

Job Satisfaction Among Probation and Parole Staff Employed by the
Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Corrections

By

Garen Avery Blanchard

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master
of Criminal Justice Administration

Middle Tennessee State University

August 2014

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Robert Rogers, Chair

Dr. Lance Selva

Dr. Michael Montgomery

I would like to dedicate this project to two very special people, both of whom during my childhood showed faith in the blind kid, believing when others refused to, that I possessed the tools to be a successful and productive member of society, despite physical limitations. First is my aunt, neighbor, babysitter, and friend Lagonda Blanchard who passed away during my sophomore year of high school. Secondly, my cousin and 7th and 8th grade history teacher William Clay “Bill” Blazer, without whose compassion, encouragement, faith, and support, I would never have made it past high school let alone obtain a Bachelor’s Degree. Bill transcended the role of educator and became a true teacher not only, of course work but also the life lessons he embodied.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to recognize several people for helping me with this project. First and foremost my most patient faculty advisor, Dr. Robert Rogers, thank you for being patient with me during this process. I know it took a lot longer than either of us wanted it to. I wish to thank my brother from another mother, Joe Carlini, who provided me with motivation and inspiration in more ways than he will ever know, and provided my driving force to finish my degree, my best friend and field work partner for over 5 years, John Grissom, for reminding me every single day that I needed to complete my Master's, my other co-workers at the Tennessee Department of Correction for helping me complete this project and encouraging me to better myself, to the wonderful employees of the Kentucky Department of Corrections Probation and Parole Division for allowing me the privilege of working with them and, letting me give voice to their opinions, and to my family and friends for the moral and financial support and love they have shown.

ABSTRACT

This study is based upon a voluntary, anonymous questionnaire survey of the job satisfaction and organizational commitment of probation and parole officers (n=223) in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Standardized validation scales were used: the Job In-General Scale (a global measure of job satisfaction), the Job Descriptive Index (a facet measure of job satisfaction), and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (a measure of loyalty to the agency itself). In brief the probation and parole officers (PO's) were satisfied with the nature of the work itself. They liked their coworkers and supervisors, but were severely dissatisfied with their pay and promotional opportunities. They demonstrated an average level of organizational commitment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER I Introduction	1
Motivation for Working	1
Job Satisfaction	2
Approaches	3
Organizational Commitment	6
Burnout	9
Core Self-Evaluation	10
Temperament and Personality	11
Stress	12
Turnover	13
Probation and Parole History	15
Caseload Model	18
Paperwork and Consequences	20
Pay, Supervision and Promotion	22
Authority	23
Officer Safety	25
Role Conflict/Ambiguity	27

Approach	28
Burnout and Turnover	29
Cost	30
Stress Reduction	31
CHAPTER II Methodology	34
Purpose of Study	34
Measures	34
Sample Population	36
Hypothesis	37
CHAPTER III Results	38
Job in General Scale	38
Job Descriptive Index	39
Organizational Commitment Questionnaire	42
Correlation Coefficients	43
Reliability Coefficients	44
Length of Service	45
Rank	51
Time in Grade	57
Type of Work	63
Sex	69
Age	74

Race	79
Education Level	84
Job Autonomy	89
Political Orientation	95
Regression Analysis	100
CHAPTER IV Conclusion	102
References	105
Appendices	114
Appendix A IRB Approval Letter	115
Appendix B Participant Questionnaire	116

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Mean Job in General Satisfaction Scores for all Employees	38
Table 2: Job Descriptive Index Scores for all Participants	39
Table 3: OCQ Scores for all Participants	42
Table 4: Pearson’s ‘r’ Correlation Coefficients	43
Table 5: Cronbach’s Alpha Reliability Coefficient	44
Table 6: Mean Job in General Satisfaction Scores for Length of Service	45
Table 7: Mean JDI Satisfaction Scores for Length of Service	47
Table 8: Mean OCQ Scores for Length of Service	50
Table 9: Mean JIG Scores for Rank	51
Table 10: Mean JDI Scores for Rank	53
Table 11: Mean OCQ Scores for Rank	56
Table 12: Mean Scores for JIG for Time in Grade	57
Table 13: Mean JDI Scores for Time in Grade	59
Table 14: Mean OCQ Scores for Time in Grade	62
Table 15: Mean JIG Scores for Respondents for Type of Work	63

Table 16: Mean JDI Scores for Respondents Based on Type of Work.....	65
Table 17: Mean OCQ Scores for Respondents Based on Work Performed.....	68
Table 18: Mean JIG Scores for Respondents Based on Sex.....	69
Table 19: Mean JDI Scores for Respondents Based Upon Sex.....	70
Table 20: Mean OCQ Scores Based Upon Sex of Respondent.....	73
Table 21: Mean JIG Scores for Respondents Based Upon Age.....	74
Table 22: Mean JDI Scores for Respondents Based on Age.....	75
Table 23: Mean OCQ Scores for Respondents Based on Age.....	78
Table 24: Mean JIG Scores for Respondents by Race.....	79
Table 25: Mean JDI Scores Based Upon Race.....	80
Table 26: Mean OCQ Scores for Respondents Based on Ethnicity.....	83
Table 27: Mean JIG Scores for Education Level.....	84
Table 28: Mean JDI Scores Based on Education Level.....	85
Table 29: Mean OCQ Scores for Education Level.....	88
Table 30: Mean JIG Scores for Job Autonomy.....	89
Table 31: Mean JDI Scores for Job Autonomy.....	91
Table 32: Mean OCQ Scores for Job Autonomy.....	94

Table 33: Mean JIG Scores for Political Orientation	95
Table 34: Mean JDI Scores for Political Orientation	96
Table 35: Mean OCQ Scores for Political Orientation	99
Comparison Table.....	104

CHAPTER I

Introduction

Motivation for Working

Prior to discussing job satisfaction and all the parameters and components, we must first discuss, why do we work? There are numerous reasons we, as human beings, have to work. Amahile, Hill, Hennessey, and Tighe (1994) outline two schools of thought as to why we work. “The labor of love aspect driving human behavior is what psychologists have, for several decades called *intrinsic motivation*: the motivation to engage in work primarily for its own sake, because the work itself is interesting, engaging, or in some way satisfying” (Amahile et al., 1994, 950). This school of thought on working implies we work because we want to, independent of any other factors. On some level, working satisfies an internal desire to partake in a working environment.

In contrast to the previous motivational school of thought, Amahile et al (1994) offer the following, “The contrasting concern . . . fits the definition of *extrinsic motivation*: the motivation to work primarily in response to something apart from the work itself, such as reward or recognition or the dictates of other people” (Amahile et al., 1994, 950). This school of thought indicates outside factors that drive the work of humankind. Working rewards us with things we need such as pay, which we, in turn, use to trade for goods or services such as food, housing, health care needs, family and any number of other necessary goods or services. In some cases, we work for recognition or the notoriety of the job we do. As we will discuss later, probation and parole work can be

satisfied more with recognition and knowing you have saved someone's life or property. For a limited number of unfortunate souls, we also work because we are forced to; this indicates slavery or forced work such as in prisons.

Where we fall within these two frameworks will invariably affect the type of work we choose to participate in. "Those who are themselves strongly intrinsically motivated may strive to select work assignments that allow them to develop new skills, exercise creativity, and become deeply involved in their work. They may also tend to see their work environments in terms that support their intrinsic motivation, and they may seek occupations where intrinsic motivators are salient" (Amabile et al., 1994, 951). Thus our views on why we work may also influence what jobs or professions we choose to participate in and may help determine how well we are satisfied in those positions.

Conversely, the opposite holds true as well. If we are strongly motivated by extrinsic motivators Amabile et al. (1994) offer the following statement: "individuals who are strongly extrinsically motivated may view their work environment in terms of its extrinsic controls, and they may seek occupations where extrinsic motivators are salient" (Amabile et al., 1994, 951). This would refer to people who take a job based on benefits, pay scale, etc. These factors all combine to help us determine whether we are satisfied with our jobs.

Job Satisfaction

In order to discuss job satisfaction and job satisfaction surveys we must examine what defines job satisfaction. "Job satisfaction is an attitudinal variable that reflects how

people feel about their jobs overall as well as about various aspects of the jobs. In simple terms, job satisfaction is the extent to which people like their jobs” (Spector, 2012, 223). According to Veronesi, “we do tend to spend about one third of our lives at work” (Veronesi, 2009, 124). Given the amount of time the average American spends at work; “I/O (Industrial and Organizational) psychologists have had a long-standing interest in job satisfaction” (Muchinsky, 2012, 271).

Job satisfaction research can, in many ways trace its roots to 1943 and a man named Abraham Maslow. According to Bangasser (2010), “Maslow indicated that humans need to satisfy physiological needs, such as hunger, prior to meeting any other needs. When that is done, higher needs emerge in the form of a hierarchy” (Bangasser, 2010, 38). That hierarchy is described as moving from meeting the need of safety, then love, and then esteem. “When that (need for love), is gratified, the need for esteem comes through. This need often applies to an individual’s work life and level of satisfaction with employment. Self-esteem, drives much of a person’s adequacy and capability at work” (Bangasser, 2010, 38).

Approaches

Spector identifies two approaches that have been utilized in measuring job satisfaction. “The global approach treats job satisfaction as a single, overall feeling toward the job. The alternative approach is to focus on job facets or different aspects of the job” (Spector, 2012, 224). Spector goes on to define some examples of aspects of the facet approach: rewards, other people, nature of the job, and the conditions in which we

work. These two approaches form the basis for most research conducted in the arena of job satisfaction.

“The global approach treats job satisfaction as a single overall feeling toward the job” (Spector, 2012, 224). This approach is utilized by many researchers and is incorporated within the facet approach when discussing overall job satisfaction. A 2012 annual report presented by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), indicates that 81% of Americans were satisfied with their jobs. This was down two percentage points since 2011 and down five percentage points since the highest recording of 86% in 2009 (SHRM, 2012, 3).

“The facet approach permits a more complete picture of job satisfaction. An individual typically has different levels of satisfaction with the various facets” (Spector, 2012, 224). Bangasser (2010) states that “when people discuss feeling happy about their work, they typically talk about their work tasks and things that make them successful in their performance. However, when discussing what makes them unhappy, they do not talk about the job itself but rather the conditions that surround the job, such as supervisors, interpersonal relations, physical conditions, salary, policies and procedures of the organization, benefits and job security” (Bangasser, 2010, 38).

Most American's appear to be happy with their jobs but not with all the aspects of their jobs. Spector lists a hierarchy of facets prioritizing satisfaction from greatest satisfaction level to the least satisfied as being: nature of work, supervision, co-workers, fringe benefits, communication, working conditions, promotion, and pays (Spector, 2012, 225). Concerning pay, Kimball and Nink (2006) state, “more than half of all workers

earning more than \$50,000 are satisfied with their jobs” (Kimball & Nink, 2006, 67). They also go on to state that, “of those earning less than \$15,000 only 45 percent are satisfied” (Kimball & Nink, 2006, 67).

The debate in the field of job satisfaction has been waged between these two approaches. The argument is over which one of these approaches provides the most accurate results in determining how satisfied we are with our employment decisions. Ironson, Brannick, Smith, Gibson, and Paul (1989) introduce us to a possible answer to this debate: “Composite scales take a different approach to obtaining a general measure. They assume, that the whole is equal to the sum of its parts” (Ironson et al., 1989, 194). While showing promise to marry the two scales, composite scales also have several limitations. Ironson et al. (1989), list a number of major drawbacks to this type of job satisfaction determination, among them, the omission of certain facets that are unimportant to the individual and the opposite, addition of facets that are equally unimportant. One of the major flaws pointed out by Ironson et al. (1989), seemingly goes against their definition of composite scales. “Simply adding facets or combining them in a single linear manner for all people may not capture the unique individual method of combining components to arrive at a summary feeling” (Ironson et al., 1989, 194). Despite these flaws Ironson et al. (1989) also note the positive effects of studying a composite scale for determining job satisfaction: “Despite these objections, a good linear combination of the JDI [Job Descriptive Index] facet scales might actually provide a good estimation of the general satisfaction” (Ironson et al., 1989, 194).

Organizational Commitment

Elbert Hubbard once said that, “An ounce of loyalty [commitment] is worth a pound of cleverness” (Wright & Bonett, 2002, 1183). The sheer amount of time we spend at work during our lifetime dictates that we have an enjoyable experience, as it will define us in many ways: “After all, we do spend about one third of our lives at work, so we should be sure that it’s a match made in heaven!” (Veronesi, 2009, 124). “Though it is naïve to think that happy workers are invariably productive workers, much research evidence collected from a variety of occupations suggests that a worker’s satisfaction does influence his job behavior” (Churchwell, Ford, & Walker, 1976, 323).

Satisfaction is a key factor in turnover rates. However, there are other components that have a higher statistical influence: “At the individual level, satisfaction is the most frequently studied psychological variable thought to be related to turnover. However, the satisfaction-turnover relationship, although consistent, usually accounts for less than 16% of the variance in turnover” (Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, & Meglino, 1979, 495).

The concept of organizational commitment refers to “employees’ commitment to their employers” (Meyer, Allen, & Smith 1993, 538). Organizational commitment has emerged in the past thirty or so years as a topic of study: “Not only has the number of studies directly concerned with the development of consequences of commitment increased dramatically, but also commitment is often included as a variable in studies where it is the primary focus of attention” (Meyer et al., 1993, 538). A better definition of organization commitment could perhaps be found in earlier works by other authors:

“More specifically, organizational commitment was defined as the strength of an individual’s identification with and involvement in a particular organization” (Mobley et al., 1979, 508)

According to Mobley et al. (1979), organizational commitment has three main characteristics. “It’s characterized by (a) a strong belief in and acceptance of an organizations goals and values, (b) a willingness to exert considerable effort on behalf of the organization, and (c) a definite desire to maintain organizational membership” (Mobley et al., 1979, 508). The first characteristic can also play into morale and is commonly referred to as “buying into” an organization or the way that organization works. The second characteristic is often promoted with incentives such as “employee of the month” or offering overtime. The third characteristic fulfills our need for employment regardless of how far away from the first two the worker is the third one motivates a lot of people to stay where they are. The three combine to form a level of emotional attachment: “Employees with a strong level of attitudinal commitment remain with the organization because they want to” (Wright & Bonett, 2002, 1184).

There is also some discussion on levels of organizational commitment based upon tenure. Given initial ideologies about what to expect and what actually occurs once one has entered an employment setting, this would seemingly feed the first characteristic, previously discussed: “[E]xperienced employees who, for whatever reason, do not leave their job might respond by withdrawing their commitment to work and retiring on the job” (Wright & Bonett, 2002, 1184). Wright and Bonett also state, “More tenured workers may increasingly become more burned out and less motivated” (Wright &

Bonett, 2002, 1184). In furtherance of this point Wright and Bonett (2002) also offer this insight on new or less tenured employees; “new employees exhibiting the honeymoon effect are typically more enthusiastic, exhibit increased job satisfaction, and are committed to their work situations” (Wright & Bonett, 2002, 1184).

The closely related topic of occupational commitment is also known as job attachment. This area of interest shows that one has a commitment to a certain profession not a particular company. A good example would be truck drivers. A driver for company A might be happier driving for company B for varying reasons including internal policies, benefits, pay or any number of external or internal factors. “Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) identified three distinct themes in the definition of commitment: commitment as an affective attachment to the organization, commitment as a perceived cost associated with leaving the organization, and commitment as an obligation to remain in the organization” (Meyer et al., 1993, 539).

According to Mobley et al. (1979) the concept of job attachment or occupational commitment involves three major characteristics, “job attachment is an attitudinal response to one’s job characterized by (a) a congruence between one’s real and ideal jobs, (b) an identification with one’s chosen occupation, and (c) a reluctance to seek alternative employment” (Mobley et al., 1979, 508). These are solely based on the individual workers beliefs and feelings about their area of professional interest and current location along that professional continuum.

Burnout

“Burnout is defined as “a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among people who do “people-work” of some kind” (Bangasser, 2010, 44). Chiu and Tsai (2006) define burnout as “a severe psychological and physical syndrome that occurs in response to prolonged stress at work” (Chiu & Tsai, 2006, 517). “For the helping professional who works continuously with people under such circumstances, the chronic stress can be emotionally draining and pose the risk of burnout” (Maslach & Jackson, 1981, 99).

Burnout research has been conducted since the late 1960's. Burnout was being studied as early as 1969 (Whitehead, 1985, 91). Whitehead further states, “In the last ten to fifteen years the phenomenon of burnout has become a topic of serious concern to students of the human services occupation” (Whitehead, 1985, 91). Leiter (1991) attributes early usage of the term to a researcher other than Bradley: “The term [burnout] first found its way into the psychological literature in an article by Freudenberger (1974) in an issue of the *Journal of Social Issues* he edited on people working in free clinics” (Leiter, 1991, 547).

Maslach and Jackson (1981) define three aspects of burnout, all of which can be applied to probation and parole officers. The first aspect is increasing feelings of emotional fatigue. This leaves the worker feeling drained and unable to carry on emotionally. The second aspect identified is the development of negative or even cynical views about the people on the workers caseloads. The third and final aspect of burnout is

intense negative self-evaluation. This process leaves the workers feeling unhappy in general, and lessens the satisfaction they derive from their work product.

Core Self-Evaluation

Core self-evaluations are essential in determining how employees feel about themselves on both the personal and professional levels. “Judge et al. (1997), defined core self-evaluations as fundamental assessments that individuals make about themselves and their self-worth” (Judge, Bono, & Locke, 2000, 237). Judge & Bono (2001) stated, “Despite a lack of studies linking core self-evaluations to job satisfaction and, specifically, to job performance, three of the core traits (self-esteem, locus of control and emotional stability) appear to be the most widely studied personality traits in personality and applied psychology” (Judge & Bono, 2001, 80).

Also identified by Judge et al. (2000) were “four dispositional traits: self-esteem, generalized self-efficiency, locus of control and low neuroticism.” Judge, Locke, Durham, and Kluger (1998) offer the following definitions for the four aspects of core self-evaluations: “Self-esteem is the basic appraisal people make of themselves” (Judge et al., 1998, 18). “Judge et al. (1997) defined generalized self-efficiency as one’s estimates of one’s capabilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources, and courses of action needed to exercise general control over events in one’s life” (Judge et al., 1998, 19). “Locus of control concerns the degree to which individuals believe that they control events in their lives (internal locus of control) or believe that the environment or fate controls events (external locus of control)” (Judge et al., 1998, 19). “[Neuroticism] constitutes the negative pole of self-esteem” (Judge et al., 1998, 19).

“[Core Self-Evaluation] was proposed to account for dispositional effects on job satisfaction. In this regard, CSE has proven successful, with studies supporting the relation of CSE with job satisfaction” (Ferris, Rosen, Djardjevic, Johnson, & Chang, 2013, 342). This supports using self-evaluation tools to determine or predict turnover intention or levels of burnout for employees. “[T]here is also evidence of a direct relationship between these concepts. Judge et al, (1998) hypothesized and found a direct link between core self-evaluation and job satisfaction” (Judge et al, 2000, 240).

Temperament and Personality

“Temperament is defined as individual differences in emotional, motor, and attentional reactivity measured by latency, intensity, and recovery of response and self-regulation processes such as effortful control that modulate reactivity” (Rothbart, 2007, 207). Temperament like most concepts we have looked at has multiple components to it: there are “[N]ine dimensions of temperament . . . included activity level, approach/withdrawal, intensity, threshold, adaptability, rhythmicity, mood, attention span, persistence, and distractibility” (Rothbart, 2007, 207-208). Having an understanding of temperament and its effect on personality is paramount to understanding how one evaluates one’s self and one’s environment. It also offers a greater insight into how one may react to and deal with job stress, as well as shape ones opinion of his working environment.

Personality plays a huge role in determining one’s job satisfaction level:

“Research has shown that positively disposed individuals rate characteristics of the task or the job as more enriched than do less positively disposed individuals” (Judge et al.,

2000, 239). Happiness or perceived happiness has been shown to have positive effects on people. The old adage laughter is the best medicine might not be too far off the mark. When we are happier, our stress levels go down freeing us from the negative health effects of stress. “Outside of the organizational sciences, it has been common for scholars to treat “happiness” as psychological well-being (sometimes called personal well-being or subjective well-being” (Wright, Cropanzano, & Bonett, 2007, 95).

Wright et al. (2007) further identify three characteristics of psychological well-being/happiness: “First, happiness is a subjective experience . . . people are happy to the extent that they believe themselves to be happy. Second, happiness includes both the relative presence of positive emotions and the relative absence of negative emotions. Third, happiness is a global judgment. It refers to one’s life as a whole” (Wright et al., 2007, 95). While happiness is not a sole predictor of job satisfaction, it may prove to be a good indicator.

Stress

“Studies have shown that satisfied employees live longer, healthier lives and are happier, more cooperative, more dependable, less critical and less likely to quit their jobs” (Whiteacre, 2006, 70). Whiteacre, (2006) was focused on correctional staff and found them to be more highly stressed than the average worker, and having higher risks for certain physical ailments. “[C]orrectional 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, 70). These effects on workers can be linked to higher rates of job dissatisfaction, and, in general, greater numbers of life dissatisfaction.

Turnover

“Employee turnover is a behavior of interest to many disciplines and is subject to analysis and discussion at many levels of discourse” (Mobley et al., 1979, 493). Mobley et al. (1979) also indicate that “turnover is an individual’s choice in behavior. Thus, the individual is the primary unit of analysis” (Mobley et al., 1979, 493). In this definition Mobley et al. (1979) is referring to voluntary turnover: “Turnover can be voluntary, which has been determined to be beyond the control of management, or involuntary, which is at the control of management” (Bangasser, 2010, 50). In voluntary turnover, there are many factors the individual will take into account before leaving a job or an employer.

“At the macro level, economists and personnel researchers have demonstrated the relationship between turnover rates and the aggregate level of economic activity, employment levels and vacancy levels” (Mobley et al., 1979, 493). “Turnover and absence are often referred to as withdraw behaviors because they reflect the employee withdrawing from a noxious employment condition, either temporarily (absence) or permanently (turnover)” (Muchinsky, 2012, 272). “Employee turnover is a significant problem for many organizations . . . commercial, government and military sectors, especially those where change is prevalent.” (Proudfoot, Corr, Guest, & Dunn, 2009, 147)

There are three types of factors that affect an employee's decision to quit his current job. The first set of factors is demographic and highly personal in nature: "Included in this category are age, tenure, sex, family responsibilities, education, personality, other personal considerations, and weighted application blanks" (Mobley et al., 1979, 496). Mobley et al., (1979) report age only accounts for 7% of the variance between job satisfaction and turnover. Tenure is one of the best single predictors of turnover. Sex is also a good indicator with women being more likely to quit. Married employees quit at lower rates. Education level has also been shown to influence turnover.

The second type of factors, are external to the employee's self or, as Mobley et al. (1979) call them, organizational and work environment factors. These factors include "pay and promotion, supervision, and peer group relations" (Mobley et al., 1979, 500). Pay, in particular, has been the focus of extensive study. Hellriegel and White (1973) referred to workers as either leavers or stayers. They indicated that leavers had much more negative attitudes toward pay than did stayers. The leavers also report increases in pay at their new employment.

The third set of factors identified by Mobley et al. (1979) is external environment. External environment refers to the employment market. In other words, attention is paid to how many vacancies are available in a given field: "Economists and sociologists have documented the aggregate relationship between economic indicators such as employment levels or job vacancy rates and turnover rates" (Mobley et al., 1979, 504).

Probation and Parole History

Now that we have explored the broad world of job satisfaction and organizational commitment we should discuss the mysterious and exciting world of probation and parole services. A report by the National Institutes of Justice (NIJ), it is asserted that the typical community corrections field agency is “the only agency that deals with the offender at every stage of their journey through the criminal justice process” (NIJ, 2003, i). Probation officers deal with every aspect of an offender’s journey from pre-trial supervision to pre-sentence investigations to the actual supervision of the offender in the community. Probation officers also have the distinction of “being the only entity that deals directly with all of the government actors, community members, victims and families that are part of the overall process” (NIJ, 2003, i). In the words of Paparozzi “Probation and parole is a matter of serious consequence, it interacts with matters of life, death, harm and cost to society” (Paparozzi, 2003, 46).

The American Probation and Parole Association or APPA is America’s largest profession organization for probation and parole officers. According to the APPA website, probation is defined as, “a court order through which an offender is placed under the control, supervision and care of a probation field staff member in lieu of imprisonment, so long as the probationer meets certain standards of conduct” (APPA, 2013). Those standards vary from state to state and even jurisdiction to jurisdiction with some judges imposing their own rules. More intensive offenders also have further restrictions with implementation of other intermediate sanctions such as curfews, wearing

house arrest devices, alcohol detection devices, global positioning monitors and more frequent face-to-face reporting.

Probation is imposed by the courts, whereas parole is determined by the executive branch of government. The only functional difference between probation and parole officer is that, in addition to supervising a caseload of offenders, probation officers also write pre-sentence investigation reports. The APPA defines parole as “the term of supervision that occurs once offenders are conditionally released to the community after serving a prison term” (APPA, 2013). Parole is most often administered by an independent body known as a Parole Board or Board of Probation and Parole. Probation and parole may be administered by the same field agency or by separate agencies.

Over the decades, probation and parole work has changed. “At year end 2008, 5,095,200 offenders were under community supervision – the equivalent of about 1 in every 45 adults in the United States. Probationers (4,270,917) represented the majority (84%) of offenders under community supervision. Parolees (828,169) accounted for a significantly smaller share (16%) of this population” (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2009, 1). According to this same BJS report the data indicate a growth of over 600,000 since 2000. In other words, the growth rate is quite high. Furthermore, “Of that number, 40% have committed a misdemeanor or other petty offense, and 60% are on probation for a felony crime” (Schloss & Alarid, 2007, 233). ‘

Considering the fact that probation [and parole] officers have contact with more offenders than most other justice practitioners, and probation [and parole] caseloads have continued to increase at unprecedented levels, there is a need to understand more about

the work of probation [and parole]” (Slate, Wells, & Johnson, 2003, 520). With this growth in caseload size for probation and parole officers nationwide stress for probation and parole officers has also been on the rise.

Probation work was born of an era of enlightenment in the mid-1800s. This transitional period was from an era of retribution justice to one of a reformatory philosophy. “As science and positivist criminology developed toward the end of the 1800’s, new beliefs developed with the emergence of the concept of criminal responsibility, and the focus shifted to the punishment needing to fit the needs of the offender, or what is referred to now as rehabilitation” (Bangasser, 2010, 15).

In 1841 one man emerged as the clear beginning point in the history of probation: “John Augustus, who has been credited with “inventing” probation in an abrupt surge of uncontrollable inspiration while sitting in a courtroom” (Clear, 2005, 172). According to Bangasser Augustus rose from a humble Bostonian boot maker to become the “Father of Probation”. “Augustus supervised offenders in the community as an alternative to locking them up” (Bangasser, 2010, 15).

It wasn’t until 1878 that any state passed legislation pertaining to, or regulating probation. That state was Augustus’s’ home state of Massachusetts. The next state, Vermont, did not follow suit until 1897. Bangasser (2010) reports that by the 1930’s, 36 states had some form of probation and the practice had been adopted by the United States Government for use at the federal level. According to the APPA, it wasn’t until 1956 that all states had adult probation laws, the last holdout being Mississippi.

The work of a probation officer has changed since its inception. Paradigm shifts, increasing demands, and technological advancements have all altered supervision of offenders in a number of ways. “By 1930 . . . the focus on probation and rehabilitation came with the rise of the medical model, or the postulation that the criminal behavior of offenders was caused by biological, social, or psychological deficiencies that required treatment” (Bangasser, 2010, 16).

“Since the early 1960’s to the present, there have been four discernible probation ideologies: offender rehabilitation (late 1960’s to mid-1970’s); offender punishment and justice for victims (mid-1970’s to early 1980’s); intermediate sanctions, punishments and treatment interventions (mid-1980’s to late 1990’s); and community involvement, interagency collaboration and offender re-entry (late 1990’s to 2002)” (Paparozzi, 2003, 46). It should be noted that this last period has continued into the present time. There are four goals for probation and parole officers that have in whole or part held true in each phase: “crime prevention, public safety, justice and restoration” (Paparozzi, 2003, 46).

Caseload Model

In the 172-year history of probation and parole in America one thing has remained constant; the caseload model. “[I]n some ways John Augustus was inspired on that lofty day to do for the first time what innumerable probation officers have done since: oversee a caseload assigned by the court” (Clear, 2005, 172). “Not only have there always been caseloads, in some ways there have never been anything but caseloads” (Clear, 2005, 173). Caseloads are one of the main stressors, they reflect the amount of

work that a supervising officer must complete and enumerate the amount of people supervised by and thus come into contact with a probation and parole officer.

Caseload size has been a hotly debated topic among researchers and officers alike. It is argued that higher caseloads are less effective in rehabilitating offenders and more stressful for the officers supervising them. “People who believed in caseloads were convinced of two things. First they believed smaller was better. Second, they believed that some optimum size could be identified that would set an upper standard, that above which it would be unwise to go” (Clear, 2005, 174). A 2005 study conducted by the Nation Institute of Justice on stress among probation and parole officers listed caseload size as the top stressor faced by officers. “High caseloads are the major source of stress . . . the average supervision caseload of a probation officer is very high: 139” (NIJ, 2005, 2).

With regard to caseload size, the APPA argues, “high priority would require 4 hours per month equaling 30 as a total caseload” (APPA, 2013). Sex offenders, would be a good example of the type of criminals placed on a high risk caseload. “Medium priority would require 2 hours per month equaling 60 as a total caseload. Low priority would require 1 hour per month equaling 120 as a total caseload . . . based on an officer having 120 hours per month to spend on offenders” (APPA, 2013). Caseloads are growing despite these optimal size caseloads suggested by the APPA. “The increase in probationers has caused an overall increase in caseload size, with each officer responsible for supervising more offenders. This has caused officers to devote less time to each client, reducing the quality of supervision” (Schloss & Alarid, 2007, 233).

Paperwork and Consequences

Big caseloads are not the only major stressor faced by probation and parole officers. Paperwork has been shown to be one of the biggest stressors reported by probation and parole officers (Slate et al., 2003, 522). Paperwork is an inherent stressor because probation and parole officers must also make deadlines and prepare reports and warrants for the courts in a timely manner. Moreover they must conduct unscheduled home visits and make court appearances. Keeping up with paperwork is so stressful that, according to a 2005 stress survey conducted by the National Institutes of Justice, “Paperwork follows as the next most significant stress factor” (NIJ, 2005, 2). Paperwork was ranked just below caseloads on the officers’ priorities list. Furthermore, “Even when management information systems have reduced paperwork, officers still may be dealing with unwieldy hardware and software” (NIJ, 2005, 2).

Why is paperwork so important in the community corrections world? The phrase “if it’s not documented, it did not happen” is frequently used. “[A] substantial value is placed on paperwork, which is the main strategy by which one ‘covers one’s exposed parts’. Experienced probation officers know that no matter how well a case seems to be going, it can always blow up in a big and astonishing way. The last thing a probation officer needs to have is an irregularity in the probationer’s behavior that received no response, immediately followed by a dramatic new crime” (Clear, 2005, 176). Clear’s statement seems to almost suggest a love/hate type of relationship between the probation and parole officers and the paperwork they must fill out. The paperwork acts as a buffer between them and the heightened scrutiny that they might face if one of their offenders

should do something that makes the news in a very dramatic way. Clear (2005) captured the view point of many probation and parole officers when he wrote: “Much the better to cross all one’s T’s and dot one’s I’s: paper that covers decisions (especially paper of this type that has been reviewed by a supervisor) is a good thing, comforting and protective, for a person whose work leaves a certain exposure to the risk of rare but nonetheless tumultuous events” (Clear, 2005, 176).

Such a fear is justified. During the summer of 2011, Nashville’s newspaper, *The Tennessean* ran a series of articles regarding the now defunct Tennessee Board of Probation and Parole. These articles centered on officers being overworked and underpaid for their jobs and how important their work was to the safety of the citizens of the state of Tennessee.

One of the cases reported by the media involved an offender who had reported to his officer that he was homeless, when in actuality he had moved into a cheap pay-by-the-week motel with his girlfriend and her children. The officer had no way of knowing of these violations of the law at the time. One night the offender was left alone to babysit a five-month-old baby girl; she began crying at some point during the night. The offender struck the girl in the head and began shaking her to stop her from crying. Upon arriving home from work, her mother discovered her unresponsive and her head severely swollen, the child later passed away at Vanderbilt Children’s Hospital.

At that time, the officer was an employee of the Tennessee Board of Probation and Parole. The administration of the board was more interested in what the officer had done instead of focusing on the criminal behavior of the offender. The officer had to

endure roughly three months of 100% file audits, as did other members of the Davidson County Programmed Services Unit, who were not even involved in that offender's supervision. Ultimately, the scrutiny led to a District Director stepping down, the manager of the unit being demoted and moved to a separate unit, and, ultimately, supervision of adult offenders in the state of Tennessee was taken away from the board and moved to the Tennessee Department of Correction. In the end, it was determined that the officer had missed doing one of two risk assessments. After finding the discrepancy, the officer completed the assessment and determined that even if it had been completed on time, nothing in its outcome would have changed the offender's risk level, and thus, nothing in the way he was supervised would have been altered.

Pay, Supervision and Promotion

There are other sources of stress on probation and parole officers. The NIJ found one such source to be supervisors: "an astonishing 87 percent of probation officers, according to one survey, said they disliked their supervisor" (NIJ, 2005, 3). Furthermore, "most say the reason is failure to recognize a job well done" (NIJ, 2005, 3). "Other interesting findings from the Simons et al., (1997) study involved the discovery that roughly 90% of their probation officer respondents indicated a dislike for their supervisors, with approximately 80% reporting that they perceived that their immediate supervisor as being incompetent at his job" (Slate et al., 2003, 523).

Pay has been identified by researchers as one of the most important factors in job satisfaction. For example, Spector indicates that in one study the respondents scored 11.9 on a scale of 24 possible points, less than half of the maximum positive score (Spector,

2012, 225). A 2005 NIJ report also makes mention of this in its 2005 report on stress and probation officers. “Low salaries are a related stress factor, the median salary for probation officers and a correctional treatment specialist, in 1999 was just over \$36,000” (NIJ, 2005, 3).

Of course, over time, probation and parole officer salaries have risen. In 2007 the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) listed the average annual wage of probation officers and Correctional Treatment Specialists as \$49,640 for those working at the state level (BLS, 2007). Along the same lines as pay, promotional opportunities, or rather the lack thereof, negatively impact many probation and parole officers. Management positions are difficult to come by for a couple of reasons. One reason is that probation and parole have flat organizational hierarchies. In other words, field agencies need a lot of front line workers but very few supervisors. A second reason is that once those managers who are promoted attain positions of authority; a proverbial log jam ensues, which stops most of their subordinates from being promoted. “The survey also identified areas in need of improvement. For example, in one study, Whiteacre (2006) reported that 54% of the respondents felt they were at a standstill in their career/job and some of the lowest scoring survey items involved evaluations of teamwork, opportunities for promotions and employee autonomy” (Whiteacre, 2006, 72).

Authority

Another factor affecting probation and parole officer job satisfaction is the role of the authority supervising the offender, the authority that governs the probation or parole officer, and the authorities that ultimately have the final say over what happens to the

person being supervised: either the court or the parole board. “Too much leniency on the part of the courts has been identified as a primary stressor for probation officers” (Slate et al., 2003, 522). When the higher authorities reject the probation and parole officer’s revocation requests, the officers feel as if they have been disrespected, and that their opinions do not matter.

As a case in point, the author working as probation and parole officer, here in Tennessee, once met with an official with the Tennessee Board of Probation and Parole, who made the following statement during a meeting to discuss steps the agency could take to increase morale amongst employees: “An officer submitted a warrant because an offender was arrested for Domestic Assault where his ex-wife filed charges on him for he slapping her butt[ocks]. And do you think I approved that warrant?” The official was laughing when he posed the last question. Situations such as this contribute to officers feeling unsupported by those who ultimately have the authority to back up the supervising officer’s actions in the eyes of the offender and the public. The bottom line is that the supervising officers feel unsupported and unable to have any form of credibility when giving instructions to offenders, those instructions which, of course, have major ramifications for public safety.

Getahun, Sims, and Hummer (2008) indicate that officers really feel the need to be supported by their supervisors. “Even with the stressors common for many who work in the criminal justice field (e.g. police and correctional officers) employees appear to function better if the following factors exist: (1) they have effective training; (2) they believe their supervisors support them” (Getahun et al., 2008, 6). In the case of probation

officers, their supervisors are not just the people they work for, the judges; of course have jurisdiction over the offenders they place on probation. The judges may or may not directly supervise the probation officers over the officers but they are ultimately the ones the officers have to answer to for any negative outcomes. These judges are also the people who have the ultimate say over the offenders, when the probation officers are trying to discipline them.

The revocation process itself has been shown as a stressor for probation and parole officers not only because of the potential for an officer feeling let down by the outcome but also because officers may feel internal pressure from their agencies to violate offenders or ignore offender violations, depending upon the state of the agencies budgets. “The dangers inherent to the job and having to make recommendations that results in custodial sentences have been identified as two potential stressors for probation officers” (Slate et al., 2003, 521).

Officer Safety

Probation officers must frequently cope with more violent criminals and higher caseloads. Moreover, it is depressing, dealing with a steady stream of failures: “It is no secret that a majority of offenders will be rearrested for new crime after release; roughly one-half to two-thirds will recidivate (i.e. be rearrested) within three years” (Matz & Kim, 2011, 1).

Given these numbers and the knowledge that a lot of those revocations involve violence, safety is a huge concern for many officers. Many jurisdictions have outlawed

the use of guns by their probation and parole officers while others have not only allowed officers to carry firearms but have made it mandatory. Probation and parole officers express safety as a key concern. The people they supervise have often directly injured or had strong intent to injure their fellow man. The carrying of firearms has often been interpreted as evidence that officers worry about their personal safety is a key stressor for the probation officers, especially in agencies that do not allow their officers to carry firearms.

“Many officers want the right to carry firearms. A favorite saying of many officers who are not authorized to carry firearms is that they would rather be judged by 12 than carried by 6” (Brown, 1990, 22). This is very clearly evident amongst officers working for agencies that have conflicting policies: “[A]n agency which insists upon enforcement functions but prohibits officers from being armed could cause serious moral problems” (Brown, 1990, 21-22). Brown goes on to assert that many officers are authorized to carry firearms but many also do so in direct violation of their agency’s policies or state laws prohibiting officers from carrying firearms while on duty. In the author’s experience working as a probation officer, this is absolutely true. Many officers feel that their safety is not important to those who make policies for their agencies consequently the officers have carried their own personal firearms which was against policy in the state of Tennessee even if the officer had a valid hand gun carry permit. Until July of 2013, it was against policy to even store a firearm in your own personal vehicle. No firearms were allowed on state property except for law enforcement officials.

Role Conflict/Ambiguity

Bangasser (2010) defines job ambiguity as “the vagueness or lack of information in carrying out job duties or responsibilities” (Bangasser, 2010, 29). Bangasser goes on to state that “Probation and parole officers struggle with job ambiguity as a part of overload of information and resources needed to complete their jobs” (Bangasser, 2010, 29).

Job ambiguity has numerous negative effects on the community supervision officer and may even have negative consequences for those being supervised by the officer suffering from job ambiguity. “More specifically situations with high job ambiguity decrease direct action and increase information seeking” (Bangasser, 2010, 30). Bangasser goes on to indicate role ambiguity is linked to stress, promotes role strain, job dissatisfaction, and is a primary cause of burnout. Furthermore Bangasser (2010) lists the physical toll that role ambiguity can have on a supervising officer: loss of sleep, exhaustion, other health issues, and familial strain. With these symptoms present, role ambiguity appears to share many of the same characteristics of job stress and burnout.

Probation and parole officers often feel as if they work in a grey area of the criminal justice system. They are torn between two worlds: social services worker and law enforcement officer. The notion of role conflict has been around since the late 1950’s and has been the subject of increase amounts of research (Whitehead & Lindquist 1985, 110). This means that the problem of role conflict has been festering for many decades, and has not been removed as a stress factor for front line probation and parole officers.

Sigler and McGraw (1984) offer the following definition of role conflict: “Role conflict is said to occur when an individual is subjected to two or more contradictory expectations whose stipulations the individual cannot simultaneously meet in behavior. In the case of probation and parole officers, the expectations held by their immediate supervisors, the Board of Pardon and Parole, local judges, defense attorneys, district attorneys, law enforcement personnel, their colleges and the general public may be so diverse and contradictory that the officers may feel they cannot possible meet these expectations” (Sigler & McGraw, 1984, 28).

Approach

To simplify matters, probation and parole work can be narrowed down to two attitudinal orientations. West and Seiter, (2013) call these two schools of supervision, control and assistance. The control school of thought indicates more of a law enforcement approach, more rigidly enforcing the rules of community supervision. Enhanced usage of law enforcement tools such as firearms, patrol cars, and allowing officers to apprehend and detain offenders. The assistance school invokes the social worker background of many probation and parole officers. Utilizing risk assessment tools, drug and alcohol treatment, educational opportunities and “working” with offenders to help them remain in compliance. This approach assumes a more ambiguous interpretation of what constitutes a violation.

Probation and parole officers are expected to protect the public, but they are also responsible for helping offenders to successfully reintegrate into the community. “The correctional model views rehabilitation as an attempt to remove the individual’s

propensity or desire to offend, or as a process of undoing the causes of offending” (Robinson & Raynor, 2006, 337). Officers work very hard in some cases for this rehabilitative effect to take hold whether it is assisting a chronically unemployed offender with locating a job or working with a long time addict in alcohol and drug treatment programs.

In short, probation and parole officers must be both cops and social workers, and the differences between these two orientations will never be resolved.

Burnout and Turnover

Probation and parole officers have several overwhelming factors that most other professions do not. Probation and parole officers, by the very nature of their work, do not pick and choose who their clients will be. “Probation and parole workers also have the rather unique problem of dealing with involuntary clients. Many other agencies can choose their clientele: criminal justice agencies usually do not have this luxury” (Whitehead, 1985, 93). In general, it is more frustrating dealing with people than machinery, and this is especially true if we are working with coerced clients. Over time this can lead to burnout. In his research Whitehead found “the problem [burnout] is indeed present in probation and parole” (Whitehead, 1985, 105).

“Employee turnover is a significant problem for many organizations. High turnover rates also occur in commercial, government, and military sectors, especially those where change is prevalent” (Proudfoot et al., 2008, 147). As it relates to probation and parole officers, Lee, Phelps, and Beto, (2009 a) and Lee, Joo, and Johnson (2009 b)

indicate turnover rates have historically been high amongst line officers. By way of establishing a baseline, “The Texas State Auditor’s Office (2007) reported a 10.8 percent voluntary turnover rate . . . among all state agencies” (Lee et al., 2009 a, 28). According to Lee, et al (2009b), in 1995, Florida reported an approximately 30% turnover rate of probation and parole officers, whereas Texas reported a 19.7% turnover rate for probation and parole officers in 2007. Other studies have shown high levels of turnover as well. “Specific to probation and parole, in a study completed by Simmons et al (1997), half of probation officers agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they would quit their jobs when they could find a better one, indicating that turnover is a concern in the corrections field” (Bangasser, 2010, 51).

Cost

Cost has often been defined in monetary terms however, when one deals with drugs and violence, there is a human cost. Paparozzi (2003) admonishes those who work in probation and parole to embrace the roles the public have given them: “To maintain the professional identity as a viable public safety program, probation and parole must embrace its contributions to justice, crime prevention and public safety, these results are valued by the general public” (Paparozzi, 2003, 46).

Many community corrections agencies underestimate the costs of turnover. Lee, et al., (2009 a) indicate that cost can take the form of inducing low morale, higher caseloads for remaining officers, low productivity, deterioration of supervision standards, higher rates of missed violations, increased recidivism rates, and lost funding due to the recruiting and training of new officers. “These negative consequences potentially

diminish the promotion of public safety, which is the ultimate mission of the American probation system” (Lee, et al., 2009 b, 33).

“Organizational and societal costs of high turnover rates include increased expenditures for recruiting and training and increased caseloads, resulting in lax supervision of offenders, which leads to more probation violations and can culminate in greater opportunities for recidivism” (Slate, Johnson, & Wells, 2000, 57). Training and equipment costs can run several thousand dollars for initial training. In this writer’s experience, offender’s attempt to take advantage of new officers using phrases such as “my old PO never said I had to do that”, and “how long you been doing this?”

Stress Reduction

“Most of the research on job stress within the criminal justice system has focused on police officers and correctional officers, with very little attention paid to probation officer stress” (Slate et al., 2000, 56). However, probation and parole officers often undergo unusually high levels of stress: “With declining budgets, limited office space, a tight job market, and the need to do more with less, probation offices across the nation are reaching a serious crossroad” (Hansen, 2001, 52). The NIJ reports that many departments are being callous with public safety in order to save money, with their cost cutting techniques raising officer stress (NIJ, 2007, 70).

With the knowledge that we are losing public safety and losing officer safety as well as economic loss, what would be the effectual gain from providing increased officer stress relief or reduction programs? Many places already offer certain types of benefits

that help in reduction of stress. The economic impact of telecommuting is very striking especially in a time of ever-present governmental budget crisis. “Telecommuting is rarely discussed in the corrections arena, but it is having a major impact upon the private sector. “Since 1991, AT&T has saved over \$550 million” (Hansen, 2001, 51). Hansen 2001 further advocates for telecommuting by sharing some very interesting results of other studies, a near, 90% satisfaction rate and an increase in productivity among private sector workers.

According to the NIJ, 2007 there are three types of stress reduction programs that might work in a correctional setting: “In-house programs, which consist of a separate unit within or operated by the correctional agency. External arrangements, which involve regular use of a private service provider and hybrid programs, which combine elements of both in-house and external structures” (NIJ, 2007, 70). Moreover, “To address on-the-job stress, researchers recommend a stress reduction program that can improve staff performance, enhance officer and public safety, and help save money” (NIJ, 2007, 70). An earlier NIJ study cited different approaches to reducing probation and parole officers stress levels: “More officers cited physical exercise than any other technique. Other methods include discussing cases with fellow officers, seeking support through religion, “venting”, and talking to a family member” (NIJ, 2005, 3). While these methods are considered to be positive, some officers also admitted to utilizing more “negative” methods to relieve stress as well: “Many take extra sick leave simply to relieve the pressure” (NIJ, 2005, 3).

Agencies are often cited as sources of officer stress: “Because many officers identify their own agencies as a source of stress, probation and parole agency managers may want to coordinate with the stress reduction program, identify the specific agency-based sources of stress for their officers, and take steps to reduce those that are within their control” (NIJ, 2005, 6). It can be very difficult for front line staff to convince their superiors that the agency itself needs to be overhauled to create a less stressful working environment. In the author’s experience working for the Tennessee Board of Probation and Parole, front line officers were often viewed as unimportant to the agency higher ups. Even front line managers and directors were treated as having irrelevant opinions on subjects that they had to cope with. Often the central office staff would pass mandates or impose insurmountable deadlines to the rank and file, and if staff voiced concerns, they were told if they did not comply they would be disciplined or terminated. As it relates to job satisfaction, stress plays a huge role: “Officers who report less stress at work are more likely to report a higher level of job satisfaction” (Getahun et al., 2008, 13).

CHAPTER II

Methodology

Purpose of Study

By now it is abundantly clear that probation and parole officers face serious challenges at work. The purpose of the present study is to determine the levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment of probation and parole staff who are employed by the Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Corrections.

Measures

The questionnaire used for this research project includes three commonly used scales for measuring job satisfaction and organizational commitment, the Job Descriptive Index (JDI) 1997 version, Job in General Scale (JIG), and the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (OCQ). These measurement tools explore such relevant topics as satisfaction with the work itself, pay, promotional opportunities, supervision, co-workers, and organizational commitment. The questionnaire also contains questions designed to gather demographic information on age, gender educational level, race, political orientation, and length of tenure (Roznowski, 1989, 805). According to Rogers (2009), the JDI was initially developed by Smith, Kendall, and Hulin (1969), and measures employees' satisfaction (Rogers, 2009, 30). The tool has seen several revisions and has been translated into French, Hebrew, Spanish, German, and Norwegian (Rogers, 2009, 27).

The JDI is made up of 72 questions, in five major clusters: eighteen questions on the present job, nine on pay, nine on promotional opportunities, eighteen for co-workers, and eighteen for supervision (Rogers, 2009, 27). There are two ways to utilize the five sub-scales. One could use them individually or add them together for a collective job satisfaction score. In either circumstance, the scores can be used to offer organizations feedback on which aspects of work need improvement, and which aspects of work seem to be satisfying to the workers (Rogers, 2009, 27).

As for the Job in General Scale or JIG, it was developed by Ironson et al. (1989) to accompany the JDI. Ironsen et al. (1989) wanted to address the issue of global job satisfaction or overall job satisfaction (Ironsen et al., 1989, 194). According to Carlini, (2009); “This particular scale has been shown to predict intentions to quit and is distributed together with the JDI” (Carlini, 2009, 41).

The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire or OCQ was also administered in conjunction with the two previously mentioned scales to participants in this study. Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1979) developed the scale which is the most widely utilized organizational commitment scale currently available (Varona, 1996, 13; Spector, 2012, 218). This scale measures the commitment of the respondent to the organization for which he works. The scale is in a 7-point Likert scale format with 1= strongly disagree – 7 strongly agree (Varona, 1996, 13).

Sample Population

The sampling frame was made up of all probation and parole officers and Supervisors who work for the Kentucky Department of Corrections, a statewide agency responsible for supervising adult offenders within the borders of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. This research study was conducted with the permission of the Kentucky Department of Corrections and their internal review board. Each of the twenty district offices received packets containing questionnaires, an optical scanner response form, an informed consent notification, an instructions page, and self-addressed return envelopes for each officer within the district. There were a total of 631 packets sent out. However, only 233 were returned yielding a response rate of 39%. The findings therefore are tentative and require further verification.

The vast majority of respondents were White (93.8%). In terms of gender, the officers were more evenly divided [female (50.6%) and male (49.4%)]. Most reported a four-year college degree (83.7%) or post graduate degree (12.4%). The officers were ranked from probation and parole officer I-V, as well as investigators. According to the Kentucky Department of Human Resources, this rank structure has PNP 1 as the lowest rank with the lowest pay grade (12), and PNP V or district managers at pay grade 15. The PNP investigators are considered to be pay grade 12. Their job entails preparing pre-sentence investigations (PSI) for the courts. (www.Kentucky.gov).

Hypothesis

Given the previously discussed research findings; the following hypothesis will be tested: 1: probation and parole officers will have a low level of overall job satisfaction; 2: the higher the rank the greater the job satisfaction; 3: as length of service increases, job satisfaction will decrease; 4: job satisfaction will be higher for the work itself than for pay or promotional opportunities; 5: there will be no specific gender differences in job satisfaction; 6: officers will feel a moderate level of organizational commitment.

CHAPTER III

Results

Job in General Scale

Table 1 shows the respondents' mean scores on the JIG scale. The Kentucky probation and parole officers in this study indicated that they experienced an above average level of global or overall job satisfaction.

Table 1

Mean Job in General Satisfaction Scores for all Employees

Scale (n=232)

Mean 30.19

SD 15.19

Note. The maximum score on the JIG is 54 points. This would reflect a perfect positive attitude. A score of 27 points is considered a balanced attitude.

Job Descriptive Index

Table 2 validates that the Kentucky probation and parole officers had very low mean scores on the pay and promotions subscales, but above average means on the work, co-workers, and supervisor subscales. Their very low scores in the pay and promotions subscales drag down their overall mean score on the JDI to a below average score.

Table 2

Job Descriptive Index Scores for all Participants

Work

Scale (n=232)

M 29.72

SD 11.42

Pay

Scale (n=232)

M 7.35

SD 8.45

Table 2 Continued*Promotions*

Scale (n=232)

M 12.92

SD 13.68

Supervision

Scale (n=232)

M 33.80

SD 15.80

Co-Workers

Scale (n=232)

M 33.47

SD 14.09

Table 2 Continued*Total JDI Scores*

Scale (n=232)

M 117.25

SD 42.50

Note. The maximum scores for the individual scales is 54 points, this represents a perfect positive attitude. A balanced attitude is represented by 27 points. The overall perfect positive attitude is represented by a score of 270 points with a balanced attitude being 135 points.

Organizational Commitment Questionnaire

Table 3 indicates an average level of organizational commitment amongst the probation and parole officers in Kentucky.

Table 3

OCQ Scores for all Participants

Scale (n=232)

M 60.38

SD 18.05

Note. The maximum score for the OCQ indicating complete commitment to the organization is 105 points. A balanced attitude is represented by a score of 60 points.

Correlation Coefficients

Table 4 indicates the correlation coefficients for the three scales utilized in the present study. The highest possible correlation between the variables is 1.0, while a correlation of 0.0 would indicate no relationship whatsoever between the variables. The global (JIG) and the faceted (JDI) measures of job satisfaction correlated highly with one another. The faceted measure of job satisfaction had a relatively high correlation with the measure of organizational commitment. The global measure of job satisfaction correlated even higher, though, with organization commitment.

Table 4

Pearson's 'r' Correlation Coefficients

<i>Scales</i>	<i>Correlations</i>	<i>Significance Levels</i>
JIG and JDI	.65	.001
JDI and OCQ	.58	.001
JIG and OCQ	.69	.001

Reliability Coefficients

Table 5 shows the reliability coefficient which indicates whether the scale is reliable or not. A good reliability coefficient is .80 and above anything below that is questionable. As will be show in Table 5, only pay has questionable reliability with a .69 reliability coefficient.

Table 5

Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficient

<i>Scale</i>	<i>Reliability Coefficient</i>
JIG	.93
JDI	.93
Work	.83
Pay	.69
Promotion	.87
Supervision	.93
Co-Workers	.91
OCQ	.89

Note. A coefficient of .80 or above indicates a high level of reliability (Vogt, 2005)

Length of Service

Table 6 shows global job satisfaction JIG scores broken down by length of service with the organization. Higher levels of satisfaction are shown with those in the categories “less than one year of service” and “one to two years of service” with 35.19 and 33.80 mean scores respectively. There is a downward curve at the “three – five year” and “six to ten year” marks, with a slight upswing in the “ten or more” category.

Group differences were found to be statistically significant in the parametric analysis, but not the non-parametric analysis:

ANOVA: $f(4, 229) = 2.42, p < .05, \eta^2 = .04$

Kruskal – Wallis: $h = 9.00, p < .06$

Table 6

Mean Job in General Satisfaction Scores for Length of Service

	<u>≤1</u>	<u>1 - 2</u>	<u>3 - 5</u>	<u>6 - 10</u>	<u>10 ></u>	<u>Total</u>
<i>Scale</i>	(n=26)	(n=41)	(n=51)	(n=65)	(n=47)	(n=230)
<u>M</u>	35.19	33.81	28.73	26.49	30.36	30.07
<u>SD</u>	13.40	14.51	16.32	14.79	15.08	15.19

Note. The maximum score on the JIG is 54 points. This would reflect a perfect positive attitude. A score of 27 points is considered a balanced attitude.

Table 7 shows the basic pattern for the faceted measure of job satisfaction for the Kentucky probation and parole officers is as follows: satisfaction is highest for the least experienced officers. Satisfaction levels then continue to dip until they rise marginally after five years of service. Officer's attitudes towards promotional opportunities, however, uniformly continue to decline.

Group differences were found to be statistically significant in Promotion Opportunities for length of service.

ANOVA: $f(4, 229) = 10.59, p = .001; \eta^2 = .16$

Kruskal-Wallis: $h = 37.74, p = .001$

Group differences were found to be statistically significant in Supervisor for length of service.

ANOVA: $f(4, 229) = 6.07, p = .001; \eta^2 = .10$

Kruskal-Wallis: $h = 21.36, p = .001$

Group differences were found to be statistically significant in Co-Workers for length of service.

ANOVA: $f(4, 229) = 2.69, p = .032; \eta^2 = .05$

Kruskal-Wallis: $h = 11.57, p = .021$

Group differences were found to be statistically significant with Total JDI for length of service

ANOVA: $f(4, 229) = 7.92, p = .001; \eta^2 = .12$

Kruskal-Wallis: $h = 26.06, p = .001$

Table 7

Mean JDI Satisfaction Scores for Length of Service

	<u>< 1 yr</u>	<u>1 - 2 yrs</u>	<u>3 - 5 yrs</u>	<u>6 - 10yrs</u>	<u>10 > yrs</u>	<u>Total</u>
Work						
<u>Scale</u>	(n=26)	(n=41)	(n=51)	(n=65)	(n=47)	(n=230)
<u>M</u>	33.96	31.95	28.96	27.08	29.45	29.63
<u>SD</u>	11.31	10.36	10.07	11.46	12.98	11.42
Pay						
	<u>< 1 yr</u>	<u>1 - 2yrs</u>	<u>3 - 5 yrs</u>	<u>6 - 10 yrs</u>	<u>10 > yrs</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=26)	(n=41)	(n=51)	(n=65)	(n=47)	(n=230)
<u>M</u>	8.69	7.07	5.61	7.08	8.85	7.30
<u>SD</u>	10.38	8.91	5.74	8.98	8.43	8.43

Table 7 Continued*Promotional Opportunities*

	<u>< 1 yr</u>	<u>1 - 2 yrs</u>	<u>3 - 5 yrs</u>	<u>6 - 10 yrs</u>	<u>10 > yrs</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=26)	(n=41)	(n=51)	(n=65)	(n=47)	(n=230)
<u>M</u>	24.92	17.37	11.37	9.05	8.47	12.72
<u>SD</u>	15.08	15.32	12.59	11.01	9.54	13.46

Supervision

	<u>< 1 yr</u>	<u>1 - 2 yrs</u>	<u>3 - 5 yrs</u>	<u>6 - 10 yrs</u>	<u>10 > yrs</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=26)	(n=41)	(n=51)	(n=65)	(n=47)	(n=230)
<u>M</u>	43.50	37.93	35.63	29.08	29.85	33.90
<u>SD</u>	11.21	12.77	15.27	16.21	16.67	15.70

Co-Workers

	<u>< 1 yr</u>	<u>1 - 2 yrs</u>	<u>3 - 5 yrs</u>	<u>6 - 10 yrs</u>	<u>10 > yrs</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=26)	(n=41)	(n=51)	(n=65)	(n=47)	(n=230)
<u>M</u>	40.85	34.41	30.41	33.02	31.81	33.33
<u>SD</u>	11.42	14.69	12.73	12.76	16.69	14.07

Table 7 Continued*Total JDI*

	<u>< 1 yr</u>	<u>1 – 2 yrs</u>	<u>3 – 5 yrs</u>	<u>6 – 10 yrs</u>	<u>10 > yrs</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=26)	(n=41)	(n=51)	(n=65)	(n=47)	(n=230)
<u>M</u>	151.92	128.73	111.98	105.29	108.43	116.87
<u>SD</u>	41.83	42.33	36.23	40.24	41.03	42.47

Note. The maximum scores for the individual scales is 54 points, this represents a perfect positive attitude. A balanced attitude is represented by 27 points. The overall perfect positive attitude is represented by a score of 270 points with a balanced attitude being 135 points.

Table 8 shows the participants' level of organizational commitment broken down among the varying length of service categories. As a whole the respondents indicated an average level of organizational commitment, as was true on the various job satisfaction scales, organizational commitment was highest for the least experienced officers.

Group differences were statistically significant in the OCQ score for length of service:

ANOVA: $f(4, 229) = 2.80, p = .027; \eta^2 = .05$

Kruskal-Wallis: $h = 10.33, p = .035$

Table 8

Mean OCQ Scores for Length of Service

	<u>< 1 yr.</u>	<u>1 - 2 yrs.</u>	<u>3 - 5 yrs.</u>	<u>6 - 10 yrs.</u>	<u>10 > yrs.</u>	<u>All</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=26)	(n=41)	(n=51)	(n=65)	(n=47)	(n=230)
<u>M</u>	69.58	62.20	57.08	57.23	60.96	60.24
<u>SD</u>	16.53	17.96	19.35	17.25	17.26	18.07

Note. The maximum score for the OCQ indicating complete commitment to the organization is 105 points. A balanced attitude is represented by a score of 60 points.

Rank

Table 9 shows global job satisfaction (JIG) for the six ranks of the probation and parole officers in the organization. These ranks are Probation and Parole Office I, II, III, IV, V and Investigator (writers of presentence reports). Overall job satisfaction was above average for all groups except the rank-and-file PNP II group. As one might anticipate global job satisfaction was highest for the regional directors, the PNP Vs. Group differences were significant on the parametric analysis, but not on the non parametric analysis:

ANOVA: $f(5, 227) = 2.55, p = .029; \eta^2 = .05$

Table 9

Mean JIG Scores for Rank

	<u>PNP I</u>	<u>PNP II</u>	<u>PNP III</u>	<u>PNP IV</u>	<u>PN PV</u>	<u>Inv</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=109)	(n=60)	(n=19)	(n=17)	(n=9)	(n=14)	(n=228)
<u>M</u>	32.01	24.33	31.84	31.53	36.11	31.57	30.07
<u>SD</u>	15.03	13.69	16.32	15.17	10.24	19.13	15.19

Note. The maximum score on the JIG is 54 points. This would reflect a perfect positive attitude. A score of 27 points is considered a balanced attitude.

Table 10 indicates the JDI scores for the various ranks of the study participants. As one might expect, the supervisors enjoyed the nature of their work more than anyone else. The rookies and the PSI investigators liked their work more than the journeymen caseload supervisors. As it relates to work the participants showed that across the ranks they have above average views of the work that they are tasked with. Virtually no one was satisfied with his pay, group differences were minimal. The rookies and the PSI investigators were the most satisfied with their promotional opportunities. All of the groups had a higher than average score in the supervisors scale. For co-workers the group mean for the various ranks scored below average. The only exception being the investigators whose mean score was 26.93, or an average level of satisfaction.

Group differences in rank were found to be statistically significant with respect to pay:

ANOVA: $f(5, 227) = 3.13, p = .010; \eta^2 = .07$

Kruskal-Wallis: $h = 11.52, p = .042$

Group differences in rank were found to be statistically significant with respect to promotional opportunities:

ANOVA: $f(5, 227) = 6.95, p = .001; \eta^2 = .14$

Kruskal-Wallis: $h = 35.01, p = .001$

Group differences in rank were found to be statistically significant with respect to supervisors:

ANOVA: $f(5, 227) = 4.10, p = .001; \eta^2 = .09$

Kruskal-Wallis: $h = 18.39, p = .002$

The total JDI scores for rank showed statistically significant group differences:

ANOVA: $f(5, 227) = 3.00, p = .012; E^2 = .06$

Kruskal-Wallis: $h = 14.03, p = .015$

Table 10

Mean JDI Scores for Rank

Work

	<u>PNP I</u>	<u>PNP II</u>	<u>PNP III</u>	<u>PNP IV</u>	<u>PNP V</u>	<u>Inv.</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(<i>n</i> =109)	(<i>n</i> =60)	(<i>n</i> =19)	(<i>n</i> =17)	(<i>n</i> =9)	(<i>n</i> =14)	(<i>n</i> =228)
<u>M</u>	30.73	27.03	31.05	28.53	32.33	30.43	29.66
<u>SD</u>	10.92	11.58	12.43	13.10	9.11	11.98	11.40

Table 10 Continued*Pay*

	<u>PNP I</u>	<u>PNP II</u>	<u>PNP III</u>	<u>PNP IV</u>	<u>PNP V</u>	<u>Inv.</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=109)	(n=60)	(n=19)	(n=17)	(n=9)	(n=14)	(n=228)
<u>M</u>	6.70	5.67	10.74	6.71	11.78	13.00	7.35
<u>SD</u>	7.81	6.32	10.05	6.20	7.45	15.92	8.44

Promotional Opportunities

	<u>PNP I</u>	<u>PNP II</u>	<u>PNP III</u>	<u>PNP IV</u>	<u>PNP V</u>	<u>Inv.</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=109)	(n=60)	(n=19)	(n=17)	(n=9)	(n=14)	(n=228)
<u>M</u>	17.30	7.20	4.53	14.82	8.89	13.43	12.82
<u>SD</u>	15.17	7.86	4.80	11.62	7.01	18.24	13.51

Supervision

	<u>PNP I</u>	<u>PNP II</u>	<u>PNP III</u>	<u>PNP IV</u>	<u>PNP V</u>	<u>Inv.</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=109)	(n=60)	(n=19)	(n=17)	(n=9)	(n=14)	(n=228)
<u>M</u>	38.16	30.32	31.74	36.06	24.00	25.64	34.07
<u>SD</u>	13.42	15.32	17.61	19.21	14.61	19.46	15.73

Table 10 Continued*Co-Workers*

	<u>PNP I</u>	<u>PNP II</u>	<u>PNP III</u>	<u>PNP IV</u>	<u>PNP V</u>	<u>Inv.</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=109)	(n=60)	(n=19)	(n=17)	(n=9)	(n=14)	(n=228)
<u>M</u>	34.74	33.12	31.53	33.94	32.56	26.93	33.42
<u>SD</u>	13.51	13.28	18.74	12.19	12.46	17.99	14.10

Total JDI for Rank

	<u>PNP I</u>	<u>PNP II</u>	<u>PNP III</u>	<u>PNP IV</u>	<u>PNP V</u>	<u>Inv.</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=109)	(n=60)	(n=19)	(n=17)	(n=9)	(n=14)	(n=228)
<u>M</u>	127.62	103.33	109.58	120.06	109.56	109.43	117.33
<u>SD</u>	41.73	35.15	40.00	44.35	27.73	66.48	42.54

Note. The maximum scores for the individual scales is 54 points, this represents a perfect positive attitude. A balanced attitude is represented by 27 points. The overall perfect positive attitude is represented by a score of 270 points with a balanced attitude being 135 points.

Table 11 shows the OCQ scores for the participants broken down by their respective ranks. The results show that PNP2 respondents showed the lowest organization commitment scores. However, all group scores were roughly similar, and indicated an average level of organizational commitment.

Table 11

Mean OCQ Scores for Rank

	<u>PNP1</u>	<u>PNP2</u>	<u>PNP3</u>	<u>PNP4</u>	<u>PNP5</u>	<u>Inv.</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=109)	(n=60)	(n=19)	(n=17)	(n=9)	(n=14)	(n=228)
<u>M</u>	62.50	54.78	61.63	62.35	63.44	63.07	60.46
<u>SD</u>	18.46	15.52	17.92	17.12	16.26	23.31	17.97

Note. The maximum score for the OCQ indicating complete commitment to the organization is 105 points.

A balanced attitude is represented by a score of 60 points.

Time in Grade

Table 12 shows the mean global job satisfaction (JIG) scores for all participants. A clear pattern emerged: the longer an officer served at his current rank, the lower his global job satisfaction. The highest mean scores were recorded by participants in the less than one year category, 36.05. The lowest mean score was recorded by those in the 6-or-more years at the same rank category: 24.31.

Time-in-rank group differences were statistically significant.

ANOVA: $f(3, 227) = 4.18, p = .007, \eta^2 = .05$

Kruskal-Wallis: $h = 11.23, p = .011$

Table 12

Mean Scores for JIG for Time in Grade

	<u>< 1 yr</u>	<u>1 - 2 yr</u>	<u>3 - 5 yr</u>	<u>6 ></u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=44)	(n=95)	(n=73)	(n=16)	(n=228)
<u>M</u>	36.05	30.42	27.04	24.31	30.00
<u>SD</u>	12.12	15.09	15.50	17.69	15.20

Note. The maximum score on the JIG is 54 points. This would reflect a perfect positive attitude. A score of 27 points is considered a balanced attitude.

Table 13 presents group measures for time-in-grade (how long the officer has served at his present rank). Scales with respect to time-in-grade: the longer an officer held his current rank, the less satisfied he was with the job dimension in question, the lone exception being a 2.65 point bump between 3 - 5 years and 6 > on the Pay scale. Overall the JDI scores indicate a downward spiral in job satisfaction levels from the least time-in-grade (141.32) time in rank to the most time-in-grade (92.38).

Group differences were statistically significant for pay with respect to time-in-grade:

ANOVA: $f(3, 227) = 2.81, p = .040; \eta^2 = .04$

Kruskal-Wallis: $h = 8.26, p = .041$

The group differences were statistically significant for pay with respect to time-in-grade:

ANOVA: $f(3, 227) = 2.85, p = .038; \eta^2 = .04$

Kruskal-Wallis: $h = 7.90, p = .048$

Group differences were statistically significant for promotional opportunities with respect to time-in-grade:

ANOVA: $f(3, 227) = 8.90, p = .001; \nu^2 = .11$

Kruskal-Wallis: $h = 27.44, p = .001$

Group differences were statistically significant for supervisors with respect to time-in-grade:

ANOVA: $f(3, 227) = 4.94, p = .002; \eta^2 = .06$

Kruskal-Wallis: $h = 12.65, p = .005$

Group differences for time-in-grade were statistically significant for total JDI, or overall faceted measure of job satisfaction:

ANOVA: $f(3, 227) = 9.15, p = .001 \eta^2 = .11$

Kruskal-Wallis: $h = 24.49, p = .001$

Table 13

Mean JDI Scores for Time in Grade

Work

	<u>< 1 yr</u>	<u>1 - 2 yr</u>	<u>3 - 5 yr</u>	<u>6 ></u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=44)	(n=95)	(n=73)	(n=16)	(n=228)
<u>M</u>	33.27	29.96	27.88	25.63	29.63
<u>SD</u>	10.73	10.97	11.95	11.67	11.43

Table 13 Continued*Pay*

	<u>< 1 yr</u>	<u>1 - 2 yr</u>	<u>3 - 5 yr</u>	<u>6 ></u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=44)	(n=95)	(n=73)	(n=16)	(n=228)
<u>M</u>	9.41	7.96	5.10	7.75	7.31
<u>SD</u>	9.91	9.31	5.76	7.48	8.45

Promotional Opportunities

	<u>< 1 yr</u>	<u>1 - 2 yr</u>	<u>3 - 5 yr</u>	<u>6 ></u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=44)	(n=95)	(n=73)	(n=16)	(n=228)
<u>M</u>	20.32	13.45	9.23	5.13	12.84
<u>SD</u>	15.37	13.49	11.30	5.51	13.49

Supervision

	<u>< 1 yr</u>	<u>1 - 2 yr</u>	<u>3 - 5 yr</u>	<u>6 ></u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=44)	(n=95)	(n=73)	(n=16)	(n=228)
<u>M</u>	40.91	34.00	32.01	25.81	34.12
<u>SD</u>	11.53	15.44	17.08	14.53	15.67

Table 13 Continued*Co-Workers*

	<u>< 1 yr</u>	<u>1 - 2 yr</u>	<u>3 - 5 yr</u>	<u>6 ></u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=44)	(n=95)	(n=73)	(n=16)	(n=228)
<u>M</u>	37.41	33.59	31.67	28.06	33.32
<u>SD</u>	12.43	14.01	14.56	15.38	14.13

Total JDI for Time-In-Grade

	<u>< 1 yr</u>	<u>1 - 2 yr</u>	<u>3 - 5 yr</u>	<u>6 ></u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=44)	(n=95)	(n=73)	(n=16)	(n=228)
<u>M</u>	141.32	118.96	105.89	92.38	117.22
<u>SD</u>	39.78	43.86	38.34	29.72	42.66

Note. The maximum scores for the individual scales is 54 points, this represents a perfect positive attitude. A balanced attitude is represented by 27 points. The overall perfect positive attitude is represented by a score of 270 points with a balanced attitude being 135 points.

Table 14 indicates that the mean scores in the organizational commitment (OCQ) scale steadily and consistently decreased as the amount of time the officer spent at his current rank increased.

The group differences proved to be statistically significant on the OCQ with respect to time-in-grade:

ANOVA: $f(3, 227) = 7.01, p = .00; \eta^2 = .09$

Kruskal-Wallis: $h = 17.85, p = .001$

Table 14

Mean OCQ Scores for Time In Grade

	<u>≤1</u>	<u>1 - 2</u>	<u>3 - 5</u>	<u>6 ≥</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(<i>n</i> =44)	(<i>n</i> =95)	(<i>n</i> =73)	(<i>n</i> =16)	(<i>n</i> =230)
<u>M</u>	69.11	60.83	57.67	48.19	48.19
<u>SD</u>	15.59	17.68	17.58	17.96	17.96

Note. The maximum score for the OCQ indicating complete commitment to the organization is 105 points. A balanced attitude is represented by a score of 60 points.

Type of Work

Table 15 shows that when it comes to global job satisfaction, the managers were the most satisfied workers, followed by the PSI writers, and the officers who supervised caseloads composed of both probationers and parolees. The least satisfied group in this study was made up of officers who both supervised caseloads and wrote PSIs.

Nevertheless, the least satisfied of these groups still had an average level of global job satisfaction, roughly speaking. All other working groups had above average global job satisfaction.

Group differences were not statistically significant.

Table 15

Mean JIG Scores for Respondents for Type of Work

	<u>Sup. Both</u>	<u>PSI Writers</u>	<u>Mixed Writer/Caseload</u>	<u>Management</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=124)	(n=26)	(n=38)	(n=20)	(n=208)
<u>M</u>	30.05	32.19	26.37	33.00	29.93
<u>SD</u>	15.34	16.72	15.66	14.62	15.52

Note. The maximum score on the JIG is 54 points. This would reflect a perfect positive attitude. A score of 27 points is considered a balanced attitude.

Table 16 indicates the mean JDI group scores concerning the variable, type of work. PSI writers had the greatest satisfaction with the work itself, followed closely by managers, and officers supervising mixed caseloads of probationers and parolees. Those probation and parole officers who supervised caseloads and wrote PSIs were the least satisfied with the intrinsic nature of their work, but group differences were not statistically different. All work groups were dissatisfied with their pay. However, the probation and parole officers writing PSI's while supervising caseloads were the most dissatisfied while probation and parole officers who only wrote PSIs were the least dissatisfied. Group differences were not statistically significant in the parametric analysis, but not the non-parametric analysis. With respect to promotional opportunities, all work groups were dissatisfied. The most dissatisfied work group was the PSI writers; the least dissatisfied group was the probation and parole officers who supervised a mixed caseload of probationers and parolees. Group differences, however, were not statistically significant.

With regard to supervision, all work groups were favorable disposed towards their supervisors, with the probation and parole officers supervising mixed caseloads being the most satisfied, and the PSI writers being the least satisfied. Group differences were not statistically significant, though.

All work groups had a favorable towards their co-workers, with the probation and parole officers with mixed caseloads being the most satisfied, and the PSI being the least satisfied. Group differences were not statistically significant.

Turning now to the composite scores on the faceted variables, the total JDI , we find that all work groups had below average job satisfaction, with the most dissatisfied group being those probation and parole officers who supervised a caseload while writing PSIs, and the least dissatisfied group being the probation and parole officers who supervised caseloads. Group differences were not statistically significant.

Table 16

Mean JDI Scores for Respondents Based on Type of Work

Work

	<u>Sup. Both</u>	<u>PSI Writers</u>	<u>Mixed Writer/Caseload</u>	<u>Management</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=124)	(n=26)	(n=38)	(n=20)	(n=208)
<u>M</u>	30.31	31.58	27.89	30.85	30.08
<u>SD</u>	10.98	13.20	10.81	11.93	11.31

Pay

	<u>Sup. Both</u>	<u>PSI Writers</u>	<u>Mixed Writer/Caseload</u>	<u>Management</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=124)	(n=26)	(n=38)	(n=20)	(n=208)
<u>M</u>	6.82	12.54	6.26	7.80	7.53
<u>SD</u>	7.53	13.39	7.92	6.83	8.64

Table 16 Continued*Promotional Opportunities*

	<u>Sup. Both</u>	<u>PSI Writers</u>	<u>Mixed Writer/Caseload</u>	<u>Management</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=124)	(n=26)	(n=38)	(n=20)	(n=208)
<u>M</u>	14.24	10.38	10.53	13.90	13.05
<u>SD</u>	13.93	14.62	11.67	11.02	13.40

Supervision

	<u>Sup. Both</u>	<u>PSI Writers</u>	<u>Mixed Writer/Caseload</u>	<u>Management</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=124)	(n=26)	(n=38)	(n=20)	(n=208)
<u>M</u>	35.09	31.42	34.89	33.85	34.48
<u>SD</u>	14.67	18.27	15.55	19.66	15.76

Co-Workers

	<u>Sup. Both</u>	<u>PSI Writers</u>	<u>Mixed Writer/Caseload</u>	<u>Management</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=124)	(n=26)	(n=38)	(n=20)	(n=208)
<u>M</u>	33.93	30.12	32.92	33.35	33.21
<u>SD</u>	13.61	18.20	13.02	12.90	14.04

Table 16 Continued*Total JDI Scores*

	<u>Sup. Both</u>	<u>PSI Writers</u>	<u>Mixed Writer/Caseload</u>	<u>Management</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=124)	(n=26)	(n=38)	(n=20)	(n=208)
<u>M</u>	120.39	116.04	112.50	119.75	118.34
<u>SD</u>	41.91	54.19	41.07	40.92	43.16

Note. The maximum scores for the individual scales is 54 points, this represents a perfect positive attitude. A balanced attitude is represented by 27 points. The overall perfect positive attitude is represented by a score of 270 points with a balanced attitude being 135 points.

Table 17 indicates the organizational commitment of the various work groups. Roughly speaking, all groups had an average level of commitment to their field agency. The PSI writers were the most committed to their employer, while the probation and parole officers writing while supervising a caseload were the least committed to their employers. Group differences, however, were not statistically significant.

Table 17

Mean OCQ Scores for Respondents Based on Work Performed

	<u>Sup. Both</u>	<u>PSI Writers</u>	<u>Mixed Writer/Caseload</u>	<u>Management</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=124)	(n=26)	(n=38)	(n=20)	(n=208)
<u>M</u>	59.90	65.54	58.79	65.40	60.93
<u>SD</u>	17.67	19.44	17.40	17.19	17.84

Note. The maximum score for the OCQ indicating complete commitment to the organization is 105 points. A balanced attitude is represented by a score of 60 points.

Sex

The probation and parole officers in this study were roughly equally divided between the two genders. Table 18 shows that both male and female officers evidenced greater than average global job satisfaction. The females had a slightly higher measure on the scale than the males, but group differences were not statistically significant.

Table 18

Mean JIG Scores for Respondents Based on Sex

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(<i>n</i> =109)	(<i>n</i> =118)	(<i>n</i> =227)
<u>M</u>	29.19	31.07	30.17
<u>SD</u>	15.10	15.14	15.12

Note. The maximum score on the JIG is 54 points. This would reflect a perfect positive attitude. A score of 27 points is considered a balanced attitude.

Table 19 will show the differences between male and female respondents on the JDI. Female probation and parole officers were slightly more satisfied with the work itself and their pay than were male probation and parole officers. In general male probation and parole officers were more satisfied than female probation and parole officers with promotional opportunities, supervisors, co-workers, and faceted job satisfaction. However, the only statistically significant group difference for gender was for the co-workers sub-scale

ANOVA: $f(1, 226) = 5.21, p = .023; \eta^2 = .02$

Table 19

Mean JDI Scores for Respondents Based Upon Sex

Work

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(<i>n</i> =109)	(<i>n</i> =118)	(<i>n</i> =227)
<u>M</u>	29.22	30.31	29.78
<u>SD</u>	11.65	11.05	11.33

Table 19 Continued*Pay*

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=109)	(n=118)	(n=227)
<u>M</u>	6.83	7.85	7.36
<u>SD</u>	8.48	8.41	8.44

Promotional Opportunities

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=109)	(n=118)	(n=227)
<u>M</u>	13.58	12.27	12.90
<u>SD</u>	13.27	13.73	13.50

Supervision

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=109)	(n=118)	(n=227)
<u>M</u>	35.53	33.03	34.23
<u>SD</u>	15.41	15.77	15.61

Table 19 Continued*Co-Workers*

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=109)	(n=118)	(n=227)
<u>M</u>	35.57	31.31	33.35
<u>SD</u>	14.34	13.65	14.12

Total JDI for Sex

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=109)	(n=118)	(n=227)
<u>M</u>	120.72	114.76	117.63
<u>SD</u>	42.69	42.17	42.43

Note. The maximum scores for the individual scales is 54 points, this represents a perfect positive attitude. A balanced attitude is represented by 27 points. The overall perfect positive attitude is represented by a score of 270 points with a balanced attitude being 135 points.

Table 20 shows that both the male and female probation and parole officers in Kentucky had roughly average levels of organizational commitment. The females scored slightly higher than the males, but not significantly so.

Table 20

Mean OCQ Scores Based Upon Sex of Respondent

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=109)	(n118)	(n=227)
<u>M</u>	58.57	62.07	60.39
<u>SD</u>	16.86	18.77	17.93

Note. The maximum score for the OCQ indicating complete commitment to the organization is 105 points. A balanced attitude is represented by a score of 60 points.

Age

Table 21 presents evidence showing that as age categories progressed upward so did global job satisfaction. All age groups of probation and parole officers had above average global job satisfaction scores. Group differences were not statistically significant.

Table 21Mean JIG Scores for Respondents Based Upon Age

	<u>20's</u>	<u>30's</u>	<u>40's</u>	<u>50's ></u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=66)	(n=92)	(n=44)	(n=24)	(n=226)
<u>M</u>	29.52	29.64	29.68	34.38	30.12
<u>SD</u>	16.12	15.25	14.70	12.66	15.13

Note. The maximum score on the JIG is 54 points. This would reflect a perfect positive attitude. A score of 27 points is considered a balanced attitude.

Table 22 shows the JDI scores for the different age groups. In general the scores in the work and pay subscales increased as age increased, although scores for the work were above average while scores for the latter were below average. The reverse pattern can be seen on the promotions and supervisors subscales, although scores on the former were way below average, and scores on the latter were above average. The only subscale that shows statistical significance for group differences in age is promotional opportunities. Mean scores on the co-workers and total JDI scales are highest at both ends of the age spectrum and lowest in the middle, although co-workers scores are above average and total JDI scores are all below average.

ANOVA: $f(3, 225), = 2.82; p = .040; \eta^2 = .04$

Kruskal-Wallis: $h = 9.59, p = .022$

Table 22

Mean JDI Scores for Respondents Based on Age

Work

	<u>20's</u>	<u>30's</u>	<u>40's</u>	<u>50's ></u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=66)	(n=92)	(n=44)	(n=24)	(n=226)
<u>M</u>	29.24	29.51	28.91	33.79	29.77
<u>SD</u>	11.15	10.99	12.24	11.52	11.35

Table 22 Continued*Pay*

	<u>20's</u>	<u>30's</u>	<u>40's</u>	<u>50's ></u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=66)	(n=92)	(n=44)	(n=24)	(n=226)
<u>M</u>	6.94	6.48	8.00	10.92	7.38
<u>SD</u>	8.97	7.06	8.05	11.66	8.45

Promotional Opportunities

	<u>20's</u>	<u>30's</u>	<u>40's</u>	<u>50's ></u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=66)	(n=92)	(n=44)	(n=24)	(n=226)
<u>M</u>	15.79	13.59	9.09	9.50	12.92
<u>SD</u>	15.48	12.92	11.68	11.44	13.52

Supervision

	<u>20's</u>	<u>30's</u>	<u>40's</u>	<u>50's ></u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=66)	(n=92)	(n=44)	(n=24)	(n=226)
<u>M</u>	36.91	35.29	29.39	31.92	34.26
<u>SD</u>	15.42	15.07	16.40	15.65	15.64

Table 22 Continued*Co-Workers*

	<u>20's</u>	<u>30's</u>	<u>40's</u>	<u>50's ></u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=66)	(n=92)	(n=44)	(n=24)	(n=226)
<u>M</u>	34.44	33.79	29.82	35.46	33.39
<u>SD</u>	14.30	13.26	15.60	13.95	14.14

Total JDI

	<u>20's</u>	<u>30's</u>	<u>40's</u>	<u>50's ></u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=66)	(n=92)	(n=44)	(n=24)	(n=226)
<u>M</u>	123.32	118.66	105.20	121.58	117.71
<u>SD</u>	47.45	40.49	38.65	40.31	42.50

Note. The maximum scores for the individual scales is 54 points, this represents a perfect positive attitude. A balanced attitude is represented by 27 points. The overall perfect positive attitude is represented by a score of 270 points with a balanced attitude being 135 points.

Table 23 demonstrates an upward trend with respect to age and organizational commitment, roughly speaking. All group means for the various age categories hovered around the national average for workers across all disciplines. The oldest age group evidenced the greatest organizational commitment, but group differences were not statistically significant.

Table 23

Mean OCQ Scores for Respondents Based on Age

	<u>20's</u>	<u>30's</u>	<u>40's</u>	<u>50's ></u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=66)	(n=92)	(n=44)	(n=24)	(n=226)
<u>M</u>	58.83	60.92	57.68	67.04	60.33
<u>SD</u>	18.82	17.54	18.11	15.86	17.95

Note. The maximum score for the OCQ indicating complete commitment to the organization is 105 points. A balanced attitude is represented by a score of 60 points.

Race

Table 24 shows global job satisfaction scores in terms of race. Only one officer identified himself as “Hispanic”. The same holds true for both “Asians” and “other”. The responses of those three subjects were thus excluded from the analysis. Moreover, there were a very small number of “Black” probation and parole officers in this study. Any conclusions drawn about race are, therefore, tentative and speculative at best. Having said that, it was observed that both Blacks and Whites had above average global job satisfaction scores. The Blacks mean scores was higher but group differences were statistically significant.

Table 24

Mean JIG Scores for Respondents by Race

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	<i>(n=212)</i>	<i>(n=11)</i>	<i>(n=223)</i>
<u>M</u>	29.86	33.36	30.03
<u>SD</u>	15.36	12.85	15.24

Note. The maximum score on the JIG is 54 points. This would reflect a perfect positive attitude. A score of 27 points is considered a balanced attitude.

Table 25 shows the JDI scale scores for the probation and parole officers broken down by race. For the scales Work, Pay, Supervision, and Total JDI, Blacks showed higher mean scores than did Whites. Mean scale scores on the Co-Workers subscale were virtually the same. Whites rated their intrinsic satisfaction with work higher than Blacks, but none of the racial group differences in this study were found to be statistically significant.

Table 25

Mean JDI Scores Based Upon Race

Work

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=212)	(n=11)	(n=223)
<u>M</u>	29.63	31.55	29.72
<u>SD</u>	11.32	13.40	11.40

Pay

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=212)	(n=11)	(n=223)
<u>M</u>	7.08	12.00	7.32
<u>SD</u>	7.96	14.14	8.38

Table 25 Continued

Promotional Opportunities

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=212)	(n=11)	(n=223)
<u>M</u>	13.03	8.36	12.80
<u>SD</u>	13.64	8.29	13.45

Supervision

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=212)	(n=11)	(n=223)
<u>M</u>	33.94	36.00	34.04
<u>SD</u>	15.95	12.42	15.78

Co-Workers

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=212)	(n=11)	(n=223)
<u>M</u>	33.69	33.18	33.67
<u>SD</u>	14.11	11.59	13.98

Table 25 Continued*Total JDI*

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(<i>n</i> =212)	(<i>n</i> =11)	(<i>n</i> =223)
<u>M</u>	117.37	121.09	117.55
<u>SD</u>	42.40	49.85	42.68

Note. The maximum scores for the individual scales is 54 points, this represents a perfect positive attitude. A balanced attitude is represented by 27 points. The overall perfect positive attitude is represented by a score of 270 points with a balanced attitude being 135 points.

Table 26 shows the OCQ mean scores for respondents as it relates to their race. The results indicate that both Black and White Kentucky probation and parole officers had an average level of organizational commitment. Group means for the two groups were virtually the same.

Table 26

Mean OCQ Scores for Respondents Based on Ethnicity

	<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=212)	(n=11)	(n=223)
<u>M</u>	60.46	59.82	60.43
<u>SD</u>	18.12	18.99	18.12

Note. The maximum score for the OCQ indicating complete commitment to the organization is 105 points. A balanced attitude is represented by a score of 60 points

Education Level

In this country probation and parole officers – unlike police officers – are required to have at least a Bachelor’s degree to work in state-run probation and parole field agencies. Table 27 shows that the Kentucky probation and parole officers with a graduate degree had an average level of global job satisfaction, while those officers with a Bachelor’s degree had an above average level of global job satisfaction. Group differences were not statistically significant, however.

Table 27

Mean JIG Scores for Education Level

	4-Year College Degree	Graduate Degree(s)	Total
<u>Scale</u>	(<i>n</i> =195)	(<i>n</i> =29)	(<i>n</i> =224)
<u>M</u>	30.46	27.10	30.03
<u>SD</u>	15.11	16.31	15.28

Note. The maximum score on the JIG is 54 points. This would reflect a perfect positive attitude. A score of 27 points is considered a balanced attitude.

Table 28 shows probation and parole officers in Kentucky with a Bachelor's degree had more satisfaction with their promotional opportunities and supervisors than did the probation and parole officers with a graduate degree. Those with graduate degrees were more satisfied with the work itself, their pay, and their co-workers than their counterparts with a Bachelor's degree. Those with a Bachelor's degree edged out those with a graduate degree in overall, facet job satisfaction. None of these group differences were statistically significant.

Table 28

Mean JDI Scores Based on Education Level

Work

	<u>4-Year College Degree</u>	<u>Graduate Degree(s)</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=195)	(n=29)	(n=224)
<u>M</u>	29.59	30.41	29.70
<u>SD</u>	11.34	11.83	11.39

Table 28 Continued

Pay

	<u>4-Year College Degree</u>	<u>Graduate Degree(s)</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=195)	(n=29)	(n=224)
<u>M</u>	7.12	8.00	7.23
<u>SD</u>	8.06	10.47	8.39

Promotional Opportunities

	<u>4-Year College Degree</u>	<u>Graduate Degree(s)</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=195)	(n=29)	(n=224)
<u>M</u>	13.08	11.72	12.90
<u>SD</u>	13.46	14.45	13.56

Supervision

	<u>4-Year College Degree</u>	<u>Graduate Degree(s)</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=195)	(n=29)	(n=224)
<u>M</u>	34.64	32.10	34.31
<u>SD</u>	15.59	17.03	15.76

Table 28 Continued*Co-Workers*

	<u>4-Year College Degree</u>	<u>Graduate Degree(s)</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=195)	(n=29)	(n=224)
<u>M</u>	33.62	34.31	33.71
<u>SD</u>	14.00	14.28	14.01

Total JDI

	<u>4-Year College Degree</u>	<u>Graduate Degree(s)</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=195)	(n=29)	(n=224)
<u>M</u>	118.05	116.55	117.85
<u>SD</u>	42.43	45.29	42.71

Note. The maximum scores for the individual scales is 54 points, this represents a perfect positive attitude. A balanced attitude is represented by 27 points. The overall perfect positive attitude is represented by a score of 270 points with a balanced attitude being 135 points.

Table 29 shows the organizational commitment level is virtually the same for both educational groups. Both groups had an average level of organizational commitment.

Table 29

Mean OCQ Scores for Education Level

	<u>4-Year College Degree</u>	<u>Graduate Degree(s)</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	<i>(n=195)</i>	<i>(n=29)</i>	<i>(n=224)</i>
<u>M</u>	60.50	60.38	60.48
<u>SD</u>	18.30	17.18	18.12

Note. The maximum score for the OCQ indicating complete commitment to the organization is 105 points. A balanced attitude is represented by a score of 60 points.

Job Autonomy

Table 30 shows that those probation and parole officers who felt they had sufficient job autonomy also had more global job satisfaction than their counterparts with insufficient job autonomy. Those respondents who felt they had sufficient job autonomy had above average global job satisfaction while those who felt they did not have sufficient job autonomy had below average global job satisfaction.

These group differences in job autonomy were found to be statistically significant:

ANOVA: $f(1, 225) = 14.20, p = .001; \eta^2 = .06$

Mann-Whitney: $u = 1808.50, p = .001$

Table 30

Mean JIG Scores for Job Autonomy

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	<i>(n=196)</i>	<i>(n=30)</i>	<i>(n=226)</i>
<u>M</u>	31.46	20.53	30.01
<u>SD</u>	14.43	17.03	15.22

Note. The maximum score on the JIG is 54 points. This would reflect a perfect positive attitude. A score of 27 points is considered a balanced attitude.

Table 31 depicts officer attitudes toward their work when job autonomy is taken into account. One of the major findings of this study is that the officers who felt they had sufficient autonomy to do their jobs had higher scores on each of the JDI faceted subscales, and in the JDI as a whole, than their counterparts who did not feel they had sufficient autonomy. Moreover, in each instance, these group differences were statistically significant.

Work:

ANOVA: $f(1, 225) = 10.75, p = .001; \eta^2 = .05$

Mann-Whitney: $u = 1983.50, p = .004$

Pay:

ANOVA: $f(1, 225) = 4.93, p = .027; \eta^2 = .02$

Mann-Whitney: $u = 2225.00, p = .029$

Promotional Opportunities:

ANOVA: $f(1, 225) = 5.10, p = .025; \eta^2 = .02$

Supervision:

ANOVA: $f(1, 225) = 21.74, p = .001; \eta^2 = .09$

Mann-Whitney: $u = 1504.00, p = .001$

Co-Workers:

ANOVA: $f(1, 225) = 5.01, p = .026; \eta^2 = .02$

Mann-Whitney: $u = 2227.50, p = .033$

Overall JDI:

ANOVA: $f(1, 225) = 20.90, p = .001; \eta^2 = .09$

Mann-Whitney: $u = 1496.50, p = .001$

Table 31

Mean JDI Scores for Job Autonomy

Work

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(<i>n=196</i>)	(<i>n=30</i>)	(<i>n=226</i>)
<u>M</u>	30.60	23.47	29.65
<u>SD</u>	10.83	12.69	11.33

Table 31 Continued*Pay*

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=196)	(n=30)	(n=226)
<u>M</u>	7.67	4.07	7.19
<u>SD</u>	8.70	4.68	8.36

Promotional Opportunities

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=196)	(n=30)	(n=226)
<u>M</u>	13.50	7.60	12.72
<u>SD</u>	14.04	6.82	13.45

Supervision

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=196)	(n=30)	(n=226)
<u>M</u>	35.86	22.10	34.03
<u>SD</u>	14.99	15.43	15.73

Table 31 Continued*Co-Workers*

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=196)	(n=30)	(n=226)
<u>M</u>	34.33	28.27	33.52
<u>SD</u>	13.60	15.16	13.94

Total JDI

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=196)	(n=30)	(n=226)
<u>M</u>	121.95	85.50	117.12
<u>SD</u>	41.51	34.53	42.44

Note. The maximum scores for the individual scales is 54 points, this represents a perfect positive attitude. A balanced attitude is represented by 27 points. The overall perfect positive attitude is represented by a score of 270 points with a balanced attitude being 135 points.

Table 32 reveals that probation and parole officers who felt they had sufficient job autonomy had greater commitment to their employing organization than those officers who did not think they had sufficient job autonomy. These group differences were found to be statistically significant.

ANOVA: $f(1, 225) = 4.33, p = .039; \eta^2 = .02$

Mann-Whitney: $u = 2226.00, p = .032$

Table 32

Mean OCQ Scores for Job Autonomy

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	<i>(n=196)</i>	<i>(n=30)</i>	<i>(n=226)</i>
<u>M</u>	61.40	54.10	60.43
<u>SD</u>	18.04	17.02	18.04

Note. The maximum score for the OCQ indicating complete commitment to the organization is 105 points. A balanced attitude is represented by a score of 60 points.

Political Orientation

Table 33 indicates that all probation and parole officers of all political persuasions had job satisfaction. The group that showed the highest level of global job satisfaction was the moderate group. The liberal and conservative groups only showed a mean score difference of 0.26. Group differences were not statistically significant.

Table 33

Mean JIG Scores for Political Orientation

	<u>Liberal</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Conservative</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=41)	(n=97)	(n=83)	
	(n=221)			
<u>M</u>	29.39	31.26	29.13	30.11
<u>SD</u>	15.31	14.58	16.02	15.23

Note. The maximum score on the JIG is 54 points. This would reflect a perfect positive attitude. A score of 27 points is considered a balanced attitude.

Table 34 suggests the impact political orientation has on views about work. The moderates, who represented the most common political orientation, had the highest satisfaction with the work itself and promotional opportunities. In all of the other subscales (pay, supervision, and co-workers) and the composite measure (the total JDI), the liberals expressed the greatest job satisfaction. The conservatives, in fact, did not have the highest job satisfaction on any of the scales (JIG, JDI, or OCQ). None of these group differences however, were statistically significant.

Table 34

Mean JDI Scores for Political Orientation

Work

	<u>Liberal</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Conservative</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=41)	(n=97)	(n=83)	(n=221)
<u>M</u>	29.85	30.33	28.87	29.69
<u>SD</u>	11.36	11.51	11.00	11.29

Table 34 Continued

Pay

	<u>Liberal</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Conservative</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=41)	(n=97)	(n=83)	(n=221)
<u>M</u>	7.76	7.46	6.87	7.29
<u>SD</u>	8.92	8.52	8.15	8.43

Promotional Opportunities

	<u>Liberal</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Conservative</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=41)	(n=97)	(n=83)	(n=221)
<u>M</u>	13.22	13.98	11.57	12.93
<u>SD</u>	13.82	13.87	13.12	13.57

Supervision

	<u>Liberal</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Conservative</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=41)	(n=97)	(n=83)	(n=221)
<u>M</u>	36.34	35.55	31.36	34.12
<u>SD</u>	16.50	14.88	16.37	15.83

Table 34 Continued*Co-Workers*

	<u>Liberal</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Conservative</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=41)	(n=97)	(n=83)	(n=221)
<u>M</u>	33.90	33.63	33.84	33.76
<u>SD</u>	14.72	14.15	13.18	13.84

Total JDI

	<u>Liberal</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Conservative</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(n=41)	(n=97)	(n=83)	(n=221)
<u>M</u>	121.07	120.95	112.51	117.80
<u>SD</u>	43.91	44.09	40.25	42.62

Note. The maximum scores for the individual scales is 54 points, this represents a perfect positive attitude. A balanced attitude is represented by 27 points. The overall perfect positive attitude is represented by a score of 270 points with a balanced attitude being 135 points.

Table 35 indicates that moderate and liberal probation and parole officers show a higher degree of organizational commitment than do conservatives, although only slightly. All three political groups had an average level of organizational commitment. Group differences were not statistically significant.

Table 35

Mean OCQ Scores for Political Orientation

	<u>Liberal</u>	<u>Moderate</u>	<u>Conservative</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Scale</u>	(<i>n=41</i>)	(<i>n=97</i>)	(<i>n=83</i>)	(<i>n=221</i>)
M	60.20	61.76	59.41	60.59
SD	18.36	17.94	17.85	17.93

Note. The maximum score for the OCQ indicating complete commitment to the organization is 105 points. A balanced attitude is represented by a score of 60 points.

Regression Analysis

Multivariate Data Analysis

So far, we have been examining bivariate analysis of the data. We will now explore the impact of a number of independent variables simultaneously on the three major dependent variables in this research project: global job satisfaction (JIG), faceted job satisfaction (JDI), and organizational commitment (OCQ). Dummy-coded step with multiple-regression was used in this analysis. Here are the major findings: two independent variables were found to be statistically significant with reference to the dependent variable, global job satisfaction. The Adjusted R square for time-in-grade was .06 [.061], indicating that 6% of the variance in global job satisfaction is explained by time-in-grade. The Adjusted R square for job autonomy was .10 [.102], an additional 4% of the variance in the dependent variable, global job satisfaction is explained by this second independent variable, job autonomy. This means, though, that 90% of the variance in the officer's scores must be explained by other independent variables which were not entered into the first regression equation.

If we add the independent variable, organizational commitment into the regression equation, then two independent variables prove significant: 1) organizational commitment, with an Adjusted R Square of .55 [.545]; and 2) job autonomy with an Adjusted R Square of .56 [.558]. These two independent variables thus account for 56% of the variance in the officers' scores. This means, of course, that 44% of the variance must still be accounted for by other independent variables.

Turning to the faceted measure of job satisfaction, if one excludes organizational commitment from the regression equation, two independent variables turn out to be statistically significant: 1) time-in-grade (Adjusted R Square = .11) [.107] and, 2) job autonomy (Adjusted R Square = .15) [.145]. However, if one includes organizational commitment to the regression equation, four independent variables prove statistically significant: 1) organizational commitment (Adjusted R Square = .36) [.363], 2) length of service (Adjusted R Square = .40) [.397], 3) sex (Adjusted R Square = .41) [.410], and 4) job autonomy (Adjusted R Square = .43) [.428]. The independent variables must still account for 57% of the variables in officers' scores on the faceted mean of job satisfaction (JDI).

When organizational commitment is the independent variable, three independent variables prove to be statistically significant: 1) time-in-grade (Adjusted R Square = .09) [.087], 2) sex (Adjusted R Square = .10) [.100], and 3) age (Adjusted R Square = .12) [.118]. However, if one adds global job satisfaction to the regression equation the following three independent variables prove to be statistically significant: 1) global job satisfaction (Adjusted R Square = .55) [.545], 2) time-in-grade (Adjusted R Square = .56) [.557], and 3) type of work (Adjusted R Square = .56) [.563]. This means that other independent variables must explain the remaining 44% of the variance in the officers' scores on the organizational commitment scale.

CHAPTER IV

Conclusion

A number of hypothesis were posited earlier in the methodology chapter, namely:

1) the Kentucky probation and parole officers would have a low level of overall job satisfaction (confirmed); 2) the higher the rank the greater the job satisfaction (failed to confirm); 3) as length of service increases, job satisfaction decreases (generally confirmed); 4) job satisfaction will be higher with respect to the work itself than for pay or promotional opportunities (confirmed); 5) there will be no significant gender differences (failed to confirm); and 6) officers will have a moderate level of organizational commitment (confirmed).

In general terms, one could say both organizational variables and individual variables contributed to the Kentucky probation and parole officers' job satisfaction, as well as the lack thereof. The officers were clearly disturbed by the low pay and limited promotional opportunities; time-in-grade is a partial reflection of promotional opportunities, clearly reduced job satisfaction. These are organizational variables that limited job satisfaction. However, another organizational variable, supervision, raised job satisfaction. Another organizational variable, job autonomy, clearly raised job satisfaction and organizational commitment as well. Age and sex were two examples of demographic variables which influence job satisfaction. Consequently, one could say that job satisfaction is the product of a number of factors it is influenced by what you bring to work and what happens to you at work.

One last note is in order. One could argue that the relatively small sample size ($n=233$) and limited response rate (37%) in the current study makes one question the reliability of the Kentucky results. It should be pointed out, though, that this current study is a replication of an earlier study (Carlini, 2009) of probation and parole officers in Tennessee. Although the Tennessee study had a larger sample size ($n=425$) and a higher response rate (58%), the same exact scales were used, and the results were remarkably similar. The job satisfaction scores of the Kentucky probation and parole officers were lower than those of the Tennessee probation and parole officers, but a pattern is observable in both studies.

Comparison Table

	Scale Mean	Scale Mean	
	<u>KY Study</u>	<u>TN Study</u>	
<u>Scale</u>	(n=233) 37%	(n=425) 58%	
<u>JIG</u>	30.2	36.0	(both above average)
<u>Work</u>	29.7	34.9	(both above average)
<u>Pay</u>	7.35	12.7	(both below average)
<u>Promotions</u>	12.9	13.4	(both below average)
<u>Supervision</u>	33.8	35.3	(both above average)
<u>Co-Workers</u>	33.5	32.2	(both above average)
<u>Total JDI</u>	117.3	128.5	(both below average)
<u>OCQ</u>	60.4	64.8	(both average)

The remarkably similar results give no additional confidence in the reliability of the Kentucky findings.

References

- Amahile, T. M., Hill, K. G., Hennessey, B. A., and Tighe, E. M. (1994). The work preference inventory: assessing intrinsic and extrinsic motivational orientations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(5), 950-967.
- American Probation and Parole Association. Probation and parole [frequently asked questions]. (2009). Retrieved October 10, 2013 from https://www.appa.net.org/eweb/DynamicPage.aspx?WebCode=VB_FAQ
- Bangasser, R. A.-K. (2010). Stress on probation and parole officers: The impact of correctional orientation, caseload and safety on job satisfaction, burnout and turnover intention. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3411520).
- Bradley, , W. B. (1969). Community-based treatment for young adult offenders. *Crime and Delinquency*, 15(3), 359-370.
- Brown, P. A. (1990). Guns and probation officers: The unspoken reality. *Federal Probation*, 54(2), 21-26.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2009). Probation and parole in the United States, 2008 (DoJ Printing No. NCJ 228230). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2007). Occupational employment and wages, May 2007 21-1092 probation officers and correctional treatment specialists. (DoL Publication No. OES 211092). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Carlini, J. (2009). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment among workers for the Tennessee board of probation and parole. (Unpublished graduate thesis). Middle Tennessee State University.
- Churchwell, G. A., Ford, N. M., and Walker, Jr., O. C. (1976). Organizational climate and job satisfaction in the sales force. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 13(4), 323-332.
- Chiu, S.-F., Tsai, M.-C. (2006). Relationships among burnout, job involvement, and organizational citizenship behavior. *The Journal of Psychology*, 140(5), 517-530.
- Clear, T. R. (2005). Places not cases?: Re-thinking the probation focus. *The Howard Journal*, 44(2), 172-184.
- Ferris, D. L., Johnson, R. E., Rosen, C. C., Djurdjevic, E., Tan, J. A., Chang, C.-H. (2013). When is success not satisfying? Integrating regulatory focus and approach/avoidance motivation theories to explain the relation between core self-evaluation and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(2), 342-353.
- Freadenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burn-out. *Journal of Social Issues*, 30, 159-165.

- Getahun, S., Sims, B., and Hummer, D. (2008). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment among probation and parole officers: A case study. *Professional Issues in Criminal Justice*, 3(1), 1-16.
- Hansen, C. (2001). Where have all the probation officers gone. *Federal Probation*, 65(1), 51-53.
- Hellriegel, D. and White, G. E. (1973). Turnover of professionals in public accounting: A comparative analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 26, 239-249.
- Ironson, G. H., Smith, P. C., Brannick, M. T., Gibson, W. M. and Paul, K. B. (1989). Construction of a job in general scale: A comparison of global, composite, and specific measures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(2), 193-200.
- Judge, T. A. and Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits-self-esteem, generalized self-efficiency, locus of control, and emotional stability-with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(1), 80-92.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E. and Locke, E. (2000). Personality and job satisfaction: The Mending role of job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(2), 237-249.
- Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., and Durham, C. C. (1997). The dispositional causes of job satisfaction: A core evaluations approach. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 19, 151-188.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C. and Kluger, A.N. (1998). Dispositional effects on job and life satisfaction: The role of core evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(1), 17-34.

Kentucky.gov. Official website of the state of Kentucky. Retrieved 10/7/13

<https://sjobs.brassring.com/TGWebHost/home.aspx?partnerid=20101&siteid=503>

1

Kimball, L. S. and Nink, C. E. (2006). How to improve employee motivation, commitment, productivity, well-being and safety. *Corrections Today*, June, 66-74.

Lee, W.-J., Phelps, J. R. and Beto, D. R. (2009). Turnover intention among probation officers and direct care staff: A statewide study. *Federal Probation*, 73(3), 28-39.

Lee, W.-L., Joo, H.-J. and Johnson, W. W. (2009). The effect of participatory management on internal stress, overall job satisfaction, and turnover intention among federal probation officers. *Federal Probation*, June, 33-40.

Leiter, M. (1991). The dream denied: Professional burnout and the constraints of human service organizations. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, 32(4), 547-558.

Matz, A. K. and Kim, B. (2011). Policy implications of police-probation/parole partnerships: A review of the empirical literature. *Federal Probation*, 77(1),

- Maslach, C. and Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 2, 99-113.
- Meyer, J. P., and Allen, N. J. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1, 61-98.
- Meyer, J. P., Allen, N. J. and Smith, C. A. (1993). Commitment to organizations and occupations: Extension and test of a three-component conceptualization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78(4), 538-551.
- Mobley, W. H., Griffeth, R. W., Hand, H. H. and Meglino, B. M. (1979). Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86(3), 493-512.
- Mowday, R., Steers, R., & Porter, . (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- Muchinsky, P. M. (2012). *Psychology applied to work: An introduction to industrial and organizational psychology* (10th ed.). Summerfield, NC: Hypergraphic Press.
- National Institutes of Justice. (2003). Addressing probation and parole officer stress. (NIJ Publication No. 207012). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- National Institutes of Justice. (2005). Stress among probation and parole officers and what can be done about it. (NCJ Publication No. 205620). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Institutes of Justice. (2007). Helping probation and parole officers cope with stress. (NIJ Publication No. 220107). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Paparozzi, M. (2003). Probation, parole and public safety: The need for principled practices versus faddism and circular policy development. *Corrections Today*, August, 46-50.
- Petway, C. and VanDine, S. (2000, November). One moment in time: Using pagers to measure how parole/probation officers spend their time. Paper presented at the American Society for Criminology, San Francisco, CA.
- Proudfoot, J. G., Corr, P. J., Guest D. E. and Dunn, G. (2009). Cognitive-behavioral training to change attributional style improves employee well-being, job satisfaction, productivity and turnover. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46, 147-153.
- Robinson, G. and Raynor, P. (2006). The future of rehabilitation: What role for the probation service? *Probation Journal*, 53(4), 334-346.
- Rogers, R. (2009). A history of theories of management and job satisfaction. Unpublished manuscript, Middle Tennessee State University.

- Rothbart, M. K. (2007). Temperament, development, and personality. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16(4), 207-211.
- Roznowski, M. (1981). Examination of the measurement properties of the job descriptive index with experimental items. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 4, 805-814.
- Schloss, C. S. and Alarid, L. F. (2007). Standards in the privatization of probation services: A statutory analysis. *Criminal Justice Review*, 32(3), 233-245.
- Sigler, R. T. and McGraw, B. (1984). Adult probation and parole officers: Influence of their weapons, role perceptions and role conflict. *Criminal Justice Review*, 9, 28-32.
- Simons, C., Cochran, J. K., and Blount, W. R. (1997). The effects of job-related stress and job satisfaction on probation officers' inclinations to quit. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 2(2), 213-229.
- Slate, R. N., Wells, T. L., and Johnson, W. W. (2000). Up to speed. *Federal Probation*, 64(1), 56-60.
- Slate, R. N., Wells, T. L. and Johnson, W. W. (2003). Opening the manager's door: State probation officers stress and perceptions of participation in workplace decision making. *Crime and Delinquency*, 49(4), 519-541.

- Society for Human Resource Management. (2012). 2012 Employee job satisfaction and engagement: How employees are dealing with uncertainty. Alexandria, VA: Victor, J.
- Spector, P. E. (2012). *Industrial and organizational psychology: Research and practice* (6th ed.). Jefferson City, MO: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Varona, F. (1996). Relationships between communication satisfaction and organizational commitment in three Guatemalan organizations. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 33(2), 111-140.
- Veronesi, J. F. (2009). Is your workforce engaged to be satisfied? *Home Healthcare Management & Practice*, 21(2), 124-126.
- Vogt, P. N. (2005). *Dictionary of statistics & methodology*. (3rd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- West, A. D. and Seiter, R. P. (2004). Social worker or cop? Measuring the supervision styles of probation & parole officers in Kentucky and Missouri. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 27(2), 27-57.
- Whiteacre, K. W. (2006). Measuring job satisfaction and stress at a community corrections center: An evidence based study. *Corrections Today*, June, 70-73.
- Whitehead, J. T. (1985). Job burnout in probation and parole its extent and intervention implications. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 12(1), 91-110.

Whitehead, J. and Lindquist, C. (1985). Job stress and burnout among probation and parole officers: Perceptions and causal factors. *International Journal of Offender Therapy & Comparative Criminology*, 29(2), 109-119.

Wright, T. A. and Bonett, D. G. (2002). The moderating effects of employee tenure on the relation between organizational commitment and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(6), 1183-1190.

Wright, T. A., Cropanzano, R. and Bonett, D. G. (2007). The moderating role of employee positive well being on the relation between job satisfaction and job performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12(2), 93-104.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A IRB APPROVAL LETTER

June 3, 2013

Garen Blanchard, Robert Rogers

Department of Criminal Justice

**garen.blanchard@tn.gov,
robert.rogers@mtsu.edu**

Protocol Title: "Job Satisfaction Among Kentucky Probation and Parole Officers"

Protocol Number: 13-357

Dear Investigator(s),

The exemption is pursuant to 45 CFR 46.101(b) (2). This is because the research being conducted involves the use of educational tests, survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior.

You will need to submit an end-of-project report to the Compliance Office upon completion of your research. Complete research means that you have finished collecting data and you are ready to submit your thesis and/or publish your findings. Should you not finish your research within the three (3) 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 on **June 3, 2016.**

Any change to the protocol must be submitted to the IRB before implementing this change.

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 before they begin to work on the project. Once your research is completed, please send us a copy of the final report questionnaire to the Office of Compliance. This form can be located at www.mtsu.edu/irb on the forms page.

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,

Kellie Hilken

APPENDIX B PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Fellow Probation/Parole Officer;

My name is Garen Blanchard and I currently work for the Tennessee Department of Correction as a Probation Parole Officer in the Nashville Davidson County Sex Offender Unit. I am also a graduate student at Middle Tennessee State University in Murfreesboro, TN. The questionnaire that is attached to this letter is my thesis project. I am studying job satisfaction amongst other Probation and Parole Officers and have chosen your state to participate. Up front I would like to thank you for your assistance and time filling out the answer sheet. I completed this same survey in 2009 when a fellow student did the same study here in Tennessee. It takes roughly 10-15 minutes to complete and is completely confidential. Upon completion I have provided a self-addressed stamped envelope please place the optical scanner form in the envelope and return it. You may throw the bulky questionnaire away. Again I sincerely thank you for your assistance in completing this survey.

Sincerely;

Garen Blanchard

**JOB SATISFACTION AND ORGANIZATIONAL COMMITMENT
QUESTIONNAIRE**

[the Job Descriptive Index (1997 revision), the Job in
General Scale, & the Organizational Commitment
Questionnaire)]

Notice of Informed Consent to Participate in Research

This questionnaire survey is designed to give you an opportunity to express your views about various aspects of your work. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers; the best answers are your own honest opinions.

Please **don't** put your name on either the questionnaire or the optical scanner answer sheet. This is a **voluntary, anonymous** questionnaire survey. If you decide that you want to quit participating in this study, you may do so at any time with no consequences for you whatsoever. You may also choose to not answer any question. By completing the survey you are consenting to usage of the data collected for the purposes of research only. Study results will be shared with the administration (and you, if you'd like) **in aggregate form only**. You may contact us as follows:

Student: garen.blanchard@tn.gov (telephone #: 615-566-4413)
Professor: robert.rogers@mtsu.edu (telephone #: 615-898-5084)

Please mark your answers with a # 2 pencil only, on the green optical scanner sheet.

In this first section, we'd like to know how well you think the items listed below describe various aspects of your job. Please mark "a" on the green answer sheet for "yes" if you think the item offers an accurate description of your job, "b" for "?" if you can't decide, and "c" for "no" if you think it is an inaccurate description of your job.

Work on Present Job

Think of the work you do at present. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your work?

- | | | | |
|----------------|------------|----------|-----------|
| 1) Fascinating | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 2) Routine | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 3) Satisfying | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 4) Boring | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 5) Good | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |

- | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 6) Gives sense of accomplishment | <u>yes</u>
(a) | <u>?</u>
(b) | <u>no</u>
(c) |
| 7) Respected | <u>yes</u>
(a) | <u>?</u>
(b) | <u>no</u>
(c) |
| 8) Uncomfortable | <u>yes</u>
(a) | <u>?</u>
(b) | <u>no</u>
(c) |
| 9) Pleasant | <u>yes</u>
(a) | <u>?</u>
(b) | <u>no</u>
(c) |
| 10) Useful | <u>yes</u>
(a) | <u>?</u>
(b) | <u>no</u>
(c) |
| 11) Challenging | <u>yes</u>
(a) | <u>?</u>
(b) | <u>no</u>
(c) |
| 12) Simple | <u>yes</u>
(a) | <u>?</u>
(b) | <u>no</u>
(c) |
| 13) Repetitive | <u>yes</u>
(a) | <u>?</u>
(b) | <u>no</u>
(c) |
| 14) Creative | <u>yes</u>
(a) | <u>?</u>
(b) | <u>no</u>
(c) |

- | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------|----------|-----------|
| 15) Dull | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 16) Uninteresting | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 17) Can see results | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 18) Uses my abilities | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |

Pay

Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe your present pay?

- | | | | |
|---------------------|------------|----------|-----------|
| 19) Income adequate | | | |
| for normal | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| expenses | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 20) Fair | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 21) Barely live | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |

on income	(a)	(b)	(c)
22) Bad	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)
23) Income provides	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
luxuries	(a)	(b)	(c)
24) Less than I	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
deserve	(a)	(b)	(c)
25) Well paid	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)
26) Insecure	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)
27) Underpaid	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)

Opportunities for Promotion

Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following

words or phrases describe these promotional opportunities?

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 28) Good opportunities
for promotion | <u>yes</u>
(a) | <u>?</u>
(b) | <u>no</u>
(c) |
| 29) Opportunities
somewhat limited | <u>yes</u>
(a) | <u>?</u>
(b) | <u>no</u>
(c) |
| 30) Promotion on
ability | <u>yes</u>
(a) | <u>?</u>
(b) | <u>no</u>
(c) |
| 31) Dead-end job | <u>yes</u>
(a) | <u>?</u>
(b) | <u>no</u>
(c) |
| 32) Good chance for
promotion | <u>yes</u>
(a) | <u>?</u>
(b) | <u>no</u>
(c) |
| 33) Unfair promotion
policy | <u>yes</u>
(a) | <u>?</u>
(b) | <u>no</u>
(c) |
| 34) Infrequent
promotions | <u>yes</u>
(a) | <u>?</u>
(b) | <u>no</u>
(c) |
| 35) Regular
promotions | <u>yes</u>
(a) | <u>?</u>
(b) | <u>no</u>
(c) |

36) Fairly good			
chance for	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
promotion	(a)	(b)	(c)

Supervision

Think of the kind of supervision that you get on your job. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe this?

37) Ask my advice	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)

38) Hard to please	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)

39) Impolite	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)

40) Praises good	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
work	(a)	(b)	(c)

41) Tactful	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)

42) Influential	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)

- | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------|----------|-----------|
| 43) Up-to-date | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 44) Doesn't
supervise
enough | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 45) Has favorites | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 46) Tells me where
I stand | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 47) Annoying | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 48) Stubborn | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 49) Knows job well | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 50) Bad | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 51) Intelligent | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |

- | | | | |
|---------------------------|------------|----------|-----------|
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 52) Poor planner | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 53) Around when
needed | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 54) Lazy | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |

People on Your Present Job

Think of the majority of people (i.e., co-workers) with whom you work. How well does each of the following words or phrases describe these people?

- | | | | |
|-----------------|------------|----------|-----------|
| 55) Stimulating | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 56) Boring | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 57) Slow | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 58) Helpful | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |

	(a)	(b)	(c)
59) Stupid	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)
60) Responsible	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)
61) Fast	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)
62) Intelligent	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)
63) Easy to make enemies	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)
64) Talk too much	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)
65) Smart	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)
66) Lazy	<u>yes</u>	<u>?</u>	<u>no</u>
	(a)	(b)	(c)

- | | | | |
|----------------------|------------|----------|-----------|
| 67) Unpleasant | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 68) Gossipy | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 69) Active | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 70) Narrow interests | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 71) Loyal | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 72) Stubborn | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |

Job in General

Think of your job in general. All in all, what is it like most of the time?

- | | | | |
|--------------|------------|----------|-----------|
| 73) Pleasant | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | (a) | (b) | (c) |

- | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|------------|----------|-----------|
| 74) | Bad | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 75) | Ideal | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 76) | Waste of time | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 77) | Good | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 78) | Undesirable | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 79) | Worthwhile | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 80) | Worse than most | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | | (a) | (b) | (c) |

- | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|------------|----------|-----------|
| 81) | Acceptable | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 82) | Superior | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 83) | Better than most | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 84) | Disagreeable | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 85) | Makes me content | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 86) | Inadequate | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | | (a) | (b) | (c) |
| 87) | Excellent | <u>yes</u> | <u>?</u> | <u>no</u> |
| | | (a) | (b) | (c) |

slightly	moderately	strongly
<u>agree</u>	<u>agree</u>	<u>agree</u>
(e)	(f)	(g)

91) I am willing to put in a great deal of effort beyond that normally expected in order to help this organization be successful.

92) I talk up this organization to my friends as a great organization to work for.

93) I feel very little loyalty to this organization.

strongly	moderately	slightly	neither disagree
<u>disagree</u>	<u>disagree</u>	<u>disagree</u>	<u>nor agree</u>
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)

slightly	moderately	strongly
<u>agree</u>	<u>agree</u>	<u>agree</u>
(e)	(f)	(g)

94) I would accept almost any type of job assignment in order to keep working for this organization.

95) I find that my values and the organization's values are very similar.

96) I am proud to tell others that I am part of this organization.

- 97) I could just as well be working for a different organization as long as the type of work was similar.
- 98) This organization really inspires the very best in me in the way of job performance.
- 99) It would take very little change in my present circumstances to cause me to leave this organization.
- 100) I am extremely glad that I chose this organization to work for over others I was considering at the time I joined.
- 101) There's not too much to be gained by sticking with this organization indefinitely.
- 102) Often I find it difficult to agree with this organization's policies on important matters relating to its employees.
- 103) I really care about the fate of this organization.
- 104) For me this is the best of all possible organizations for which to work.
- 105) Deciding to work for this organization was a definite mistake on my part.

* * * * *

106) Which of the following statements best describes your own orientation?

- a) I am more interested in protecting society than in rehabilitating offenders.
- b) I am more interested in rehabilitating offenders than in protecting society.
- c) I am equally interested in protecting society and rehabilitating offenders.

107) Which of the following statements do you think best describes the orientation of your co-workers?

- a) They are more interested in protecting society than in rehabilitating offenders.
- b) They are more interested in rehabilitating offenders than in protecting society.
- c) They are equally interested in protecting society and rehabilitating offenders.

108) Would you say that, in general, you are satisfied with your job?

- a) yes
- b) no

109) Would you say that, in general, you are satisfied with your career?

- a) yes

b) no

110) Would you say that, in general, you are satisfied with your life?

a) yes

b) no

* * * * *

Finally, we'd like to know just a little bit about you so that we can see if different kinds of individuals have different attitudes about the issues we have been examining. We'd greatly appreciate it if you would answer the following demographic questions!

111) How long have you been working for your current employer?

a) less than 1 year

b) 1 to 2 years

c) 3 to 5 years

d) 6 to 10 years

e) over 10 years

112) How would you describe your current rank?

- a) Probation/Parole Officer I
- b) Probation/Parole Officer II
- c) Probation/Parole Officer III
- d) Probation/Parole Officer IV
- e) Probation/Parole Officer V
- f) Probation/Parole Investigator

113) How long have you been at this rank?

- a) less than 1 year
- b) 1 to 2 years
- c) 3 to 5 years
- d) 6 to 10 years
- e) over 10 years

114) What sort of work do you do?

- a) supervise a caseload of probationers
- b) supervise a caseload of parolees
- c) supervise a caseload of both probationers & parolees
- d) write presentence investigation reports
- e) write presentence investigation reports & supervise a caseload of probationers/parolees
- f) management
- g) other

115) Which sex are you?

- a) male
- b) female

116) How old are you?

- a) in your teens
- b) in your twenties
- c) in your thirties
- d) in your forties
- e) in your fifties
- f) in your sixties or above

117) What is your race or ethnic group?

- a) White
- b) Black
- c) Hispanic
- d) Oriental
- e) Other

118) Please indicate the highest level of formal education you have had:

- a) high school
- b) some college but no degree
- c) Associate's (2-year) degree(s)

- d) Bachelor's (4-year) degree(s)
- e) graduate degree(s)

119) Although my supervisors give me my specific job assignments, I am generally satisfied with the amount of control I have over the way I perform my duties on a day-to-day basis.

- a) yes
- b) no

120) Generally speaking, how would you describe your political orientation?

- a) liberal
- b) moderate
- c) conservative

This ends the questionnaire. Thank you so much for your cooperation. We really appreciate it! If you have any additional thoughts or comments you would like to make, please put them on a separate sheet and return them to us.