JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT WITHIN TENNESSEE CORRECTIONAL ALTERNATIVE SENTENCING PROGRAMS

by:

Ashley S. Grose

A Thesis Submitted to the
Faculty of the College of Graduate Studies at
Middle Tennessee State University
In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Science
in Criminal Justice Administration

Murfreesboro, TN
May 2013

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to take the opportunity to acknowledge those who have assisted me with this accomplishment. I am grateful to the staff of all correctional alternative sentencing programs in the State of Tennessee who assisted me with the statistical portion of the research; without them this thesis would not have been possible. I would like to express my appreciation to God, my family, and friends who have prayed as well as inspired me to reach my full potential. All of these individuals and inspiration has given me strength to achieve my goals.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this research study was to examine if caseload size, length of employment, and position at the organization affected both the job satisfaction and the organizational commitment. The participants consisted of probation officers, drug and alcohol counselors, psychiatrists and psychologists, along with other support staff to enable these programs to be effective. The questionnaire was distributed at DCCCP located in Nashville, Tennessee and community corrections programs throughout the state of Tennessee. The questionnaire consisted of a basic Demographic Survey, the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS), and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). Staff members will be informed about the nature of the study and asked to participate.

There is a correlation of -.426, a negative moderate relationship, between caseload size and job satisfaction; as caseload size increases job satisfaction decreases. The ANOVA value is 2.667 and level of significance .045, displaying the role at an organization effects job satisfaction.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Correctional alternative sentencing programs, such as those researched in this study, have high turnover rates. The issue is that there are many disgruntled employees, and the question is whether this issue is caused by caseload size, length of employment, or an employee's position at the organization. The overall goal of this research project is to determine the level of job satisfaction and organizational commitment among staff in the State of Tennessee that are employed within correctional alternative sentencing programs.

Applied Significance

This study is designed to measure the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of community corrections workers by means of a survey questionnaire. Additionally, the author will list the universal concepts that serve as a foundation for job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The research will begin by reviewing literature that examines the philosophy behind job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Moreover, the author will examine and define some of the characteristics of job satisfaction and organizational commitment as measured by the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), which are scales used to measure employees' opinions. The researcher will examine the historical aspects of probation and the transformation of Community Corrections.

Further, the author will analyze the data from the surveys to determine the level of satisfaction and commitment within these organizations. Through these evaluations, the reader can identify strengths and weaknesses within these organizations. The objective of this research is to examine these two alternative probation-sentencing programs throughout the state of Tennessee. The results can give correctional alternative sentencing organizations some insight on improving these programs and promoting better communication and unity amongst supervisors and co-workers.

This study is important on both applied and pure research grounds. On practical grounds, this research can have significance in re-defining policies and regulations in reference to how supervisors within correctional alternative sentencing organizations communicate with their employees. Furthermore, this study could have significance in determining whether these entities are effective in improving communication and work productivity. This study will allow programs in the State of Tennessee to determine whether ones job dissatisfaction and a lack of organizational commitment is contributed to caseload size, length of employment, or role at an organization. Many employers who strive to understand how issues (such as job autonomy, promotions, co-workers, supervision, pay, job titles, and commitment) may influence job satisfaction and their organizations could use this study as a guide.

Scientific Significance

Scientific applications for this study are primarily to contribute to the body of knowledge that already exists on job satisfaction and to the organizations by its employees' commitment. This research will provide further data on how employees from

alternative sentencing programs in Tennessee evaluate job satisfaction and organizational commitment in their professional careers. The study further defines the significance of job satisfaction and organizational commitment as it relates to caseload size. This research seeks to answer three questions: 1) if caseload size is a direct influence on job satisfaction and organizational commitment, 2) if the length of time at an organization has a significant effect on job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and 3) if an employee's role at an organization effects their job satisfaction and organizational commitment. The researcher hypothesizes:

- Officers with a larger caseload size will have less job satisfaction, as well as organizational commitment, than those who have a smaller caseload size,

- Those with a longer length of employment will be more satisfied and have a higher organizational commitment, and

- Employees that have a caseload will have a lower job satisfaction and organizational commitment than those who have little to no caseload.

Organization of Study

This study is divided into five main chapters. Chapter one serves as an introduction to the issues and reasons for the study, identifying important elements to be examined and the need for such an examination. The salient issues to be investigated by the researchers are identified in this chapter. The second chapter contains a thorough review of the literature available on the subject of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Also, this chapter gives a brief overview of alternative sentencing programs and organizations.

Chapter three explains the research design, method of data collection, sampling, and analysis. Chapter four provides details about the results of the survey conducted for this research. The conclusions are presented in chapter five. This chapter provides the researchers interpretations of data based on the findings as they are related to job satisfaction and employees commitment to the organization. The appendix section includes a sample questionnaire as well a descriptive statistics for the organizational commitment questionnaire as well as the job satisfaction survey. The organization of this thesis should provide a logical, structured, format in which to examine the information gathered in this study.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Historical Perspective of Job Satisfaction

The definition of a job is a paid position of regular employment (Merriam-Webster, 2011). The definition of satisfaction can be defined as the fulfillment of one's wishes, expectations, or needs or the pleasure derived from this (Merriam-Webster, 2011). So when thinking of job satisfaction one can assume that job satisfaction, in short, is a fulfillment of a paid position of regular employment.

Many authors of job satisfaction research have not found one single universal definition. Hoppock (1935) defined job satisfaction as any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, "I am satisfied with my job." Muchinsky (2000) defines job satisfaction as the degree of pleasure an employee derives from his or her job. Job satisfaction has been defined, by Locke (1976), as a positional, emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience. According to Kalleberg (1977), job satisfaction defines an overall affective orientation on the part of individuals toward work roles, which they are presently occupying (*A Theory of Job Satisfaction* p. 176). Spector (2006) defines job satisfaction as an attitudinal variable that reflects how people feel about their jobs overall as well as how they feel about various specific aspects of their jobs. Carrol (1973) suggested that the multitude of definitions make it difficult for researchers to measure job satisfaction.

A common approach to examining if one is satisfied with his or her job is by way of interview and/or questionnaires. Survey research is the most efficient and typical type of research that most researchers use. Descriptive research in many studies is used in gathering information about interest of some employees, practices, concerns, attitudes, and preferences (Gay and Airasian, 2003). These types of questionnaires can be considered to be voluntary and performed anonymously, which can leave room for more honesty in the answers that individuals give when responding to attitudes, opinions, and rationale.

The Job Descriptive Scale, sometimes called Job Descriptive Index, (JDI) is one of the most prevalent job satisfaction scales currently available for researchers, according to Spector (2006). Literature reveals that the Job Descriptive Scale is the most methodically authenticated research tool as a measure of job satisfaction (Spector, 2006). The Job Descriptive Scale has five characteristics of job satisfaction: work, pay, promotional opportunities, supervision, and co-worker. With there being only five characteristics, there are a few restrictions with this scale. Some researchers, who are referred to as "organization" researchers, often use the JDI to conduct job satisfaction research. Spector (2006) noted over 100 published studies used the JDI. Many more surveys of this nature have been completed since the completion of these studies. The use of the JDI provides an extensive amount of proof of the research legitimacy. Criticism is not foreign when evaluating the works of using the JDI, because this scale does not apply to those that fall into the categories of those that volunteer and intern (Cook et al., 1981). The JDI references, more so, those that are paid employees and not those that are

performing internships or volunteer services; however, this criticism may be true for most job satisfaction scales (Spector, 2006). Researchers in the future could explore whether there is significant differences in the level of job satisfaction between paid employees and those that intern or volunteer.

Two Approaches to the Study of Job Satisfaction

The global approach and the facet approach are the two common approaches to the study of job satisfaction. The global approach to studying job satisfaction acts as a single, inclusive feeling toward the employee's job (Spector, 2006). The facet approach, concentrates on job characteristics, which were those discussed earlier in the chapter, or different parts of the job; for example rewards (pay or bonus possibilities), job circumstances, and the nature of the job. The facets that are commonly studied when attempting a study from this particular approach are paying promotions, supervision, co-workers, and job conditions (environment) (Spector, 2006).

The facet approach allows for a broader picture of job satisfaction. An individual typically has different levels of satisfaction with the various facets of his or her work. He or she may be very displeased with pay and room for pay increase and/or a possible bonus, but pleased with the nature of the work itself and the supervision on the job (Spector, 2006).

Research on Job Satisfaction & Other Variables

Muchinsky (2000) witnessed that the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance has been researched for over 40 years. One of the most continuing myths about employee behavior is the link between job satisfaction and job performance. To be

more precise, the more satisfied employee will have better job performance. It is suggested that these are the reasons the employees would like to be productive and happy in their work. The insinuation is the employer attempts to satisfy their employees, because job performance will be unsuccessful if there is an unsatisfied employee (Muchinsky, 2000). The reason being one is related to the other. Muchinsky (2000) argued that there are some organizations that may attempt to increase productivity through strict management policy and procedure guidelines that could negatively affect job satisfaction.

Stress and the Workforce

Occupational stress has been commonly correlated with the law enforcement workforce, but it also has an adverse affect on several other employment agencies as well. The American Institute of Stress 2000 Integra Survey found that 65% of workers reported stress in the workplace. Nineteen percent of employees terminated their previous employment due to workplace stress, and 10% stated that they experienced firsthand, or acknowledged physical abuse that occurred due to the job related stress. Individuals that participated in this survey were current employees in areas that were largely composed of organizational structures that are disciplined in regards to their daily operations and purposes. Lack of independence, meaning the increase in the workload and absence of involvement employees give to their field, is found to be a result related to the employees and their perspective careers.

It is argued (Inlander, 1996) that in many fields, a single employee is currently doing the job that 3.1 employees were accountable for in the previous decade.

Corrections programs have established policies intended to lower employees stress levels by attacking several issues that pertain to their well-being, as an outcome of this problem. The policies include: decreasing deadlines with self- determined timelines, encouraging open communication with authority (supervisors, managers, etc.), exhibiting concern for the safety and well being of employees, and paying more attention to equality in job titles.

Due to the seriousness of correcting these policies for the better, various programs have applied seven additional mechanisms that incorporate employment satisfaction; they are as follows: skill, discretion, benefits, social relations, social rights, meaningfulness, and integrating family and social life with professional life. Garcez (2006) quoted a study that was conducted in 2005 referred to as the SHRM survey (Society for Human Resource Management). This study surveyed programs whose primary goal is to address the overall job satisfaction of their employers in the following categories: benefits, compensation, work/life balance, job security, and several others. The capability of an employee to apply and improve his or her skill level pertains to an employee's skill discretion. The level of control a superior has with making his or her own work and preparing a schedule is autonomy. A democratic approach to dealing with grievances and rules addresses the area of social relations. Employees working together to achieve one goal are caused by social rights. Meaningfulness ensures that employees understand what superiors (management, supervisors, etc.) expect from them. Integration of family and societal obligations demonstrates management acknowledgment of their employee's needs to take care of matters not related to the job.

Issues Influencing Job Satisfaction

Education: The individual's level of education has been found to influence both job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Evidence suggest as education increases for blue-collar employees, job satisfaction decreases. A job may become less fulfilling to a middle class employee when new values are incorporated, according to authors Rice, McFarlin, and Bennet (1998). Rogers (1991) supported this statement by suggesting that employees who have more formal education have more aspirations and increased expectations. Job dissatisfaction becomes a factor when aspirations and expectations, that are raised, are not obtained.

Individuals with a master degree seem to be those that have the lowest level of job satisfaction (Dyer & Theriault, 1976). Employees with higher recognized education, that are employed in corrections, have the most job dissatisfaction because of the lack of social integration with the existing protective force, not much career advancement, and job quality as a whole, says authors Rice, McFarlin, and Bennet (1998).

Pay: Pay can be dissatisfying, because it temporarily has a change in job attitudes according to past research (Herzberg, 1966). It can be argued that those with a larger salary are more satisfied with their job than those that are paid a lower salary (Carroll, 1973). Job security and benefits are common categories to compensate for low satisfaction from financial incentives. Many researchers have made an effort to link job satisfaction with being satisfied with salary. What an employee is paid and what they feel their employment salary is worth determines pay satisfaction. When there is a gap between what employees are paid and what they feel they should be paid the more job

dissatisfaction results (Lawler, 1973). There has not been enough experimental data concerning pay satisfaction as it relates to job satisfaction.

Gender: In the last 30 years, there has been a significant attempt to multiply the number of females that are employed in the field of corrections (Horne, 1985). Some researchers reported that females in the field of corrections have higher job satisfaction than their male coworkers (Horne, 1985). However, Hulin and Smith (1964) reported that prior research found that females have a habit of being less satisfied than their male coworkers. The argument is that although women make less from their jobs than men, they have lower expectations, and should be as satisfied as, if not more satisfied than, men (McNeese-Smith, 1996). It is presumed from this concept that women should be more satisfied than men when job levels and work rewards are held constant (Horne, 1985). Locke (1975) suggested there is no relationship between gender and correctional job satisfaction. One may reasonably conclude that there is no consensus about the nature of the relationship between job satisfaction and gender.

Turnover and Job Satisfaction

One can assume that turnover rates are high in the area of Community Corrections due to job satisfaction or the lack thereof. Oliver (1998) noticed that high turnover is usually the result of not being satisfied with the job and a combination of the ability to secure more fitting employment elsewhere. Many individuals begin looking for better employment when there is consistent dissatisfaction with their current employment situation. If the job market is up or down, determination to resign from an organization is dependent on if there is a better employment opportunity (Mobley, 1977).

The more possibilities an organization presents to its employers for personal growth and advancement, the more employers will be inclined to stay with the organization. High turnovers in the workplace have been reported to have costly consequences for any organization (McNeese-Smith, 1996). This outcome can be due to the organization losing large amounts of money, work hours that are used to conduct interviews, background checks, and training for the new hire employee. It is noted by Herman (1999) that employee turnover is the most misunderstood and discovered to be expensive by some researchers for productivity, efficiency, and profits. A direct cost of high turnover that is affected is recruitment costs, selection costs, hiring and placement costs, as well as separation cost. Indirect costs refer to the transferring of personnel from within the organization, the time allocated for new employee training, negative public relations, and informed lines within the organization. Herman (1999) explains that hiring and recruiting costs can at minimum double the annual salary of the employee being placed. Job satisfaction reduces absenteeism and turnover (Whiteacre, 2006).

Administration leaders within organizations are looking for incentives to keep long-term, valuable employees, because they are aware of the benefits of having employees wanting to stay with the organization. Raising job satisfaction is a fundamental way of decreasing high turnover; committed employees are more likely to remain in the organization than employees that are not so committed (Muchinsky, 2000). Employees have a hard time committing to a company where they are not that involved. Employees who have engaged in greater amounts of employee training reported more commitment to their organization and less cynicism about the possibility of

organizational change (Rogga, Schmidt, Shull, & Schmitt, 2001). Whiteacre (2006) states the overall best predictor of an employee's job satisfaction is based upon happiness. In early studies the best predictor has been known to be work satisfaction. These findings are important to the corrections field because they add more information to previous research that shows correctional employees have a higher than average risk for heart attacks, high blood pressure and ulcers, and that correctional officers have shorter life spans, higher divorce rates and higher rates of alcoholism than the general public (Whiteacre, 2006).

Organizational Commitment

There are many variables that are important when describing the way one may perceive their employers or organizations. Organizational commitment expresses the employee's attachment to an organization. This is a strong, direct reflection of job satisfaction, yet different (Meyer, Bobocel, & Allen, 1991). Organizational commitment has many of the same variables as job satisfaction, including job characteristics, role variables, turnover, absence, and age (Spector, 2006).

Historical Perspective of Probation

Probation is releasing convicted offenders into the community under a conditional suspended sentence, avoiding imprisonment for those offenders who exhibit good behavior under the supervision of a probation officer (DCCCP, 2005). Around the 17th century judges in the state of Massachusetts used discretion to suspend a sentence of a particular offender. Due to overcrowding in prisons and jails, this was a direct influence on alternative sentencing. Boston Municipal Judge Peter O. Thatcher exercised lenience

during sentencing. Examples of his lenience were allowing offenders to be released on their "good name," commonly referred to as ROR (release on recognizance), either before or after the charges were adjudicated. This resulted in an indefinite suspension of the offender's sentence. Judge Thatcher assumed that such sentences would persuade convicted offenders to practice good behavior and avoid committing new crimes (Petersilia, 2002).

The actions of Judge Thatcher were regarded as a precursor of probation. However, John Augustus began modern probation. His concern was that alcoholics were being incarcerated until they were sober and felt they needed help, not incarceration. He took them into his Boston home as an act of compassion. Since Augustus's successful supervision and reformation of the nation's first probationer in 1841, probation has become the most commonly used supervised sentencing method in this country (Black, 1990).

Due to the success of probation, Massachusetts was the first state to pass a probation statute in 1878. Captain Savage, a former police officer, was the first probation officer to be hired in Boston. Between 1886 and 1900, a number of houses were allocated in low income neighborhoods, for the purposes of assisting the poor and improving the lives of disadvantaged probationers by providing supervision and enforcing rules and regulations. These homes were experimental efforts prominently in the development and use of probation during that period (Peterisilia, 2002).

There are many opinions about rehabilitation while incarcerated. One belief is that incarceration does not deter crime. Abadinsky (2003) argues that incarcerating offenders

only makes matters worse because newly confined offenders learn more about crime from more experienced, violent prisoners. It is believed that probation is far less expensive than long term incarceration. Some forms of probation or alternative sentencing programs, such as Community Corrections and Drug Courts are less expensive and can be utilized to rehabilitate drug offenders and deter criminal behavior.

Historical Perspective of Community Corrections

Community Corrections is defined as any community based program designed to supervise convicted offenders as an alternative of incarceration, either by county, city, state or federal authority that provides various services to offenders (DCCCP, 2005). The purpose of community-based programs is to afford probationers the opportunity to avoid confinement and remain within their communities so that they perform productive work to support themselves and to repay victims for losses suffered (Markley, 1994). The programs were also designed to supervise offenders who are not a danger to the community while not in prison; however, it can be difficult to determine which offenders are more dangerous than others. Community corrections supervise offenders according to conditions that are court ordered. Offenders are expected to have various responsibilities such as fee payments, stress compensation, community service, and restitution in some cases. There is also a continuation of punishment offered through more controlled supervision and greater accountability (DCCCP, 2005). Community corrections programs are often used in a way to refer to a range of punishments known as intermediate sanctions. Intermediate sanctions are programs designed to closely control or monitor offender behaviors. There are several possible meanings of intermediate punishments.

Therefore, the term is used in several settings, including a variety community based offenders programs involving non-incarcerated sanctions (DCCCP, 2005). Some characteristics of intermediate sanctions are curfew, frequent monitoring, and contact by program officials (Hoy & Worrall, 2005). Offenders in intermediate programs are given considerable restrictions of movement within their communities, it is contemplated that such intensive monitoring and control promote a high degree of compliance with program requirements. It is sometimes presumed that intensive supervision deters offenders from committing new crimes. Most likely those offenders who are eligible for Community corrections programs are low risk, nonviolent offenders. Community corrections also supervise offenders who create little or no risk to the public if they should be released into the community under close supervision. Furthermore, community corrections reduces prison and jail overcrowding by diverting certain offenders into these programs or by releasing inmates back into the community under strict supervision. Male and female offenders are "clients" of this alternative sentencing program (Hoy & Worrall, 2005).

Both Hoy and Worrall (2005) agree with Markley (1994) when he stated that the various mission statements concerning community corrections programs throughout the United States enforce a philosophy that provides certain types of offenders with a range of rehabilitative treatment that focuses on the enhancement of their personal abilities and professional skills. By doing this, it is believed that their chances for recidivism are minimized. One way to accomplish this is through community-based programs

established through Community Corrections programs. These programs include halfway houses, outreach centers, and monitoring systems.

The first state to employ Community Corrections was California. This was due to the state's Probation Subsidy Program, which was begun in 1965 (Lawerence, 1991). This program was used to provide local communities with additional resources to manage larger numbers of probationers. One of the resources implemented was a community residential center where probationers could receive counseling, assistance in gaining lawful employment, and other forms of guidance and supervision. Nevertheless, it took another decade for a large scale of philosophical shifts to occur among different U.S. jurisdictions so that Community Corrections could be implemented more widely. Gail Hughes (1990) adds that the Safe Street Act of 1968 and the emergence of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) provided the bases for developing more community-based corrections programs. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice Report of 1967 was one of the first official acknowledgements of the need for community-based programs as a possible front-end solution to prison and jail overcrowding (American Probation & Parole Association, 1996).

The President's Law Report suggests that offenders that are being supervised by a community-based program cost less than it may cost to keep a prisoner incarcerated. The LEAA provides extensive funding for experiments in community based programming. Since incarceration has been unable to offer the public any sustainable proof that offenders leave rehabilitated, policymakers are convinced of the argument that

community corrections programs are no more of a disadvantage than incarceration. This statement has been noted to be an indirect way of stating that community corrections can be as effective as incarceration at rehabilitating offenders (Mays & Gray, 1996). The effect that being incarcerated has on some prisoners is another variable that has lead to the development of community-based programs.

Most community corrections programs offer increased sentencing options to local courts, victim assistance, and provide a public service to local governments that is cost efficient. Since these programs are grant funded, states avoid paying the cost of daily jail fees to house a prisoner, or the imprisonment of non-violent offenders; which leads to taxpayers saving money. Felony offenders that are sentenced to community corrections are held accountable for paying fees for their supervision and the cost of the program.

Examining Tennessee Community Corrections Programs

There are currently various alternative sentencing programs throughout the State of Tennessee. The Tennessee General Assembly, in 1985, approved community corrections programs as a solution in reducing the overcrowding in correctional facilities. Lawmakers believe that it is important for inmates within the Tennessee Department of Corrections to be provided with the proper supervision and services with the goal of reducing the likelihood of recidivism (Tennessee Department of Corrections, 2005). In 1985 Tennessee Community Corrections Program was started.

Goals

Hartland (1996) stated that any program that seeks to preserve offender attachments to their communities by diverting them from incarceration and housing them

in local neighborhoods will cause the community to criticize. The two principle objections for alternative sentencing programs are: (1) freeing dangerous felons has some risk to public safety, and (2) that these offenders remain free, and perceived as going unpunished. Restitution payments to victims, public service work requirements, fee payments, accountability to abide by strict rules and complying with what seems to be unreasonable behavioral restrictions and limitations are all forms of punishments. Some citizen's think, however, that offenders should be incarcerated to visibly illustrate total control by authorities and true retribution for the crime committed (Hoy and Worrall, 2005).

Summary

When the Tennessee Community Corrections Programs were implemented, there was a greater need for more supervision among offenders, due to there being a significant increase in drug related crimes. Those offenders that needed treatment the most were not subject to any kind of release into the community; at this time it was apparent that a residential facility was needed. After taking into account this special need, Judge Seth Norman realized that these individuals needed special attention to overcome their drug addictions and in addition to Community Corrections program began the Davidson County Drug Court Program.

The research presented in this study focuses on job satisfaction and organizational commitment among Community Corrections Programs throughout the state of Tennessee, in addition to the Davidson County Drug Court Program. These organizations are alternative sentencing programs that focus on rehabilitation and recidivism. The

researcher conducted a survey study and analyzed the data from the employees who participated anonymously in the research and was able to do so, due to the participants being fellow employees.

An analysis of the research illustrates that the most studied causes of job satisfaction are independent variables usually associated with job performance, regular absence, and turnover rate. There are other variables that may influence employees' level of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This research will focus on the relationships between job satisfaction, educational level, race, gender, length of employment, and pay satisfaction, among others.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter the researcher will discuss the variables in the study as well as the research design, how the data was collected and the instrument used to collect the data, sampling, and how the data was analyzed.

Variables

Independent variables: the independent variables in this study are as follows: caseload size, length of employment, role (position), age, gender, and type of agency employed. The independent variable can be tested to see if it influences the dependent variable. Caseload size and age are the two independent variables in this study that are measured with an open-ended question. All other independent variables are measured with multiple-choice questions. Each of these independent variables was asked with a basic demographic questionnaire.

Dependent variables: the dependent variables in this study are job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Job satisfaction is measured with a 180-point scale made up of 36 likert scale questions. Organizational commitment is measured with a 45-point scale comprised of 9 likert scale questions. The dependent variable is the outcome from these two scales.

Research Design

The current study will explain the treatment conditions and both the control and experimental group. The treatment conditions in this specific research are the independent variables, which are believed to be influencing the outcome, dependent

variables. The control group in this research is employees with small caseloads and the experimental group is employees with larger caseloads. This research design is commonly defined as a quasi-experimental design. A quasi-experimental design has many similarities with the traditional experimental design, but they specifically lack the element of random assignment to treatment or control groups. Quasi-experimental designs do not allow for the researcher to control the assignment to the treatment conditions. In this study there is no control due to caseload size being pre-determined.

Data Collection

The instrument used to gather data in this study comes from several questionnaires that make up three sections that complete the job satisfaction survey. The first section, mostly close-ended questions, consists of seven demographic questions that address age, gender, employment title/length, and caseload size are all questions comprised on the general demographic questionnaire. The second section is the organizational commitment questionnaire, which has nine questions, was from a previous study and developed by Cook and Walls (1980). The final section of the survey is the job satisfaction survey, which has a total of 36 questions was developed by Paul E. Spector (1994) at the University of South Florida. Both section 2 and section 3 are measured on a 6-point likert scale.

Four agencies in the State of Tennessee were contacted and asked to participate in the voluntary, anonymous job satisfaction survey. The researcher required all participants in the study to review and sign an informed consent form before any questionnaires were distributed (Appendix E). The week following the collection of informed consent, those

employees that decided to go forward with the study were then given the survey questionnaire and instructed to return it within a week. The researcher followed up with each agency that agreed to participate and collected all anonymous surveys. See Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire.

Sample

The population represented in this research is Tennessee Community Corrections employees. The researcher wanted to use a purposive sample instead of random selection. When a purposive sample is selected, the sample is sure to represent those intended, whereas with random sampling it is not a true representation and can sometimes deem sampling error. The researcher does not have a random sample size. There were a total of 87 employees asked to participate and of those 87 employees, 56 employees returned anonymous surveys, meaning a response rate of 73 percent.

Data Analysis

The data that was collected in the questionnaire was managed and coded using SPSS. Descriptive stats are used to describe the sample. ANOVA's and Pearson's R correlations are used to analyze the relationships between the independent and dependent variables.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Overview

In this chapter the researcher will display the statistical analysis and results from the job satisfaction and organizational commitment survey. There were 87 employees from various Tennessee community corrections programs asked to participate in the job satisfaction survey. Of the 87 employees, 56 completed the survey and returned it to the researcher, causing a response rate of 73 percent.

Demographics

In this section the researcher will define and display the categorical demographic variables used in Table 1 and Table 2 using descriptive stats.

In Table 1 the reader will note the frequency of each variable and the percentage. This table shows that most respondents are female. There are various levels of education that one may have in this profession other than college course work. While majority of employees have a college degree, 91.1 % of the respondents are college educated whether it is a bachelor's, some post-graduate work, or a post-graduate degree. The primary positions of respondents were probation/case officers equaling a 64.30 %. This is important to the researcher due to the research hypothesis and will be discussed later in the chapter. It is important to the researcher that the length of employment is accounted, because this could have some significance in relation to job satisfaction, which will be reviewed later in the chapter. Forty-three percent of employees are within their first three

years or less; this percentage is indicative of a high turnover rate, and maybe evidence of little job satisfaction. While the researcher is not inquiring as to the type of institution having an effect on organizational commitment/job satisfaction, the information was gathered.

Table 1
Categorical Demographics

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	22	39.3
Female	34	60.7
Education		
Trade school	5	8.9
College degree	25	44.6
Some Post-grad	10	17.9
Post-grad Degree	16	28.6
Position		
Probation officer	20	35.7
Assessor	2	3.6
Case officer	16	28.6
Administrator	14	25.0
Counselor	3	5.4
Length of Employment		
<3 Years	24	42.9
3-5 Years	12	21.4
6-10 Years	12	21.4
>10 Years	8	14.3
Type of Institution		
Public	47	83.9
Private	4	7.1
Proprietary	5	8.9

Note: Positions percentage totals to 98.2 % due to missing information from 1 respondent.

Table 2 represents two scale variables that are best represented in means. All other variables in this study are categorical and are assessed with frequencies and percentages therefore these two tables are separate. The average age of respondents is 36, the eldest being the age of 67. The mean caseload size, for those respondents that carry a caseload, is about 70. The largest reported caseload size is 156. There are 15 missing responses for caseload size, in which the researcher has concluded from data gathering, are respondents that reported themselves as administrators that do not carry caseloads.

Table 2
Demographic Statistics

Scale	N	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Age of Respondent	56	36.16	21	67
Caseload Size	41	69.59	2	156

Note: Majority of 15 missing cases were administrators without caseloads.

Scales

In this section the researcher will discuss the scales used to measure organizational commitment and job satisfaction. The organizational commitment survey consists of 9 likert scale questions. The minimum score, indicating the least committed employee, is 6 points. The maximum score, indicating the most committed employee, on the organizational commitment survey is 45 points, and the lowest, least committed

employee, is zero. The reader can reference Appendix B, which indicates the average for each question.

The job satisfaction survey consists of 36 likert scale questions. The job satisfaction questionnaire has a maximum score of 180 points, indicating the absolute most satisfied employee, and the lowest possible score of zero. The job satisfaction survey has also been provided to the reader in Appendix C to reference the average for each question.

The following table displays averages for the results from the job satisfaction questionnaire and organizational commitment questionnaire. The most committed employer rated their commitment a 45 and the least committed a 6. The most satisfied employer rated their satisfaction score a 141 and the least satisfied employer rated their satisfaction a 33.

Table 3
Descriptive Statistics

Scale	N	Mean	Minimum	Maximum
Org. Commitment	55	26.55	6	45
Job Satisfaction	49	90.66	33	141

Note: Survey's not counted due to missing information consists of 7 Job Satisfaction Survey's & 1 Organizational Commitment Survey's

Correlations & ANOVA

In this section, the researcher uses a Pearson-R Correlation to compare the relationship between caseload size and job satisfaction and organizational commitment. This correlation is necessary when 2 scale variables are being measured. The researcher hypothesizes that caseload size effects an employee's job satisfaction as well as organizational commitment. There is a correlation of -.426, which is a negative moderate relationship, between caseload size and job satisfaction. Meaning when caseload size increases job satisfaction decreases. Table 4 displays the correlation and that the research hypothesis will be accepted, because the level of significance is .01, leaving only a 1 % chance that the result is due to sampling error. The null hypothesis is rejected because of this significance.

Organizational commitment and caseload size have a negative moderate correlation of -.395 with significant level of .012. The research hypothesis can be accepted, because this produces the same result as stated above, when caseload size increases organizational commitment of an employee decreases. The null hypothesis is rejected.

Table 4
Correlations between Caseload size, Job satisfaction, & Organizational
Commitment

Scale	Job Satisfaction	Org. Commit.
N	36	40
Pearson Correlation	-.426**	-.395*
Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	.012

Note: **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
 *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 5 displays the results for measurements of the relationship between the time

employed at an organization and job satisfaction using an ANOVA (Analysis of

Variance). An ANOVA is different from that of Pearson-R Correlation, in that an

ANOVA provides a statistical test that determines if the means of several variables are

equal and there is significant difference between these means. The ANOVA value is

2.055 this value is significant at the .12 level. Therefore the research hypothesis is

rejected that time employed at an organization has an effect on job satisfaction and accept

the null hypothesis that length of employment has no significant impact on job

satisfaction.

Table 5

ANOVA comparing Length Employed and Job Satisfaction

Scale	N	Mean
>3 Years	21	88.81
3-5 Years	12	77.67
6-10 Years	9	99.90
<10 Years	7	106.57
Total	49	90.66

Note: ANOVA Value: 2.055

Level of Significance: .12

Table 6 displays the correlation between role at an organization and job satisfaction using an ANOVA. The ANOVA value is 2.667 and level of significance .045, displaying a statistical significant difference. This table allows the research hypothesis to be accepted that the role at an organization has an influence on job satisfaction and reject the null hypothesis. The means display that probation and case officers have less job satisfaction than their co-workers.

Table 6
ANOVA comparing Role and Job Satisfaction

Scale	N	Mean
Assessor	2	102.00
Probation Officer	17	82.59
Case Officer	16	82.94
Counselor	2	131.50
Administration	11	104.09
Total	48	90.48

Note: ANOVA Value: 2.667
Level of Significance .045

Summary of Results

The researcher can summarize statistically there are more females that responded than male and there are more college educated employees than those who may have attended trade school, post graduate course work, or graduate degrees. The researcher has statistically indicated that the research hypothesis can be accepted that larger caseloads lead to less job satisfaction and less organizational commitment. The researcher also notes that statistically length of employment has no statistical significant effect on job satisfaction, rejecting the research hypothesis. Last, the researcher accepts the research hypothesis that an employee's role or position in the organization does influence job satisfaction due to there being a significant value that probation officers and case officers have less job satisfaction than any other position.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Summary

The purpose of this research was to examine job satisfaction and organizational commitment of employees at Tennessee community correction programs. The researcher hypothesized that there are three different effects that cause a decrease in job satisfaction and organizational commitment with employees of Tennessee community corrections programs. The first hypothesis was that caseload size would affect an employee's job satisfaction as well as organizational commitment levels. Generally, as caseload size increases, job satisfaction and organizational commitment would decrease. Table 4 uses a Pearson's R, which shows a negative moderate correlation between caseload size and job satisfaction as well as caseload size and organizational commitment. In this case the research hypothesis was accepted that caseload size is an influence on job satisfaction and organizational commitment and therefore the researcher rejects the null hypothesis.

Table 5 reflects the relationship between length of employment and job satisfaction using an ANOVA, which is the second research hypothesis. The hypothesis stated that time employed at an organization has an effect on job satisfaction. In this case the research hypothesis was rejected and the null hypothesis that length of employment has no significant impact on job satisfaction was accepted. The statistics indicated that the ANOVA level of 2.055 is significant at the .12 level, which is no significant relationship. Simply stating that one variable has no relationship with the other variable.

Last the researcher hypothesized that dependent on an employee's role (position) job satisfaction and organizational commitment can be affected. Table 6 uses an ANOVA, as Table 5, to statistically compare these variables. Table 6 indicates that there is an ANOVA value of 2.667 and a level of significance at .045. Therefore, the research hypothesis, that the role at an organization influences job satisfaction, can be accepted and the null hypothesis, that role does not effect an employee's job satisfaction score, is rejected. Those who hold an administrative position, such as clerical, supervisor, or management yield a higher job satisfaction score than those that have a case officer or probation officer position.

The literature review in Chapter 2 highlights the ideas behind job satisfaction and organizational commitment but gives the historical aspects of the community corrections programs. This research has brought forth the many characteristics that contribute to job satisfaction and organizational commitment of Tennessee community correction employees. Those characteristics would include, but are not limited to, gender, an employee's caseload size, and the role, which an employee has at their organization. This research can presume that with a combination of these characteristics consequences, such as high turnover rates, can become an issue if not addressed by administration staff.

Chapter three and four are both important, in that the purpose of the research, gathering of information, scales used, and analysis are discussed and explained. These two chapters also elaborate on the characteristics that contribute to dissatisfied and under committed employees. The most significant finding of these two chapters would be in Chapter 4 Table 4, the correlation table of caseload size and the relationship to job

satisfaction and organizational commitment. This table concluded that there was a significance of .01, meaning a 1 % chance there was sampling error.

The researcher will also note that other than there being more female respondent's than male respondent's, the research indicates an interesting fact that an employee who is a probation or case officer are less satisfied than their co-workers who are assessors, counselors, and administration. Since statistics state that the higher the caseload the more dissatisfied an organization employee, it would make sense that probation and case officers are overall the least satisfied. The reader can reference Table 6 to review this statistical conclusion.

Limitations

A major limitation in this study would be the length of the survey and the amount of time it took a participant to complete the survey. The survey was 4 pages and took an approximate 15 minutes to complete. Many employees became disinterested once discovering the length and time of the survey and asked to no longer participate. The second limitation of the study would be reliability. The researcher explained that the survey was voluntarily and anonymous but did not supervise the employees while they took their survey. Participants could have completed the survey together or were persuaded to answer a question with the influence of one of their co-workers. The researcher also took extreme complication in regards to finding research that was current relating to job satisfaction and organizational commitment.

Although the research collected reflects the level of job satisfaction particularly within Davidson County and nearby counties, the researcher experienced difficulty in

obtaining information from agencies that were over three hours away. The researcher was limited to four alternative sentencing programs within Tennessee. Yet, there are 14 other community corrections programs throughout the state of Tennessee. As a result, the researcher was limited to a smaller sample.

Implications

Those that are employed in the field of criminal justice perceive job satisfaction as a relevant topic. It is important for the reader to note that financial issues surrounding job satisfaction as criminal justice agencies are often beset with high turnover rates, high overtime, expensive training costs, and the largest portion of operating budgets are in the area of personnel. Simply stated, unsatisfied workers in a criminal justice environment present a large financial burden. Criminal justice organizations would be greatly benefitted if policies were established encouraging flexible work schedules to accommodate complex family relationships, pay incentives based on merit, non-monetary benefits such as free parking, financial rewards for not taking sick leave, and other methods to express worker appreciation.

Using the data gathered in this particular study, the researcher proposes that organizations should first explore caseload size in comparison to each individual employer. Many organizations have an ideal "average" caseload size that they would like for each officer to have. In reality, there are more probationers than there are officers; this issue causes more paperwork. The researcher proposes that organizations should explore the idea of hiring maybe two to three individuals that can handle the paperwork only. For example there could be one individual that writes warrants for all officers, as well as

conducts home visits, curfew calls, and other paperwork that may cause the officer to be more accepting to a larger caseload size because the paperwork is a little less. Another officer could be hired to handle all intakes, orientations, and any court coverage needed. This would allow the officer to have more time at the office being available for probationers and more time to maintain files and paperwork.

Organizations may also explore the idea of those that actually have caseloads could be given incentives such as flex time for the extra time that is required do to paperwork or having to stay later to finish paperwork. The rational for this is, most organizations are state funded, meaning these are often salary positions. Although these positions are often paid too little and require a lot of time and paperwork to be finished in a timely manner, many employees would appreciate the incentive of being able to have time to flex for the hours that are worked past forty hours per week. This flex- time could be used before any vacation time is applied to time off. One may see this as well, there is a possibility that more than forty hours is worked on a weekly basis and poses a threat to vacation time never being applied. A good way to balance this could be only allowing no more than 4 hours flex time monthly with the maximum amount being 48 hours annually. An employee would have to use this time within the year accumulated and must be subtracted from any vacation or sick time first and cannot be paid out if an employee resigns from the position.

According to the researcher's findings, those who have an administrative position have more job satisfaction, proposing to be more satisfied. This could be a result of having less paperwork from not having to supervise a caseload. Most administrative

positions are those of supervisors and managers and are in turn paid a higher salary. Therefore, the incentive stated above would apply to officers only.

Future Research

The researcher recommends that if future research is see fit into this topic, that one should research more in depth as to pay grade, address why promotions and pay are low within these organizations, or research as to if the beneficial perks mentioned above were implemented in lieu of pay increase and if that would reduce turnover. Researchers can explore if job security, the company morale, growth and opportunity (advancement) can affect an individuals satisfaction and commitment as well.

Future researchers can improve the data gathering process from providing only questionnaires to conducting interviews as well. Some individuals are more inviting to a conversation, interview versus strictly pen to paper process. This would improve the reliability of the research. Geographical limitations were proposed in this study; this issue can be avoided in future research via mail, email and courtesy follow-ups. If the researcher is requesting feedback via mail, a courtesy follow-up should be sent within two weeks of the original mailing. A request should for feedback should not be sent via email because this causes the research to no longer be anonymous; however, courtesy follow-ups can be sent via email asking the agency if they have received the questionnaires or are willing to continue their participation in this study. The researcher could send a small thank you, such as coupon, maybe thank you cards, candy, or some form of a small monetary incentive to let the participants know their feedback is not only valued but critical and appreciated.

The researcher appreciates the data analysis of this research and hopes that it helps organizations and their employees with future growth.

References

Abadinsky, H. (2003). *Probation and parole: theory and practice 8th ed.* New
    Jersey: Prentice Hall

Black, C. (1990). *Black's Law Dictionary. 6th ed.* Minnesota: West Publishing
    Company.

Carroll, B. (1973). Job satisfaction: a review of the literature (rev. ed.)
    Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Davidson County Community Corrections Program (2005). *Administrative
    Policies and Procedures*: Nashville, TN: Tennessee Division of Criminal
    Court

Davidson County Drug Court Residential Program (2005). *Administrative
    Policies and Procedures*: Nashville, TN: Tennessee Division of Criminal
    Court

Dyer, L., & Theriault, R. (1976). The determinants of pay satisfaction. *Journal
    of Applied Psychology, 61,* 596-604.

Garcez, C. (2006). Job satisfaction: the challenges transformed organizations face.
    A. P. Lawrence

Gay, L. & Airasian, P. (2003). *Educational research: competencies for analysis
    and applications.* New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall

Hartland, T. (1996). *Changing correctional options that work: defining the
    Demand and evaluating the supply.* California: Sage.

Herman, R. (1999). Keeping good people: Strategies for solving the #1 problem
    facing business today (rev. ed.). Winchester, VA: Oakhill Press.

Herzberg, F. (1966) *Work and the nature of man*. The World Pub. Co.
    Cleveland and New York

Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction.* New York: Harper and Brothers.

Horne, P. (1985). Female correctional officers: A status report. *Federal
    Probation, 49,* 46-54

Hulin, C. L., Smith, P.C. (1964). Sex differences in job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* American Psychological Association. Pp.88-92.

Inlander, C., & Morgan, C. (1996). *63 ways to relieve tension and stay healthy.* Canada: Thomas Allen and Son.

Job. 2011. In *Merriam-Webster.com*. Retrieved April 4, 2012, from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/job

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

Lawler, E.E., III. (1973). *Motivation in work organizations.* Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Eds.), Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (pp.1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Markley, G. (1994). *the role of mission statements in community corrections.* APPA Perspective, pages 47-50

Meyer, J.P., Bobocel, D.R., & Allen, N.J. (1991). Development of organizational commitment during the first year of employment: A longitudinal study of pre- and post-entry influences. *Journal of Management, 17*, 717-733

McNeese-Smith, D. (1996). Increasing employee productivity, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Hospital and Health Administration*, 41, 160-168.

Mobley, W. H. (1977). Intermediate linkages in the relationship between job satisfaction & employee turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology,62,*237-240.

Muchinsky, P. (2000). Psychology applied to work: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology (6th ed.): US: Wadworth Thompson Learning.

Oliver, J. (1998). High staff turnover – find out why our staff are leaving. *Management Today, Jan,* p84 (1).

Petersilia, J. (2002). *Reforming probation and parole probation*: In the 21st Century. Maryland: American Correctional Association.

Rice, R.W., McFarlin, D. B., & Bennett, D.E. (1989). Standards of comparison and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 74,* 591-598.

Rogers, R. (1991). The effects of educational level on correctional officer job satisfaction." *Journal of Criminal Justice.* Vol. 19 (1991) pp. 23-137

Rogga, K., Schmidt, D., Shull, C., & Schmitt, N. (2001, July). Human resource practices, organizational climate, and customer satisfaction. *Journal of Management. Retrieve* February 29, 2004, from http:///www,findarticles.com/cf_dls/m4256/4.27/77627391/print.jhtml.

Satisfaction. 2011. In Merriam-Webster.com. Retrieved April 8, 2012, from http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/satisfaction

Spector, P. (2006). Industrial and organizational psychology: research and practice. New York, NY: John Wiley & sons, Inc.

Tennessee Department of Corrections (2005). *Annual Reports 2004-2005.* Nashville, Tennessee: Retrieved January 3, 2006 from the World Wide Web: http: www.state.tn.us/correction/planning/annualrpt.html

Whiteacre, K. W. (2006). Measuring job satisfaction and stress at a community corrections center: an evidence-based study. *Corrections Today Magazine Volume:68 Issue:3*, 70-73.

Worrall, A & Hoy, C. (2005). *Punishment in the community: managing offender and making choices 2nd edition.* Portland, Oregon: William Publishing.

Appendices

Appendix A

General Demographic Questionnaire

Directions: Please answer all questions listed below as truthfully as possible.

1. What is your gender?
A. Male
B. Female

2. What is your age?

  _____

3. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
A. trade/technical/vocational training
B. college graduate
C. some postgraduate work
D. post graduate degree

4. Which of the following best describes your primary role at your institution?
A. Assessor
B. Probation Officer
C. Case Officer
D. Counselor
E. Administrator (clerical, supervisor, manager, etc.)

5. Your institution would best be described as:
A. Public
B. Private (non profit)
C. Proprietary (for profit)

6. How long have you been employed at your organization?
A. Less than 3 years
B. 3-5 years
C. 6-10 years
D. Over 10 Years

7. How many cases do you currently supervise?
  _____

Appendix B

Organizational Commitment Questionnaire

QUESTIONS: PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT.	Disagree Very Much	Disagree Moderately	Disagree Slightly	Agree Slightly	Agree Moderately	Agree Very Much
1. I am quite proud to tell people who it is I work for?	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I sometimes feel like leaving the organization for good?	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I am not willing to put myself out just for the organization?	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Even if the organization was struggling financially I would be reluctant to find another employer?	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I feel myself to be part of the organization?	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. In my work I like to feel I am making some effort, not just for myself, but for the organization as well?	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. The offer of a bit more money with another employer would not seriously make me think of changing my job?	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I would not recommend a close friend to join our staff?	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. To know that my own work had made a contribution to the good of the organization would please me?	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix C
Job Satisfaction Survey

		Disagree very much	Disagree moderately	Disagree slightly	Agree slightly	Agree moderately	Agree very much
	PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT.						
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	I like the people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9	Communications seem good within this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10	Raises are too few and far between.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12	My supervisor is unfair to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
13	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	1	2	3	4	5	6
14	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15	My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17	I like doing the things I do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6

46

	PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT. Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994, All rights reserved.	Disagree very much	Disagree moderately	Disagree slightly	Agree slightly	Agree moderately	Agree very much
19	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
20	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	1	2	3	4	5	6
22	The benefit package we have is equitable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
23	There are few rewards for those who work here.	1	2	3	4	5	6
24	I have too much to do at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
25	I enjoy my coworkers.	1	2	3	4	5	6
26	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
27	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6
28	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	1	2	3	4	5	6
29	There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	1	2	3	4	5	6
30	I like my supervisor.	1	2	3	4	5	6
31	I have too much paperwork.	1	2	3	4	5	6
32	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	1	2	3	4	5	6
33	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	1	2	3	4	5	6
34	There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	1	2	3	4	5	6
35	My job is enjoyable.	1	2	3	4	5	6
36	Work assignments are not fully explained.	1	2	3	4	5	6

Appendix D

Organizational Commitment Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
I am proud to tell people who I work for.	56	1	6	4.70
I feel like leaving the organization for good.	55	1	6	3.80
I am not willing to put myself out for the organization.	56	1	6	3.64
If the organization is struggling financially, I would be reluctant to find another employer.	56	1	6	2.86
I feel like part of the organization.	56	1	6	4.50
I like to feel I am making some effort for the organization.	56	1	6	5.07
The offer of more money would not make me change jobs.	56	1	6	3.00
I would not recommend a friend to join our staff.	55	1	6	3.44
Pleases me to know my work benefits the organization.	56	3	6	5.39
Valid N (listwise)	55			

Appendix E

Job Satisfaction Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
I am being paid a fair amount.	55	0	6	2.11
There is too little chance for promotion.	56	1	6	4.57
My supervisor is competent.	55	1	6	4.76
I am not satisfied with my benefits.	55	1	6	2.98
When I do a good job I get recognition.	56	1	6	3.21
Many of our rules make doing a good job hard.	56	1	6	3.54
I like the people I work with.	55	1	6	4.96
I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	56	1	6	3.14
Communication seems good.	56	1	6	2.98
Raises are few and far between.	56	1	6	5.16
Those who do well will be promoted.	55	1	6	2.75
My supervisor is unfair.	55	1	6	2.25
The benefits we receive are as good as anywhere else.	55	1	6	4.47
My work is not appreciated.	55	1	6	3.80
My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	54	1	6	3.48
I work harder because my coworkers are incompetent.	56	1	6	3.23
I like doing the things I do at work.	56	1	6	4.68

The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	55	1	6	2.62
I feel unappreciated when I think about my pay.	55	1	6	4.38
People get ahead as fast here as somewhere else.	55	1	6	2.38
My supervisor shows no interest in feelings of workers.	55	1	6	3.20
Our benefit package is equitable.	52	1	6	4.31
There are few rewards for those that work here.	56	1	6	4.46
I have too much work to do.	56	1	6	4.14
I enjoy my coworkers.	55	1	6	5.02
I feel I don't know what is going on in the organization.	56	1	6	3.98
I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	56	1	6	4.80
I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	55	1	6	2.33
There are benefits we don't have that we should.	55	1	6	3.73
I like my supervisor.	55	1	6	4.67
I have too much paperwork.	56	1	6	4.46
I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	55	1	6	4.36
I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	55	1	6	2.53
There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	55	1	6	4.11
My job is enjoyable.	56	1	6	4.43
Work assignments are not fully explained.	55	1	6	2.89
Valid N (listwise)	49			

Appendix F

MIDDLE TENNESSEE
STATE UNIVERSITY

July 31, 2012

Ashley Grose
Department of Criminal Justice Administration
asg3f@mtmail.mtsu.edu , Joshua.harms@mtsu.edu

Protocol Title: "Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment within Davidson County Community Corrections and Davidson County Board of Probation and Parole"

Protocol Number: 13-019

Dear Investigator(s),

The MTSU Institutional Review Board, or a representative of the IRB, has reviewed the research proposal identified above. The MTSU IRB or its representative has determined that the study poses minimal risk to participants and qualifies for an expedited review under the 45 CFR 46.110 Category 7.

Approval is granted for one (1) year from the date of this letter for 200 participants.

According to MTSU Policy, a researcher is defined as anyone who works with data or has contact with participants. Anyone meeting this definition needs to be listed on the protocol and needs to provide a certificate of training to the Office of Compliance. If you add researchers to an approved project, please forward an updated list of researchers and their certificates of training to the Office of Compliance (c/o Emily Born, Box 134) before they begin to work on the project. Any change to the protocol must be submitted to the IRB before implementing this change.

Please note that any unanticipated harms to participants or adverse events must be reported to the Office of Compliance at (615) 494-8918.

You will need to submit an end-of-project form to the Office of Compliance upon completion of your research located on the IRB website. Complete research means that you have finished collecting and analyzing data. Should you not finish your research within the one (1) year period, you must submit a Progress Report and request a continuation prior to the expiration date. Please allow time for review and requested revisions. Your study expires July 31, 2013.

Also, all research materials must be retained by the PI or faculty advisor (if the PI is a student) for at least three (3) years after study completion. Should you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Emily Born

Emily Born
Research Compliance Officer
Middle Tennessee State University

Appendix G

INFORMED CONSENT

My name is Ashley Grose and I am currently a graduate student trying to fulfill the partial requirement of my thesis in the Master's of Criminal Justice Administration program at Middle Tennessee State University. The purpose of this study is to examine job satisfaction amongst the staff of the Davidson County Community Corrections Program. This research will be conducted by a questionnaire. The questionnaire will consist of the Job Descriptive Index (JDI), Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ), and various attitudinal and demographic questions.

The data will be obtained by utilizing an anonymous, voluntary questionnaire. *The participant is voluntarily filling out the questionnaire and may choose to answer or not answer any of these questions. There are no anticipated risks and you can withdraw at any time with no negative consequences.* It will take approximately thirty minutes to read the survey and fill out the answer sheet. Also, the researcher will notify each individual that they are to remain truthful about their opinions of their overall job satisfaction and moral within the organization.

You must first read and sign this informed consent form and return before the researcher is able to distribute the survey. All willing participants of the program understand they will be given a week during the data-gathering period to actively participate. The participants will have one week to return the survey to the researcher within the provided envelope. All participants should understand they are free to email me at grose.ashley@gmail.com or call 615-862-8589 if you have any questions or concerns.

I would finally like to thank every participant for taking their time to fill out this survey. These efforts will enable me to continue with my research and come one step closer to fulfilling my Thesis requirements.

If you have any questions, comments, or concerns about the study or the informed consent,

you may write or call Ashley Grose at Davidson County Community Corrections at 408 2nd

Ave. North, Suite 2100, Nashville, TN 37201, 615-862-8589

I acknowledge that I have read, understand, and received a copy of the Consent Form.

_____

Signature   Date