



North Carolina Department of Public Safety
Division of Adult Correction and Juvenile Justice
Adult Institutional Corrections
Recruitment and Retention Evaluation (update)

Commissioned by the Criminal Justice Standards Division of the
North Carolina Department of Justice for the
North Carolina Criminal Justice Education & Training Standards Commission

February 10, 2017

Heidi S. Bonner, Ph.D.
Department of Criminal Justice
Thomas Harriot College of Arts and Sciences
240 Rivers Building
Greenville, NC 27858
(252) 328-4382 office
bonnerhe@ecu.edu

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
INTRODUCTION	5
LITERATURE OVERVIEW	5
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	7
Research Design	7
Data Collection	7
Measures	8
Analytical Plan	9
RESEARCH FINDINGS	10
Characteristics of Those Responding to the Survey	10
Recruitment and Retention	11
<i>Efforts to Recruit Staff</i>	11
<i>Efforts to Retain Staff</i>	12
<i>Positive Aspects of Job</i>	12
<i>Negative Aspects of Job</i>	13
Turnover Intent	13
<i>Exit Information</i>	14
The Decision to Work in Adult Institutional Corrections	15
Level of Satisfaction	15
Hiring Standards	16
Training	17
Input in Decision Making	17
Job Satisfaction	18
Job Burnout	19
Dangerousness	20
Supervisory Support	20
Peer Support	22
Work Stress	23
Role Strain	24
Formalization	25
Organizational Commitment	25
Predicting Turnover Intent	27
CONCLUSION	29
REFERENCES	30
Appendix A – Table for Job Burnout	32

Executive Summary

The purpose of this study was to assess the recruitment and retention of adult institutional corrections officers. These human resources issues are particularly important to consider for the field of corrections, where reported voluntary turnover rates are exceptionally higher than other fields. High turnover rates in the field of corrections are problematic for several reasons including the high proportion of inexperienced personnel delivering services to the offending population, inconsistent supervision strategies, and the cost of recruiting and training new staff on an ongoing basis. Assessing the causes of voluntary turnover among institutional corrections staff can lead to improved recruitment and retention efforts in this field.

A stratified random sample of adult institutional corrections officers and supervisors (n = 4,995) was used to assess the perceptions and attitudes of staff. Surveys were administered via hard copy to selected employees at their facility. Respondents were instructed to return their completed survey in the provided self-addressed, stamped envelope. A total of 1,271 respondents completed at least some portion of the survey, resulting in a response rate of 25%. Nineteen percent of respondents were supervisors.

When asked what efforts were currently being made to recruit staff to adult institutional corrections, several avenues were mentioned including advertisement (on vehicles, via radio, and in newspapers), job fairs, use of the career counselor, and word of mouth. A significant number of respondents, however, stated that they had no idea of the process used to recruit new staff, and many stated that they themselves were not recruited, they just applied to the agency. When asked if they felt that the agency actively makes efforts to retain staff, 71% of respondents responded in the negative. Only 29% felt that adult institutional corrections leadership tried to retain personnel. Respondents were asked what efforts could be made to retain staff and provided several suggestions related to pay and benefits, supervisory support, and resolving staff shortages so time off for existing staff was not affected.

When asked what they liked most about their job, a very common response was the schedule. In particular, respondents liked the 12-hour shift and the rotation of days off which allowed for greater concentrations of personal time. Respondents also noted co-workers, job security, knowing that every day is different, and the knowledge that the job being done is important as positives. However, respondents also noted a number of concerns with institutional corrections employment including being short staffed, low salary, and being paid monthly. A perception that the administration was out of touch, and unconcerned with employee morale were also noted as negative aspects of the job. Additional areas of concern included poor management, favoritism, and stress.

Turnover intent (an individual's desire to stay or leave his or her organization) was measured by four items, which were added together to form an index. Fifty-six percent of respondents stated that they had thought about quitting their job in the last six months, and 39% stated they currently desired to quit their job. The index could range from two to twelve, with a higher number indicating a greater degree of turnover intent. The mean degree of turnover intent

among all respondents was 5.9, and non-supervisors had a significantly higher degree of turnover intent compared to supervisors.

Exit information was obtained to determine why individuals have left adult institutional corrections. Two years of data, from 2014 and 2015, were analyzed. Data indicated that nearly 60% of the employees who left resigned and, of those, about 30% did so for better employment. The remaining exits were due to retirement, transfer, reassignment, or promotion, dismissal, or departure while under investigation.

When respondents were asked if the standards required for entry into the field were stringent enough, 58% agreed that they were while 42% thought they were not. Thirty-five percent of respondents provided suggestions on changes they would make to hiring standards. Respondents were also asked if they felt the training received for their job was adequate. Respondents were asked if they felt the training received for their job was adequate and the majority (70%) thought that it was adequate. Twenty-seven percent of respondents provided suggestions on changes they would make to hiring standards.

A total of three ordinary least squares (OLS) regression equations were estimated to predict turnover intent. The final model (Model 3) included personal characteristics, work environment perceptions, and job attitudes as independent variables. This full model indicated that, in terms of personal characteristics, respondents who were younger and who had more than a high school education were more likely to consider leaving. In terms of work environment perceptions, respondents who perceived that they had less input into decision making, and who perceived less support from their supervisor were more likely to indicate an intent to turnover. Finally, in terms of job attitudes, respondents who felt more work stress and who felt less satisfaction with their job were more likely to consider leaving.

The statistical analysis of turnover intent indicate areas upon which the agency can focus to improve retention. The qualitative analysis, when complete, will provide more context for these findings, as well as provide suggestions by employees to improve perceptions of input into decision making, supervisory support, work stress, and job satisfaction.

Introduction

In December 2014, the Principal Investigator was approached by a research and planning specialist in the Criminal Justice Standards Division of the North Carolina Department of Justice to determine the degree of interest in studying recruitment and retention within criminal justice. The proposed research study was a component of NCDOJ's 3-year plan, and a two-pronged study (one of local law enforcement and one of corrections) was proposed. Faculty at East Carolina University ultimately agreed to conduct the corrections component of the study. Postage costs were paid by NCDOJ, and copying costs were paid by ECU. No compensation for this study was provided. Topics and occupations of interest within corrections were developed through subsequent planning conversations with NCDOJ, as well as input from Commissioners on the Criminal Justice Education & Training Standards Commission.

Thus, the purpose of this study is to assess the recruitment and retention of adult institutional corrections officers and supervisors. These human resources issues are particularly important to consider for the field of corrections, where reported voluntary turnover rates are exceptionally higher than other fields. The annual average voluntary turnover rate for correctional officers is estimated to range between 12 and 30%, with some estimates placing this figure closer to 45% (Lambert, 2001; Lommel, 2004; Nink, 2010; Wees, 1996; Wright, 1993).

Literature Overview

The nature of working in corrections is stressful for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the difficulty associated with managing and intervening in situations involving the offending population. The stressors are similar for institutional and community corrections officers. Specifically, the emotionally and physically demanding workload, dangerous environmental conditions (especially for prison correctional officers), low pay, and long hours make working in corrections particularly stressful. Communication difficulties with fellow officers and supervisors is also a source of frustration for both institutional and community correctional officers (Cheek & Miller, 1983; Finn & Kuck, 2005). In addition, the role conflict associated with attempting to balance treatment and custody directives from administrators can also increase employee stress levels and burnout, while decreasing overall job satisfaction, thereby heightening the likelihood for one to seek an alternative career path (Cheek & Miller, 1983; Finn & Kuck, 2005; Huckabee, 1992).

High turnover rates in the field of corrections are problematic for several reasons. First, employee turnover is an indicator of organizational effectiveness and stability. Secondly, constant turnover can weaken the management structure, internal communication, and leadership, all of which are critical to carrying out the mission of correctional agencies. Thirdly, turnover in the institutional and community corrections setting equates to a high proportion of inexperienced personnel delivering lower quality of services to the offending population and inconsistent supervision strategies. Finally, recruiting and training new staff on an ongoing basis is costly to the already burgeoning correctional budget (Cheek & Miller, 1983; Cullen, Link, Wolfe, & Frank, 1985; Lambert, 2001; Lambert & Paoline, 2008). Taking these issues into consideration, assessing the

causes of voluntary turnover among correctional staff can lead to improved recruitment and retention efforts in this field.

When examining factors associated with voluntary turnover, several key dimensions arise in the literature. Because it is often difficult to gather information from individuals that have left the field of corrections, several researchers have attempted to examine factors associated with turnover intent using samples of currently employed institutional and community corrections officers (Lambert & Paoline, 2010; Lambert, 2006; Lee, et al., 2009) The assumption underlying this approach is that factors associated with one's intent to leave the organization ultimately influence one's actual departure from the field. As stated by Lee et al. (2009), "turnover intention has been found to be the best predictor and the most immediate precursor of actual turnover" (pg. 31). This line of research has revealed that turnover intent is linked to several work environment characteristics in the field of corrections, such as input into decision-making, instrumental communication, organizational fairness, and role stress (Lambert, 2006; Lambert & Paoline, 2010). These researchers have also found that several work-related attitudes are associated with turnover intent, including job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and job involvement (Lambert, 2006; Lambert & Paoline, 2010; Lee et al., 2009). Many of the work environment characteristics just listed have been studied in relation to work-related attitudes in an effort to assess how work conditions influence employee satisfaction as a precursor to turnover. Research in this area has found that these dimensions tend to overlap and interact with one another in the correctional environment (i.e. job satisfaction is linked to work stress and role strain, role stress is linked to organizational commitment, input into decision-making, etc.) suggesting further research is needed to disentangle these measures in this context (Cullen, Link, Wolfe, & Frank, 1985; Lambert, 2001; Lambert & Paoline, 2008).

Another measure that has been discussed in the context of retention and turnover intention among correctional staff is job burnout. Burnout is described as the emotional and physical exhaustion that results from work stress, often leading to personal and professional problems (Morgan, VanHaveren, & Pearson, 2002). Many of the studies that have examined burnout among individuals working in a human services field have utilized a scale that was developed by Maslach (1981) which consists of three subcomponents: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and lack of personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion taps into the overwhelming emotional toll and exhaustion that can stem from work-related stress. The depersonalization subscale measures the extent to which individuals have begun to embrace an impersonal and distant approach to working with clients (offenders). The final subscale of job burnout, lack of personal accomplishment, assesses negative self-evaluations of job performance. Job burnout can be conceptualized as the sum of these subscales or these subscales can be examined independently. When this concept has been examined using samples of correctional staff, Whitehead and Lindquist (1986) found that lack of job satisfaction is associated with all three subscales, while role conflict, lack of support, age of employee, and work stress are only associated with emotional exhaustion and depersonalization. Moreover, lack of participation in decision-making was linked to emotional exhaustion and scores on the personal accomplishment subscale. Prior research has also found that gender, tenure (length of

employment), and prison type (male vs. female inmates) influence scores on the burnout scale among correctional staff (Carlson, Anson, & Thomas, 2003; Morgan, et al., 2002).

Research Methodology

Research Design

In an effort to assess factors associated with retention among the North Carolina Department of Public Safety employees, the current study builds off the existing literature to examine the work environment characteristics and attitudinal dimensions just described in relation to turnover intention among institutional corrections officers and supervisors. In addition, this study explored the relationships between the work environment characteristics and the attitudinal dimensions that are associated with turnover intent in the correctional environment. To this end, the study identified the key factors (work environment characteristics and attitudinal dimensions) that contribute to turnover intent among adult institutional corrections personnel.

As an additional component of this study, participants were asked a number of questions pertaining to recruitment and retention to assess what strategies may be employed in the future to improve efforts in these areas. Specifically, participants were asked to identify factors that compelled them to join the field of adult institutional corrections. In addition, they were asked to specify what efforts are currently being made, and what could be done in the future, to improve the recruitment and retention of staff. This version of the report includes the results of those qualitative analyses.

Data Collection

A stratified random sample (n = 4,995) was used to assess the perceptions and attitudes of staff. Surveys were provided to each Regional Director, who in turned provided them to the appropriate Facility Head. Survey materials were contained in an envelope bearing the potential respondent's name so it could be delivered to the right staff member. Identifying information was not contained on the actual survey materials. A self-address, postage paid envelope was provided so that respondents could mail surveys back to NCDOJ Criminal Justice Standards Division, who provided them unopened to the Principal Investigator. Data collection opened on May 17, 2016 and closed on July 31, 2016. The longer data collection timeframe was necessary because of the distribution method – Central was the first region to receive surveys on April 20, and Mountain was the last on June 14.

A total of 1,271 respondents completed at least some portion of the survey, resulting in a response rate of 25%. Table 1 shows the response rates by region.

Table 1: Response Rate by Region

	Number Distributed	Number Received	Response Rate
Central	1,195	340	28.5%
Coastal	1,099	261	23.7%
Mountain	1,260	313	24.8%
Triangle	1,441	265	18.4%
Unaffiliated*		92	
	4,995	1,271	25.4%

*Some respondents removed the facility identifier from their survey before returning so it is impossible to know the region from which it came

It is important to note that a number of employees contacted the Principal Investigator about the survey, primarily with concerns about confidentiality. Although the recruitment information made it clear that confidentiality would be maintained, there is anecdotal evidence that some Facility Heads may have attempted to curb data collection, or may have attempted to circumvent confidentiality. In particular, a handful of respondents stated that Facility Heads attempted to collect completed surveys from them so they could be mailed back en masse. It is impossible to know if these activities were due to simple misunderstanding about the data collection process, or if there was another intent. However, both Regional Directors and Facility Heads were provided with letters that explained the study, including the process for returning surveys. It is unclear how data collection may have been impacted as a result of these activities in some facilities.

Measures

The following measures were used:

- **Turnover intent** refers to an individual's desire to stay or leave his or her organization and is measured by four items, two indicating simple agreement, one indicating degree of likelihood, and one indicating degree of activity (adopted from Sager et al., 1998, per Lambert (2006).
- **Input into decision-making** is the degree to which staff members perceive they have a voice in the decisions made by the organization. It was measured by four items answered using a 5-point Likert scale indicating how much input respondent feels he or she has (adopted from Curry et al., 1986, per Lambert & Paoline, 2008)
- **Burnout** is a type of job stress, a state of physical, emotional, or mental exhaustion. Employees who are burned out may be physically present, but be psychologically withdrawn from work which can be of particular concern in the field of corrections. Job burnout was measured by twenty-two items answered using a 5-point Likert scale indicating level of agreement (adopted from Malasch & Jackson, 1981, per Whitehead & Lindquist, 1986).
- Employees working in the field of corrections may oftentimes feel that their job is a dangerous job. Perception of **dangerousness** was measured by five items answered using

a 5-point Likert scale indicating level of agreement (adopted from Cullen et al., 1985, per Lambert & Paoline, 2008).

- **Supervisory support** refers to the degree that a staff member feels supported by administration. Four items answered using a 5-point Likert scale indicating level of agreement (adopted from Cullen et al., 1985) were used to measure supervisory support.
- **Peer support** refers to the degree that a staff member feels supported by other staff members. Peer support was measured by four items answered using a 5-point Likert scale indicating level of agreement (adopted from Cullen et al., 1985).
- **Work stress** is a response to work-related stressors and consists of an individual's feeling of job-related tension, worry, or anxiety. Six items answered using a 5-point Likert scale indicating level of agreement (adapted from Crank, Regoli, Hewitt, & Culbertson, 1995, per Lambert & Paoline, 2008) were used to measure work stress.
- **Job satisfaction** is the fulfillment of certain needs associated with work and is measured by five items answered using a 5-point Likert scale indicating level of agreement (adapted from Brayfield & Rothe, 1951, per Lambert & Paoline, 2008).
- An employee can experience **role strain** when assigned responsibilities and duties are ill-defined and ambiguous or when direction from administration is contradictory. Role strain was measured using seven items answered using a 5-point Likert scale indicating level of agreement (adapted from Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970, Cullen et al., 1985, and Poole & Regoli, 1983, per Lambert & Paoline, 2008).
- **Formalization** refers to the extent to which rules and procedures are established and known by the members of the organization and was measured by five items answered using a 5-point Likert scale indicating level of agreement (adopted from Oldham & Hackman, 1981, and Taggart & Mays, 1987, per Lambert & Paoline, 2008).
- **Organizational commitment** is the connection that an employees has with his/her organization, and it was measured by two items answered using a 5-point Likert scale indicating level of agreement (adapted from Mowday et al., 1982, per Lambert & Paoline, 2008).

Demographic information including race/ethnicity, education, age, and gender, and job characteristics including supervisory status, position, and tenure, was also captured.

Analytical Plan

The data were analyzed using univariate, bivariate, and multivariate procedures. The key dependent variable examined in the study was turnover intent, as an indicator of employee retention. A series of analyses were conducted to examine the bivariate relationships between perceptions of work conditions (dangerousness, role strain, work stress, formalization, and input into decision-making) and turnover intent among participants. A similar set of bivariate analyses were employed to assess the relationships between several work-related attitudinal measures (job satisfaction, burnout, and organizational commitment) and turnover intent. These initial analyses were conducted to identify the measures that are significantly associated with turnover intent. Additional bivariate analytical procedures were utilized to examine the correlations

between the work condition measures and the attitudinal measures previously described to determine if interaction terms need to be built into multivariate modeling procedures. Once all key independent measures were tested in relation to turnover intent, a multivariate model incorporating interaction terms and demographic control variables was constructed to examine the strength of the measures collectively in explaining turnover intent.

Simple frequency distributions and descriptive statistics were provided for all variables pertaining to retention and recruitment. As noted, qualitative data is still being entered. Once that is complete, content analysis will be conducted on both exit information, and all open-ended questions to identify themes pertaining to employees' perceptions of what is currently being done, and what may need to be done in the future, to recruit and retain staff.

Research Findings

Characteristics of Those Responding to the Survey

The demographic characteristics of respondents are presented in Table 2. There were nearly three times as many males than females. Roughly 60% were White, and nearly 32% were Black. Very few of the respondents were Hispanic/Latino. About 14% had either a bachelors or graduate degree, and about 28% had served, or were currently serving, in the military. Nearly 19% indicated that they were supervisors.

Table 2: Demographics of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Gender (N = 1,233)¹		
<i>Male</i>	900	73.0%
<i>Female</i>	333	27.0%
Race (N = 1,251)		
<i>White</i>	748	59.8%
<i>Black or African-American</i>	396	31.7%
<i>Asian or Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian</i>	11	0.9%
<i>American Indian or Alaska Native</i>	42	3.4%
<i>Multi-racial</i>	40	3.2%
<i>Other</i>	14	1.1%
Ethnicity (N = 1,229)		
<i>Hispanic/Latino</i>	1,185	96.4%
<i>Non-Hispanic/Latino</i>	44	3.6%
Age (N = 1,220)		
<i>22-29</i>	215	17.6%
<i>30-39</i>	285	23.4%
<i>40-49</i>	296	24.3%
<i>50-59</i>	348	28.5%
<i>60 and older</i>	76	6.2%
Highest Education Level Obtained (N = 1,251)		
<i>High School Diploma/GED</i>	815	65.1%
<i>Some College</i>	64	5.1%
<i>Associates Degree</i>	194	15.5%
<i>Bachelor Degree</i>	143	11.4%
<i>Graduate Degree</i>	35	2.8%
Military Service (N = 1,247)		
<i>Yes</i>	346	27.7%
<i>No</i>	901	72.3%
Supervisor (N = 1,236)		
<i>Yes</i>	234	18.9%
<i>No</i>	1,002	81.1%

Recruitment and Retention

Efforts to Recruit Staff

Respondents were asked what efforts were currently being made to recruit staff to adult institutional corrections, and they mentioned a number of avenues including advertisement (on

¹ N within tables refers to the sample size, which varies by question. For example, N = 280 means that of the 284 employees who participated in the survey, 280 answered the question about gender.

vehicles, via radio, and in newspapers), job fairs, use of the career counselor, and word of mouth. A large number of respondents, however, indicated that they had no idea of the process used to recruit new staff. A number also stated that no efforts were being made, or that the efforts in place were not working. One noted, for example, that he/she didn't "feel as though they have made enough attempt to recruit staff, and when they do hire staff they don't last long." Others indicated that recruitment efforts were not keeping pace with shortages, or that standards had been lowered in order to recruit. Still others noted the futility of recruiting with current compensation levels. As one respondent stated, "I don't see how the state can expect to get recruits when we have not had a raise above the cost of living in the last 5 years, and they keep cutting benefits."

Respondents were also asked how they were initially recruited into the agency. A large number stated they were recruited by a friend or family member who already worked at NCDPS, or another referral. Others referenced ads in newspaper, job fairs, or general job hunting, including online job searches or through Employment Security Commission. Many said they applied online, but did not indicate how they knew about the opportunity.

Efforts to Retain Staff

When asked if they felt that the agency actively makes efforts to retain staff, 71% of respondents responded in the negative. Only 29% felt that adult institutional corrections leadership made an attempt to retain personnel. Respondents were also asked what efforts were could be made to retain staff. Many mentioned an increase in pay and better benefits. Others noted the importance of expressing appreciation to employees, and ensuring employees were able to take requested days off (which are impacted by staff shortages). As one responded stated "We feel sometimes our service is overlooked and sometimes it makes us feel unappreciated."

Positive Aspects of Job

When asked what they liked most about their job, a very common response was the schedule. Many respondents liked the 12-hour shift and the rotation of days off which allowed for greater concentrations of personal time. Another common response was co-workers. Respondents mentioned camaraderie and teamwork as positives, and one stated that he/she liked "that there are a lot of us correctional officers that do the right thing and keep our noses clean on the job, and making sure that we all go home safe." Others noted that the work is stable, and they like having job security.

For some respondents, knowing that every day is different was a positive component of the job. One stated that he/she liked that "every day is different and comes with its own set of unique problems requiring creative approaches to solve." Other respondents felt that the job is important. One noted that it was a positive to provide a "needed service for the state and the community." Another highlighted the "possibility of making a difference in inmates' lives" as an aspect he/she enjoyed.

Negative Aspects of Job

When asked what they liked least about their job, a large number of respondents noted being short staffed. Many expressed frustration with having to work on days off due to staff shortages. Others considered low pay to be a negative component of the job, and many disliked being paid once a month.

A large number of respondents felt that the administration was out of touch. For example, one perceived that “rules and regulations [are] being made by people that have never been in a prison nor even worked in one.” Many also perceived a lack of concern for employee morale by administration. One respondent stated that “good staff are treated just like bad staff. Bad staff are not held accountable for their actions and good staff are not shown appreciation for doing a good job.”

Respondents also consider poor management and favoritism to be negative aspects of the job. One stated that “a bad supervisor can ruin a good crew.” Others noted the stress of the job, both from the nature of the job itself, as well as from administrative uncertainty. One respondent mentioned stress from “dealing with inmates on a daily basis, not knowing what is going to happen hour to hour” as well as stress from “not knowing if you are going to have scheduled day off, working over time.”

Turnover Intent

Turnover intent was measured by four items, which were added together to form an index. Specifically, respondents were asked if they had thought about quitting their job in the last six months, and if they currently desired to quit their job. They were also asked how likely it was that they would be in their current job a year from now (reverse coded), and how actively they had searched for a job with other employers in the last year. Fifty-six percent of respondents stated that they had thought about quitting their job in the last six months, and 39% stated they currently desired to quit their job.

As mentioned, the four items were summed to create an index of turnover intent which had a Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient of .72. The index could range from two to twelve, with a higher number indicating a greater degree of turnover intent. The mean degree of turnover intent among all respondents was 5.9. The mean degree of turnover intent for supervisors was 5.5 while the mean degree for non-supervisors was 6.0. The difference in degree of turnover intent between supervisors and non-supervisors was significant, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test. In other words, non-supervisors were significantly more likely than supervisors to indicate and intent to leave.

Respondents were also asked why they felt people left the field of adult institutional corrections. Many cited low pay, stress and burnout, and being mentally unprepared or otherwise unsuited for the job. When those who were considering leaving were asked if there was anything that could be done to encourage them to stay, the majority mentioned pay.

Exit Information

Exit information was obtained to determine why individuals have left adult institutional corrections. Two years of data, from 2014 and 2015, were analyzed and are summarized in Table 3. About 59% of the employees who left resigned and, of those, about 30% did so for better employment. Over 13% of exits were due to retirement, and 11% were dismissals or employees who resigned while under investigation. The remaining exits were due to transfer, reassignment, promotion, or a change in certification, the employee not reporting or not certifying, separation due to unavailability, or other reasons.

Table 3: Exit Information for Adult Institutional Corrections, 2014-2015

	Number	Percent
Resignation	2,571	58.5%
<i>Better employment</i>	753	29.3%
<i>No reason given</i>	661	25.7%
<i>Medical/Disability/Death</i>	226	8.8%
<i>Personal reasons</i>	931	36.2%
Dismissed/Resigned while under investigation	483	11.0%
Other	63	1.4%
Did not report/did not certify	28	0.6%
Transfer/reassignment/promotion/change certification	416	9.5%
Retirement	582	13.3%
Separation due to unavailability	250	5.7%
TOTAL	4,393	100%

The Decision to Work in Adult Institutional Corrections

Respondents were asked what influenced their decision to work in adult institutional corrections (Table 4). About 50% were moderately or extremely influenced by financial reasons, and about 55% were compelled by a desire to explore new opportunities. Forty-four percent stated they were moderately or extremely influenced by the opportunity to contribute to society.

Table 4: Factors Influencing the Decision to Work in Adult Institutional Corrections

	Not at All # (%)	Slightly # (%)	Somewhat # (%)	Moderately # (%)	Extremely # (%)
Financial Reasons (N = 1,253)	157 (12.5%)	158 (12.6%)	306 (24.4%)	331 (26.4%)	301 (24.0%)
Self-Fulfillment (N = 1,243)	312 (25.1%)	207 (16.7%)	323 (26.0%)	268 (21.6%)	133 (10.7%)
Career Development (N = 1,244)	174 (14.0%)	176 (14.1%)	303 (24.4%)	354 (28.5%)	237 (19.1%)
Contribution to Society (N = 1,243)	213 (17.1%)	174 (14.0%)	309 (24.9%)	343 (27.6%)	204 (16.4%)
Interest in the Field (N = 1,242)	208 (16.7%)	210 (16.9%)	333 (26.8%)	344 (27.7%)	147 (11.8%)
Exploration of New Opportunities (N = 1,247)	142 (11.4%)	133 (10.7%)	293 (23.5%)	405 (32.5%)	274 (22.0%)

Level of Satisfaction

Table 5 presents the level of satisfaction respondents felt with various aspects of the job. Respondents indicated that they were most satisfied with the work itself, and the gender and racial/ethnic diversity of their co-workers. They were least satisfied with the pay and benefits, career advancement opportunities, and communication with supervisors.

Table 5: Level of Satisfaction with Factors Associated With Current Job

	Not at All Satisfied # (%)	Slightly Satisfied # (%)	Somewhat Satisfied # (%)	Moderately Satisfied # (%)	Extremely Satisfied # (%)
Teamwork (N = 1,244)	210 (16.9%)	226 (18.2%)	370 (29.7%)	292 (23.5%)	146 (11.7%)
Pay and Benefits (N = 1,258)	406 (32.3%)	274 (21.8%)	305 (24.2%)	222 (17.6%)	51 (4.1%)
Career Advancement Opportunities (N = 1,252)	271 (21.6%)	253 (20.2%)	387 (30.9%)	259 (20.7%)	82 (6.5%)
Communication with Other Staff (N = 1,256)	199 (15.8%)	277 (22.1%)	366 (29.1%)	313 (24.9%)	101 (8.0%)
Communication with Supervisors (N = 1,253)	255 (20.4%)	246 (19.6%)	290 (23.1%)	319 (25.5%)	143 (11.4%)
Gender Diversity of Co-Workers (N = 1,235)	143 (11.6%)	192 (15.5%)	374 (30.3%)	367 (29.7%)	159 (12.9%)
Racial/Ethnic Diversity of Co-Workers (N = 1,232)	124 (10.1%)	156 (12.7%)	365 (29.6%)	407 (33.0%)	180 (14.6%)
Meaningfulness of the Job (N = 1,244)	232 (18.6%)	227 (18.2%)	330 (26.5%)	332 (26.7%)	123 (9.9%)
The Work Itself (N = 1,252)	165 (13.2%)	212 (16.9%)	361 (28.8%)	372 (29.7%)	142 (11.3%)
Resources Available to Support Your Efforts (N = 1,252)	390 (31.2%)	269 (21.5%)	302 (24.1%)	217 (17.3%)	74 (5.9%)

Hiring Standards

When respondents were asked if the standards required for entry into the field were stringent enough, 58% agreed that they were while 42% thought they were not. Supervisors were slightly more likely than non-supervisors to feel that hiring standards were stringent enough, but the difference was not significant, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test.

Thirty-five percent of respondents provided suggestions on changes they would make to hiring standards. These included raising the age limit for hiring, imposing better physical and psychological standards, and performing better background checks. Many respondents felt that

current recruits were not qualified. As one noted, “a lot of the people coming in need a job--this isn't it. You need a certain mindset, physical standard, discipline to work this job.” Another stated that “people need to mentally prepare themselves to work in such a very serious setting before they begin to work here.”

Others mentioned ensuring that new employees are trained properly before starting the job. One respondent stated that “valuable information is not given” to new employees “prior to working in the prison environment.” Some respondents noted the importance of being up front with new employees before they start about the realities of working in a correctional institution. As one respondent stated, “I believe that if the hiring standards were more stringent in the screening process and in the absolute honesty about the work we do, fewer officers would quit.” Others took issue with retention of poor employees noting that “the biggest problem is the state holds on to the low quality staff when performance levels are well-documented because of their need for a body” and “this brings down the quality of the work environment in general.”

Training

Respondents were asked if they felt the training received for their job was adequate and the majority (70%) thought that it was adequate. Non-supervisors and supervisors were nearly identical in their views regarding the adequacy of training. Those who were not satisfied with training were provided the opportunity to express what additional training they wanted, and 27% of respondents provided suggestions. These included more physical fitness, self-defense, and firearms training. Other suggestions included riot control training, less than lethal munitions training, cell extraction training, training on how to interact with inmates, and training on how to manage mentally ill offenders.

Respondents also wanted to see an increase in the length of basic training, and a commitment to ensuring staff are adequately trained before starting in a facility. As one respondent noted, “I wasn't trained by DPS until I was with the state for about 6 months. Even then once I went to the training a lot of the topics taught or were very general. I don't think it's safe to have untrained personnel in this setting.” Many respondents also expressed a desire for the continuation of the mentor program, and for training that keeps up with a changing inmate population (e.g. transgender population)

Input into Decision Making

Input into decision making was measured by four items, which were added together to form an index. These four items, and how respondents responded, are provided in Table 6. About 55% of respondents believe they have little or no say over what happens on their job, and the same amount believe the same about taking part in decisions that affect them. Thirty-two percent believe their job allows them to make decisions “a lot” or “a great deal” on their own.

Table 6: Perception of Input into Decision Making

	Not at All # (%)	A Little # (%)	Some # (%)	A Lot # (%)	A Great Deal # (%)
How much does your job allow you to make decisions on your own? (N= 1,255)	129 (10.3%)	277 (22.1%)	445 (35.5%)	298 (23.7%)	106 (8.4)
How much say do you have over what happens on your job? (N = 1,256)	322 (25.6%)	370 (29.5%)	393 (31.3%)	133 (10.6%)	38 (3.0%)
How much freedom do you have as to how to do your job? (N = 1,254)	180 (14.4%)	329 (26.2%)	451 (36.0%)	225 (17.9%)	69 (5.5%)
How much does your job allow you to take part in making decisions that affect you? (N = 1,252)	338 (27.0%)	335 (26.8%)	370 (29.6%)	146 (11.7%)	63 (5.0%)

As mentioned, the four items were summed to create an index of input into decision making, which had a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .89. The index could range from four to twenty, with a higher number indicating a greater degree of input into decision making. The mean perception of input into decision making among all respondents was 10.5. The median degree of input in decision making was 10 for non-supervisors, and 11.5 for supervisors. This difference was significant, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test. In other words supervisors were significantly more likely to believe they had a greater degree of input into decision making compared to non-supervisors.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction was measured by five items, which were added together to form an index. These five items, and how respondents responded, are provided in Table 7. Most respondents indicated dissatisfaction with their job. Although about 42% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that were seldom bored with their job only 26% agreed with the statement that they found real enjoyment in their job. Roughly 58% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that they would not consider taking another job.

Table 7: Job Satisfaction

	Strongly Disagree # (%)	Disagree # (%)	Neutral # (%)	Agree # (%)	Strongly Agree # (%)
I am seldom bored with my job. (N= 1,247)	125 (10.0%)	221 (17.7%)	366 (29.4%)	386 (31.0%)	149 (11.9%)
I would not consider taking another job. (N = 1,249)	351 (28.1%)	371 (29.7%)	303 (24.3%)	135 (10.8%)	89 (7.1%)
Most days I am enthusiastic about my job. (N = 1,247)	109 (8.7%)	187 (15.0%)	450 (36.1%)	370 (29.7%)	131 (10.5%)
I find real enjoyment in my job. (N = 1,249)	172 (13.8%)	236 (18.9%)	519 (41.6%)	249 (19.9%)	73 (5.8%)
I feel fairly well satisfied with my job. (N = 1,244)	123 (9.9%)	198 (15.9%)	431 (34.6%)	403 (32.4%)	89 (7.2%)

As mentioned, the five items were summed to create an index of job satisfaction, which had a Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient of .76. The index could range from five to 25, with a higher number indicating a greater degree of job satisfaction. The mean degree of job satisfaction among all respondents was 14.7, meaning respondents were fairly neutral about job satisfaction. There was no significant difference in job satisfaction between supervisors and non-supervisors, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test.

Job Burnout

Job burnout was measured by 22 items, which were added together to form an index. Items were measured as a 7-point Likert scale ranging from never to every day. Items included statements such as “I feel emotionally drained from my work” and “I can easily understand how the offenders I supervise feel about things.” These 22 items, and how respondents responded, are provided in a table in the appendix.

The index of job burnout had a Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient of .84. The index ranged from 25 to 143, with a higher number indicating more burnout. The mean degree of job burnout among all respondents was 79.1. The median degree of job burnout for supervisors was 77, while the median degree for non-supervisors was 79. The difference in degree of job burnout between supervisors and non-supervisors was not significant, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test.

Dangerousness

Dangerousness was measured by five items, which were added together to form an index. These five items, and how respondents responded, are provided in Table 8. Nearly 92% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they worked in a dangerous job. Similarly, 89% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that their job was a lot more dangerous than other kinds of jobs, compared to four percent that disagreed. About 89% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that a person stands a good chance of getting hurt in their job.

Table 8: Dangerousness

	Strongly Disagree # (%)	Disagree # (%)	Neutral # (%)	Agree # (%)	Strongly Agree # (%)
My job is a lot more dangerous than other kinds of jobs. (reverse coded) (N= 1,251)	18 (1.4%)	26 (2.1%)	99 (7.9%)	409 (32.7%)	699 (55.9%)
In my job, a person stands a good chance of getting hurt. (reverse coded) (N= 1,253)	15 (1.2%)	18 (1.4%)	98 (7.8%)	379 (30.2%)	743 (59.3%)
There is really not much chance of getting hurt in my job. (N = 1,252)	796 (63.6%)	350 (28.0%)	61 (4.9%)	23 (1.8%)	22 (1.8%)
A lot of people I work with get physically injured in the line of duty. (reverse coded) (N = 1,253)	67 (5.3%)	280 (22.3%)	379 (30.2%)	361 (28.8%)	166 (13.2%)
I work in a dangerous job. (reverse coded) (N = 1,255)	8 (0.6%)	13 (1.0%)	83 (6.6%)	384 (30.6%)	767 (61.1%)

The index of dangerousness had a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .72. The index ranged from nine to 25, with a higher number indicating a greater perception of dangerousness. The mean perception of dangerousness among all respondents was 21.1 meaning respondents considered their job to be very dangerous. There was no significant difference in perception of dangerousness between supervisors and non-supervisors, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test.

Supervisory Support

Supervisory support was measured by five items, which were added together to form an index. These five items, and how respondents responded, are provided in Table 9. Many respondents were neutral when it came to their opinion about supervisory support. However, nearly 59% felt

that supervisors stressed the importance of the job, and 47% felt that supervisors encouraged them to do the job in a way that they could be proud of. In contrast, 33% felt that supervisors often blamed others when things went wrong, even when it might not be the fault of those blamed.

Table 9: Supervisory Support

	Strongly Disagree # (%)	Disagree # (%)	Neutral # (%)	Agree # (%)	Strongly Agree # (%)
My supervisors often encourage us to do the job in a way that we really would be proud of. (reverse coded) (N= 1,250)	152 (12.2%)	168 (13.4%)	343 (27.4%)	415 (33.2%)	172 (13.8%)
The people I work with often have the importance of their job stressed to them by their supervisors. (reverse coded) (N = 1,250)	54 (4.3%)	128 (10.2%)	336 (26.9%)	519 (41.5%)	213 (17.0%)
My supervisors often encourage the people I work with to think of better ways of getting the work done which may never have been thought of before. (reverse coded) (N = 1,249)	163 (13.1%)	262 (21.0%)	384 (30.7%)	336 (26.9%)	104 (8.3%)
My supervisors often blame others when things go wrong, which are possibly not the fault of those blamed. (N = 1,248)	118 (9.5%)	297 (23.8%)	349 (28.0%)	265 (21.2%)	219 (17.5%)
When my supervisors have a dispute with one of my fellow guards they usually try to handle it in a friendly way. (reverse coded) (N = 1,242)	135 (10.9%)	193 (15.5%)	335 (27.0%)	457 (36.8%)	122 (9.8%)

The index of supervisory support had a Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient of .75. The index ranged from five to 25, with a higher number indicating more supervisory support. The mean degree of perception of supervisory support among all respondents was 15.8, meaning respondents were fairly neutral in their perception of supervisory support. The median degree of perception of supervisory support among supervisors was 17, while the median degree of perception of supervisory support among non-supervisors was 16. This difference in perception of supervisory support was significant, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test. In other words, supervisors were significantly more likely to perceive more supervisory support than non-supervisors.

Peer Support

Peer support was measured by five items, which were added together to form an index. These five items, and how respondents responded, are provided in Table 10. Respondents were equivocal in terms of peer support. Nearly 50% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that fellow officers often complimented someone who has done his/her job well, however, 48% also agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that fellow officers often blamed each other when things go wrong. About 40% felt that fellow officers often encouraged each other to do the job in a way we would really be proud of.

Table 10: Peer Support

	Strongly Disagree # (%)	Disagree # (%)	Neutral # (%)	Agree # (%)	Strongly Agree # (%)
My fellow officers often blame each other when things go wrong. (N = 1,250)	97 (7.8%)	243 (19.4%)	62 (28.3%)	386 (30.9%)	217 (17.4%)
My fellow officers often encourage each other to think of better ways of getting the work done which may never have been thought of before. (reverse coded) (N = 1,247)	133 (10.7%)	240 (19.2%)	414 (33.2%)	342 (27.4%)	118 (9.5%)
My fellow officers spend hardly any time helping me work myself up to a better job by showing me how to improve performance. (N = 1,247)	141 (11.3%)	346 (27.7%)	447 (35.8%)	211 (16.9%)	102 (8.2%)
My fellow officers often compliment someone who has done his/her job well. (reverse coded) (N = 1,249)	115 (9.2%)	184 (14.7%)	331 (26.5%)	474 (38.0%)	145 (11.6%)
My fellow officers often encourage each other to do the job in a way that we would really be proud of. (reverse coded) (N = 1,247)	103 (8.3%)	231 (18.5%)	419 (33.6%)	371 (29.8%)	123 (9.9%)

The index of peer support had a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .74. The index ranged from five to 25, with a higher number indicating more peer support. The mean perception of peer support among all respondents was 15.4, meaning respondents were neutral in their perception of peer support. There was no significant difference in perception of peer support between supervisors and non-supervisors, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test.

Work Stress

Work stress was measured by six items, which were added together to form an index. These six items, and how respondents responded, are provided in Table 11. Most respondents indicated a fair amount of work stress in their job. Nearly 62% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they were usually calm and at ease when working, compared to 16% that disagreed. However, 42% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they usually feel they are under a lot of pressure when at work, 53% felt that there were a lot of aspects of their job that could make them pretty upset about things, and 45% felt that the job made them very frustrated or angry a lot of the time.

Table 11: Work Stress

	Strongly Disagree # (%)	Disagree # (%)	Neutral # (%)	Agree # (%)	Strongly Agree # (%)
I like my job better than the average correctional officer does. (N = 1,249)	71 (5.7%)	138 (11.0%)	492 (39.4%)	405 (32.4%)	143 (11.4%)
There are a lot of aspects about my job that can make me pretty upset about things. (reverse coded) (N = 1,246)	53 (4.3%)	179 (14.4%)	360 (28.9%)	404 (32.4%)	250 (20.1%)
I am usually calm and at ease when I am working. (N = 1,254)	47 (3.7%)	155 (12.4%)	274 (21.9%)	552 (44.0%)	226 (18.0%)
A lot of times, my job makes me very frustrated and angry. (reverse coded) (N = 1,248)	71 (5.7%)	236 (18.9%)	381 (30.5%)	334 (26.8%)	226 (18.1%)
Most of the time when I am at work, I don't feel that I have very much to worry about. (N = 1,248)	272 (21.8%)	480 (38.5%)	300 (24.0%)	150 (12.0%)	46 (3.7%)
I usually feel that I am under a lot of pressure when I am at work. (reverse coded) (N = 1,248)	71 (5.7%)	268 (21.5%)	387 (31.0%)	340 (27.2%)	182 (14.6%)

The index of work stress had a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .74. The index ranged from seven to 30, with a higher number indicating more work stress. The mean perception of work stress among all respondents was 18.8, meaning respondents were moderately stressed. There was no significant difference in perception of work stress between supervisors and non-supervisors, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test.

Role Strain

Role strain was measured by seven items, which were added together to form an index. These seven items, and how respondents responded, are provided in Table 12. Most respondents indicated a moderate amount of role strain in their job. More than 91% agreed or strongly agreed that they knew the responsibilities for their job. Similarly, 79% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that felt certain about what is expected of them for their job. However, 47% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that there are so many people telling us what to do here that you can never be sure who is boss.

Table 12: Role Strain

	Strongly Disagree # (%)	Disagree # (%)	Neutral # (%)	Agree # (%)	Strongly Agree # (%)
There are so many people telling us what to do here that you never can be sure who is boss. (reverse coded) (N= 1,245)	87 (7.0%)	308 (24.7%)	270 (21.7%)	299 (24.0%)	281 (22.6%)
I feel certain how much authority I have. (N = 1,246)	101 (8.1%)	172 (13.8%)	376 (30.2%)	450 (36.1%)	147 (11.8%)
I know what my responsibilities are for my job. (N = 1,248)	15 (1.2%)	23 (1.8%)	80 (6.4%)	582 (46.6%)	548 (43.9%)
I know what exactly what is expected of me for my job. (N = 1,247)	26 (2.1%)	66 (5.3%)	168 (13.5%)	555 (44.5%)	432 (34.6%)
The rules and regulations are clear enough here that I know specifically what I can and cannot do on my job. (N = 1,249)	79 (6.3%)	142 (11.4%)	246 (19.7%)	507 (40.6%)	275 (22.0%)
I know that I have divided my time properly. (N = 1,235)	23 (1.9%)	60 (4.9%)	424 (34.3%)	575 (46.6%)	153 (12.4%)
The rules that we're supposed to follow here never seem to be very clear. (reverse coded) (N = 1,251)	148 (11.8%)	340 (27.2%)	334 (26.7%)	245 (19.6%)	184 (14.7%)

The index of role strain had a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .73. The index ranged from seven to 35, with a higher number indicating more role strain. The mean perception of role strain among all respondents was 17.4, meaning respondents perceived moderate role strain. There was no significant difference in perception of role strain between supervisors and non-supervisors, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test.

Formalization

Formalization was measured by five items, which were added together to form an index. These five items, and how respondents responded, are provided in Table 13. Most respondents indicate a high degree of formalization in their job. Roughly 81% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that whatever situation arises we have procedures to follow in dealing with it. Similarly, 79% agreed that a “rules and procedures” manual exists and is readily available within the organization, and 75% agreed that the organization keeps a written record of everyone’s job performance.

Table 13: Formalization

	Strongly Disagree # (%)	Disagree # (%)	Neutral # (%)	Agree # (%)	Strongly Agree # (%)
My organization keeps a written record of everyone’s job performance. (reverse coded) (N = 1,246)	32 (2.6%)	75 (6.0%)	206 (16.5%)	550 (44.1%)	383 (30.7%)
A “rules and procedures” manual exists and is readily available within this organization. (reverse coded) (N = 1,247)	37 (3.0%)	60 (4.8%)	160 (12.8%)	583 (46.8%)	407 (32.6%)
Job guidance is readily available. (reverse coded) (N = 1,252)	105 (8.4%)	171 (13.7%)	429 (34.3%)	392 (31.3%)	155 (12.4%)
There is no policy manual for my job. (N = 1,244)	594 (47.7%)	487 (39.1%)	102 (8.2%)	28 (2.3%)	33 (2.7%)
Whatever situation arises, we have procedures to follow in dealing with it. (reverse coded) (N = 1,251)	18 (1.4%)	49 (3.9%)	176 (14.1%)	665 (53.2%)	343 (27.4%)

The index of formalization had a Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient of .68. The index ranged from seven to 25, with a higher number indicating more formalization. The mean perception of formalization among all respondents was 19.5, meaning respondents perceived that they consider the organization to be formal. There was no significant difference in perception of formalization between supervisors and non-supervisors, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment was measured by two items, which were added together to form an index. These two items, and how respondents responded, are provided in Table 14. Many

respondents were neutral in their degree of organizational commitment. About 46% agreed or that they were proud to tell others they were part of the organization, compared to 21% that were not. Roughly 35% felt the job inspired the best in them in the way of job performance.

Table 14: Organizational Commitment

	Strongly Disagree # (%)	Disagree # (%)	Neutral # (%)	Agree # (%)	Strongly Agree # (%)
This job really inspires the best in me in the way of job performance. (N = 1,244)	131 (10.5%)	196 (15.8%)	486 (39.1%)	308 (24.8%)	123 (9.9%)
I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization. (N = 1,247)	111 (8.9%)	145 (11.6%)	417 (33.4%)	375 (30.1%)	199 (16.0%)

The index of organizational commitment had a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .74. The index ranged from two to 10, with a higher number indicating more organizational commitment. The mean degree of organizational commitment among all respondents was 6.4, meaning respondents had were neutral in their degree of organizational commitment. There was no significant difference in degree of organizational commitment between supervisors and non-supervisors, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test.

Predicting Turnover Intent

Only respondents who had provided answers for all of these items could be included in the multivariate analysis. Thus, the sample for the models included 816 respondents (out of the 1,271 respondents who completed at least some portion of the survey). Table 15 provides the descriptive statistics for the variables included in the analysis.

Table 15: Descriptive statistics of model variables

Variable	Med.	Min.	Max.	Mean	St dev	α
<i>Personal characteristics</i>						
Gender	1	0	1	0.73	0.44	--
Age	43	20	73	42.7	11.8	--
Race	1	0	1	0.60	0.49	--
Education	0	0	1	0.35	0.48	--
Military	0	0	1	0.28	0.45	--
Supervisor	0	0	1	0.19	0.39	--
<i>Work environment perceptions</i>						
Input into decision making	10	4	20	10.49	3.84	.89
Dangerousness	22	9	25	21.10	2.94	.72
Supervisory support	16	5	25	15.79	4.09	.75
Peer support	15	5	25	15.36	3.94	.74
Role strain	17	7	35	17.41	4.56	.73
Formalization	20	7	25	19.51	3.16	.68
<i>Job attitudes</i>						
Job burnout	79	25	143	79.08	21.34	.84
Job satisfaction	15	5	25	14.69	4.00	.76
Work stress	18	7	30	18.78	4.26	.74
Organizational commitment	6	2	10	6.41	2.00	.74
<i>Dependent variable</i>						
Turnover intent	6	2	12	5.90	3.05	.72

Note: Med., Min., Max., St dev, and α represent median value, minimum value, maximum value, standard deviation, and Cronbach's alpha, respectively.

A total of three ordinary least squares (OLS) regression equations were estimated to predict turnover intent (Table 16). Model 1 used only personal characteristics as independent variables. As indicated age and education were significant. In other words, respondents who were a younger, and who had more than a high school education, were more likely to indicate an intent to leave.

Table 16: OLS regression predicting turnover intent

Variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	B	β	B	β	B	β
<i>Personal characteristics</i>						
Gender	-.09	-.03	-.06	-.01	-.31	-.04
Age	-.04	-.29*	-.06	-.23*	-.03	-.13*
Race	.08	.03	-.03	-.01	-.04	-.01
Education	.52	.17*	.96	.15*	.96	.15*
Military	.10	.03	.12	.02	.22	.03
Supervisor	-1.26	-.04	.16	.02	-.45	-.01
<i>Work environment perceptions</i>						
Input into decision making			-.13	-.72*	-.06	-.08*
Dangerousness			.06	.05	-.03	-.03
Supervisory support			-.14	-.19*	-.09	-.12*
Peer support			-.05	-.07	-.02	-.02
Role strain			.06	.10*	-.03	-.04
Formalization			-.01	-.01	.01	.02
<i>Job attitudes</i>						
Job burnout					-.00	-.01
Job satisfaction					-.28	-.38*
Work stress					.10	.14*
Organizational commitment					-.02	-.01
R-squared		0.12*		0.27*		0.42*

Note: B represents the unstandardized regression coefficient, and β represents the standardized regression coefficient.

* $p \leq 0.05$

Model 2 included both personal characteristics and work environment perceptions as independent variables. Being younger and having more than a high school education remained significant. Input into decision making, supervisory support, and role strain were also significant. In other words, in addition to the demographic indicators, respondents who perceived that they had less input into decision making, perceived less support from their supervisor, and perceived more role strain were more likely to indicate an intent to leave.

Finally, Model 3 (the full model) included personal characteristics, work environment perceptions, and job attitudes as independent variables. Being younger and having more than a high school education remained significant, as did input into decision making and supervisory support. Job satisfaction and work stress were also significant. In other words, in addition to the demographic and work perception indicators, respondents who felt less satisfaction with their job and felt more work stress were more likely to indicate an intent to turnover.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to assess the recruitment and retention of adult institutional corrections officers. The majority of employees were quite negative when asked if they felt the agency actively made efforts to retain staff, and respondents provided a number of suggestions for efforts that could be made to retain staff including pay, expressing appreciation to employees, and ensuring employees were able to take requested days off (which are impacted by staff shortages).

When asked what they liked most about their job, a very common response was the schedule. Respondents also referenced co-workers and the feeling that the work being done was important as positive aspects. However, respondents also noted a number of concerns with adult institutional corrections employment including being short staffed, low pay, and lack of support by administration and management.

An analysis of turnover intent revealed that 56% of respondents stated that they had thought about quitting their job in the last six months. Further, 39% stated they currently desired to quit their job. Both the statistical analysis of turnover intent, and the qualitative analysis of employee perceptions, indicate areas upon which the agency can focus to improve retention. In particular, a number of suggestions were provided by employees to improve perceptions of supervisory support, job burnout, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction.

References

- Carlson, J.R, Anson, R.H., & Thomas, G. (2003). Correctional officer burnout and stress: Does gender matter. *The Prison Journal*, 83, 277-288.
- Cheek, F.E. & Milller, M.D. (1983). The experience of stress for correction officers: A double blind theory of correctional stress. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 11,105-120.
- Cullen, F., Link, B., Wolfe, N., & Frank, J. (1985). The social dimensions of correctional office stress. *Justice Quarterly*, 2, 505-533.
- Finn, P. & Kuck, S. (2005). Stress among probation and parole officers and what can be done about it. National Institute of Justice. Research for Practice Report. June 2005. Retrieved from: <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/205620.pdf>
- Huckabee, R.G. (1992). Stress in corrections: An overview of the issues. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20, 479-486.
- Lambert, E.G. (2001). To stay or quit: A review on the literature on correctional staff turnover. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 26, 61-76.
- Lambert, E. G. (2006). I want to leave: A test of a model of turnover intent among correctional staff. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*, 2, 57-83.
- Lambert, E.G., & Paoline, E.A. (2010). Take this job and shove it: An exploratory study of turnover intent among jail staff. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 139-148.
- Lambert, E.G. & Paoline, E.A. (2008). The influence of individual, job, and organizational characteristics on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Criminal Justice Review*, 33, 541-564.
- Lee, W., Phelps, J.R., & Beto, D.R. (2009). Turnover intention among probation officers and direct care staff: A statewide study. *Federal Probation*, 73, 28-39.
- Lee, W., Joo, H., Johnson, W.W. (2009). The effect of participatory management on internal stress, overall job satisfaction, and turnover intention among federal probation officers. *Federal Probation*, 73, 33-40.
- Lommel, J. (2004). Turning around turnover. *Corrections Today Magazine*, 66, 54-57.
- Malasch, C., & Jackson, S. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 2, 99-113.
- Morgan, R.D., Van Haveren, R.A., Pearson, C.A. (2002). Correctional officer burnout: Further analyses. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29, 144-160.
- Nink, C. (2010). Correctional officers: Strategies to improve retention. MTC Institute. Retrieved from: <https://www.mtctrains.com/sites/default/files/CO%20Retention%202010.pdf>
- North Carolina Department of Corrections (2000). DOC addresses correctional officer recruitment and retention issues. *Correction News*. July 2000. Retrieved from: <http://www.doc.state.nc.us/NEWS/cnews/0007/recruit.htm>
- Office of Performance Evaluations Idaho State Legislature (1999). Employee morale and turnover at the Department of Correction. October 1999. Retrieved from: <http://www.legislature.idaho.gov/ope/publications/reports/r9903.pdf>
- Pitts, W.J. (2007). Educational competency as an indicator of organizational stress for probation and parole officers. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32, 57-73.
- Sager, J., Griffeth, R., & Hom, P. (1998). A comparison of structural models representing turnover cognitions. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 53, 254-273.

Texas Juvenile Probation Commission (2003). A follow-up study: Turnover rates of Juvenile Probation Department Personnel in Texas. February 2003. Retrieved from:

<https://www.tjpd.texas.gov/publications/Reports/RPTOTH200301.pdf>

Wees, G. (1996). Fewer correctional officer positions created in '96: Respondents in larger jurisdictions project slower growth. *Corrections Compendium*, 21, 12-29.

Wright, T.A. (1993). Correctional employee turnover: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 21, 131-142.

Whitehead, J.T. & Lindquist, C.A. (1986) Correctional officers job burnout: A path model. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 23, 23-42.

Appendix

Job Burnout

	Never	A few times a year	Once a month or more	A few times a month	Once a week	A few times a week	Every day
"I feel emotionally drained from work."	10.1%	13.9%	12.1%	22.1%	7.3%	18.7%	15.8%
"I feel used at the end of the workday."	10.1%	12.0%	11.2%	18.3%	8.9%	18.8%	20.6%
"I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job."	13.9%	13.3%	12.8%	16.3%	7.3%	17.2%	19.2%
"I can easily understand how the offenders I supervise feel about things." (reverse coded)	37.3%	17.2%	7.8%	13.6%	4.5%	8.6%	11.0%
"I feel I treat some inmates I supervise as they were impersonal objects."	78.5%	7.8%	3.7%	3.7%	1.4%	2.2%	2.7%
"Working with inmates all day is really a strain for me."	36.4%	21.4%	13.0%	13.0%	4.4%	6.2%	5.5%
"I deal very effectively with the problems of the inmates I supervise." (reverse coded)	8.5%	3.1%	4.4%	8.6%	6.6%	19.4%	49.4%
"I feel burned out from my work."	15.7%	20.4%	12.9%	15.5%	8.0%	11.0%	16.5%
"I feel I'm positively influencing inmates' lives through my work." (reverse coded)	22.4%	15.5%	9.6%	15.1%	7.2%	11.9%	18.2%

"I've become more callous toward people."	34.3%	14.3%	8.8%	13.0%	5.3%	8.6%	15.7%
"I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally."	38.0%	13.5%	6.6%	10.5%	5.3%	8.8%	17.4%
"I feel very energetic." (reverse coded)	16.3%	10.6%	11.8%	16.7%	8.2%	20.0%	16.4%
"I feel frustrated by my job."	12.5%	17.2%	12.8%	17.1%	8.0%	14.8%	17.5%
"I feel I'm working too hard on my job."	28.0%	16.2%	12.2%	16.6%	7.4%	10.2%	9.3%
"I don't really care what happens to some of the inmates I supervise."	49.0%	16.1%	7.2%	7.7%	3.2%	5.6%	11.2%
"Working with inmates directly puts too much stress on me."	50.7%	22.4%	8.4%	8.5%	2.8%	3.9%	3.2%
"I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with the inmates I supervise." (reverse coded)	35.7%	8.6%	8.9%	11.3%	5.6%	12.4%	17.5%
"I feel exhilarated after working closely with inmates I supervise." (reverse coded)	72.2%	10.0%	5.5%	5.8%	2.2%	2.9%	1.3%
"I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job." (reverse coded)	18.8%	23.7%	11.2%	17.0%	5.7%	10.4%	13.2%
"I feel like I am at the end of my rope."	54.9%	14.3%	7.5%	8.5%	2.7%	4.3%	7.9%
"In my work, I deal with emotional problems very calmly." (reverse coded)	2.3%	4.9%	5.7%	12.7%	7.0%	19.4%	48.1%

“I feel the offenders I supervise blame me for some of their problems.”

33.8%	12.4%	8.2%	11.3%	6.6%	11.1%	16.6%
-------	-------	------	-------	------	-------	-------