hopefulness. The detainees who completed the measures after the retrofits had slightly higher hopelessness scores but lower negative affect scores than those in cells where no retrofit had taken place.

Another approach we took with these data was to determine whether psychological adjustment had any relationship to evaluations of the physical environment. A few interesting findings emerged after conducting correlation tests. That is, we found that detainees with higher levels of hopelessness had a tendency to give more negative ratings to the adequacy of the sleeping space, $r = -.39$, $p < .07$, and they felt less safe, $r = -.38$, $p < .07$. Also, they gave higher ratings to the availability of drugs/alcohol, $r = .40$, $p < .06$. Higher levels of negative mood were associated with lower ratings of the availability of good medical care, $r = -.37$, $p < .08$. Finally, detainees with higher levels of hopefulness gave higher adequacy ratings to the sleeping space, $r = .38$, $p < .08$, and the adequacy of the lighting, $r = .41$, $p < .05$. Also, those with higher levels of hopefulness reported feeling safer in the holding cell, $r = .42$, $p < .05$. Note that we reported findings that did not meet conventional levels of statistical significance ($p < .05$) because of the lower sample size.

Overall, these findings are noteworthy because they suggest that the psychological distress experienced by the detainee is a factor that is associated with negative cognitive appraisals of the physical environment. This tendency is in keeping with other research in other contexts that suggests that the appraised threat of a stressful situation is linked with psychological distress.

Analyses of Data From Guards/Matrons/Officers

Table 5 lists the characteristics of the holding cell environments as evaluated by guards/matrons/officers and Table 6 contains a summary of ratings by site of detachment. Respondents make five-point evaluations with an answer of “1” being “never,” an answer of “3” being “sometimes,” and an answer of “5” being “always.” According to the

ratings, it can be seen in Table 5 that highly favourable aspects of the environment (as indicated by a mean rating of 3.50 or greater) were given to the following statements: the detainee has access to medical care, the guard/officer is able to adjust the lighting, the holding cell is a safe area, the amount of light is adequate, and there is enough room in the cell. Concerns were raised about unacceptable odours and the level of noise, as well as the colour of the walls. It was also indicated that detainees did not have extensive privacy ($\underline{M} = 2.70$).

Table 7 summarizes the ratings for the Naine site before and after the changes. It can be seen that the results are somewhat anomalous in that more negative ratings were evident, more often than not, in the post-test ratings.

Perhaps the most relevant findings are displayed in Table 8, which summarizes the perceptions of the changes from the perspectives of the guards/matrons/officers at two locations (i.e., Courtenay and Naine). The overall need for change was rated as $\underline{M} = 3.67$. A greater need for change was recognized in terms of the need for windows ($\underline{M} = 4.25$) and for improved visibility ($\underline{M} = 3.78$). Once again, lower ratings were given to the need for improved paint colour ($\underline{M} = 3.00$). Overall, there was general agreement that changes were important ($\underline{M} = 3.67$) and had resulted in improvement ($\underline{M} = 3.67$), and there was an acceptable level of satisfaction ($\underline{M} = 3.67$). The levels of satisfaction with the changes were comparable at Courtenay and Naine.

One guard in the study felt the need to write a comment on his questionnaire booklet. He wrote "There are cells in dets E division that are barely fit to put prisoners in and despite repeated attempts to have them repaired, nothing was done and all requests ignored i.e. in Port Rupert sub/det near Prince Rupert. My two years there 97-99 resulted

in a/n opinion. How can thousands of dollars be used for the improvements here in Courtenay and on this study when some Dets have water leaking through lights into cellblocks and it takes years to get this addressed Feel free to call me...(Signed with phone number).”

The need for windows was clearly acknowledged. More general evaluations of the visibility issue revealed that the need for improved visibility was recognized at both sites. However, some differences did emerge, with the respondents at Courtenay indicating less satisfaction in terms of visibility ($M = 2.20$).

Conclusions:

There is clearly a need for a brief, standardized assessment tool to assess self-destructiveness, as used in other jurisdictions (i.e. New York), to supplement the training that is currently provided. Self-harm is a threat to a small but significant number of offenders held in holding cells. The fact that some individuals who are at risk were revealed in this small sample reinforces the importance of careful screening. Further, there is a demonstrated need for a comprehensive, full-scale assessment of the changes as a goal for future research. As can be seen not all changes are viewed as beneficial. For the guard/matrons the issue is not only personal safety but also the importance of working in a humane environment. For most detainees a safe healthy environment is crucial but there is varied opinion as to what constitutes a psychologically sound environment

References

- Beck, A. T., Steer, R. A., Kovacs, M., & Garrison, B. (1985). Hopelessness and eventual suicide: A 10-year prospective study of patients hospitalized with suicidal ideation. American Journal of Psychiatry, 142, 559-563.
- Beck, A. T., Weissman, A., Lester, D., & Trexler, L. (1974). The measurement of pessimism: The Hopelessness Scale. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 861-865.
- Blaauw, E., Arensman, E., Kraaij, V., Winkel, F. W., & Bout, R. (2002). Traumatic life events and suicide risk among jail inmates: The influence of type of events, time period and significant others. Journal of Traumatic Stress, 15, 9-16.
- Blaauw, E., Kerkhof, A. J. F. M., & Vermunt, R. (1997). Suicides and other deaths in police custody. Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 27, 153-163.
- Blanc, A., Lauwers, V., Telmon, N., & Rouge, D. (2001). The effects of incarceration on prisoners' perception of their health. Journal of Community Health, 26, 367-378.
- Bonner, L. (2000). Correctional suicide prevention in the year 2000 and beyond. Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior, 30, 370-376.
- Hayes, L. M. (2001). Jail suicide risk despite denial (or: when actions speak louder than words). Crisis, 22, 7-9.
- Snyder, C. R., Harris, C., Anderson, J. R., Holleran, S., Irving, L., Sigmon, S., Yoshinobu, L., Gibb, J., Langelle, C., & Harney, P. (1991). The will and the ways: Development and validation of an individual difference measure of hope. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 570-585.

Watson, D., & Clark, L. A. (1994). Manual for the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule – Expanded Form. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa.

Table 1

Prisoner Ratings of Importance of Characteristics

Characteristic of the Environment	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
1. Having access to medical care	4.28	1.34
2. A clean holding cell area	4.21	1.25
3. Good ventilation	4.12	1.48
4. Comfortable temperature	4.04	1.37
5. The odour of the cell	4.04	1.57
6. The amount of noise in the cell	4.00	1.29
7. A window to the outside	3.92	1.47
8. Enough room in the cell	3.79	1.25
9. A quiet holding cell area	3.68	1.14
10. Contact with other people	3.64	1.44
11. A safe area	3.63	1.41
12. Some privacy	3.52	1.48
13. Being able to tell time	3.43	1.56
14. The amount of light	3.40	1.22
15. Vandalism	3.04	1.67
16. The colour of the walls	2.21	1.35

Table 2

Detainee Evaluations of Environment

Characteristic of the Environment	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
1. I feel safe while in the holding cell	4.44	1.16
2. The lighting is adequate	4.00	1.38
3. The sleeping space in the holding cell is adequate	3.79	1.28
4. The space in this holding cell is adequate	3.76	1.36
5. It is difficult for someone to bring in drugs/alcohol	3.68	1.73
6. It is difficult for someone to bring in weapons	3.68	1.68
7. The temperature is comfortable	3.64	1.38
8. If it is noisy, the guard/matron will do something about it	3.63	1.58
9. The holding cell area is clean	3.43	1.44
10. Good medical care is available to the detainee	3.28	1.67
11. There is fresh air	3.12	1.79
12. The walls are painted attractive colours	3.04	1.46
13. I am able to have the light adjusted	3.00	1.84
14. I am concerned about becoming ill while in the cell	2.88	1.86
15. I am able to tell the time of day while in the cell	2.88	1.86
16. It is noisy	2.84	1.55
17. I am able to have the temperature adjusted if necessary	2.83	1.86
18. Odours are a problem	2.68	1.73

19. Vandalism is a problem	2.04	1.43
20. The holding cell is crowded	1.76	1.42
21. Assault is a problem among the detainees	1.72	1.31
22. Assault is a problem among detainees and guards	1.44	1.04
23. Drugs/alcohol are available in the holding cell	1.44	1.23

Table 3

Detainee Pre-Test and Post-Test Evaluations of Environmental Characteristics

	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
1. I feel safe while in the holding cell		
Naine: Pre-Test	4.17	1.60
Naine: Post-Test	4.50	1.00
2. The lighting is adequate		
Naine: Pre-Test	3.50	1.97
Naine: Post-Test	3.00	1.83
3. The sleeping space in the holding cell is adequate		
Naine: Pre-Test	3.00	1.58
Naine: Post-Test	4.25	0.96
4. The space in this holding cell is adequate		
Naine: Pre-Test	2.83	1.17
Naine: Post-Test	3.25	1.71
5. It is difficult for someone to bring in drugs/alcohol		
Naine: Pre-Test	2.83	2.04

Naine: Post-Test	3.50	1.91
6. It is difficult for someone to bring in weapons		
Naine: Pre-Test	3.50	1.97
Naine: Post-Test	2.75	1.26
7. The temperature is comfortable		
Naine: Pre-Test	3.50	1.52
Naine: Post-Test	4.00	0.82
8. If it is noisy, the guard/matron will do something about it		
Naine: Pre-Test	3.17	1.47
Naine: Post-Test	5.00	0.00
9. The holding cell area is clean		
Naine: Pre-Test	2.60	1.67
Naine: Post-Test	3.25	1.71
10. Good medical care is available to the detainee		
Naine: Pre-Test	3.67	1.51
Naine: Post-Test	3.50	1.73

11. There is fresh air

Naine: Pre-Test	2.83	2.00
Naine: Post-Test	2.00	2.00

12. The walls are painted attractive colours

Naine: Pre-Test	2.83	1.33
Naine: Post-Test	3.50	1.29

13. I am able to have the light adjusted

Naine: Pre-Test	3.00	2.19
Naine: Post-Test	2.75	2.06

14. I am concerned about becoming ill while in the cell

Naine: Pre-Test	1.33	0.82
Naine: Post-Test	2.75	2.06

15. I am able to tell the time of day while in the cell

Naine: Pre-Test	3.67	2.07
Naine: Post-Test	4.25	1.50

16. It is noisy

Naine: Pre-Test	2.17	1.17
-----------------	------	------

Naine: Post-Test	3.50	1.29
17. I am able to have the temperature adjusted if necessary		
Naine: Pre-Test	3.17	1.83
Naine: Post-Test	3.75	1.89
18. Odours are a problem		
Naine: Pre-Test	3.00	1.79
Naine: Post-Test	3.25	2.06
19. Vandalism is a problem		
Naine: Pre-Test	1.67	0.82
Naine: Post-Test	4.00	1.41
20. The holding cell is crowded		
Naine: Pre-Test	2.00	1.55
Naine: Post-Test	2.75	2.06
21. Assault is a problem among the detainees		
Naine: Pre-Test	1.67	1.03
Naine: Post-Test	1.75	1.50

22. Assault is a problem among detainees and guards

Naine: Pre-Test	1.50	1.22
-----------------	------	------

Naine: Post-Test	1.00	0.00
------------------	------	------

23. Drugs/alcohol are available in the holding cell

Naine: Pre-Test	1.67	1.63
-----------------	------	------

Naine: Post-Test	1.75	1.50
------------------	------	------

Table 4

Detainees' Evaluation of Changes

Rating Dimensions

Characteristic	Need		Satisfaction		Importance		Improvement	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Overall								
Total	4.43	0.79	3.57	1.62	4.29	1.11	4.50	0.84
Windows								
Total	4.00	1.67	3.29	1.50	4.17	1.60	4.50	1.22
Visibility								
Total	4.43	0.98	4.00	1.00	3.71	1.50	4.33	0.82
Painting								
Total	4.20	1.10	3.33	0.82	3.00	1.10	3.40	1.14

Table 5

Guard/Matron/Officer Evaluations of Environment

Characteristic of the Environment	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
1. The detainee has access to medical care	4.46	0.77
2. The guard/matron is able to adjust the lighting	4.33	1.23
3. The holding cell is a safe area	4.29	0.90
4. The holding cell area is clean	4.10	0.86
5. The amount of light is adequate	3.98	1.01
6. There is enough room in the cell	3.95	1.24
7. The guard/matron is able to adjust the temperature	3.39	1.77
8. The holding cell area is quiet	3.29	0.81
9. The temperature is comfortable	3.26	1.10
10. The detainee has contact with other people	3.22	1.17
11. The odour of the cell is unacceptable	3.22	1.17
12. There is a window to the outside	2.98	1.75
13. The holding cell is noisy	2.98	0.76
14. There is good ventilation	2.95	1.47
15. There is a problem with vandalism	2.75	1.24
16. The colour of the walls is attractive	2.70	1.26
17. There is some privacy for the detainee	2.70	1.26

18. The guard/officer is able to control the noise in the cell	2.37	1.11
19. The detainee is able to tell the time	2.22	1.53

Table 6

Mean Ratings Provided by Guards/Matrons/Officers by Site

Characteristics of the Environment	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
1. The detainee has access to medical care	4.46	0.77
Courtenay (1)	4.50	0.55
Naine (2)	4.30	0.92
Wetaskiwin (3)	4.63	
0.74		
McLennan (4)	4.00	1.07
St. Albert (7)	5.00	0.00
2. The guard/officer is able to adjust the lighting	4.33	1.23
Courtenay (1)	5.00	0.00
Naine (2)	4.00	1.63
Wetaskiwin (3)	4.75	
0.71		
McLennan (4)	3.12	1.25
St. Albert (7)	5.00	0.00
3. The holding cell is a safe area	4.29	0.90
Courtenay (1)	4.17	0.75

Naine (2)	4.40	0.84
Wetaskiwin (3)		4.13
0.99		
McLennan (4)	4.00	1.31
St. Albert (7)	5.00	0.00
4. The holding cell area is clean	4.10	0.86
Courtenay (1)	4.83	0.41
Naine (2)	3.60	0.97
Wetaskiwin (3)		3.63
0.74		
McLennan (4)	4.38	0.74
St. Albert (7)	4.00	0.82
5. The amount of light is adequate	3.98	1.01
Courtenay (1)	4.50	0.55
Naine (2)	3.33	1.06
Wetaskiwin (3)		3.63
1.19	McLennan (4)	4.25
0.89		
St. Albert (7)	4.50	0.58
6. There is enough room in the cell	3.95	1.24

Courtenay (1)	4.83	0.41
Naine (2)	3.60	0.97
Wetaskiwin (3)		3.63
0.74		
McLennan (4)	4.38	0.74
St. Albert (7)	4.00	0.82
7. The guard/officer is able to adjust the temperature	3.39	1.77
Courtenay (1)	1.17	0.41
Naine (2)	4.80	0.42
Wetaskiwin (3)		4.00
1.51		
McLennan (4)	3.38	1.51
St. Albert (7)	5.00	0.00
8. The holding cell area is quiet	3.29	0.81
Courtenay (1)	3.50	0.55
Naine (2)	3.30	1.06
Wetaskiwin (3)		3.00
0.54		
McLennan (4)	3.75	1.03
St. Albert (7)	2.80	0.45

9. The temperature is comfortable	3.26	1.10
Courtenay (1)	3.67	1.04
Naine (2)	3.60	0.97
Wetaskiwin (3)		2.88
0.99		
McLennan (4)	3.25	1.04
St. Albert (7)	4.25	0.50
10. The detainee has contact with other people	3.22	1.17
Courtenay (1)	2.67	1.03
Naine (2)	3.78	0.97
Wetaskiwin (3)		3.38
0.74		
McLennan (4)	3.00	1.20
St. Albert (7)	3.00	1.63
11. The odour of the cell is unacceptable	3.22	1.17
Courtenay (1)	3.17	0.75
Naine (2)	2.70	1.49
Wetaskiwin (3)		4.13
0.64		
McLennan (4)	3.13	1.13
St. Albert (7)	3.25	1.71

12. There is a window to the outside	2.98	1.75
Courtenay (1)	3.00	1.79
Naine (2)	3.50	1.78
Wet (3)	1.50	1.41
McLennan (4)	4.13	1.36
St. Albert (7)	2.00	2.00
13. The holding cell is noisy	2.98	0.76
Courtenay (1)	3.00	0.00
Naine (2)	2.80	1.03
Wetaskiwin (3)		3.13
0.35		
McLennan (4)	2.75	1.17
St. Albert (7)	3.25	0.50
14. There is good ventilation	2.95	1.47
Courtenay (1)	3.00	1.26
Naine (2)	3.80	1.03
Wetaskiwin (3)		1.38
1.06		
McLennan (4)	2.75	1.49
St. Albert (7)	4.25	0.96

15. There is a problem with vandalism	2.75	1.24
Courtenay (1)	2.33	0.52
Naine (2)	3.56	1.24
Wetaskiwin (3)		2.63
1.41		
McLennan (4)	1.88	1.13
St. Albert (7)	3.00	1.63
16. The colour of the walls is attractive	2.70	1.26
Courtenay (1)	3.83	0.98
Naine (2)	2.80	1.40
Wetaskiwin (3)		1.63
1.19		
McLennan (4)	3.00	1.63
St. Albert (7)	3.00	1.73
17. There is some privacy for the detainee	2.70	1.26
Courtenay (1)	2.33	1.51
Naine (2)	3.10	1.37
Wetaskiwin (3)		2.13
0.99		
McLennan (4)	3.13	0.84

St. Albert (7)	3.75	0.96
18. The guard/officer is able to control the noise in the cell	2.37	1.11
Courtenay (1)	3.00	1.41
Naine (2)	2.50	0.97
Wetaskiwin (3)		2.13
0.83		
McLennan (4)	2.50	1.31
St. Albert (7)	2.50	1.00
19. The detainee is able to tell the time	2.22	1.53
Courtenay (1)	1.17	0.41
Naine (2)	3.60	1.35
Wetaskiwin (3)		1.50
1.41		
McLennan (4)	1.71	0.95
St. Albert (7)	4.00	1.15

Table 7

Pre-Post Characteristics of the Environment	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
1. The detainee has access to medical care		
Naine: Pre-Test	4.50	0.84
Naine: Post-Test	4.00	0.82
2. The guard/officer is able to adjust the lighting		
Naine: Pre-Test	3.50	1.97
Naine: Post-Test	4.75	0.50
3. The holding cell is a safe area		
Naine: Pre-Test	4.83	0.41
Naine: Post-Test	3.75	0.96
4. The holding cell area is clean		
Naine: Pre-Test	4.17	0.75
Naine: Post-Test	2.75	0.50
5. The amount of light is adequate		
Naine: Pre-Test	3.33	1.03
Naine: Post-Test	3.25	1.26

6. There is enough room in the cell

Naine: Pre-Test	3.83	1.03
Naine: Post-Test	3.25	1.26

7. The guard/officer is able to adjust the temperature

Naine: Pre-Test	4.67	0.52
Naine: Post-Test	5.00	0.00

8. The holding cell area is quiet

Naine: Pre-Test	3.17	1.33
Naine: Post-Test	3.50	0.58

9. The temperature is comfortable

Naine: Pre-Test	3.67	1.03
Naine: Post-Test	3.50	1.00

10. The detainee has contact with other people

Naine: Pre-Test	4.00	1.00
Naine: Post-Test	3.50	1.00

11. The odour of the cell is unacceptable

Naine: Pre-Test	2.17	1.47
-----------------	------	------

	Naine: Post-Test	3.50	1.29
12.	There is a window to the outside		
	Naine: Pre-Test	3.00	1.90
	Naine: Post-Test	4.25	1.50
13.	The holding cell is noisy		
	Naine: Pre-Test	2.67	1.47
	Naine: Post-Test	3.50	1.29
14.	There is good ventilation		
	Naine: Pre-Test	3.67	0.82
	Naine: Post-Test	4.00	1.41
15.	There is a problem with vandalism		
	Naine: Pre-Test	4.00	1.00
	Naine: Post-Test	3.00	1.41
16.	The colour of the walls is attractive		
	Naine: Pre-Test	3.00	1.10
	Naine: Post-Test	2.50	1.91
17.	There is some privacy for the detainee		

Naine: Pre-Test	3.50	1.90
Naine: Post-Test	2.50	1.00
18. The guard/officer is able to control the noise in the cell		
Naine: Pre-Test	2.00	0.89
Naine: Post-Test	3.25	0.50
19. The detainee is able to tell the time		
Naine: Pre-Test	3.17	1.47
Naine: Post-Test	4.25	0.96

Table 8

Evaluations From Guards/Matrons/Officers of Changes Made

Rating Dimensions

Characteristic	Need		Satisfaction		Importance		Improvement	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Overall								
Total	3.67	1.00	3.67	1.00	3.67	0.87	3.67	0.87
Courtenay	4.00	0.71	3.60	1.14	3.80	0.84	3.80	0.84
Naine	3.25	1.26	3.75	0.96	3.50	1.00	3.50	1.00
Windows								
Total	4.25	0.96	3.75	0.96	4.00	0.82	3.50	1.00
Courtenay	DNA							
Naine	4.25	0.96	3.75	0.96	4.00	0.82	3.50	1.00

Visibility

Total	3.78	0.83	2.78	1.48	4.11	1.17	3.33	1.73
Courtenay	3.80	0.84	2.20	1.64	4.00	1.41	3.20	2.28
Naine	3.75	0.96	3.50	1.00	4.25	0.96	3.50	1.00

Painting

Total	3.00	0.87	3.22	0.44	3.00	1.22	3.22	0.44
Courtenay	3.40	0.55	3.40	0.55	2.40	1.14	3.40	0.55
Naine	2.50	1.00	3.00	0.00	3.75	0.96	3.00	0.00