



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The power of dedication: a study of affective commitment profiles and work attitudes and behaviors of prison staff

Ravenstein, F. van; Sentse, M.

Citation

Ravenstein, F. van, & Sentse, M. (2026). The power of dedication: a study of affective commitment profiles and work attitudes and behaviors of prison staff. *Journal Of Crime And Justice*.
doi:10.1080/0735648X.2026.2649649

Version: Publisher's Version
License: [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](#)
Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4302868>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).



The power of dedication: a study of affective commitment profiles and work attitudes and behaviors of prison staff

Francesca van Ravenstein & Miranda Sentse

To cite this article: Francesca van Ravenstein & Miranda Sentse (01 Apr 2026): The power of dedication: a study of affective commitment profiles and work attitudes and behaviors of prison staff, Journal of Crime and Justice, DOI: [10.1080/0735648X.2026.2649649](https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2026.2649649)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2026.2649649>



© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



Published online: 01 Apr 2026.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 171



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)

The power of dedication: a study of affective commitment profiles and work attitudes and behaviors of prison staff

Francesca van Ravenstein  and Miranda Sentse 

Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands

ABSTRACT

Many prison organizations face staff shortages and struggle to recruit and retain sufficient personnel. Their workers are confronted with high work pressure and mental strain. Affective organizational commitment of prison staff could help improve employee retention, performance, and psychological strain. However, affective commitment and its outcomes have been scarcely studied in a prison context, and existing research is limited in its scope, samples, and measurements. Moreover, prison research has not considered the relevance of including multiple foci and studying profiles to enhance the prediction of outcomes. This study measured affective commitment to the prison work team, facility, and agency, and explored the existence of affective commitment profiles and their links to work attitudes and behaviors among a large and nationwide sample of Dutch prison workers ($N = 2.667$). A latent profile analysis identified three profiles: workers with low, high, and moderate affective commitment. Results from a multivariate analysis of variance showed that the profiles significantly differed across work attitudes and behaviors. Prison workers with high commitment to multiple organizational foci generate the best outcomes. Recommendations for future research include replicating the study in other countries, incorporating additional foci, and examining links between affective commitment and prison climate perceptions.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 9 January 2026

Accepted 18 March 2026

KEYWORDS

Affective organizational commitment; prison staff; prison work; detained individuals

Introduction

Prison organizations in many countries are dealing with staff shortages and are struggling to recruit and retain sufficient correctional personnel (Bish 2023; Nam-Sonenstein and Sanders 2024; Vereycken and Ramioul 2019). This problem has been largely caused by years of austerity measures in the prison sector, and coincides with a rising prison population (Eurostat 2025; Vereycken and Ramioul 2019). Understaffing and overcrowding have resulted in dangerous situations for both prison staff and detained individuals and continue to undermine a positive work and prison climate (Bish 2023; Cowan 2025; Shaw 2017). Simultaneously, the nature of prison work for the remaining staff has become increasingly demanding (Miller, Bruenig, and Shakespeare-Finch 2025). Prison staff are

CONTACT Francesca van Ravenstein  f.van.ravenstein@law.leidenuniv.nl  Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology Leiden University, Steenschuur 25, Leiden 2311 ES, The Netherlands

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

tasked with implementing the organization's (sometimes conflicting) objectives and maintaining constructive relationships with detained individuals while ensuring a safe prison environment. Unsurprisingly, levels of measurable mental health problems are reported to be augmenting (Eurostat 2025; Schultz and Ricciardelli 2024). Prison organizations are looking for ways to counteract these problems, often focusing on new recruitment strategies (Bish 2023). However, recruitment might be futile if organizations are not able to retain their employees. Affective organizational commitment is a concept that can help prison organizations understand why certain staff members remain working for their organizations while others do not (Lambert et al. 2021). Originally conceptualized in occupational psychology literature, affective commitment is a mental state that represents the bond between a worker and their organization (Meyer and Allen 1991). It refers to a worker's involvement in, identification with, and emotional attachment to the organization. Affective commitment is the product of positive job characteristics and work experiences, and research in various occupational contexts has established its relevant links with not only turnover, but also job performance, mental strain, and positive customer experiences (Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner 2000; Malhotra and Mukherjee 2004; Meyer and Maltin 2010; Riketta 2002). A few prison studies have confirmed some of these associations (Lambert et al. 2021). This small body of research underlines the potential relevance of affective commitment in relation to improved employee retainment and performance, and reduced burnout as an indicator of mental strain.

While affective commitment is usually measured toward the global organization, research has underlined the relevance of including multiple foci of commitment (Becker 1992; Reichers 1986; Vandenberghe, Bentein, and Stinglhamber 2004). As argued by Meyer and Herscovitch (2001), commitment compels an individual to demonstrate a certain attitude or behavior directed at one or more specific targets, such as the work team or the supervisor. The relevance of the multifocal perspective is that employees can be committed to multiple organizational targets and (the interaction between) these commitment foci can shape how commitment affects outcomes (Morin et al. 2011; Wombacher and Felfe 2017). Studies have shown that the inclusion of multiple foci enhances the prediction of and helps explain the variance in relevant work outcomes (Morin et al. 2011). A handful of studies conducted outside the prison environment went a step further in the multifocal approach by identifying specific profiles of employee commitment (Morin et al. 2011; Perkins, Williamson Smith, and Carter 2025; Tsoumbris and Xenikou 2010; Wombacher and Felfe 2017). The consideration of distinct subgroups of employees with differing patterns of affective commitment enables a more accurate examination of their attitudinal and behavioral responses (Morin et al. 2011; Tsoumbris and Xenikou 2010). Prison research has, so far, largely overlooked the potential relevance of studying multifocal commitment profiles to understand prison staff attitudes and behaviors. Additionally, despite the expected importance of affective commitment in relation to factors such as attendance, performance, mental strain, and staff-prisoner relationships, empirical prison research has not been centered around outcomes of affective commitment (Lambert et al. 2021). Moreover, almost all studies on affective commitment of prison staff have been conducted in the United States. Since studies have been almost exclusively carried out in one country and are usually based on data deriving from a single prison facility, results cannot be generalized to other prisons or countries. The current study had two aims. First, it explored the existence of various affective

commitment profiles of prison staff by including three foci of commitment: the entire prison organization, the prison facility, and the work team. Second, it sought to examine whether employee retention, mental strain, performance, and staff-prisoner relationships were differently associated with certain commitment profiles. The following section reviews relevant theoretical and empirical work on affective commitment foci and profiles, and the associations between affective commitment and work attitudes and behaviors.

Literature review

Commitment foci and profiles

A number of theoretical models can be used to illuminate the role of organizational foci in the study of affective commitment and staff attitudes and behaviors. According to Field Theory (Lewin 1943), a person's behavior derives from the constant interplay between internal factors and the external environment, which can be seen as a 'field' that encompasses all that affects the person. The person's behavior is driven by their perception of their environment, and especially by those environmental factors that are perceived as proximal and noticeable. This idea of proximity is in line with the propositions of the Choice-Process Theory (Lawler 1992), which states that an organization consists of nested group structures, and that employees become more easily attached to proximal collectives. However, according to Consistency Theory (Festinger 1957), affective commitment to both proximal and distant organizational foci are expected to jointly shape employees' attitudes and behaviors. Given that people inherently seek to maintain consistency between their beliefs and actions, an employee's affective commitment is likely to be particularly meaningful when directed to multiple foci that reinforce one another.

Organizational commitment foci have been studied extensively by researchers outside the prison context. This research has confirmed that these foci are factorially distinct (Vandenberghe, Bentein, and Stinglhamber 2004), and can be interconnected, as affective commitment to the work team has been found to enhance feelings of affective commitment to the organization (Wombacher and Felfe 2017). Moreover, researchers studying commitment profiles have generally found that employees who are simultaneously committed to multiple foci demonstrate the most favorable and meaningful work attitudes and behaviors (Tsoumbis and Xenikou 2010; Wombacher and Felfe 2017). That is, workers with high levels of affective commitment across different foci – such as the entire organization, the supervisor and the workgroup – exhibit the highest scores on relevant attitudes and behaviors, such as performance and turnover (Morin et al. 2011; Perkins, Williamson Smith, and Carter 2025). Researchers have urged others to include the work team as an organizational target (Vandenberghe, Bentein, and Stinglhamber 2004) and to use large and representative samples to study affective commitment profiles (Morin et al. 2011; Perkins, Williamson Smith, and Carter 2025).

A few prison studies focusing on antecedents of affective commitment have included multiple foci in their analyses by distinguishing between the prison agency and facility as organizational targets (B. E. Garland, McCarty, and Zhao 2009; Lambert, Hogan, and Jiang 2008). The results indicated that the associations between some of the antecedents and affective commitment depended on the included organizational target. Nevertheless, the

scarcity of prison studies including multiple foci has not examined the potential existence of various affective commitment profiles, nor have they linked these profiles to possible outcomes of affective commitment (Garland, McCarty, and Zhao 2009; Lambert, Hogan, and Jiang 2008). Therefore, it remains unclear whether the study of different affective commitment profiles could enhance the prediction of relevant work attitudes and behaviors of prison workers (Tsoumbis and Xenikou 2010; Wombacher and Felfe 2017).

Work attitudes and behaviors of prison staff

Several researchers have sought to define the underlying mechanism that explains how affective commitment is associated with relevant work attitudes and behaviors (Meyer and Allen 1991). Although much of this work remains hypothetical, three theories can be outlined. First, according to the Social Exchange Theory, prison workers might exchange their affective commitment for the perceived efforts made by the organization (Homans 1958). Affective commitment is anticipated to arise in response to positive work experiences (Lambert and Hogan 2009; Meyer and Allen 1991). Second, based on Self-Determination Theory, affective commitment is expected to be associated with positive work attitudes and behaviors in case the psychological needs of the employee are met by the organization (Deci and Ryan 1985). Last, the Person-Environment Fit Theory underlines the importance of the fit between a person and their environment (Greguras and Diefendorff 2009). Specifically, person-organization fit indicates the match between the employee and the organization, including the extent to which the values of the employee correspond to those of the organization (Meyer and Allen 1991). Positive attitudes and behaviors could be linked to the worker's fit with their work team, prison facility or agency. The theoretical proposition that affective commitment is mostly the result of the interaction between a worker and their environment is inextricably linked to the notion of prison staff culture. Prison staff culture constitutes the shared beliefs, values and norms of prison workers (Garrihy 2020), and could affect how affective commitment is shaped. The unpredictable, demanding and sometimes dangerous nature of prison work can give rise to a strong staff culture that could bring about feelings of safety, cohesion and satisfaction, and protect the group from outside criticism (Garrihy 2020). At the same time, the culture can elicit feelings of tension or exclusion, especially if new staff members are unable to comply to the social norms of the shared culture. Staff cultures are often characterized by rigid hierarchies, a strong focus on masculinity and toughness, and a stigmatization of mental health problems (Schultz and Ricciardelli 2024; Wills et al. 2021). Therefore, a positive and supportive culture defined by positive social exchanges, a strong fit, and the fulfillment of psychological needs might foster affective commitment, whereas an exclusionary or stressful culture characterized by strained exchanges, misfit, and unmet needs could reduce it.

Affective commitment is expected to have strong positive associations with a wide range of work attitudes and behaviors (Meyer and Allen 1991). Prison studies have confirmed the relevance of affective commitment in reducing turnover (intent) and (negative) absenteeism (views) (Garland et al. 2013; Lambert and Paoline 2010; Lambert et al. 2005, 2015). Additionally, a handful of prison studies established links between affective commitment and organizational citizenship behavior as a measure of performance (Lambert et al. 2017; Lambert, Hogan, and Jiang 2008). Prison research findings

also indicate that affective commitment is negatively related to burnout (Garland et al. 2014; Lambert, Kelley, and Hogan 2013). The associations between affective commitment and attendance and withdrawal behaviors, performance, and mental strain are in line with research in other occupational contexts (Meyer and Allen 1997; Meyer and Maltin 2010; Saeed and Jun 2022). Although prison researchers have started to investigate associations between affective commitment and relevant work attitudes and behaviors, many links remain unexplored. Research findings should be replicated and new measures of attendance and withdrawal, performance, and mental health should be introduced (Lambert et al. 2021). For instance, while research outside the prison context shows that affective commitment is associated with customer-oriented work attitudes and positive customer experiences (Malhotra and Mukherjee 2004; Masterson 2001), prison research has not yet considered links between affective commitment and attitudes toward detained individuals. Additionally, prison studies have been limited in their geographical variety and therefore generalizability. Moreover, most prison studies use an older measurement of affective commitment (i.e., the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, Mowday et al. 1979), that, due to a number of limitations, has become outdated in other research contexts (Griffeth, Hom, and Gaertner 2000). These limitations include the fact that the scale conflates notions of affective attachments with moral obligations and behavioral intentions and is less suitable for predicting outcomes such as turnover because these outcomes are already reflected in scale items.

Current study

The literature review illuminates existing research gaps in relation to the general study of affective commitment outcomes, multifocal approaches, large and representative samples, and a valid measurement of affective commitment. Building on these identified gaps, the current study aimed to explore the existence of affective commitment profiles among Dutch prison workers, and to describe the extent to which the potential profiles were linked to work attitudes and behaviors. The study addressed the following research questions: to what extent can distinct profiles of affective commitment of Dutch prison workers be distinguished, and to what extent are work attitudes and behaviors linked to these affective commitment profiles? Based on the aforementioned theoretical models and empirical research, we hypothesized that workers with high levels of affective commitment across multiple foci (the work team, prison facility, and prison agency) would demonstrate the most favorable work attitudes and behaviors. We used a large sample ($N = 2667$) of Dutch prison workers in five different executive work roles covering all 28 penitentiary facilities to answer the research questions.

Methods

Data and sample

The Dutch Custodial Institutions Agency [DJI] is responsible for the execution of all sentences and custodial measures in the Netherlands. Detained individuals are held in juvenile detention centers, psychiatric penitentiary facilities, detention centers for foreign citizens, and standard prison facilities. This study includes prison staff working in general

prison facilities. There are 23 overarching penitentiary institutions spread across 28 individual locations, with prison regimes varying from minimum to maximum security. The current study uses a combination of survey data and administrative data. Survey data derive from an employee satisfaction survey carried out via e-mail among all employees of the Agency in the spring of 2024. The survey was administered using the Internet Mirror [Internetspiegel], an instrument that allows organizations access to a set of scientifically validated modules to assess employees' perceptions of job conditions and work experiences (Effectory [n.d.](#)). The administrative data concerns information on general staff characteristics and were extracted from a software system that manages employee data. Survey participants provided informed consent prior to participation. The research project was approved by the Committee Ethics and Data of the Faculty of Law of Leiden University.

The present study predominantly uses survey and administrative data from prison workers occupying executive work roles: correctional officers, security officers, labor supervisors, and intake officers. Casemanagers were added to the sample, as they serve as a dedicated point of contact for all detained individuals. Of a total of 5828 prison workers holding these five positions, 2966 staff members participated in the survey (a response rate of 51%). By excluding workers that were missing on any of the three affective commitment scales or did not work in a specific team (and would therefore not be able to answer questions related to affective commitment to their work team), the final subsample consists of 2667 respondents. Descriptive statistics of the respondents are detailed in the results section.

Measures

Affective commitment

Three affective commitment scales were modelled after Allen and Meyer's (1990) original scale to represent the three different organizational foci. The original scale consists of eight items, answered on 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), with higher scores reflecting higher levels of affective commitment. The items reflect the worker's involvement in, identification with, and emotional attachment to the organization (for instance 'I feel "emotionally attached" to the agency', or 'I feel a strong sense of belonging to the agency'). Negatively formulated items were reversed based on factor analytic recommendations (Merritt 2012). While the formulation of all items remained identical, the word 'organization' in the original scale was replaced by 'agency', 'facility', and 'team' to create the scales for the three affective commitment foci. The internal consistency of the scales is excellent, demonstrated by Cronbach's Alpha scores of 0.86 for affective commitment to the agency, 0.87 for affective commitment to the facility, and 0.90 for affective commitment to the team.

Work attitudes and behaviors

The survey included the work attitudes of turnover intention, need for recovery, and relational safety. It additionally included the work behaviors of absenteeism, effective teamwork, and craftsmanship. These six work attitudes and behaviors were selected based on their previously established or reasonably expected associations with affective commitment (Lambert et al. 2021). The scales of need for recovery, effective teamwork,

and craftsmanship derived from the existing Internet Mirror modules framework. The researchers were permitted to incorporate supplementary measures in the survey to assess turnover intention and relational safety for the purpose of the present study. The measure of absenteeism was based on administrative data.

Turnover intention is a withdrawal attitude that concerns the worker's intent to quit working for the prison agency, facility, or team, and was measured using three separate items reflecting the intent to quit working for one of the three organizational foci (e.g., 'In the past six months, I have considered transferring to a different prison facility'). Need for recovery reflects work-related fatigue as an indicator of mental strain and was measured with three items (e.g., 'After a day at work, I am completely exhausted', $\alpha = 0.88$). Relational safety, as a measure of positive staff-prisoner relationships, concerns the importance of creating a safe prison environment through positive interactions between staff and detained individuals. Relational safety was measured using seven items (e.g., 'On my unit, employees have sufficient contact with the detainees', $\alpha = 0.90$). The items mirrored the relational safety scale used in the prison climate questionnaire of the Life in Custody study (Nieuwbeerta et al. 2025) and were slightly adapted to reflect the staff perspective. All work attitudes were answered on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). For need for recovery, higher scores indicate greater work-related fatigue. The work behavior of absenteeism was measured by calculating the absenteeism rate of a prison worker in the twelve months prior to and the month during which data collection took place. The absenteeism rate indicates employee absence expressed as a proportion of the available working days during that period, based on a worker's weekly working hours. Due to inaccuracies in registration, 37 workers had an absenteeism rate higher than 100%. These impossible values were replaced with a missing data marker. Eight items were used to measure effective teamwork as an indicator of performance (e.g., 'My team makes a successful contribution to achieving organizational objectives', $\alpha = 0.89$). Craftsmanship, measured with five items, was selected as a second, more individual measure of performance (e.g., 'I constantly strive to improve myself in my work', $\alpha = 0.81$). The two performance measures were answered on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Analyses

We first explored the existence of affective commitment profiles among Dutch prison workers using a latent profile analysis (LPA). LPA can be used to identify hidden (latent) subgroups of individuals in a population based on their patterns of responses (Spurk et al. 2020). As opposed to for instance cluster analyses, LPA provides clear guidelines to identify the number of profiles in the data, offers flexible modeling options that can accommodate the complexities of the data, and yields model-based and reproducible results (Morin et al. 2011). We started with two commitment profiles and subsequently added profiles. Competing models were evaluated using adjusted Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC; lower values indicate better fit) and Sample-size Adjusted Bayesian Information Criterion (SABIC), entropy (higher values reflect clearer classification), and minimum group size ($\geq 5\%$ of the sample). The best-fitting model was selected based on fit indices and interpretability, and respondents were assigned to their most likely profile. To interpret and validate the final profile solution, mean scores on the commitment scales

(agency, facility, and team) were calculated for each profile. The nominal variable representing the different profiles was used as the variable of interest in the following analyses.

We then examined how the original affective commitment scales and established profiles correlated with work attitudes and behaviors. This allowed us to compare the strength and direction of the bivariate associations of both the continuous scales and the latent profiles with work attitudes and behaviors. Finally, we conducted a MANOVA and post hoc analyses to examine multivariate associations between profile membership and work attitudes and behaviors. As the proportion of missing values was relatively low and appeared to be randomly distributed, listwise deletion was used to handle missing data. Analyses were conducted in R Studio 2024.12.1 and SPSS IBM SPSS Statistics 29.

Results

Descriptive statistics and non-response analysis

Descriptive information of the sample is provided in Table 1. Notably, prison workers felt most affective committed to their work team ($M = 3.22$) as compared to the other two organizational foci. Most prison staff were assigned to a profile with a medium level of affective commitment (53.60%). Mean scores on the work attitudes show that respondents, on average, were inclined to continue working for their prison agency ($M = 2.47$), prison facility ($M = 2.05$) and work team ($M = 2.13$), and valued investing in a safe prison

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the sample.

Variable	<i>n</i>	Min	Max	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	%
Age	2667	18	66	45.27	12.88	
Gender						
Male	1853					69.50
Female	814					30.50
Work role						
Correctional officers	1074					40.30
Security officers	878					32.90
Labor supervisors	374					14.00
Casemanagers	276					10.30
Intake officers	65					2.40
Number of years in current work role	2667	0.00	11.80	4.97	4.04	
Affective commitment						
Prison agency	2667	1.00	5.00	3.01	0.73	
Prison facility	2667	1.00	5.00	3.06	0.76	
Team	2667	1.00	5.00	3.22	0.78	
Profile membership						
Profile 1: low commitment	364					13.60
Profile 2: high commitment	873					32.70
Profile 3: moderate commitment	1430					53.60
Turnover intention						
Prison agency	2629	1.00	5.00	2.47	1.42	
Prison facility	2620	1.00	5.00	2.05	1.27	
Team	2626	1.00	5.00	2.13	1.31	
Need for recovery	2662	1.00	5.00	2.97	1.05	
Relational safety	2399	1.00	5.00	3.58	0.68	
Absenteeism rate	2630	0.00	1.00	0.09	0.15	
Effective teamwork	2599	1.00	5.00	3.66	0.64	
Craftsmanship	2665	1.20	5.00	4.02	0.55	

environment through positive staff-prisoner interactions ($M = 3.58$). Staff members reported an average level of the need for recovery after a workday ($M = 2.97$). As for the included work behaviors, scores revealed that prison workers, on average, positively rated their team ($M = 3.66$) and individual ($M = 4.02$) performance. The absenteeism rate indicates that respondents generally missed 9% of scheduled work time in the twelve months prior to and the month during which the data collection occurred.

Independent T-tests and chi-square tests were used to evaluate whether respondents included in the multivariate analysis ($N = 2302$) significantly differed from those that were excluded based on listwise deletion (365 cases) across a number of relevant characteristics. Test results revealed significant differences between respondents and non-respondents for affective commitment, age, and work role. First, t-test results showed that those omitted from the sample generally had lower levels of affective commitment to the prison agency ($(M = 2.90, SD = 0.76), t(2665) = -3.03, p = 0.002, \text{Cohen's } d = -0.17$), facility ($(M = 2.97, SD = 0.77), t(2665) = -2.50, p = 0.01, \text{Cohen's } d = -0.14$), and team ($(M = 2.97, SD = 0.77), t(2665) = -6.64, p < 0.001, \text{Cohen's } d = -0.37$) than those included in the analysis. Second, non-respondents were slightly younger ($M = 41.30, SD = 13.90$), than respondents ($(M = 45.90, SD = 12.61), t(463.94) = -5.96, <0.001, \text{Cohen's } d = -0.36$). Last, chi-square results showed moderate differences between respondents and non-respondents for work role ($\chi^2 (2, N = 2667) = 311.69, p = <0.001, \text{Cramer's } V = 0.17$). Security officers appeared underrepresented in the sample. Notwithstanding these results, effect sizes indicated that differences between respondents and non-respondents were generally small.

Latent profile analysis

Latent profile analysis was used to explore the existence of affective commitment profiles among Dutch prison workers. Models up to five profiles were estimated and compared using BIC, SABIC, entropy, and minimum group size as fit indices (see Table 2). The fit indices demonstrated improvement up to the four-profile solution. However, the three-profile solution showed the best balance of both statistical fit and interpretability. First, the relative improvement from the three-profile solution to the four-profile solution was small, entropy remained virtually unchanged, and group size was less adequate. The entropy value indicated that the three different profiles were well-distinguishable and unambiguous in their classification. Second, the mean scores on the affective commitment dimensions as presented in Table 3 indicated that the three profiles reflected (1) Low general affective commitment, (2) High general affective commitment, and (3) Moderate general affective commitment. An additional fourth profile split the moderate

Table 2. Latent profile analysis fit statistics.

Model	Profiles	BIC	SABIC	Entropy	Smallest class (%)
2-profile	2	16,204.97	16,173.20	0.78	28.2
3-profile	3	15,160.27	15,115.79	0.79	13.6
4-profile	4	14,660.59	14,603.40	0.80	9.5
5-profile	5	14,404.38	14,334.48	0.80	6.4

Note. BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion; SABIC = Sample-size Adjusted BIC. Lower BIC and SABIC values indicate better model fit. Entropy values closer to 1 indicate a clearer profile classification. The smallest class percentage should be $\geq 5\%$.

Table 3. Mean scores on affective commitment foci per profile.

Profile	N	Prison agency	Prison facility	Work team
1 (Low commitment)	364	1.81	1.76	2.42
2 (High commitment)	873	3.73	3.80	3.70
3 (Moderate commitment)	1430	2.87	2.94	3.12

group into ‘moderate-low’ and ‘moderate-high’ affective commitment, which did not yield meaningful theoretical distinctions for the purpose of this study. Based on statistical fit, parsimony, and interpretability, the three-profile solution was selected (Spurk et al. 2020).

Bivariate associations

Pearson correlations were used to examine bivariate associations between the three affective commitment scales (i.e., foci), the three affective commitment profiles and all work attitudes and behaviors (see Table 4). The associations with work attitudes and behaviors revealed some notable differences among the affective commitment foci, especially in regard to commitment to the work team as compared to the other two foci. For instance, affective commitment to the work team was more strongly related to the intent to leave the work team than affective commitment to the prison agency and vice versa. Similarly, affective commitment to the work team was more strongly related to relational safety and effective teamwork, whereas affective commitment to the prison agency was more strongly related to craftsmanship. In general, the correlations between the foci and work attitudes and behaviors demonstrated that affective commitment was positively associated with positive attitudes and behaviors, and negatively associated with negative attitudes and behaviors. All associations were significant.

Pearson correlations were additionally used to explore associations between the various latent profiles and the work attitudes and behaviors (Table 4). Overall, workers with low affective commitment (profile 1) were positively linked to negative work attitudes and behaviors (such as turnover intent, need for recovery, and absenteeism) and negatively linked to positive work attitudes and behaviors (such as relational safety, effective teamwork, and craftsmanship). In contrast, prison workers with high affective commitment (profile 2), were positively associated with positive attitudes and behaviors and negatively with negative work attitudes and behaviors. Aside from absenteeism rate in regard to the high commitment profile, all associations between these two profiles and

Table 4. Correlations of affective commitment scales and profiles with work attitudes and behaviors.

Variable	Agency	Facility	Team	Low (1)	High (2)	Moderate (3)
Turnover (agency)	−0.42**	−0.43**	−0.26**	0.37**	−0.30**	0.03
Turnover (facility)	−0.22*	−0.31**	−0.22**	0.22**	−0.20**	0.04*
Turnover (team)	−0.14**	−0.18**	−0.33**	0.16**	−0.14**	0.03
Need for recovery	−0.16**	−0.17**	−0.10**	0.16**	−0.11**	−0.004
Relational safety	0.22**	0.25**	0.34**	−0.19**	0.21**	−0.07**
Absenteeism rate	−0.06**	−0.08**	−0.04*	0.06**	−0.02	−0.02
Effective teamwork	0.25*	0.29**	0.49**	−0.21**	0.24**	−0.09**
Craftsmanship	0.37**	0.34**	0.21**	−0.23**	0.31**	−0.14**

Note. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. As profiles were dummy coded (0/1), Pearson correlations involving profile variables are mathematically equivalent to point-biserial correlations (Field 2018, 1030).

the work attitudes and behaviors were significant. It is notable that many of the links between workers with moderate affective commitment (profile 3) and the work attitudes and behaviors could not be established. Moreover, the significant correlations in relation to this profile were generally weak.

Multivariate associations

A Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was used to investigate multivariate associations between profile membership and the work attitudes and behaviors. The results revealed general profile differences across work attitudes and behaviors, as indicated by the multivariate test statistic (*Pillai's Trace* = 0.28, $F(16, 4586) = 46.80$, $p < 0.001$). Test results further showed that the three affective commitment profiles significantly differed for all separate work attitudes and behaviors (see Table 5). The largest profile differences were found for turnover intent regarding the prison agency ($\eta^2 = .18$) and craftsmanship ($\eta^2 = .12$). Post hoc comparisons showed that all three profiles differed significantly on all but one of the work attitudes and behaviors. Specifically, those in the high commitment profile (2) scored significantly lower on all turnover dimensions (to agency, facility, and team), and need for recovery, and significantly higher on craftsmanship, relational safety, and effectiveness, than the low (1) and moderate (3) commitment profiles. Additionally, prison workers with low affective commitment (profile 1) showed a significantly higher absenteeism rate than the other two profiles, while prison workers with high (profile 2) and moderate (profile 3) affective commitment did not significantly differ.

Table 5. Descriptive statistics and MANOVA statistics for work attitudes and behaviors across profiles.

Variable	Low (1) <i>M (SD)</i>	High (2) <i>M (SD)</i>	Moderate (3) <i>M (SD)</i>	<i>F</i>	Partial η^2
Turnover (agency)	3.77 (1.44) ^a	1.86 (1.19) ^b	2.53 (1.30) ^c	244.67***	0.18
Turnover (facility)	2.70 (1.57) ^a	1.70 (1.12) ^b	2.11 (1.20) ^c	75.70***	0.06
Turnover (team)	2.64 (1.54) ^a	1.86 (1.25) ^b	2.17 (1.24) ^c	41.42***	0.04
Need for recovery	3.38 (1.17) ^a	2.82 (1.04) ^b	2.98 (1.02) ^c	31.37***	0.03
Craftsmanship	3.72 (0.66) ^a	4.26 (0.49) ^b	3.95 (0.50) ^c	149.68***	0.12
Relational safety	3.27 (0.78) ^a	3.78 (0.62) ^b	3.54 (0.64) ^c	72.01***	0.06
Effectiveness	3.36 (0.78) ^a	3.90 (0.56) ^b	3.62 (0.58) ^c	100.76***	0.08
Absenteeism rate	0.11 (0.17) ^a	0.09 (0.15) ^b	0.08 (0.15) ^b	3.91*	0.003

Note. * $p < .05$. *** $p < .001$. Significant differences in post hoc comparisons between profiles are indicated with differing superscripts.

Discussion

This study examined the potential existence of affective commitment profiles among Dutch prison workers and their supposed links to relevant work attitudes and behaviors. By doing so, it aimed to fill the gap in prison research in regard to the multifocal and person-centered study of affective commitment, scarcely included outcomes, a dominant affective commitment measurement, and large scale and nationwide research designs. Based on a latent profile analysis, three affective commitment profiles could be distinguished: prison workers with low, high, and moderate affective commitment. Therefore,

the three affective commitment foci (prison agency, facility, and team) produced profiles that indicated a general level of affective commitment. Results from a multivariate analysis of variance subsequently showed that the established profiles significantly differed across the included work attitudes and behaviors. The affective commitment profiles corresponded to these work attitudes and behaviors in a logical manner. Prison workers in the high affective commitment profile demonstrated the highest scores on craftsmanship, relational safety, and effectiveness, whereas prison workers in the low affective commitment profile scored highest on all turnover dimensions, need for recovery and absenteeism. The insights of the current study add to the empirical and theoretical understanding of affective commitment in a prison context. The finding that prison workers ascribed to a high affective commitment profile demonstrated the most beneficial work attitudes and behaviors, is in line with empirical (Morin et al. 2011; Perkins, Williamson Smith, and Carter 2025; Tsoumbis and Xenikou 2010; Wombacher and Felfe 2017) and theoretical (Deci and Ryan 1985; Greguras and Diefendorff 2009; Homans 1958) expectations. Prison workers with high commitment to multiple organizational foci generate the best outcomes for prison organizations (in terms of reduced turnover and absenteeism, and improved individual and team performance), prison workers (in terms of the reduced need to recover from work), and detained individuals (in terms of positive interactions between staff and detained individuals). This study confirmed the importance of affective commitment in relation to employee retainment, performance, and reduced mental strain (Lambert et al. 2021), and established relevant links with hitherto unexplored attitudes and behaviors.

While the three profiles significantly differed on almost all work attitudes and behaviors, prison workers in the moderate and high affective commitment profiles did not significantly differ in terms of absenteeism. Although scores on absenteeism were in line with expectations (prison workers with high affective commitment scored lower on absenteeism and vice versa), no specific contrast could be established between the moderate and high commitment profiles. It seems that low affective commitment can be considered as a clear risk factor for absenteeism, whereas reaching at least a moderate level of affective commitment should be sufficient to differentiate workers from those with low affective commitment. Additionally, it is possible that the lack of more specific distinctions in the absenteeism of prison staff among the profiles was due to its measurement. Empirical research indicates that affective commitment could be more strongly related to self-reported views on voluntary absenteeism rather than the more direct measure of total absence as included in the current study (Lambert et al. 2015; Meyer and Allen 1997). The general high level of absenteeism in the Dutch prison sector includes both voluntary and involuntary absence, and might be less sensitive to gradations in affective commitment. It is furthermore notable that the latent profile analysis exclusively identified general affective commitment profiles rather than profiles that reflected differences among the three organizational foci (i.e., work team, facility, agency). Research indicates that that affective commitment foci are factorially distinct and can be differently related to work attitudes and behaviors (Van Ravenstein et al. 2026; Vandenberghe, Bentein, and Stinglhamber 2004), and the current study's results hint at the existence of such nuances. For instance, prison workers reported stronger affective commitment to their work team than to their facility or agency, and those in the low commitment

profile still showed relatively higher affective commitment to their team. Additionally, bivariate associations revealed apparent differences among affective commitment foci in their links to specific attitudes and behaviors. Therefore, it would have been reasonable to expect profiles with workers who had, for example, a high affective commitment to their work team but low commitment to their prison agency. There are several possible explanations for the fact that only general affective commitment profiles were found. First, from a methodological perspective, it is likely that latent profile analysis, by taking a person-centered approach rather than studying relationships between variables, accentuates the inherent and shared dimension of affective commitment across foci (Morin et al. 2011). Second, from a theoretical perspective, the Consistency Theory (Festinger 1957) states that proximal and distant foci could reinforce one another in shaping employees' attitudes and behaviors. Affective commitment to organizational foci rarely occurs in isolation: while a prison worker might be slightly more committed to their work team, they are inclined to also develop affective attachments to other organizational foci. Third, from a contextual perspective, the included organizational foci and the characteristics of the prison environment may reinforce this notion of interconnectedness. This study included three physical organizational targets rather than a more diverse spectrum of foci, such as affective commitment to the supervisor or work role. It is possible that a more global pattern of affective commitment emerged because all foci represent spatially embedded and, more importantly, nested layers of one prison organization that operates as a relatively interdependent system.

Limitations

It is important to reflect on some of the study's limitations. First of all, while this study is theoretically centered around affective commitment and its outcomes, the cross-sectional research design precludes interpretations about the directionality of the associations between the affective commitment profiles and work attitudes and behaviors. While measures such as absenteeism and turnover intention provided stable indicators of employee behavior, the study design did not allow the examination of longer-term temporal relationships to better understand the enduring consequences of affective commitment. Second, as a MANOVA is based on group differences, it was not possible to take classification uncertainty into account by weighing posterior probabilities in the multivariate analysis (Spurk et al. 2020). Nevertheless, the generally high average posterior probabilities (93%, 89%, and 90% for profiles 1, 2, and 3, respectively) and excellent entropy value indicate an adequate and clear classification of profiles. Third, the non-response analyses revealed significant differences between prison workers that were and were not included in the multivariate analysis due to missing values on the attitudes and behaviors. It is unsurprising that excluded prison workers were less committed and younger (age has been inversely linked to affective commitment for Dutch prison staff), than those included, as respondents with less affective commitment are less likely to complete the survey. The fact that security workers were underrepresented could derive from the field-based insight that they have a more limited access to computers during working hours than colleagues in other work roles. Notwithstanding these significant differences, the generally small effect sizes suggest that the risk of bias remains limited.

Recommendations for research and practice

Based on the study's results, we formulate three recommendations for future research on affective commitment of prison staff. First, it would be interesting to replicate this study in other countries to see if the findings concerning Dutch prison workers could be applied to prison staff in other geographical contexts. As mentioned, many prison organizations are dealing with difficulties similar to those of the Dutch Custodial Institutions Agency (Bish 2023; Nam-Sonenstein and Sanders 2024; Vereycken and Ramioul 2019). It would be relevant to examine the generalizability of the conclusions to countries that are also struggling with staff shortages and overcrowding. Additionally, it would be interesting to examine whether specific factors related to particular prison systems, such as penal philosophy or staff-to-prisoner ratio, could moderate findings across geographical contexts. Affective commitment is largely shaped by environmental factors (Greguras and Diefendorff 2009; Homans 1958; Meyer and Allen 1991), and these contextual factors may highly differ across countries. Since almost all studies on affective commitment of prison workers are conducted in the United States, replicating the current Dutch study in other settings would provide more robust evidence of the transferability of the established profiles to other correctional systems. Second, future studies might include additional organizational foci such as those included in studies conducted outside the prison context (Morin et al. 2011), in order to explore a potentially wider range of affective commitment profiles. Specifically, affective commitment to supervisors, management, the work role, or detained individuals could be explored. Including a greater variety of affective commitment targets could lead to the establishment of more nuanced profiles in which more distinct patterns for different targets become apparent (Vandenberghe, Bentein, and Stinglhamber 2004). These studies could adopt longitudinal approaches in which prison workers are followed over a longer period of time to confirm whether these profiles prospectively predict attitudes and behaviors. Additionally, future research could draw on qualitative research to help understand how prison workers define and experience affective commitment to different targets. A subjective understanding of the relational mechanisms and workplace experiences that shape affective attachments could illuminate how affective commitment leads to certain attitudes and behaviors. Third, this study demonstrates that affective commitment of prison workers is not only related to increased performance and employee retention, and reduced mental strain, but also to the previously unexplored outcome of relationships with detained individuals. Future research could try to more specifically study potential links between affective commitment of prison staff and their attitude and behavior toward detained individuals, and perceptions and experiences of detained individuals themselves. As research indicates that perceptions of staff and detained individuals could be linked (Van Ginneken et al. 2020), it would be interesting to examine whether the affective commitment of prison workers could be positively related to detained individuals' perceptions of prison climate dimensions, such as experienced safety or staff-prisoner relationships.

The results indicate that prison organizations should invest in fostering affective commitment at multiple levels of the prison organization. It is likely that team-level interventions such as colleague support could improve affective commitment to the work team, facility-level interventions such as input into managerial decision-making could enhance affective commitment to the prison facility, and agency-level interventions

such as a clear communication of the agency's values and objectives could raise affective commitment to the prison agency (Lambert et al. 2021). The most beneficial outcomes are likely to result from a policy that targets affective commitment at these organizational levels simultaneously and stimulates a positive occupational culture (Wills et al. 2021) centered around positive social exchanges (Homans 1958), the satisfaction of psychological needs (Deci and Ryan 1985), and the match between a worker and their organization (Greguras and Diefendorff 2009). The general affective commitment profiles established in the current study also indicate that interventions at one level could positively spillover to other affective commitment targets (Festinger 1957). Prison organizations could additionally monitor affective commitment profiles to observe potential changes in the affective commitment of their workforce in response to certain (in)formal policies. Beyond focusing on recruiting new personnel to solve current issues (Bish 2023), affective commitment could be a valuable key in unlocking employee retainment, presence at work, mental health, individual and team performance, and positive relations with detained individuals.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

This contribution is part of the Life in Custody Study. The Life in Custody Study was funded by Dutch Prison Service (DJI) and Leiden University. The opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the DJI.

Notes on contributors

Francesca van Ravenstein is a PhD candidate in the Criminology department of the Institute for Criminal Law and Criminology at Leiden University. She is involved in the Life in Custody Study, that aims improve our understanding of staff and detained individuals' perceptions and experiences of prison life. Francesca's research focuses on commitment of prison staff, their work environment, and their relationships with detained individuals.

Miranda Sentse is Associate Professor at the Institute of Criminal Law and Criminology at Leiden University. She conducts interdisciplinary research that focuses on interactions between the individual and the social network to explain problem behaviors. By applying advanced analytical techniques including longitudinal social network analysis, multilevel analysis, and growth curve modelling, she examines the way in which group norms and one's social status in the group are related to individual behavior. She also applies this research to the context of prisons.

ORCID

Francesca van Ravenstein  <http://orcid.org/0009-0000-2593-3147>
Miranda Sentse  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7915-0252>

References

- Allen, N. J., and J. P. Meyer. 1990. "The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization." *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 63 (1): 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x>.
- Becker, T. E. 1992. "Foci and Bases of Commitment: Are They Distinctions Worth Making?" *Academy of Management Journal* 35 (1): 232–244. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/256481>.
- Bish, A. 2023. "Concerns Over Staffing Pressures at Kent and Sussex Prisons." BBC News. October 18. <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-67096774>.
- Cowan, D. 2025. "Scotland's Jails at 'Crisis Point,' Say Prison Officers." BBC News. October 29. <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/ckgyerwkjvgo>.
- Deci, E. L., and R. M. Ryan. 1985. *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Effectory. n.d. "Internetspiegel [Internet Mirror]." <https://www.effectory.com/nl/producten/organisatie/internetspiegel/>.
- Eurostat. 2025. "Prison Statistics." https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Prison_statistics.
- Festinger, L. 1957. *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Field, A. 2018. *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*. 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Garland, B. E., W. P. McCarty, and R. Zhao. 2009. "Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Prisons: An Examination of Psychological Staff, Teachers, and Unit Management Staff." *Criminal Justice & Behavior* 36 (2): 163–183. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854808327343>.
- Garland, B., N. L. Hogan, T. Kelley, K. Bitna, and E. G. Lambert. 2013. "To Be or Not to Be Committed: The Effects of Continuance and Affective Commitment on Absenteeism and Turnover Intent Among Private Prison Personnel." *Journal of Applied Security Research* 8 (1): 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19361610.2013.738402>.
- Garland, B., E. G. Lambert, N. L. Hogan, B. Kim, and T. Kelley. 2014. "The Relationship of Affective and Continuance Organizational Commitment with Correctional Staff Occupational Burnout: A Partial Replication and Expansion Study." *Criminal Justice & Behavior* 41 (10): 1161–1177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854814539683>.
- Garrihy, J. 2020. "There Are Fourteen Grey Areas': 'Jailing', Professionalism and Legitimacy in Prison Officers' Occupational Cultures." *Irish Probation Journal* 17:128–150.
- Greguras, G. J., and J. M. Diefendorff. 2009. "Different Fits Satisfy Different Needs: Linking Person–Environment Fit to Employee Commitment and Performance Using Self-Determination Theory." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 94 (2): 465–477. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014068>.
- Griffeth, R. W., P. W. Hom, and S. Gaertner. 2000. "A Meta-Analysis of Antecedents and Correlates of Employee Turnover: Update, Moderator Tests, and Research Implications for the Next Millennium." *Journal of Management* 26 (3): 463–488. <https://doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600305>.
- Homans, G. C. 1958. "Social Behavior as Exchange." *The American Journal of Sociology* 63 (6): 597–606. <https://doi.org/10.1086/222355>.
- Lambert, E. G., C. Edwards, S. D. Camp, and W. G. Saylor. 2005. "Here Today, Gone Tomorrow, Back Again the Next Day: Antecedents of Correctional Absenteeism." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 33 (2): 165–175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2004.12.008>.
- Lambert, E. G., M. L. Griffin, N. L. Hogan, and T. Kelley. 2015. "The Ties That Bind: Organizational Commitment and Its Effect on Correctional Orientation, Absenteeism, and Turnover Intent." *Prison Journal* 95 (1): 135–156. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032885514563293>.
- Lambert, E. G., and N. L. Hogan. 2009. "A Test of the Importation and Work Environment Models: The Effects of Work Ethic, Importance of Money, and Management Views on the Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment of Correctional Staff." *Journal of Crime & Justice* 32 (1): 61–92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2009.9721262>.

- Lambert, E. G., N. L. Hogan, and S. Jiang. 2008. "Exploring Antecedents of Five Types of Organizational Commitment Among Correctional Staff." *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 19 (4): 466–490. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403408320460>.
- Lambert, E. G., L. D. Keena, D. May, S. H. Haynes, and Z. Buckner. 2017. "To Be Committed or Not: Examining Effects of Personal and Workplace Variables on the Organizational Commitment of Southern Prison Staff." *Criminal Justice Studies* 30 (3): 223–239. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.2017.1293536>.
- Lambert, E. G., T. Kelley, and N. L. Hogan. 2013. "Hanging on Too Long: The Relationship Between Different Forms of Organizational Commitment and Emotional Burnout Among Correctional Staff." *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 38 (1): 51–66. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-012-9159-1>.
- Lambert, E. G., M. Leone, N. L. Hogan, Z. Buckner, R. Worley, and V. B. Worley. 2021. "To Be Committed or Not: A Systematic Review of the Empirical Literature on Organizational Commitment Among Correctional Staff." *Criminal Justice Studies* 34 (1): 88–114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.2020.1762082>.
- Lambert, E. G., and E. A. Paoline. 2010. "Take This Job and Shove It: An Exploratory Study of Turnover Intent Among Jail Staff." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38 (2): 139–148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.01.002>.
- Lawler, E. J. 1992. "Affective Attachments to Nested Groups: A Choice-Process Theory." *American Sociological Review* 57 (3): 327–339. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2096239>.
- Lewin, K. 1943. "Defining the 'Field at a Given Time'." *Psychological Review* 50 (3): 292–310. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0062738>.
- Malhotra, N., and A. Mukherjee. 2004. "The Relative Influence of Organisational Commitment and Job Satisfaction on Service Quality of Customer-Contact Employees in Banking Call Centres." *Journal of Services Marketing* 18 (3): 162–174. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08876040410536477>.
- Masterson, S. S. 2001. "A Trickle-Down Model of Organizational Justice: Relating Employees' and Customers' Perceptions of and Reactions to Fairness." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86 (4): 594–604. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.4.594>.
- Merritt, S. M. 2012. "The Two-Factor Solution to Allen and Meyer's (1990) Affective Commitment Scale: Effects of Negatively Worded Items." *Journal of Business & Psychology* 27 (4): 421–436. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-011-9252-3>.
- Meyer, J., and N. Allen. 1997. *Commitment in the Workplace: Theory, Research, and Application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452231556>.
- Meyer, J. P., and N. J. Allen. 1991. "A Three-Component Conceptualization of Organizational Commitment." *Human Resource Management Review* 1 (1): 61–89. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822\(91\)90011-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/1053-4822(91)90011-Z).
- Meyer, J. P., and L. Herscovitch. 2001. "Commitment in the Workplace: Toward a General Model." *Human Resource Management Review* 11 (3): 299–326. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822\(00\)00053-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(00)00053-X).
- Meyer, J. P., and E. R. Maltin. 2010. "Employee Commitment and Well-Being: A Critical Review, Theoretical Framework, and Research Agenda." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 77 (2): 323–337. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.04.007>.
- Miller, O., D. Bruenig, and J. Shakespeare-Finch. 2025. "High Risk, Low Reward: A Mixed-Method Exploration of Correctional Officer Mental Health and Perceptions of Prison Work." *Journal of Crime & Justice*: 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.2025.2457591>.
- Morin, A. J. S., J. Morizot, J. S. Boudrias, and I. Madore. 2011. "A Multifoci Person-Centered Perspective on Workplace Affective Commitment: A Latent Profile/Factor Mixture Analysis." *Organizational Research Methods* 14 (1): 58–90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428109356476>.
- Mowday, R. T., R. M. Steers, L. W. Porter, R. Dubin, J. Morris, F. Smith, E. Stone, et al. 1979. "The Measurement of Organizational Commitment." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 14 (2): 224–247. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791\(79\)90072-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-8791(79)90072-1).
- Nam-Sonenstein, B., and E. Sanders. 2024. "Why Jails and Prisons Can't Recruit Their Way Out of the Understaffing Crisis." *Prison Policy Initiative*. December 9. <https://www.prisonpolicy.org/blog/2024/12/09/understaffing/>.

- Nieuwbeerta, P., H. Palmen, F. van Ravenstein, and S. Martens. 2025. "'Een sociaal, veilig, gezond en activerend leefklimaat in detentie" ["A social, safe, healthy, and active prison climate"]." *Proces* 104 (1): 50–60. <https://www.boomportaal.nl/doi/10.5553/PROCES/016500762025104001006>.
- Perkins, H. E., R. Williamson Smith, and N. T. Carter. 2025. "Organizational Commitment Profiles and Employee Well-Being: Exploratory and Confirmatory Latent Profile Analyses." *Occupational Health Science* 9 (3): 639–673. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41542-025-00225-2>.
- Reichers, A. E. 1986. "Conflict and Organizational Commitments." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 71 (3): 508–514. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.508>.
- Riketta, M. 2002. "Attitudinal Organizational Commitment and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis." *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 23 (3): 257–266. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.141>.
- Saeed, F., and Y. Jun. 2022. "The Impact of Transformational Leadership on Employee Turnover Intention: The Mediating and Moderating Role of Affective Commitment and Job Embeddedness." *International Journal of Management, Accounting and Economics* 9 (5): 247–267. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6762232>.
- Schultz, W., and R. Ricciardelli. 2024. "Correctional Officers and the Ongoing Health Implications of Prison Work." *Health and Justice* 13 (1): 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40352-024-00308-2>.
- Shaw, D. 2017. "What Is Going Wrong with the Prison System?" January 26. BBC News. <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-38596034>.
- Spurk, D., A. Hirschi, M. Wang, D. Valero, and S. Kauffeld. 2020. "Latent Profile Analysis: A Review and 'How To' Guide of Its Application Within Vocational Behavior Research." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 120:103445. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2020.103445>.
- Tsoumbis, P., and A. Xenikou. 2010. "Commitment Profiles: The Configural Effect of the Forms and Foci of Commitment on Work Outcomes." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 77 (3): 401–411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2010.07.006>.
- Vandenbergh, C., K. Bentein, and F. Stinglhamber. 2004. "Affective Commitment to the Organization, Supervisor, and Work Group: Antecedents and Outcomes." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 64 (1): 47–71. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791\(03\)00029-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0001-8791(03)00029-0).
- Van Ginneken, E. F. J. C., A. Q. Bosma, A. Pasma, and H. Palmen. 2020. "Unhappy Staff, Unhappy Prisoners? The Relation Between Work Climate and Prison Climate in Dutch Prisons." *Kriminologie* 2 (2): 182–200. <https://doi.org/10.18716/ojs/krimoj/2020.2.5>.
- Van Ravenstein, F., M. Sentse, H. Palmen, and P. Nieuwbeerta. 2026. "Assessing the Affective Organizational Commitment Scale: A Multilevel Psychometric Study Among Prison Staff." *Criminal Justice & Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00938548261419331>.
- Vereycken, Y., and M. Ramioul. 2019. "Employment Quality of Prison Staff in Europe: Trapped in a Vicious Circle?". Brussels: ETUI. <https://www.etui.org/topics/health-safety-working-conditions/hesamag/working-behind-bars/employment-quality-of-prison-staff-in-europe-trapped-in-a-vicious-circle>.
- Wills, C., K. Bates, N. A. Frost, and C. E. Monteiro. 2021. "Barriers to Help-Seeking Among Correction Officers: Examining the Influence of Institutional Culture and Structure." *Criminal Justice Studies* 34 (4): 423–440. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601X.2021.1997276>.
- Wombacher, J. C., and J. Felfe. 2017. "Dual Commitment in the Organization: Effects of the Interplay of Team and Organizational Commitment on Employee Citizenship Behavior, Efficacy Beliefs, and Turnover Intentions." *Journal of Vocational Behavior* 102:1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2017.05.004>.