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

The purpose of this study was to assess the recruitment and retention of juvenile justice officers and juvenile court counselors. 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 juvenile justice staff can lead to improved recruitment and retention efforts in this field.

The population of juvenile justice officers, juvenile court counselors, and supervisors (n = 779) was used to assess the perceptions and attitudes of staff. Surveys were administered via email to employees' official email addresses. A total of 284 respondents completed at least some portion of the survey, resulting in a response rate of 37%. Most of the sample consisted of Juvenile Court Counselors – only 29% of respondents were Juvenile Justice Officers. Nearly 21% of respondents were supervisors. Exit information was also gathered from the NCDOJ database.

When asked what efforts were currently being made to recruit staff to juvenile justice, several avenues were mentioned including agency postings, job fairs, and internships. However, 18% of those who answered the question said they did not know what recruiting efforts were made, and 28% said that no efforts were made. The majority of respondents noted that they were not actively recruited, they just applied after seeing a posting. When asked if they felt that the agency actively makes efforts to retain staff, 71% of respondents responded in the negative. Respondents were asked what efforts could be made to retain staff and provided several suggestions related to pay, incentives and awards for performance, opportunities for advancement, and supervisory support.

When asked what they liked most about their job, a very common response was the ability to help people. Respondents also noted a good work environment and the opportunity to have a flexible schedule as a positive. However, respondents also noted a number of concerns with juvenile justice employment including overwork, administrative duties that reduce the time available for direct services, and limited resources and services for clients. Low salary, lack of support from management, low morale, and the perception that the employee was not valued were also noted as negative aspects of the job.

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. Sixty-two percent of respondents stated that they had thought about quitting their job in the last six months, and 30% 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 6.2. The difference in degree of turnover intent between supervisors and non-supervisors was not significant. However, the difference in turnover intent between

Juvenile Justice Officers and Juvenile Court Counselors was significant - Juvenile Justice Officers were significantly more likely than Juvenile Court Counselors to indicate an intent to leave.

Exit information was obtained to determine why individuals have left juvenile justice. Five years of data, from 2011 through 2015, were analyzed. Data indicated that about 44% of the employees who left resigned and, of those, about 25% did so for better employment. The remaining exits were due to retirement, dismissal, the employee not reporting or not certifying, the employee not accepting a transfer, or other reasons.

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 had served in the military were more likely to consider leaving. In terms of work environment perceptions, respondents who perceived less ambiguity (role strain) in their job were more likely to indicate an intent to turnover. Finally, in terms of job attitudes, respondents who felt less satisfaction with their job and perceived more work stress were more likely to consider leaving.

Both the statistical analysis of turnover intent and the qualitative analysis of employee perceptions (described more detail in the full report) 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 job satisfaction and work stress.

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. 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 juvenile justice officers and juvenile court counselors. 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). These rates are slightly lower (approximately 10-15%) for probation and parole officers (Idaho State Legislature, 1999; Lee, Phelps, & Beto, 2009; North Carolina Department of Corrections, 2003; Texas Juvenile Probation Commission, 2003; Won-Jae, Joo & Johnson, 2009) and the figures pertaining to juvenile justice officers and court counselors are unknown due to the limited research in this area.

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 Malasch (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 juvenile justice officers and juvenile court counselors. Much of the prior research on the topic of recruitment and retention in the field of corrections has focused on institutional correctional officers. Therefore, exploring these factors among employees in the juvenile justice system contributes to the state of the knowledge surrounding these issues. 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 juvenile justice 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 juvenile justice. 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.

Data Collection

The population of juvenile justice officers, juvenile court counselors, and supervisors (n = 779) was used to assess the perceptions and attitudes of staff. There were 418 Juvenile Court Counselors and 316 Juvenile Justice Officers among the list of employees to be surveyed. Surveys were administered via email to employees' official email addresses. Each potential respondent who did not respond to the initial request for participation received two follow-up emails. Data collection opened on May 17, 2016 and closed on June 17, 2016.

A total of 284 respondents completed at least some portion of the survey, resulting in a response rate of 37%. Of those completing the survey, 29% were Juvenile Justice Officers and 71% were Juvenile Court Counselors. Juvenile Justice Officers make up about 41% of the population surveyed, so findings regarding Juvenile Justice Officers should be interpreted with caution because they may not be reflective of all Juvenile Justice Officers.

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. Kimberly Quintus (Juvenile Justice Policy, Training & Strategic Planning Director) graciously provided her time and expertise to refine the data collection instrument.

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. In addition, content analysis was conducted on 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 1. The sample was fairly even in terms of gender (48% male compared to 52% female), and between White (47%) and Black (45%) respondents. Very few of the respondents were Hispanic/Latino. Twenty percent of respondents had a graduate degree, and about 12% had served, or were currently serving, in the military. Nearly 21% indicated that they were supervisors. As noted previously, most of the sample consisted of Juvenile Court Counselors – only 29% of respondents were Juvenile Justice Officers. As such, findings regarding Juvenile Justice Officers should be interpreted with caution since they may not be reflective of the population.

Table 1: Demographics of Respondents

	Frequency	Percent
Gender (N = 280)[1]		
Male	135	47.5%
Female	145	51.8%
Race (N = 280)		
White	132	47.1%
Black or African-American	125	44.6%
Asian or Pacific Islander or Native Hawaiian	4	1.5%
American Indian or Alaska Native	3	1.1%
Multi-racial	8	2.9%
Other	8	2.9%
Ethnicity (N = 278)		
Hispanic/Latino	7	2.5%
Non-Hispanic/Latino	271	97.5%
Age (N = 274)		
22-29	13	4.7%
30-39	76	27.7%
40-49	105	38.3%
50-59	67	24.5%
60 and older	13	4.7%
Highest Education Level Obtained (N = 281)		
High School Diploma/GED	10	3.6%
Associates Degree	13	4.6%
Bachelor Degree	201	71.5%
Graduate Degree	57	20.3%
Military Service (N = 280)		
Yes	33	11.8%
No	247	88.2%
Job Certification (N = 275)		
Juvenile Justice Officer	80	29.1%
Juvenile Court Counselor	195	70.9%
Supervisor (N = 277)		
Yes	58	20.9%
No	219	79.1%
Shift (N = 277)		
8-hour day	70	25.3%
8-hour day plus on-call responsibility	158	57.0%
8-hour evening	10	3.6%
8-hour night	5	1.8%

---

[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.

12-hour day	9	3.2%
12-hour night	13	4.7%
Other	12	4.3%

Recruitment and Retention

Efforts to Recruit Staff
Respondents were asked what efforts were currently being made to recruit staff to juvenile justice, and they mentioned a number of avenues including agency postings, job fairs, and internships. However, 18% of those who answered the question said they did not know what recruiting efforts were made, and 28% said that no efforts were made.

Respondents were also asked how they were initially recruited into the agency. The majority (61% of those responding to the question) noted that they were not actively recruited, they just applied after seeing a posting. Others indicated that they learned about an opportunity through word of mouth or transferred from another state agency. A handful also stated that they were recruited through a college job fair, or applied after completing an internship.

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 juvenile justice leadership made an attempt to retain personnel. Respondents were also asked what efforts were currently made to retain staff, as well as what efforts could be made to retain staff.

In terms of current efforts made to retain staff, respondents mentioned a supportive work environment. One stated "I am treated with respect [and] . . . my opinions in regards to recommendations and possible solutions are taken into consideration." Others mentioned flexible schedules, weekly meetings that allowed staff to address concerns, the option to attend quality training, additional salary in the form of longevity, on-call, and overtime pay, as well as generous benefits as additional efforts made to retain staff.

When asked what efforts the agency could make to retain staff, respondents provided a number of suggestions. A number suggested tangible expressions of appreciation in the form of incentives and awards for outstanding performance. Other respondents noted the importance of salary increases and merit pay, and the need for more opportunities for career advancement or job enhancement. One stated that "there needs to be more opportunities for staff in districts where there is not a lot of upward movement, as well as opportunities for staff to show leadership." Finally, respondents stated a need for more support from supervisors, and improved morale, as keys to retaining staff. One respondent noted that employees do not feel valued when they are repeatedly told they are replaceable. Another noted the distinction between different job classifications stating "direct care personnel do not receive the same treatment as those who hold higher positions outside the facility."

Positive Aspects of Job
When asked what they liked most about their job, nearly 73% of respondents who answered this question stated that the ability to help others was important. In the words of one respondent, "working with the children and their families to make a difference in their lives" was the best part of the job. Others noted a good work environment as a positive – one even likened coworkers to family – as well as the opportunity to have a flexible schedule.

Negative Aspects of Job
When asked what they liked least about their job respondents noted a number of areas. Some concerns pertained to being understaffed at the same time expectations for performance are rising. One respondent noted that "more and more responsibilities and expectations are being placed upon us and nothing is being taken away. We are expected to do more and more as part of our job, both in role and function, but we aren't being compensated in any way." Others noted administrative duties that reduce the time available for direct services, and limited resources and services for clients.

Respondents also noted concerns with supervision when asked about negative aspects of the job. Some described lack of support or concern from management, while others cited micromanaging. As one stated "I don't like being micromanaged. If you hire me, you should have confidence in me to be able to do my job without standing over me." More generally, respondents were concerned about low morale, and not being valued. Finally, a large number of respondents stated that the pay was the thing they liked least about their job. Concerns about pay centered on the belief that compensation was inadequate for the work performed, and the perception that "newer people coming in are making more than people with experience."

<u>Turnover Intent</u>

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. Sixty-two percent of respondents stated that they had thought about quitting their job in the last six months, and 30% 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 .69. 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 6.2. The mean degree of turnover intent for supervisors was 6.0 while the mean degree for non-supervisors was 6.2. The difference in degree of turnover intent between supervisors and non-supervisors was not significant, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test. In other words, there was no difference in the degree of turnover intent between supervisors and non-supervisors.

The difference in turnover intent was also considered by job certification. The mean degree of turnover intent for Juvenile Justice Officers was 7.2, while the mean degree of turnover intent was 5.8 for Juvenile Court Counselors. The difference in degree of turnover intent between Juvenile Justice Officers and Juvenile Court Counselors was significant, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test.

Exit Information

Exit information was obtained to determine why individuals have left juvenile justice. Five years of data, from 2011 through 2015, were analyzed and are summarized in Table 2. About 44% of the employees who left resigned and, of those, about a quarter did so for better employment. Nearly 17% of exits were due to transfer, reassignment, promotion, or a change in certification, and about 14% were due to reductions in force. The remaining exits were due to retirement, dismissal, the employee not reporting or not certifying, the employee not accepting a transfer, or other reasons.

Table 2: Exit Information for Juvenile Justice, 2011-2015

	Number	Percent
Resignation	**529**	**43.5%**
Better employment	*138*	*26.1%*
No reason given	*142*	*26.8%*
Medical/Disability/Death	*28*	*5.3%*
Personal reasons	*166*	*31.4%*
Position no longer certified	*55*	*10.4%*
Dismissed	**50**	**4.1%**
Other	**61**	**5.1%**
Did not report/did not certify	**48**	**3.8%**
Did not accept transfer	**34**	**2.8%**
Transfer/reassignment/promotion/change certification	**202**	**16.6%**
Retirement	**121**	**10.0%**
Reduction in force/appointment ended	**171**	**14.1%**
TOTAL	**1,216**	**100%**

The Decision to Work in Juvenile Justice

Respondents were asked what influenced their decision to work in juvenile justice (Table 3). Nearly 85% were moderately or extremely influenced by their interest in the field, and about 80% were compelled by a desire to contribute to society. Only 17% stated they were moderately or extremely influenced by financial reasons.

Table 3: Factors Influencing the Decision to Work in Juvenile Justice

	Not at All # (%)	Slightly # (%)	Somewhat # (%)	Moderately # (%)	Extremely # (%)
Financial Reasons (N= 249)	94 (37.8%)	48 (19.3%)	64 (25.7%)	23 (9.2%)	20 (8.0%)
Self-Fulfillment (N = 248)	13 (5.2%)	15 (6.0%)	46 (18.5%)	80 (32.3%)	94 (37.9%)
Career Development (N = 252)	16 (6.3%)	20 (7.9%)	60 (23.8%)	86 (34.1%)	70 (27.8%)
Contribution to Society (N = 249)	9 (3.6%)	8 (3.2%)	33 (13.3%)	73 (29.3%)	126 (50.6%)
Interest in the Field (N = 251)	5 (2.0%)	8 (3.2%)	25 (10.0%)	69 (27.5%)	144 (57.4%)
Exploration of New Opportunities (N = 250)	15 (6.0%)	28 (11.2%)	52 (20.8%)	82 (32.8%)	73 (29.2%)

Level of Satisfaction

Table 4 presents the level of satisfaction respondents felt with various aspects of the job. Respondents indicated that they were most satisfied with the meaningfulness of the job, the work itself, and the gender diversity of their co-workers. They were least satisfied with the pay and benefits, and career advancement opportunities.

Table 4: Level of Satisfaction with Factors Associated With Current Job

	Not at All Satisfied # (%)	Slightly Satisfied # (%)	Somewhat Satisfied # (%)	Moderately Satisfied # (%)	Extremely Satisfied # (%)
Teamwork (N= 249)	16 (6.4%)	37 (14.9%)	50 (20.1%)	92 (36.9%)	54 (21.7%)
Pay and Benefits (N = 248)	94 (37.9%)	69 (27.8%)	55 (22.2%)	24 (9.7%)	6 (2.4%)
Size of Caseload (N = 250)	41 (16.4%)	39 (15.6%)	81 (32.4%)	65 (26.0%)	24 (9.6%)
Career Advancement Opportunities (N = 252)	121 (48.0%)	61 (24.2%)	41 (16.3%)	23 (9.1%)	6 (2.4%)
Communication with Other Staff (N = 252)	17 (6.7%)	41 (16.3%)	49 (19.4%)	90 (35.7%)	55 (21.8%)
Communication with Supervisors (N = 252)	35 (13.9%)	37 (14.7%)	32 (12.7%)	69 (27.4%)	79 (31.3%)
Gender Diversity of Co-Workers (N = 248)	11 (4.4%)	22 (8.9%)	51 (18.0%)	85 (34.3%)	79 (31.9%)
Racial/Ethnic Diversity of Co-Workers (N = 250)	18 (7.2%)	26 (10.4%)	48 (19.2%)	87 (34.8%)	71 (25.0%)
Meaningfulness of the Job (N = 252)	7 (2.8%)	22 (8.7%)	45 (17.9%)	97 (38.5%)	81 (32.1%)
The Work Itself (N = 252)	4 (1.6%)	25 (9.9%)	59 (23.4%)	113 (44.8%)	51 (20.2%)
Resources Available to Support Your Efforts (N = 252)	56 (22.2%)	56 (22.2%)	71 (28.2%)	57 (20.1%)	12 (4.8%)

Hiring Standards

When respondents were asked if the standards required for entry into the field were stringent enough, 82% agreed that they were while 18% 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. Twelve percent of respondents provided suggestions on changes they would make to hiring standards.

Training

Respondents were asked if they felt the training received for their job was adequate and the majority (77%) thought that is was adequate. Non-supervisors were slightly more likely than supervisors to feel that the training they received was adequate. There were no meaningful differences between supervisors and non-supervisors when it came to perception of training, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test.

Those who were not satisfied with training were provided the opportunity to express what additional training they wanted, and 14% of respondents provided suggestions. A number suggested improvements to basic training, including when new hires are trained. One respondent believed that "the state training was beneficial, but it doesn't make since to have a job for over six months before you are officially trained and certified." Many also wanted additional training on department systems and process. In particular, respondents mentioned a desire for training on NCJOIN as well as additional training for management.

Other suggestions included training related to court process (e.g. completing court reports and filing petitions) and juvenile law, adolescent development, mental health training, and secure custody training. One respondent noted that "juvenile law is covered for only four hours out of a four-week training. That is basically the majority of the job is to know what we can and cannot do under the law."

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 5. Thirty-three percent 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. Forty-six percent believe their job allows them to make decisions "a lot" or "a great deal" on their own.

Table 5: 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= 251)	13 (5.2%)	47 (18.7%)	75 (29.9%)	71 (28.3%)	45 (17.9%)
How much say do you have over what happens on your job? (N = 251)	32 (12.7%)	52 (20.7%)	97 (38.6%)	56 (22.3%)	14 (5.6%)
How much freedom do you have as to how to do your job? (N = 251)	13 (5.2%)	53 (21.1%)	84 (33.5%)	72 (28.7%)	29 (11.6%)
How much does your job allow you to take part in making decisions that affect you? (N = 250)	29 (11.6%)	54 (21.6%)	90 (36.0%)	61 (24.4%)	16 (6.4%)

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 .91. 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 12.4. There was no significant difference in perception of input into decision making between supervisors and non-supervisors, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test. The difference in perception of input into decision making was also considered by job certification. The median degree of input in decision making was 11 for Juvenile Justice Officers, and 13 for Juvenile Court Counselors. This difference was significant, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test. In other words, Juvenile Court Counselors were significantly more likely to believe they had a greater degree of input into decision making compared to Juvenile Justice Officers.

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 6. Most respondents indicated satisfaction with their job. Nearly 59% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they found real enjoyment in their job, compared to 13% that disagreed. Similarly, 57% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that were seldom bored with their job, compared to 24% that disagreed. However, 56% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that they would not consider taking another job.

Table 6: Job Satisfaction

	Strongly Disagree # (%)	Disagree # (%)	Neutral # (%)	Agree # (%)	Strongly Agree # (%)
I am seldom bored with my job. (N= 225)	25 (11.1%)	30 (13.3%)	41 (18.2%)	66 (29.3%)	63 (28.0%)
I would not consider taking another job. (N = 224)	58 (25.9%)	68 (30.4%)	61 (27.2%)	21 (9.4%)	16 (7.1%)
Most days I am enthusiastic about my job. (N = 226)	14 (6.2%)	24 (10.6%)	62 (27.4%)	97 (42.9%)	29 (12.8%)
I find real enjoyment in my job. (N = 226)	11 (4.9%)	19 (8.4%)	63 (27.9%)	99 (43.8%)	34 (15.0%)
I feel fairly well satisfied with my job. (N = 225)	12 (5.3%)	31 (13.8%)	70 (31.1%)	90 (40.0%)	22 (9.8%)

As mentioned, the five items were summed to create an index of job satisfaction, which had a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .77. 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 16.3, 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. The difference in perception of input into decision making was also considered by job certification. The median degree of input in decision making was 15 for Juvenile Justice Officers, and 17.5 for Juvenile Court Counselors. This difference was significant, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test. In other words, Juvenile Court Counselors are significantly more satisfied with their jobs than Juvenile Justice Officers.

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 .86. The index ranged from 25 to 126, with a higher number indicating more burnout. The mean degree of job burnout among all respondents was 65. The median degree of job burnout for supervisors was 70, while the median degree for non-supervisors was 64.5. The difference in degree of job burnout between supervisors and non-supervisors was not significant, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test.

The difference in degree of job burnout was also considered by job certification. The median degree of job burnout was 70 for Juvenile Justice Officers, and 64 for Juvenile Court Counselors. This difference in degree of job burnout between Juvenile Justice Officers and Juvenile Court Counselors 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 7. Roughly 62% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they worked in a dangerous job, compared to 15% that disagreed. Similarly, 63% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that their job was a lot more dangerous than other kinds of jobs, compared to 12% that disagreed. Seventy-four percent disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that there was not much chance of getting hurt in their job.

Table 7: Dangerousness

	Strongly Disagree # (%)	Disagree # (%)	Neutral # (%)	Agree # (%)	Strongly Agree # (%)
My job is a lot more dangerous than other kinds of jobs. (reverse coded) (N= 219)	3 (1.4%)	24 (11.0%)	54 (24.7%)	87 (39.7%	51 (23.3%)
In my job, a person stands a good chance of getting hurt. (reverse coded) (N= 219)	8 (3.7%)	24 (11.0%)	54 (24.7%)	87 (39.7%)	46 (21.0%)
There is really not much chance of getting hurt in my job. (N = 219)	76 (34.7%)	86 (39.3%)	43 (19.6%)	12 (5.5%)	2 (0.9%)
A lot of people I work with get physically injured in the line of duty. (reverse coded) (N = 217)	53 (24.4%)	87 (40.1%)	44 (20.3%)	27 (12.4%)	6 (2.8%)
I work in a dangerous job. (reverse coded) (N = 216)	5 (2.3%)	27 (12.5%)	50 (23.1%)	87 (40.3%)	47 (21.8%)

The index of dangerousness had a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .82. The index ranged from eight to 25, with a higher number indicating a greater perception of dangerousness. The mean perception of dangerousness among all respondents was 17.3 meaning respondents considered their job to be dangerous. There was no significant difference in perception of dangerousness between supervisors and non-supervisors, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test.

The difference in perception of dangerousness was also considered by job certification. The median degree of perception of dangerousness was 19 for Juvenile Justice Officers, and 17 for Juvenile Court Counselors. This difference in perception of dangerousness was significant, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test. In other words, Juvenile Justice Officers were significantly more likely to perceive their job to be dangerous than Juvenile Court Counselors.

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 8. Many respondents were neutral when it came to their opinion about supervisory support. However, nearly 58% felt that supervisors stressed the importance of the job, and 65% felt that supervisors encouraged them to do the job in a way that they could be proud of. In contrast, 23% felt that supervisors often blamed others when things went wrong, even when it might not be the fault of those blamed.

Table 8: 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= 217)	19 (8.8%)	23 (10.6%)	35 (16.1%)	80 (36.9%)	60 (27.6%)
The people I work with often have the importance of their job stressed to them by their supervisors. (reverse coded) (N = 214)	8 (3.7%)	19 (8.9%)	62 (29.0%)	89 (41.6%)	36 (16.8%)
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 = 217)	16 (7.4%)	35 (16.1%)	57 (36.3%)	77 (35.5%)	32 (14.7%)
My supervisors often blame others when things go wrong, which are possibly not the fault of those blamed. (N = 216)	41 (19.0%)	84 (38.9%)	41 (19.0%)	33 (15.3%)	17 (7.9%)
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 = 214)	15 (7.0%)	20 (9.3%)	63 (29.4%)	83 (38.8%)	33 (15.4%)

The index of supervisory support had a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .77. The index ranged from five to 25, with a higher number indicating more supervisory support. The mean perception of supervisory support among all respondents was 17.5, meaning respondents were fairly neutral in their perception of supervisory support. The mean perception of supervisory support among supervisors was 19, while the mean perception of supervisory support among non-supervisors was 18. The difference in perception of supervisory support between supervisors and non-supervisors, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test, was not significant.

The difference in perception of supervisory support was also considered by job certification. The median degree of perception of supervisory support was 17 for Juvenile Justice Officers, and 18.5 for Juvenile Court Counselors. This difference in perception of supervisory support was significant, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test. In other words, Juvenile Court Counselors were significantly more likely to perceive more supervisory support than Juvenile Justice Officers.

<u>Peer Support</u>

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 9. Most respondents felt that there was a high degree of peer support in their jobs. Nearly 63% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that fellow officers often complimented someone who has done his/her job well, and 59% felt that fellow officers often encouraged each other to do the job in a way we would really be proud of. However, 17% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that fellow officers often blamed each other when things go wrong.

Table 9: Peer Support

	Strongly Disagree # (%)	Disagree # (%)	Neutral # (%)	Agree # (%)	Strongly Agree # (%)
My fellow officers often blame each other when things go wrong. (N= 219)	46 (21.0%)	74 (33.8%)	62 (28.3%)	27 (12.3%)	10 (4.6%)
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 = 216)	14 (6.5%)	24 (11.1%)	60 (27.8%)	97 (44.9%)	21 (9.7%)
My fellow officers spend hardly any time helping me work myself up to a better job by showing me how to improve performance. (N = 216)	21 (9.7%)	80 (37.0%)	65 (30.1%)	40 (18.5%)	10 (4.6%)
My fellow officers often compliment someone who has done his/her job well. (reverse coded) (N = 214)	11 (5.1%)	22 (10.3%)	47 (22.0%)	98 (45.8%)	36 (16.8%)
My fellow officers often encourage each other to do the job in a way that we would really be proud of. (reverse coded) (N = 216)	8 (3.7%)	15 (6.9%)	66 (30.6%)	90 (41.7%)	37 (17.1%)

The index of peer support had a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .71. The index ranged from six to 25, with a higher number indicating more peer support. The mean perception of peer support among all respondents was 17.4, 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.

The difference in perception of peer support was also considered by job certification. The median degree of perception of peer support was 17 for Juvenile Justice Officers, and 18 for Juvenile Court Counselors. This difference in perception of peer support was significant, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test. There was no significant difference in perception of peer support between Juvenile Justice Officers and Juvenile Court Counselors, 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 10. Most respondents indicated a fair amount of work stress in their job. Nearly 83% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they were usually calm and at ease when working, compared to 5% that disagreed. However, 44% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they usually feel they are under a lot of pressure when at work, 40% felt that there were a lot of aspects of their job that could make them pretty upset about things, and 37% felt that the job made them very frustrated or angry a lot of the time.

Table 10: Work Stress

	Strongly Disagree # (%)	Disagree # (%)	Neutral # (%)	Agree # (%)	Strongly Agree # (%)
I like my job better than the average correctional officer does. (N= 219)	5 (2.3%)	12 (5.5%)	75 (34.2%)	87 (39.7%)	40 (18.3%)
There are a lot of aspects about my job that can make me pretty upset about things. (reverse coded) (N = 217)	10 (4.6%)	55 (25.3%)	66 (30.4%)	66 (30.4%)	20 (9.2%)
I am usually calm and at ease when I am working. (N = 217)	2 (0.9%)	9 (4.1%)	27 (12.4%)	111 (51.2%)	68 (31.3%)
A lot of times, my job makes me very frustrated and angry. (reverse coded) (N = 216)	25 (11.6%)	53 (24.5%)	59 (27.3%)	61 (28.2%)	18 (8.3%)
Most of the time when I am at work, I don't feel that I have very much to worry about. (N = 217)	17 (7.8%)	63 (29.0%)	61 (28.1%)	68 (31.3%)	8 (3.7%)
I usually feel that I am under a lot of pressure when I am at work. (reverse coded) (N = 217)	11 (5.1%)	42 (19.4%)	68 (31.3%)	70 (32.3%)	26 (12.0%)

The index of work stress had a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .73. The index ranged from seven to 27, with a higher number indicating more work stress. The mean perception of work stress among all respondents was 16.7, 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.

The difference in perception of work stress was also considered by job certification. The median degree of perception of work stress was 18 for Juvenile Justice Officers, and 17 for Juvenile Court Counselors. This difference in perception of work stress was not significant, 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 11. Most respondents indicated a moderate amount of role strain in their job. More than 90% agreed or strongly agreed that they knew the responsibilities for their job. Similarly, 82% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that felt certain about what is expected of them for their job. However, 41% 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 11: 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= 219)	57 (26.0%)	69 (31.5%)	218 (21.5%)	217 (21.4%)	195 (19.2%)
I feel certain how much authority I have. (N = 218)	13 (6.0%)	17 (7.8%)	71 (32.6%)	83 (38.1%)	34 (15.6%)
I know what my responsibilities are for my job. (N = 217)	4 (1.8%)	4 (1.8%)	11 (5.1%)	93 (42.9%)	105 (48.4%)
I know what exactly what is expected of me for my job. (N = 217)	3 (1.4%)	12 (5.5%)	25 (11.5%)	89 (41.0%)	88 (40.6%)
The rules and regulations are clear enough here that I know specifically what I can and cannot do on my job. (N = 214)	7 (3.3%)	19 (8.9%)	26 (12.1%)	91 (42.5%)	71 (33.2%)
I know that I have divided my time properly. (N = 214)	0 (0.0%)	11 (5.1%)	57 (26.6%)	105 (49.1%)	41 (19.2%)
The rules that we're supposed to follow here never seem to be very clear. (reverse coded) (N = 215)	45 (20.9%)	71 (33.0%)	51 (23.7%)	36 (16.7%)	12 (5.6%)

The index of role strain had a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .80. The index ranged from seven to 33, with a higher number indicating more role strain. The mean perception of role strain among all respondents was 15.3, 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.

The difference in perception of role strain was also considered by job certification. The median degree of perception of role strain was 17 for Juvenile Justice Officers, and 14 for Juvenile Court Counselors. This difference in perception of role strain was significant, 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 12. Most respondents indicate a high degree of formalization in their job. Roughly 85% agreed that the organization keeps a written record of everyone's job performance and 80% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that whatever situation arises we have procedures to follow in dealing with it. Similarly, 78% agreed that a "rules and procedures" manual exists and is readily available within this organization

Table 12: Formalization

	Strongly Disagree # (%)	Disagree # (%)	Neutral # (%)	Agree # (%)	Strongly Agree # (%)
My organization keeps a written record of everyone's job performance. (reverse coded) (N = 219)	3 (1.4%)	7 (3.2%)	24 (11.0%)	90 (41.1%)	95 (43.4%)
A "rules and procedures" manual exists and is readily available within this organization. (reverse coded) (N = 215)	7 (3.3%)	15 (7.0%)	25 (11.6%)	83 (38.6%)	85 (39.5%)
Job guidance is readily available. (reverse coded) (N = 216)	9 (4.2%)	21 (9.7%)	59 (27.3%)	86 (39.8%)	41 (19.0%)
There is no policy manual for my job. (N = 217)	112 (51.6%)	72 (33.2%)	18 (8.3%)	9 (4.1%)	6 (2.8%)
Whatever situation arises, we have procedures to follow in dealing with it. (reverse coded) (N = 217)	1 (0.5%)	13 (6.0%)	29 (13.4%)	121 (55.8%)	53 (24.4%)

The index of formalization had a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .69. The index ranged from nine to 25, with a higher number indicating more formalization. The mean perception of formalization among all respondents was 20.1, 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.

The difference in perception of formalization was also considered by job certification. The median degree of perception of formalization was 19 for Juvenile Justice Officers, and 20 for Juvenile Court Counselors. This difference in perception of formalization was significant, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test. In other words, Juvenile Court Counselors were significantly more likely to perceive a greater degree of formalization than Juvenile Justice Officers.

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 13. Many respondents were neutral in their degree of organizational commitment. Nearly 52% agreed or that they were proud to tell others they were part of the organization, compared to 8% that were not. Roughly 56% felt the job inspired the best in them in the way of job performance.

Table 13: Organizational Commitment

	Strongly Disagree # (%)	Disagree # (%)	Neutral # (%)	Agree # (%)	Strongly Agree # (%)
This job really inspires the best in me in the way of job performance. (N = 219)	9 (4.1%)	17 (7.8%)	71 (32.4%)	80 (36.5%)	42 (19.2%)
I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization. (N = 219)	7 (3.2%)	11 (5.0%)	68 (31.1%)	85 (29.9%)	48 (21.9%)

The index of organizational commitment had a Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient of .61. 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 7.3, meaning respondents had a fairly high 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.

The difference in perception of organizational commitment was also considered by job certification. The median degree of perception of organizational commitment was 6 for Juvenile Justice Officers, and 8 for Juvenile Court Counselors. This difference in perception of organizational commitment was significant, as determined by a Mann-Whitney U test. In other words, Juvenile Court Counselors were significantly more likely to have a greater degree of organizational commitment than Juvenile Justice Officers.

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 160 respondents (out of the 284 respondents who completed at least some portion of the survey). Table 14 provides the descriptive statistics for the variables included in the analysis.

Table 14: Descriptive statistics of model variables

Variable	Med.	Min.	Max.	Mean	St dev	α
Personal characteristics						
Gender (male = 1)	0	0	1	0.48	0.50	- -
Age	43	23	66	43.71	8.97	- -
Race (non-minority =1)	0	0	1	0.47	0.50	- -
Education (graduate degree = 1)	0	0	1	0.20	0.40	- -
Military (military = 1)	0	0	1	0.12	0.32	- -
Supervisor (supervisor = 1)	0	0	1	0.20	0.40	- -
Work environment perceptions						
Input into decision making	13	4	20	12.37	3.84	.91
Dangerousness	18	8	25	17.32	3.81	.82
Supervisory support	18	5	25	17.50	4.06	.77
Peer support	18	6	25	17.41	3.53	.71
Role strain	15	7	33	15.31	4.73	.80
Formalization	20	9	25	20.11	3.17	.69
Job attitudes						
Job burnout	65	25	126	64.92	19.09	.77
Job satisfaction	17	5	25	16.30	4.04	.86
Work stress	17	7	27	16.72	3.93	.73
Organizational commitment	8	2	10	7.30	1.72	.61
Dependent variable						
Turnover intent	6	2	12	6.18	3.01	.69

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 15). Model 1 used only personal characteristics as independent variables, and none of these characteristics significantly predicted turnover intent.

Table 15: OLS regression predicting turnover intent

Variables	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	B	β	B	β	B	β
Personal characteristics						
Gender	-.16	-.03	-.16	-.03	-.36	-.06
Age	-.04	-.12	-.05	-.13	-.04	-.13
Race	-.14	-.02	-.04	-.01	-.50	-.08
Education	-.16	-.02	.48	.07	.23	.03
Military	1.22	.13	1.82	.19*	1.60	.17*
Supervisor	.06	.01	.79	.12	.72	.09
Work environment perceptions						
Input into decision making			-.18	-.23*	-.06	-.07
Dangerousness			.13	.16*	.00	.00
Supervisory support			-.23	-.32*	-.13	-.17
Peer support			.04	.04	.01	.01
Role strain			-.00	-.01	-.18	-.28*
Formalization			.03	.03	.07	.07
Job attitudes						
Job burnout					-.30	-.02
Job satisfaction					-.00	-.40*
Work stress					.24	.33*
Organizational commitment					-.27	-.15
R-squared	0.02*		0.27*		0.47*	

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. Respondents who had served in the military were significantly more likely than those who had not to consider leaving. In terms of work environment perceptions, input into decision making, dangerousness, and supervisory support were significant. In other words, respondents who perceived that they had less input into decision making, perceived more danger in their job, and perceived less support from their supervisor 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. Having previously served in the military

remained a significant indicator of turnover intent. In terms of work environment perceptions, input into decision making, dangerousness, and supervisory support lost their significance. However, role strain was significant. That is, employees who perceived less ambiguity in their job to be more likely to leave. 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 perceived 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 juvenile justice officers and juvenile court counselors. 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, incentives and awards for performance, opportunities for advancement, and supervisory support.

When asked what they liked most about their job, a very common response was the ability to help people. However, respondents also noted a number of concerns with juvenile justice employment including overwork, administrative duties that reduce the time available for direct services, and limited resources and services for clients. Low salary, lack of support from management, low morale, and the perception that the employee was not valued were also noted as negative aspects of the job.

An analysis of turnover intent revealed that 62% of respondents stated that they had thought about quitting their job in the last six months. Further, 30% stated they currently desired to quit their job. Both the statistical analysis of turnover intent and the qualitative analysis of employee perceptions (described more detail in the full report) 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 job satisfaction and work stress.

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.tjjd.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."	7.5%	15.5%	8.0%	27.9%	10.6%	18.1%	12.4%
"I feel used at the end of the workday."	11.5%	11.5%	6.2%	25.2%	12.8%	18.6%	14.2%
"I feel fatigued when I get up in the morning and have to face another day on the job."	14.9%	17.6%	13.6%	17.2%	10.9%	14.0%	11.8%
"I can easily understand how the offenders I supervise feel about things." (reverse coded)	11.7%	6.3%	6.3%	12.6%	11.3%	25.2%	26.6%
"I feel I treat some offenders I supervise as they were impersonal objects."	85.5%	8.1%	3.2%	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%	0.9%
"Working with offenders all day is really a strain for me."	34.5%	18.2%	17.7%	15.0%	7.7%	4.1%	2.7%
"I deal very effectively with the problems of the offenders I supervise." (reverse coded)	2.3%	1.8%	4.5%	7.7%	7.3%	22.3%	54.1%
"I feel burned out from my work."	14.5%	22.3%	10.5%	21.4%	8.6%	10.9%	11.8%
"I feel I'm positively influencing offenders' lives	2.7%	5.9%	5.0%	13.2%	9.6%	24.7%	38.8%

through my work." (reverse coded)							
"I've become more callous toward people."	45.7%	20.1%	7.3%	13.2%	5.5%	3.2%	5.0%
"I worry that this job is hardening me emotionally."	40.5%	21.4%	8.2%	10.9%	9.1%	5.5%	4.5%
"I feel very energetic." (reverse coded)	5.1%	7.9%	10.7%	21.5%	14.5%	24.3%	15.9%
"I feel frustrated by my job."	6.5%	21.8%	9.7%	23.6%	11.6%	13.0%	13.9%
"I feel I'm working too hard on my job."	14.2%	10.1%	11.5%	21.6%	12.8%	15.1%	14.7%
"I don't really care what happens to some of the offenders I supervise."	81.9%	7.9%	2.3%	2.3%	0.9%	1.4%	3.2%
"Working with offenders directly puts too much stress on me."	41.3%	28.4%	10.1%	10.1%	6.9%	0.9%	2.3%
"I can easily create a relaxed atmosphere with the offenders I supervise." (reverse coded)	5.1%	6.5%	3.7%	8.3%	15.3%	30.6%	30.6%
"I feel exhilarated after working closely with offenders I supervise." (reverse coded)	16.3%	13.5%	12.6%	15.8%	14.4%	17.7%	9.8%
"I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job." (reverse coded)	2.8%	8.9%	7.9%	14.5%	14.5%	25.2%	26.2%
"I feel like I am at wit's end."	36.9%	23.0%	12.4%	9.2%	7.8%	5.1%	5.5%
"In my work, I deal with emotional problems very	2.3%	1.8%	3.2%	8.3%	6.0%	28.9%	49.5%

calmly." (reverse coded)							
"I feel the offenders I supervise blame me for some of their problems."	33.6%	20.3%	11.1%	12.9%	11.1%	8.8%	2.3%