

JOB SATISFACTION OF JUVENILE FACILITY DIRECTORS: RESULTS FROM
A NATIONAL SURVEY

Amy Renee Flanigan, B. S.

Thesis Prepared for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

August 2001

APPROVED:

Tory Caeti, Major Professor

Eric Fritsch, Committee Member

Gail Caputo, Committee Member

Robert W. Taylor, Chair of the Department of Criminal
Justice

David W. Hartman, Dean of the School of Community
Service

Neal Tate, Dean, Robert B. Toulouse School of Graduate
Studies

Flanigan, Amy Renee, Job Satisfaction of Juvenile Facility Directors: Results from a National Survey. Master of Science (Criminal Justice), August 2001, 108 pp., 28 tables, references, 47 titles.

This study utilizes a national survey to measure the job satisfaction of juvenile facility directors. The prior literature has focused on the experiences of line personnel within the adult correctional system, and this research serves to provide new information regarding this specific population. The current study will address the predictors and correlates of a director's job satisfaction. It is hypothesized that specific characteristics within the organization will predict job satisfaction. Issues regarding staff within an institution and their affect on a director's job satisfaction are the focus. Results indicate that staff issues significantly contribute to the job satisfaction of a director. Specifically, this research can be used to understand facility director retention, staff and juvenile related issues, and the affect of job satisfaction on criminal justice policy issues.

Copyright 2001

by

Amy Renee Flanigan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	iv
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
Level of Job Satisfaction of Juvenile Facility Directors.....	8
Correlates and Predictors of Job Satisfaction	12
Job Satisfaction and its Affect on Perceptions.....	23
Job Satisfaction and Correctional Orientation.....	27
Summation of the Literature.....	29
3. METHODOLOGY.....	32
Overview of Project	32
Population under Study.....	33
Sampling.....	36
Overview of Measurement.....	37
Overview of the Survey Process.....	54
4. FINDINGS	57
Job Satisfaction Level of Juvenile Facility Directors.....	57
Correlates/ Predictors of Job Satisfaction.....	59
Job Satisfaction and Perceptions.....	72
Job Satisfaction and Correctional Orientation.....	77
5. DISCUSSION/CONCLUSIONS	81
Limitations.....	82
Results.....	83
Implications of Findings.....	91
APPENDIX.....	94
REFERENCE LIST.....	105

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Job Satisfaction Questions.....	40
2. Job Satisfaction Scale.....	40
3. Individual Characteristics.....	41
4. Background and Working Conditions.....	42
5. Staff Performance Index Questions.....	44
6. Staff Creativity Index Questions.....	45
7. Staff Problems Index Questions.....	46
8. Organizational Communication Index Questions.....	46
9. Staff Employment Index Questions.....	47
10. Staff Empowerment Index Questions.....	47
11. Internal Influences Index Questions.....	48
12. External Influences Index Questions.....	49
13. Rehabilitation Scale Questions.....	52
14. Punishment Scale Questions.....	52
15. Custody Scale Questions.....	53
16. Job Satisfaction Measurements.....	58
17. Individual Characteristics of Juvenile facility Directors.....	60
18. Background and Work Conditions of Juvenile Facility Directors.....	62
19. Specific Characteristics of Institution.....	63

20. Table of Correlates.....	65
21. Coefficients.....	70
22. Model Summary.....	70
23. Stress Measure.....	72
24. Facility Director’s Assessment of the Juvenile Population in Their Institution.....	74
25. Correlations of Juvenile Population.....	75
26. Staff Correlations.....	76
27. Percentages of Ranks by Goals of Juvenile Corrections.....	79
28. How Important is Rehabilitation to the Juvenile Correctional System?.....	83

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

The juvenile justice system in the United States has gone through tremendous changes over its one hundred-year history. From idealistic intentions of *parens patriae* to the tough on crime stance in recent years, the system has changed radically from its initial inception. The original concept behind the juvenile justice system developed from the idea of *parens patriae*. This doctrine was interpreted as giving the power to the king (state) to provide protection for persons who were not of full legal capacity. The essential component of this doctrine was focus on the welfare of the child. In this sense the juvenile court acted in the interests of the child noting that children did not have the capacity to understand and interpret their behavior as being delinquent. This line of thought led to the understanding that crimes committed by juveniles were not the same as those of adults, but rather supported evidence of delinquency. The aim was for adjudicated juveniles not to receive stigma later in life for their crimes under this philosophy, but rather were rehabilitated in order to change their delinquent behavior. In other words, the job of the court was not to punish juvenile crime but rather to guide delinquents toward a productive adult life.

In recent decades, as juvenile crimes began to increase in number and severity the goal of the juvenile justice system as being a rehabilitative tool began to be questioned. Ideas of a more punitive system began to surface with the idea that the public needed to be protected (Bazemore and Feder, 1997; Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Cullen, Cullen, and Wozniak, 1988; Ferdinand, 1994; McCorkle, 1993). Individuals, especially

juveniles, should be held accountable for their actions with swift and certain punishment (Forst, 1992). Many of the arguments pressing for this punitive stance were fueled by the idea that the public supported this ideological shift.

What has been found is that the public, if anything, supports a system based on rehabilitation especially in the area of juvenile justice (Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Bynum, Greene, and Cullen, 1986, 2000; Applegate, Cullen, and Fisher, 1997). More specifically, the public and legislatures alike support rehabilitation within the correctional process (Cullen, Golden, and Cullen, 1983; Bynum, Greene, and Cullen, 1986; Applegate 1997). This fact lends to the idea of a balanced approach to justice whereby both goals of rehabilitation and punishment are utilized within the same context.

These issues have led to multiple problems in the administration of justice in the United States. The change in ideology from juveniles being considered delinquents to offenders has led to a series of changes within the system. We are now faced with the dilemma of whether we want to simply protect the community from delinquents or rehabilitate these youths to prevent further delinquency.

The differing ideologies within the juvenile justice system are the backdrop for the current research. The dual goals of rehabilitation versus punishment could potentially create a major rift in the administration of programs within the juvenile justice system. Specifically, the juvenile correctional system has experienced some degree of conflict between these inherently different goals (Bazemore and Feder, 1997; Caeti, Hemmens, and Burton, 1994; Caeti, Hemmens, Burton and Cullen, 1997; Caeti, 2001; Farkas, 1999; Grusky, 1959; Hepburn and Albonetti, 1980; Loverich and Reisig, 1998; Poole and

Regoli, 1980; Sigler, 1988). It is important to understand how these conflicts are resolved in the day-to-day operations of juvenile justice. We have moved away from the specific idea that juveniles are in need of protection and rehabilitation and moved towards an idea of accountability and swift justice (Cullen et al., 1983, 1988, 1990; Forst, 1992).

Regardless, understanding the management and administration of juvenile justice systems in this country is an important step in identifying how theory is put into practice.

It is for this reason that this research looks at the administration of juvenile corrections in this country. The majority of the literature on the topic of juvenile corrections in criminal justice research has focused on the attitudes of line personnel in the adult system (Farmer, 1977, Mitchell, Mackenzie, Styve, and Gover, 2000, Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989, 1992; Jurik, 1985; Crouch and Alpert, 1988; Cullen, Lutze, Link, and Wolfe, 1989; Farkas, 1999; Hepburn and Bonetti, 1980; Loverich and Reisig, 1998) rather than on juvenile correctional administrators. The current research attempts to bridge the gap between the existing literature to focus on the administration of juvenile correctional facilities. Although it is important to identify the attitudes of the public as well as correctional officers in the field, the hypothesis here is that the attitudes of administrators and key decision-makers within the system serve to shape the organizational environment of correctional settings (Bazemore and Feder, 1997; Stohr, Loverich, Menke, and Zupan, 1994; Loverich and Reisig, 1998; Grusky, 1959, Caeti, 2001). A correctional administrator's attitude toward the goals of the juvenile justice system directly influences the way they manage a particular institution. Conflict resulting from focusing on multiple goals (i.e. rehabilitation versus punishment) has been linked to

higher levels of stress and low job satisfaction within individuals (Cullen et al., 1985; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989, 1992). High levels of stress are also associated with lower levels of job satisfaction for criminal justice professionals. An administrator's level of job satisfaction is crucial in understanding the management and operation of correctional facilities. If the upper level administrators have low job satisfaction, what climate are they creating for the rest of the facility?

In order to justify the purpose of studying the job satisfaction levels of juvenile correctional administrators, we must look at why this research is important and how it can be applied to the juvenile correctional system as a whole. Specifically, this research can be used to understand the concepts of director retention, staff and juvenile related issues, and the affect of job satisfaction on criminal justice policy issues. High rates of turnover within director positions of juvenile facilities results in inconsistent management practices. This inconsistency directly reflects onto the staff and juvenile populations within the institution creating a climate of uncertainty and ambiguousness. Finally, the attitudes and job satisfaction of juvenile facility directors is important in understanding how juvenile programs are implemented in the field. If a facility director is not satisfied with his/her position is that hindering the successful application of treatment and punitive programs within the institution? Does satisfaction level affect the rigorous implementation of juvenile justice policies and programs? These questions are the focus for the current research.

A self-administered questionnaire was used to measure the level of job satisfaction of juvenile facility directors in the United States. Specifically, the research

looked at the predictors and correlates of the job satisfaction levels of juvenile correctional administrators. By understanding the job satisfaction levels, what predicts high and low satisfaction, and the effects of this job satisfaction on the director we can begin to understand how it relates to the system as a whole. A juvenile correctional administrator serves to shape the entire climate of a correctional institution, and his/her level of job satisfaction bleeds into all aspects of the facility, both operationally and theoretically.

This research is a replication of a National Survey of Juvenile Correctional Administrators (Caeti, Hemmens and Burton, 1994). This research examines the relationship between general demographic factors, correctional orientation, and work-related variables on the job satisfaction levels of juvenile facility directors. Four specific questions are addressed:

1. What is the level of job satisfaction of juvenile facility directors?
2. What are the correlates/predictors of the job satisfaction of juvenile facility directors?
3. How does job satisfaction affect the perceptions of juvenile facility directors toward the juveniles, their staff, and their jobs?
4. How does job satisfaction affect the correctional orientation of juvenile facility directors?

Chapter Two will outline the current research on job satisfaction as related to predictors and correlates, it's affect on an administrators perceptions of their institution,

and it's relationship to correctional orientation. Although the literature is limited in regards to our target population, it is a necessary foundation to the current research.

In Chapter Three, the methodology used for the present study will be described in detail. Included will be the steps necessary to gather the list of all juvenile correctional facilities, issues regarding the construction of the survey instrument, and the specific tools used to measure job satisfaction. Detailed information regarding the scales and indexes used to measure the correlates and predictors of job satisfaction will be included as well.

The results from the analysis and findings from the study will be provided in Chapter Four. Initially, the level of job satisfaction of the juvenile facility directors will be addressed including comparisons of similar populations within criminal justice personnel. Second, an analysis of the correlates and predictors of job satisfaction will be included. Chapter Four will next address the affects of job satisfaction with regards to staff, the juveniles, and a director's attitude toward their job in general. And finally, the relationship between job satisfaction and correctional orientation will be discussed.

Finally, Chapter Five will be reserved for discussion of the major implications of the study upon the juvenile justice system. What effect will knowing the job satisfaction levels of facility directors have on the system as a whole? In addition, Chapter Five will address the limitations of the current study and discuss the topics for further research in the area of juvenile corrections.

CHAPTER II LITERATURE REVIEW

The central hypothesis of the current research is that the job satisfaction levels of juvenile correctional administrators are important in understanding how correctional institutions in this country are managed and operated. While there is an abundant amount of information on the topic of juvenile corrections within criminal justice research, there is much variation as to its scope and depth. Much of the literature is limited to the correctional line staff in adult prisons, however where the information is available studies focusing solely on correctional administrators or key decision-makers will be utilized. The purpose of studying correctional administrators is that the attitudes and beliefs of these individuals will differ distinctly from that of correctional line workers and serve to shape the climate of the rest of the institution. By understanding that their behaviors, attitudes, and ultimately their degree of satisfaction serves as a roadmap of how the rest of an institution looks at their jobs; we can begin to see the importance of studying job satisfaction

The purpose of this research is to assess the predictors and correlates of the job satisfaction of correctional administrators within the United States. The major topics of discussion will be job satisfaction issues as related to the level of job satisfaction, the correlates and predictors of job satisfaction, the perceptions of correctional personnel, and the relationship between job satisfaction and correctional orientation. In order to

measure these topics, several questions will be used to guide the research. The general research questions to be addressed include:

1. What is the level of job satisfaction of juvenile facility directors?
2. What are the correlates/predictors of the job satisfaction of juvenile facility directors?
3. How does job satisfaction affect the perceptions of juvenile facility directors toward the juveniles, their staff, and their jobs?
4. How does job satisfaction affect the correctional orientation of juvenile facility directors?

Level of Job Satisfaction of Juvenile Facility Directors

Research used to measure the level of job satisfaction within correctional institutions, specifically of the administrators of these institutions, is necessary in order to gain an understanding of how the correctional system actually works. Developing an accurate picture of the job satisfaction levels of juvenile facility directors is important in understanding job retention, staff related issues, juvenile issues, and general philosophy regarding juvenile corrections. Juvenile facility directors are in a unique place within the prior research within juvenile corrections because this population is one in which little to no research has been conducted in the past. While the research on the satisfaction levels of juvenile facility directors is limited; job satisfaction levels have been measured with a variety of correctional personnel including correctional administrators (Caeti, Hemmens, and Burton, 1994; Caeti, Hemmens, Burton, and Cullen, 1997; Caeti, 2001 (forthcoming), correctional line staff (Gordon, 2001; Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link, and

Wolfe, 1991), and prison wardens (Flanagan, Johnson, and Bennett, 1996; Cullen et al., 1988, 1989, 1990, 1993). Same and or similar measures of job satisfaction will be used in the current research. All scales are adopted from the prior literature and have a reliability index of at least .75 (Cullen et al, 1993; Burton et al., 1991). This similarity is important because it allows for comparisons between different areas in corrections, more specifically comparisons between the adult and juvenile systems.

While the purpose of this research is directed only at juvenile facility directors, it is important to note the available comparisons between different correctional personnel populations. Studying job satisfaction is important to understand how the philosophy of the criminal justice system is applied into the real world and how this system affects the individuals working within it. Finally, in order to justify the purpose of studying the job satisfaction levels of these individuals, we must look at why this research is important and how it can be applied to the juvenile correctional system as a whole. Specifically, this research can be used to understand the concepts of director retention, staff and juvenile related issues, and the affect of job satisfaction on criminal justice policy issues.

Job Retention

The most basic application of this research is the relationship between job satisfaction levels and job retention of juvenile facility directors. When individuals are not satisfied with their jobs they are more likely to leave the profession. Not only are we concerned with retaining qualified administrators, but also how high turnover rates affect the institution as a whole.

Especially for the area of juvenile corrections, maintaining qualified staff is an essential component of maintaining consistency within the institution both for the staff and juvenile populations. Consistency is paramount in maintaining a well-organized and stable institution. By understanding the relationship between job satisfaction and retention levels of juvenile facility directors we can move a step closer in ensuring this consistency exists.

In addition to consistency in the correctional environment, retention of qualified administrators serves to shape the environment within the institution. Correctional administrators are in a unique position in that their behaviors, attitudes, and actions serve as an example of how the organization should work. If new administrators are continually moving into the institution as a result of high turnover it presents an image to the rest of the facility that even the directors don't want to be there.

A third factor relating to job retention is the aspect of cost. Two aspects of cost are important for the population of juvenile facility directors; financial cost and the cost of time. The cost of training new employees in any field is expensive, and any additional cost in a juvenile correctional institution is cost taken away from the management and administration of juvenile programs. Cost is also related to time, in the time it takes to find and hire a new administrator the whole institution may suffer.

Finally, retaining consistent and qualified staff is important to insure a high quality of management within the correctional institution. Maintaining qualified correctional administrators who have high levels of job satisfaction will promote the smooth flow of operations within the facility.

Staff Issues

A second major issue in the importance of studying the job satisfaction levels of juvenile facility directors is its relationship to staff within the institution. As stated earlier, the attitudes and behaviors of correctional administrators serve to shape the environment within the institution. Staff within the institution use administrators as a sign of how the institution is running. Issues related to staff retention, implementing programs effectively, and cost can be correlated with the job satisfaction levels of administrators. There is little in the available literature on the role staff issues play in the job satisfaction of juvenile facility directors. However, Caeti et al. (1995) found that many juvenile facility directors rated staff issues as more problematic than juvenile issues. Therefore, staff issues must be accounted for in this research to identify this missing link.

Juvenile Issues

A third issue related to the job satisfaction levels of administrators is its affect on the juveniles within the institution. The purpose of having a juvenile correctional institution is to manage and rehabilitate juveniles. If administrators have lost their ability to effectively provide these services, the juveniles will suffer. Quality of care is an important part of the correctional process. Although the juveniles have been ordered to the institution as a punishment they should in no way be denied the services, even if it is punishment, because of a facility director who is not satisfied with their job. It is therefore important to address the relationship between a director and his/her juvenile population.

Philosophy

Finally, research measuring the job satisfaction levels of juvenile facility directors is important in understanding the overall philosophy of juvenile justice and the implementation of programs within it. How does job satisfaction levels influence how an administrator views his or her staff, the juveniles, the system, and the goals of the system? Finally, does the satisfaction level of an administrator affect their correctional orientation as either rehabilitative or punitive? Prior research has shown that low job satisfaction is related to more punitive attitudes (Caeti et al., 1995).

Correlates and Predictors of Job Satisfaction

The second research question addresses the correlates and predictors of job satisfaction. The literature is fairly consistent in explaining the correlates and predictors of attitudes and job satisfaction levels within criminal justice personnel (Bazemore and Dicker, 1994; Caeti, Hemmens, and Burton, 1994; Caeti et al., 1997; Caeti, 2001; Farmer, 1977; Flanagan, Johnson, and Bennett, 1996; Hoath, Schneider, and Starr, 1998; Jurik, 1985; Kauffman, 1981; Lambert, Barton, and Hogan, 1999; Loverich and Reisig, 1998; Mitchell et al., 2000; Robinson, Porporino, and Simourd, 1997; Zhao, Thurman and He, 1999) . The two major groupings of variables relating to attitudes and job satisfaction are individual characteristics and work-related/ organizational characteristics. The specific research on juvenile facility directors is limited to the prior study conducted by Caeti et al. (1995), so the majority of the literature focuses on police, probation and parole officers, and line staff within correctional institutions.

Individual Characteristics

A major predictor/correlate of job satisfaction identified in the prior literature is the category of individual characteristics (Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989, 1992; Cullen et al., 1985, 1989, 1990; Bazemore and Dicker, 1997; Jurik, 1985; Zhao, Thurman, and He, 1999; Mitchell et al., 2000). Individual characteristics can be identified as those variables related to the individual and what they bring to the work environment. The importation model of work environment assumes that individuals bring their own ideas about the world to the work environment. The Importation-Differential Experiences Model identifies the impact that an individual's personal and demographic factors have on ones experiences and perceptions in the work environment (Cullen et al., 1990). The model assumes that individuals bring with them different orientations that affect their work experiences. Individuals import their ideas from their own past experiences into their role within the work environment. It is assumed that these past experiences will taint the ability to have a clear, stable work environment in the present. The specific characteristics included in this model that relate to what an individual imports into the workplace that affect job satisfaction are age and experience, gender, race, education level, and stress levels.

Age

The variable age can be linked to chronological age as well as experience within the system. Age is related to the idea that older individuals or those who have been in the profession longer have fundamentally different perceptions about their jobs than the younger individuals. Older and more experienced individuals often see long-term

changes with regard to the correctional system as a whole. The assumption is that if an individual is dissatisfied with their job they would have already left the profession. In regards to correctional orientation, older officers are more likely to support rehabilitation. In contrast, the more experienced officer has also been found to be more likely to experience burnout, with less favorable attitudes toward inmates and a more custody orientation (Whitehead and Lindquist, 1996). Alienation was also found to vary with seniority. The relationship was found to follow a U curve: officers with 5-19 years of experience were found to be more alienated than those officers with less than 5 or more than 20 years of experience (Toch and Klofas, 1982; Kaufman, 1981). The existence of these differences in findings promotes the idea that more research is warranted with regards to the relationship between age and attitudes.

Gender

An increasing number of females have begun to enter the field of criminal justice, more specifically in corrections, in recent decades. Literature on the job satisfaction levels of these women indicates they have a fundamentally different experience in the workplace than males in the system. Both their experiences and their motivations for entering the profession seem to differ from their male counterparts. Analysis of the work orientations and job satisfaction levels of female correctional officers as compared to their male counterparts is a growing trend in correction research (Jurik and Halemba, 1984). The major hypothesis is that both male and female correctional officer's attitudes about their jobs and satisfaction is derived from their experiences at work rather than outside forces. This finding is similar to the research on correctional orientation on the

affect of individual versus organizational factors as contributing to an individuals experience in the workplace.

Female officers have been found to be more treatment oriented and satisfied than their male counterparts. In addition, the presence of female correctional officers is thought to make a favorable change in the conduct of inmates within the institution. The presence of females is seen as calming the atmosphere of the correctional institution. This process of increasing the amount of minority and female officers in the correctional setting is labeled integration (Cullen et al., 1990). This finding can be linked to women entering the profession of juvenile corrections more for an altruistic motivation than any other. Their main purpose is to treat and rehabilitate juveniles and the motivation may lead to a higher level of satisfaction derived from their careers.

Race

Staff perceptions of the work environment with regard to race account for a large percentage of the literature on the correlates of job satisfaction (Wright and Saylor, 1992; Zhao, Thurman, and He, 1999), stress (Liou, 1995), and correctional orientation (Cullen et al., 1989; Bazemore and Dicker, 1994; Van Voorhis et al., 1994; Whitehead and Lindquist; 1989, 1992). The research on worker ideology looks at the affects of race and gender on correctional orientation. The literature identifies the trend of the increasing use of minorities in correctional officer populations to insure that officers sharing the socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds of offenders would be more sympathetic to inmate rights (Robinson, Porporino, and Simourd, 1997; Jurik and Halemba, 1984; Wright and Saylor, 1992; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). Specifically for job satisfaction,

research in federal prisons has been conducted for both minority and non-minority correctional officers.

Wright and Saylor (1992) utilized the Prison Social Climate Survey to assess how minority correctional officers perceived the work environment within the prison setting. The survey included four sections: work environment, personal well-being, personal safety and security, and quality of life. The most important section to the current research is the work environment section. This section looks at how the work environment affects an individual's attitudes and experiences in the workplace. While the individual characteristic of race is important here, the majority of the literature links race with an individual's actual experience in the workplace (organizational characteristic). This section looks at four dependent variables: supervision, job-satisfaction, personal efficacy, and job-related stress. The variable supervision looked at respondent's views on the adequacy of supervision, looking at direction and freedom, and performance and feedback. The job satisfaction measure looked at the satisfaction, interest, suitability and likelihood of change for individuals. The personal efficacy measure looked at individual's belief that they can perform their jobs adequately and effectively. And finally, the job related stress item measures individual's stress level with regards to their attitudes and beliefs about their jobs. The assumptions were that if minority employees experienced harassment and/or discrimination in the workplace they would rate their attitudes toward their workplace more negatively than non-minority employees would. The results indicated that there is no relationship between race/ethnicity and perceptions about the quality of supervision and job satisfaction.

Education Level and Attainment

Education level and attainment in the profession of corrections has been an increasing requirement in recent decades. Education has been linked to correctional orientation and occupational adjustment of correctional officers (job satisfaction and stress/burnout). This increased focus on education has paralleled an increased focus on treatment rather than custody orientations among prisons. The jobs of criminal justice professionals in general have become more professionalized. The use of increased educational requirements has led to a professionalization with an additional result being an increase in the level of job satisfaction among employees. The literature is mixed as to whether this actually has occurred in the field. Some studies report that increased educational requirements lead to lower satisfaction of employees (Zhao, Thurman, and He, 1999), while others report little or no influence (Robinson, Porporino, and Simourd, 1997). Robinson, Porporino, and Simourd (1997) tried to measure the relationship of education and satisfaction with the Career Salience Scale. The scale was used to measure the extent to which correctional employees valued career development and planning. The findings of this study indicate that age and gender were better predictors of positive attitude and satisfaction than education. These findings are indicative that there is little agreement as to the significance of education in determining job satisfaction. It is for this reason that educational attainment will be included in the analysis.

Stress

The link between job satisfaction, role conflict, and stress in criminal justice professionals has been identified (Cullen et al., 1985; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1986).

Research on stress in criminal justice professionals has focused on police (Anshel, 2000; Baldwin and Harris, 1999; Hoath, Schneider, and Starr, 1998; Zhao, Thurman, and He, 1999), as well as corrections personnel (Whitehead and Lindquist, 1996; Toch and Klofas, 1982; Poole and Regoli, 1980; Pollak and Sigler, 1998; Liou, 1995; Kaufman, 1981). This relationship has been linked to job satisfaction, burnout and turnover in these professions. The problem with looking at the relationship between job satisfaction and stress is that it is often difficult to identify the direction of the relationship between these two factors. Does high stress lead to lower job satisfaction levels or visa versa?

Two types of stress have been identified in the literature, role stress and job stress (Poole and Regoli, 1980; Liou, 1995; Whitehead and Lindquist; 1986). Role stress can be defined as occurring as a result of ambiguousness and conflict in terms of a person's role in their job. Job stress can be defined as an individual's feelings of job-related anxiety and pressure.

The focus on stress in policing is predominant in the overall literature on stress in criminal justice professionals (Anshel, 2000; Hoath, Schneider, and Starr, 1998).

Although the work of police is fundamentally different that correctional personnel, it is important to see the indicators and issues related to stress in general for criminal justice professionals. High rates of the physical indicators of stress as well as psychological indicators have been identified in police populations. The causes of stress have been linked to situational factors and poor coping skills. Stress is understood in a conceptual model where the stages of acute stress can be identified and the implications of its prolonged presence understood (Anshel, 2000). It has been found that acute stress, when

not properly identified and coped with by the individual, leads to chronic stress. This chronic stress, which is defined as persistent and prolonged levels of stress, will affect the satisfaction levels of individuals including: burnout, low motivation, poor performance and eventual retiring from the field. This cycle leading to burnout and high turnover needs to be addressed in all criminal justice settings in order to identify ways in which this pattern can be corrected. A high level of turnover in police populations due to unmanaged stress influences the management and administration of police as a whole.

In addition to the literature on police, role and job stress has also been identified in the juvenile correctional setting. Liou (1995) looked at role/job stress among juvenile detention workers. The study attempted to look at the relationship between job/role stress, personal characteristics and job attitudes (correctional orientation). Factors related to stress found in the literature were that perceived job stability was negatively related to stress. External locus of control, hours worked per week and workload were positively related to stress. Therefore, when individuals felt out of control of their work environment and/or were overworked due to lack of staff, stress was present. When perceived role conflict and ambiguity in job role was found stress occurred in individuals.

In conclusion, some demographic factors have been found related to stress in individuals; age was negatively related to stress and education was positively related to stress. The relation of age can be applied to just chronological age and its affects but can also be related to tenure and job position of individuals as age increases. The assumption is that juvenile care workers experience higher degree of stress because the nature of

their job of working with juveniles promotes the dual orientations of treatment versus custody. As with many correctional officers it is found that juvenile correctional workers often find themselves as either supporting custody or treatment. It is rare that these two competing goals can coexist within individuals. The types of correctional orientation that individuals hold will affect the type of role/job stress they experience (Liou, 1995; Poole and Regoli, 1980). The literature on stress somewhat mirrors that of role conflict indicating that these variables may be correlated. A research note on this relationship is that because of the anticipated correlation between role conflict and stress it may be difficult to separate the two similar variables.

Organizational Characteristics

A second category of predictors/correlates of job satisfaction identified in the prior literature is organizational characteristics (Bazemore and Dicker, 1997; Cullen et al., 1989; Crouch and Alpert, 1990; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1992; Loverich and Reisig, 1994). Organizational characteristics can be identified as those variables related to the institution or the work experiences within the institution. Specific characteristics included in this category that relate to job satisfaction of juvenile facility directors are specific characteristics of the institution and job, experiences with staff, juvenile population within their facility, and types of influence on the director.

The Work Role-Prisonization Model emphasizes that some work roles overpower the individual differences that individuals bring to the work force (Cullen et al., 1990). With this model, Cullen assumes that the experiences in the work setting are more powerful than an individual's personal experiences. This theme of individual

characteristics versus organizational characteristics affecting the work environment is a common theme in the literature on management and organization in criminal justice (Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989, 1992; Cullen et al., 1985, 1989, 1990; Bazemore and Dicker, 1997; Jurik, 1985; Zhao, Thurman, and He, 1999; Mitchell et al., 2000). The question then becomes are orientations to one's work and labor experiences influenced more by individual characteristics like gender and race that workers bring (import) to the work setting, or are they affected predominately by work conditions (Cullen, 1990)? Work conditions in this study were correlated with actual assignment and work shift of correctional officers.

The literature related to job satisfaction points to the applicability of studying the topic to the management and administration of criminal justice. Low levels of job satisfaction have been connected to high rates of turnover in justice personnel. The literature on job satisfaction points to a very basic assumption about individual's experiences in the workplace; job satisfaction is ultimately determined by an individual experience at work (Zhao, Thurman, and He, 1999). Although it is important to understand how demographic and individual characteristics affect an individual level of job satisfaction; the work environment is essential to understanding satisfaction.

Characteristics of Work Environment and Job

Much of the literature emphasizes the importance of the work environment in developing correctional attitudes (Bazemore and Dicker, 1997; Cullen et al., 1989; Crouch and Alpert, 1990; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1992; Loverich and Reisig, 1994), and influencing the stress levels and satisfaction of individuals within the criminal justice

system. Organizational variables have been found to be more influential than traditional demographic or individual factors. Although individual attitudes are important, the climate of the work environment has a much larger affect of the orientations of correctional officers and criminal justice professional in general (Whitehead and Lindquist, 1989, 1992; Cullen et al., 1989, 1990; Bazemore and Dicker, 1997; Jurik, 1985; Zhao, Thurman, and He, 1999; Mitchell et al., 2000). The organizational factors identified in the literature point to the development of the work environment and climate of the institution in affecting attitudes of correctional personnel. The development of the work environment and climate is best created through prison administrators and management personnel. It is assumed that these individuals have the power and influence to create a work setting. The administrators in a sense set the tone for the rest of the organization to follow.

Work Related Issues

The work related issues identified in the literature deal predominately with correctional line staff populations. This limits the applicability to juvenile facility directors because the characteristics of the work environment may be fundamentally different for this population. Regardless, the specific work related variables identified in the literature are security level, work shift, and locality.

Security Level

Maximum-security assignment of correctional officers is predominate in the literature. Although this population is different from administrators the concept of working in a secure facility can be applied to both populations. Those officers in

minimum-security settings have a more favorable attitude toward inmates (Cullen et al., 1990). This finding may relate to the role an individual places in a maximum versus minimum-security setting. With maximum-security assignment the focus of correctional personnel is on custody rather than utilizing treatment options in a facility. The organizational setting is key to officer's perceptions about inmates and their roles in the institution. The attitude a correctional administrator has regarding the management of a facility will affect how line staff perceives the institution.

Work Shift

An individual's work shift determines the quantity and quality of interactions with others, both staff and inmates alike. The shift assigned to the individual officer determines the type of interactions they have with inmates. Those individuals working 'graveyard' shifts have fundamentally different perceptions about their job role than those individuals working daytime hours.

Job Satisfaction and its Affect on Perceptions

The third purpose of the research is to identify how the job satisfaction levels of juvenile facility directors affect their perceptions and attitudes. What are the consequences or results of low job satisfaction in juvenile facility directors? Several issues will be addressed regarding the results of low job satisfaction: stress, turnover, and alienation. The purpose of this question is to assess what affect job satisfaction has on a facility directors day to day working environment. Job satisfaction may be important to

study, but if it affects things greater than the individual then it is an even more important topic to address.

Consequences of Continued Stress

As noted previously, the relationship between stress and job satisfaction has been identified (Anshel, 2000; Baldwin and Harris, 1997; Farmer, 1977; Grusky, 1959; Hepburn and Albonetti; Liou, 1995; Mitchell et al., 2000; Pollak and Sigler, 1998; Poole and Regoli, 1980; Toch and Klofas, 1982; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1986). While this relationship has been noted, the direction of the correlation has not specifically been addressed. It is therefore important to identify how stress occurs and is related to job satisfaction levels.

In addition to the specific causes of stress, the literature also focuses on the results of continued stress in criminal justice. Continued stress in the workplace has been found to lead to burnout and cynicism (Whitehead and Lindquist, 1986; Poole and Regoli, 1980). The effects of stress have been linked to a burnout process. Job burnout was defined as “ a syndrome of emotional exhaustion and cynicism that occurs frequently among individuals who do ‘people work’” of any kind like that done in criminal justice (Whitehead and Lindquist; 1986). Burnout can lead to three outcomes:

1. Emotional exhaustion: is exhibited by feelings of exhaustion and over-extension in the workplace.
2. Depersonalization: results when an impersonal and/or cynical approach to clients occurs.

3. Lack of personal accomplishment: refers to the negative feelings of worthiness regarding work with clients.

The literature indicates that continued intense interpersonal contact with inmates leads to job stress and is a primary cause of job burnout. Additional factors related to job burnout were boredom, an excess of job demands and organizational factors. Chronic and intense stress by employees can lead to burnout, especially if they have no means of adapting or coping to the stress.

Turnover

A second consequence of low job satisfaction is high rates of turnover among employees. As noted earlier, a major purpose of studying the job satisfaction of correctional administrators is to assess its affect on retention of employees and the costs to the system. Baldwin et al. (1999) looks at the voluntary turnover practices of police officers in the Birmingham Alabama Police Department. By using the concept of confluency theory, the research states that police officers that are not in philosophical agreement with their departments leave within their first few years of employment. The implications of this research are to identify the causes and correlates of police officer turnover. The difference lies in the sources of turnover practices. Baldwin notes that when job expectations are not met individuals leave the profession. The belief is that incoming officers have certain expectations about their work as police officers prior to entering the profession. These expectations include ideas on general benefits, assigned positions, retirement benefits, opportunities for advancement, salary, leadership styles of chiefs, department administrative policies, and departmental personnel policies. Some of

the expectations of new recruits are unrealistic and should have been dealt with during training and recruitment. When these unrealistic expectations are not identified prior to entering the force these individuals experience cognitive dissonance. This cognitive dissonance occurs when individuals have contradictory perceptions about their roles as police officers. Their expectation about their roles and the environment of the police force are in conflict with the observed characteristics of the job. This conflict or dissonance leads to job dissatisfaction among the officers. The end result of this process is for officers to change or abandon their initial attitudes or leave the profession.

Alienation

Similar to the literature on turnover, worker alienation for the correctional officer is linked to job satisfaction (Toch and Klofas, 1982). This worker alienation is assumed to occur when there is a discrepancy between the aspirations of the worker and the actual job attributes. Job alienation is seen to lead to job burnout. Burnout occurs when individuals have high aspirations in terms of their careers and experience on the job contradicts these aspirations, which leads to indifference and cynical thinking about the field and their job in particular. The concepts of alienation that the research addressed were:

1. Powerlessness: can be described as a feeling of worthlessness in a job. One feels powerless when they believe that their experience in their job has no meaning and they cannot affect change.
2. Meaninglessness: a feeling of not knowing the expectations that you are being held to. An ambiguity about what you are supposed to do.

3. Self-estrangement: describes the feeling that your job has no worth.
4. Bureaucratic indifference: describes the feeling of staff when they feel as if their work is not appreciated and purposeful.

Although limiting, the research regarding the effects of low job satisfaction provide a framework in understanding why job satisfaction is important. The hypothesis in the current study is that job satisfaction is important in understanding how it affects the bigger picture. How does job satisfaction relate to retention, staff and juvenile issues, and overall implementation of policy?

Job Satisfaction and Correctional Orientation

The final question of the current research is to look at the relationship between job satisfaction and correctional orientation. Does ones attitude towards the goals of the juvenile system shape their experiences within it, or does their experiences within it shape how they view the system as a whole? This question may never be answered, but it is an important component of the current research.

Correlates of Correctional Beliefs and Orientation

The concept of correctional orientation has been a hot topic in the area of criminal justice in the past two decades. Correctional orientation refers to the attitudes of employees and administrators alike towards the goals of the correctional system. Specifically, the two major correctional orientations are rehabilitation and punishment orientation. The premise behind a rehabilitation orientation is the belief that offenders are in need of treatment in order to change their behaviors. A punishment orientation

emphasizes the impact of accountability and incapacitation of offenders for their crimes as a major goal. These often conflicting orientations occur at every level of the criminal justice system. Traditionally, the juvenile justice system in this country has focused primarily on the rehabilitation of delinquents. Due to this history of a rehabilitation stance toward juveniles it is believed that the degree of conflict of actors within this system will be greater than with adult populations.

The literature on adult prison settings offers a solution to successful management and operation of institutions that differs from the traditional punishment versus treatment approach. The best way to manage prisons is to utilize an ‘earned benefits’ approach rather than an order-first mentality (Stohr et al., 1994). Instead of putting the focus of prison management on rules and order, this management style attempts to treat employees and inmates alike with an air of responsibility and accountability. The goal of this setting is to ensure smooth operation of the facility as well as provide a safe environment for inmates and staff alike. The end result is that management practices are the key determinant to successful prison operations. The way that prison officials organize and run an institution is key to the successful maintenance of the facility.

In addition, DiLulio’s “Control Model” (1987) emphasizes both the control of procedural and security matters as well as modeling behavior of officers as to the correct behavior expected. By changing the way staff addresses the correctional system, one can gain more control of an institution. He asserts that this model will insure less violence and turnover in the facility as well as higher levels of morale and inmate development. Several factors are key to the successful implementation of the control model:

1. Formal bureaucratic organization
2. Hands on administrators
3. Consensus among correctional factions within and outside the facility

The literature on DiLulio's model looks at whether outcomes such as higher job satisfaction, lower stress, turnover, and role conflict were related to organizational attributes within the correctional facilities. The results of this research are important here because it links organizational variables to the concept of role conflict, job satisfaction and stress within individuals. To some degree the employees under an "employees investment model" had higher responses to job satisfaction and lower levels of role conflict and stress.

Summation of Literature

The literature regarding job satisfaction of criminal justice personnel, while abundant, is mixed at best. The major dilemma with looking at the prior literature in corrections is its lack of attention to the juvenile system. Much of the literature focuses on adult populations and the experiences of line staff within organizations rather than looking at the administration and management of criminal justice. Although the prior literature can be used as a foundation to the current research it by no means addresses all questions regarding the management and administration of juvenile correctional facilities. Can experiences in the adult system be applied to the experiences with juvenile populations? Do administrators at the adult level have different assumptions about their roles as administrators that would affect their experiences in the system? We cannot

assume that the adult and juvenile systems have similar attributes and that individuals within those systems would be similar. Although on the surface the jobs of juvenile correctional administrators may seem to mirror those within the adult system, the assumption made in the current research is that their experiences with regard to job satisfaction will be fundamentally different.

Initially, the purpose of the current research is to measure the job satisfaction levels of juvenile correctional administrators. The prior literature on this topic with this population is limited. Little or no research has been conducted on the key decision makers within juvenile correctional institutions. The prior research will serve as a basis for comparison of the job satisfaction levels of criminal justice personnel; at all levels.

Additionally, the literature identifies some major grouping of variables that are predictive of job satisfaction. Although we want to expand upon the existing research with the current study, there is no need to reinvent the wheel. An additional purpose of the current research is to verify conclusions drawn in prior research in corrections. Specifically, the emphasis on individual versus organizational characteristics as predictive or correlating to job satisfaction will be tested.

Third, the prior literature identifies the affects of low job satisfaction levels on employees in the system. Specifically, the relationship between the concepts of stress, burnout and turnover in criminal justice as a result of low job satisfaction. The current research will attempt to identify if these things result within juvenile correctional administrators.

Finally, the relationship between job satisfaction and correctional orientation within the field of juvenile corrections is a topic that has not been addresses previously. While both topics have an abundant amount of attention, the relationship between them has not been addressed in the prior literature.

The current research attempts to answer these fundamental questions about the experiences of juvenile facility directors in criminal justice. It attempts to bridge the gap between the prior literature on the topics of job satisfaction in juvenile corrections. Clearly more research is warranted not only in the area of adult corrections, but also juvenile corrections. The purpose of this study is to assess the attitudes and beliefs of juvenile facility directors in hopes of filling the void that currently exists in the literature. The present study has the opportunity to have significant implications on juvenile justice policy and to determine the predictors, correlates, and effects of job satisfaction levels of correctional administrators at the juvenile level.

CHAPTER III METHODOLOGY

Overview of Project/ Research Questions

This research is a replication of a study of juvenile facility directors conducted in 1995 (Caeti, Hemmens, and Burton, 1995). The survey instrument and procedures are adopted from this original project. The purpose of this research is to enhance our understanding of the attitudes and correctional beliefs of juvenile facility directors. In addition to building upon existing research on the attitudes of correctional administrators, this study will address the predictors and correlates of job satisfaction within this population. The degree to which a correctional administrator's orientation differs from that of their institution will affect their level of job satisfaction within their institution. This research will test this hypothesis and the results will be used to assess policy changes in the area of maintaining quality management, enhancing training, reducing turnover rates and stress management within juvenile correctional institutions.

Broad Research Questions:

1. What is the level of job satisfaction of juvenile facility directors?
2. What are the correlates/predictors of the job satisfaction of juvenile facility directors?
3. How does job satisfaction affect the perceptions of juvenile facility directors?
4. How does job satisfaction affect the correctional orientation of juvenile facility directors?

Population under Study

The population of this project is all juvenile facility directors in the United States. The title facility director is used to describe individuals who operate facilities housing convicted juvenile offenders. These institutions are traditionally state run facilities and a state or local court has convicted the juveniles within them. Juvenile correctional facilities are defined as state run institutions housing post-adjudicated youths that are not detention centers, drug treatment centers, or community based group homes. A complete list of these individuals was obtained from the American Correctional Association (ACA). The original list contained 475 names of juvenile correctional facilities with their corresponding directors in the United States. Although the list is a current database of facility directors, this information was updated using several methods to insure the accuracy of the list. Initially, the list was broken down by state and the individual facilities within the states were matched using the state sponsored web sites. For the majority of states, a current list of juvenile correctional facilities was available through this web site search. However, several problems arose from this web site search technique.

The first of these problems was the inconsistency in the terminology of local juvenile justice systems throughout the country. The assumption was that the other states would have similar systems to that of Texas where there is a distinction between Juvenile Detention Centers and Juvenile Correctional Facilities. The difference in Texas is that the former is a holding facility for juveniles for short periods of time or waiting for trial while the latter constitutes a state sanctioned facility for longer periods. This distinction is not as

clear for all states. In addition, in Texas there is a separate correctional system for juvenile offenders while in other states this responsibility is part of the adult correctional system.

The second major problem encountered with our web site search was the unavailability of web sites for all states. Some states had well-organized web sites with an abundance of information. While in others the information was sparse or no web site existed at all. These problems led us to a second step of verification of the ACA list.

After the initial web site verification ended, the second step was to contact the individual juvenile facility directors identified in the list. This process was utilized to insure the names of the facility directors were accurate and to identify any inaccuracies on the list (i.e. additional facilities not on the list or facilities that were no longer used or whose names had changed). Facility directors were contacted and their names, name of the facility, address and phone numbers were verified. The facility directors contacted were also questioned as to the system in their state. Information was gathered at this time about additional facilities in the area that we were unaware of. This process proved to be extremely helpful because many of the names and addresses had changed or had been deleted or added. In addition to this information, the juvenile facility directors were also notified at this time of their inclusion in a national survey of juvenile facility directors. This notification was made to insure that they were aware of the upcoming survey being sent to them. For those facilities where there was no phone number available, telephone information systems for each state were used. Once the verification was completed many of the facilities and directors were added as well as deleted. A total of 525 facilities were included in the initial list.

A major problem was found regarding the initial phone contact with the juvenile facility directors and the accuracy of the updated list. A large number of directors and facilities were not included in the original list. This exclusion occurred because not all of the facilities were contacted during the initial phone verification process. By not contacting all of the juvenile facilities the list of directors was incomplete. Unfortunately, this problem was not addressed until the second phone verification process (6 months after initial verification) that was conducted after the second wave of surveys was distributed.

In addition to the original verification process to update the list from the ACA, a second verification process was conducted after the second wave of surveys was distributed to the population. The second verification process was used to insure that the data about each facility was still correct. In addition, this verification was used to contact directors who had not responded to the initial two waves of the survey. Only facility directors who had not responded were notified at this time. The final phone verification process found several problems with the ACA corrected list. Many facilities had been included in the initial list that did not fit the profile of a juvenile correctional facility. In addition, in the 6 months from initial verification and final verification, many addresses and directors names had been changed. Unfortunately, the inaccuracies in the ACA list after initial verification were not identified until this time. The reasons for these inaccuracies may be due to actual change in the facilities or by inaccurate verification during the first wave.

Finally, the juvenile correctional facilities in two states required special authorization from their state offices in order to complete any survey regarding the management and operation of their facilities. Both Tennessee and Georgia required this

additional authorization. Both states requested additional information about the survey and uses of the information obtained. This process worked well for Tennessee, and the responses although delayed, were finally returned. The process of state authorization for Georgia was lengthier and less successful. Georgia required a copy of the survey, a copy of the research purpose and intended uses of the information, and approval from the director. Because of these problems, no responses from Georgia will be included in this analysis.

The final verification excluded 131 of the names and addresses from the initial list of juvenile facility directors. A total of 394 names were included in the final list of facility directors. The end result was a much more accurate list than the one received from the American Correctional Association (ACA). No specific demographic information of the population was known at this time, but all individuals are professionals of varying ages, races and gender. The individuals will be over the age of 21 and it is assumed with higher levels of education.

Sampling

All facility directors in the United States were contacted; therefore no sampling method was used. The decision to include all facility directors in the country was two fold. First, the juvenile facility project was a replication of a previous study in which all juvenile directors were identified and surveyed. To insure the consistency between the two groups it was important to conduct a national survey as well. Secondly, the research on juvenile corrections, specifically correctional orientation, job satisfaction and stress is fairly limited in the literature. Research has been conducted primarily in adult

correctional settings. Therefore, it was important for this project to expand on the existing research and conduct a survey of all juvenile facility directors. In addition, a national survey would also serve to bridge the gap between the previous research because the majority of the literature cited state or local area research.

Overview of Measurement

Data for this research was conducted through the use of a self-administered questionnaire. This research is a replication of a survey conducted in 1995 and the actual instrument used here was modified from this original survey (Caeti, Hemmens, and Burton, 1995). All scales and items used in the original survey were used in similar form to insure the reliability of the research. The specific items (dependent variables) to be addressed in this aspect of the project are the level of custody orientation, job satisfaction and stress of the juvenile facility directors. The primary independent variables will include several demographic factors such as age, years in juvenile corrections, experience in the military, educational experience, and employment history in criminal justice. In addition, specific information about each juvenile facility including: size of facility, type of facility and capacity of institution. The hypothesis here is that the variables of job satisfaction will be related to the specific work related variables of their position.

The scales used in the present study were adapted from the original survey (Caeti, Hemmens, and Burton, 1994); these scales were drawn from Cullen et al. (1993). Same or similar measurement tools have been used in criminal justice research (Burton et al., 1991; Caeti, Hemmens, and Burton, 1994; Caeti et al., 1997, Caeti, 2001 (forthcoming);

Cullen et al., 1989, 1990, 1993; Flanagan, Johnson, and Bennett, 1996; Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link, and Wolfe, 1991). The research conducted by Cullen et al. (1993) focused on the correctional orientation of prison wardens to assess if the rehabilitative ideal continues to receive support. Of the current research, it is the most similar to the present study. The research by Cullen et al. (1993) is the foundation for the present study. It is the only study in the present literature that focuses on the key administrators of the prison system (i.e. prison wardens), as we are focusing our attention to juvenile facility directors. Because of this distinct similarity, we chose to draw our scales from the Cullen et al. (1993) study.

Conceptualization of Job Satisfaction

The literature on job satisfaction is generally in agreement as to the definitions of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction can be defined as a “pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences (Lambert, Barton, and Hogan, 1999). This definition measures job satisfaction as a result of an individual’s attitude towards their job or experiences at the job. The measurement of job satisfaction in this study looks at satisfaction in terms of how they currently feel about their job as a juvenile facility director. Questions such as: 1) All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your current job; 2) Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide; 3) In general, how well would you say that your job measures up to the sort of job you wanted when

you took it, were used to assess the facility directors general feelings about their job in terms of expectations versus actual experiences.

Job Satisfaction Level of Juvenile Facility Directors

The first research question was to assess the job satisfaction levels of the juvenile facility directors. In the job satisfaction portion of the survey respondents were asked to identify their level of job satisfaction with being a juvenile facility director. Respondents were asked to identify their level of satisfaction with their current position. The specific questions were used to measure their satisfaction and expectations of their current position with a range of responses. Five questions were used to compile the job satisfaction scale. An alpha of .7324 and standardized item Alpha of .7550 were found for this scale. The specific questions included in the scale with their mean percentages for the population are included in Table 1 entitled Job Satisfaction Questions. Table 1 details each question used in the job satisfaction scale as well as the possible responses to each question. Specific analysis of this scale and the questions included within it will be addressed in Chapter Four.

The job satisfaction scale was calculated by adding the responses together and dividing by five (the total number of questions for the scale). The questions included in Table 1 were used to compile the job satisfaction scale. This scale was scored so that a high score indicates a high level of job satisfaction (scores could range from 1 to 4; and 1 to 3). The average score on this scale was 2.58 and scores ranged from 1.2 to 3.

Table 1: Job Satisfaction Questions

QUESTION	RESPONSES	MEAN
All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?	Very Satisfied	57%
	Somewhat Satisfied	40
	Not too Satisfied	2
	Not satisfied at all	0
With regard to the kind of job you'd most like to have: If you were free to go into any kind of job you wanted, what would your choice be?	I would keep the job I now have	63%
	I would want to retire and not work at all	14
	I would prefer some other job to the job I now have	22
Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide?	I would decide without hesitation to take the same job	79%
	I would have some second thoughts about taking my job	16
	I would decide definitely not to take the same job	4
In general, how well would you say your job measures up to the sort of job you wanted when you took it?	My job is very much like the job I wanted	54%
	My job is somewhat like the job I wanted	40
	My job is not very much like the job I wanted	5
If a good friend of yours told you he or she was interested in working in a job like yours for your employer, what would you tell him or her?	I would strongly recommend the job	72%
	I would have doubts about recommending the job	22
	I would advise my friend against taking the job	5

Table 2 reports on the measures of central tendency for the job satisfaction scale. The scale was calculated using the five questions regarding job satisfaction. Included in Table 2 are the minimum and maximum scores, mean, median, mode, and standard deviation scores for the job satisfaction scale.

Table 2: Job Satisfaction Scale

MINIMUM	MAXIMUM	MEAN	MEDIAN	MODE	STD. DEVIATION
1.20	3.00	2.58	2.6	3.0	.43

Correlates/Predictors of Job Satisfaction

The literature indicated two major groupings of variables that have been correlated with the job satisfaction of criminal justice personnel; individual and organizational variables. The following sections report on the specific variables included to measure these two categories of variables.

Individual Characteristics

Several general demographic variables are included in the survey that has been indicated as correlates of job satisfaction levels. . Many demographic variables were collected, but these were identified in the literature as correlating with job satisfaction. These individual characteristics are grouped into general demographic variables as well as work related variables of education, experience, salary and type and size of facility.

Table 3: Individual Characteristics reports on the individual variables used as independent variables in the survey along with the way in which the variables were coded for analysis.

Table 3: Individual Characteristics

VARIABLE	CODING
Age	
Mean Age of Juvenile Facility Directors	In Years
Range of Ages in Population	In Years
Race	
White	0
Minority (Black, Hispanic, Asian, Other)	1
Gender	
Male	0
Female	1

In addition to the demographic characteristics on the population, several additional individual characteristics were collected. These items included information regarding education, experience in the military, experience in adult corrections, juvenile corrections, prior experience as a facility director, and salary. Table 4: Background and Working Conditions reports on the specific background characteristics collected for the population and the coding schemes utilized.

Table 4: Background and Working Conditions

VARIABLE	CODING
Education	
Attended College	1= yes, 0= no
College Graduate	1= yes, 0= no
Total Years of Education	In Years
Military Experience	
Branch Served	
Army	0
Navy	1
Air Force	2
Marines	3
Coast Guard	4
Adult Corrections Experience	1= yes, 0= no
Juvenile Corrections Experience	
Security Staff	1= yes, 0= no
Counselor/ Psychologist	1= yes, 0= no
Previously Employed as a Director	1= yes, 0= no
Salary	In Dollars

Job-Related Stress Measure

The final individual variable identified was stress. In response to the literature on stress and its relationship to job satisfaction a likert style question was used to assess the

affect of stress in the workplace for the facility directors. The stress related question included the item: "I often feel that the control of my institution is slipping out of my hands." Responses on the stress measure could range from 1 to 7. The questions were coded so that a high score was indicative of high levels of job related stress. Scores on this measure ranged from 1 to 7 with a mean score of 2.27 and a standard deviation of 1.36. These measures of stress were included as independent variables in the final analysis.

Organizational Characteristics

The second major grouping of correlates and predictors of job satisfaction was organizational characteristics. The grouping organizational characteristics looks at the specific experiences an individual has in the workplace and how that affects their level of job satisfaction.

The first way to measure organizational characteristics is through collecting information about the workplace itself. For the population of juvenile facility directors it is necessary to gather information regarding the physical attributes of the correctional facility, including size, average daily population, maximum capacity of the institution and region where the facility is located. The variables were collected in the survey in order to assess the general organizational characteristics of each institution.

One of the major duties of a facility director is to manage the institution. Management of an institution involves working directly with staff and juveniles in the institution. In the original 1995 research, it was discovered that many juvenile facility directors cited staff issues as very problematic and the source of pressure within their

positions. To this end, organizational climate scales were created centering on staff issues and problems identified in the 1995 research. The description of these scales follows.

Staff Performance Scale

A staff performance scale was created to assess the perception a director has of his or her staff involving issues of performance, creativity, general staff problems, and organizational communication. Four indexes of these issues were used to create the staff performance scale. Reliability analysis of the scale revealed an Alpha of .8240 with a standardized item Alpha of .8294. The following indexes were included in the development of the scale:

Staff Performance Index - A four-item index was created to assess the director’s attitudes towards the activities of his or her staff members. The specific variables included to form the index were statements such as “I can generally trust my staff to handle matters when I am away from the institution,” and “The staff are the most valuable resource in my institution.” The specific questions included in the measure are reported in Table 5.

Table 5: Staff Performance Index Questions

<u>QUESTIONS</u>	MIN	MAX	MEAN	MEDIAN	MODE	STD. DEVIATION
I can generally trust staff to handle matters when I am away from the institution	2	7	5.7	6	6	.89
Most staff have a positive outlook on doing their jobs	2	7	5.2	5	5	.95
Staff do a good job of communicating with juveniles	3	7	5.4	5	5	.91
The staff are the most valuable resource in my institution	1	7	6.3	7	7	1.0

Higher scores on the index indicated that the facility director valued the performance and abilities of his or her staff members. Scores on this index ranged from 4 to 7, with an average score of 5.65.

Staff Creativity Index - A two-item index was calculated to assess the director’s attitudes towards the creativity of their employees. The two variables used included statements such as “staff are encouraged to problem-solve on their own,” and “staff are rewarded for being creative in this organization.” Higher scores on the index indicated that director emphasized creativity within their institutions. Scores on the index ranged from 3.67 to 7, with an average score of 5.37. The specific questions included in this index are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Staff Creativity Index Questions

<u>QUESTIONS</u>	MIN	MAX	MEAN	MEDIAN	MODE	STD. DEVIATION
Staff are encouraged to problem solve on their own and implement solutions	3	7	5.3	5	5	.92
Staff are rewarded for being creative in this institution	2	7	5.1	5	5	1.1

Staff Problems Index - A four-item index was created to determine a director’s attitude toward staff problems within their institution. Statements such as “it is difficult to get staff to change,” and “many staff would rather cover up a mistake than attempt to correct it” were used in the development of this index. Higher scores on the index are indicative of a director’s belief that staff problems are prominent within their institution. Scores on the index ranged from 1 to 5.75, with an average score of 3.54. The specific questions included in the index are shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Staff Problems Index Questions

QUESTIONS	MIN	MAX	MEAN	MEDIAN	MODE	STD. DEVIATION
No matter how explicit I make my directives, staff always find a way to get around them	1	7	3.3	3	3	1.2
Many staff would rather cover up a mistake than attempt to correct it	1	7	3.4	3	3	1.2
Many staff try to look good than communicate freely with management	1	7	3.6	3	3	1.1
It is difficult to get the staff to change the way they do things in my institution	1	7	3.9	4	3	1.2

Organizational Communication Index - A three-item scale was developed to measure the amount of communication within a director’s correctional facility. Items such as “management could do a better job of communicating with staff,” and “communication between management and staff is excellent” were included in this index. Higher scores reveal that directors value communication in the workplace. Scores on the index ranged from 1.67 to 7, with an average score of 3.63. The specific questions included in the index are shown in Table 8.

Table 8: Organizational Communication Index Questions

QUESTIONS	MIN	MAX	MEAN	MEDIAN	MODE	STD. DEVIATION
In general, management could do a better job of communicating with staff (RECODED)	1	7	3.3	3.0	3.0	1.2
Communication between management and staff is excellent	2	7	4.4	5.0	5.0	1.2
I want my staff to be more sensitive to providing for juveniles daily needs than they are now (RECODED)	1	7	3.2	3.0	3.0	1.3

Staff Employment Index - In order to assess the issues related to staff employment a two-item index was formulated. Questions dealing with the hiring and retaining of staff were used in the development of this index. The alpha score for this index was found to be .7368. High scores on the index indicated that directors believed that this was a problem in their facility. Scores on the index ranged from 1 to 7, with an average score of 4.37. The actual questions included in the index are shown in Table 9.

Table 9: Staff Employment Index Questions

QUESTIONS	MIN	MAX	MEAN	MEDIAN	MODE	STD. DEVIATION
I find it difficult to hire qualified staff	1	7	4.6	5	5	1.5
My institution has a problem in retaining qualified staff	1	7	4.2	4	3	1.6

Staff Empowerment Index - Two items were used to create an index that measured the extent to which directors valued empowering their staff. Questions regarding the amount of influence staff should have in determining procedures and offering suggestions for change within the institution were used to compile this index. High scores showed a director's willingness to empower his or her staff members. Scores on the index ranged from 3 to 7, with an average score of 5.34. The specific questions included in the index are reported in Table 10.

Table 10: Staff Empowerment Index Questions

QUESTIONS	MIN	MAX	MEAN	MEDIAN	MODE	STD. DEVIATION
Staff should have a say in determining procedures designed to implement institutional policy	2	7	5.7	6	5	.84
Staff should have more opportunities to give me input into the design of institutional procedures	1	7	5.0	5	5	.98

In addition to questions regarding the attitude a juvenile facility director had towards their staff, several measures regarding who exerts the most influence on a director were used. These indexes were used to assess whether actors inside or outside the institution had a greater influence on the day-to-day operations of the facility. The prior literature indicated that facility directors responded differently to pressures within as opposed to outside the correctional facility. The scales were developed to measure the degree of job-related pressure that a facility director experienced within the duties of their position.

Internal Influences Index - A four-item index was created to assess the amount of influence that individuals within the organization have on a facility director. The specific variables included to create this index were the degree of influence of directors themselves, administration, staff and juveniles. These variables were taken together to form a general index of internal influence that measured how influential these internal forces were to the individual facility director. The alpha level for this index is .6931 with a standardized item alpha score of .7055. Higher scores on the index indicated that internal factors constitute a high degree of influence within the director's institution. Scores on the index ranged from 2.5 to 10 with an average score of 7.8. The actual questions included in the index are shown in Table 11.

Table 11: Internal Influences Index Questions

QUESTIONS	MIN	MAX	MEAN	MEDIAN	MODE	STD. DEVIATION
Director (yourself)	3	10	8.5	9	9	1.4
Correctional Staff	1	10	7.9	9	10	2.2
Juvenile clients	1	10	7.1	7	10	2.3
Top Institution Administrators (Excluding Director)	2	10	7.6	8	8	1.9

External Influences Index - A three-item index was created to assess the amount of influence that external forces have on the activities of the facility director. The specific variables included to create this index were the degree of influence of the courts system, parents and the general public. These variables were taken together to form a general index of external influence. Reliability analysis revealed an alpha level of .6514 for this index. Higher scores on the index indicate that external forces exert a high degree of influence on facility directors. Scores on the index ranged from 1 to 9.33 with an average score of 4.21. The specific questions included in the index are detailed in Table 12.

Table 12: External Influences Index Questions

<u>QUESTIONS</u>	MIN	MAX	MEAN	MEDIAN	MODE	STD. DEVIATION
Courts	1	10	5.2	5	3	2.8
Parents of Juvenile Clients	1	10	4.1	3	3	2.1
General Public	1	10	3.3	3	2	1.9

Job Satisfaction and Perceptions

In addition to questions regarding the emphasis an individual's facility placed on certain objectives, respondents were asked about their opinions towards several topics in juvenile justice. These questions were used to look at the individual's opinions and perceptions of the juvenile justice process and specifically juvenile offenders. The first of these was used to assess respondents' ideas about the goals of the juvenile correctional system. In this question, respondents were asked to rank the four goals of the juvenile correctional system. Possible scores for this measure were 1 (indicating the most

important goal) to 4 (indicating the least important goal). The four goals included in the survey were:

1. **Retribution**-to pay juvenile offenders back or punish them for the harm they have caused society.
2. **Deterrence**-to teach juveniles, as well as other people contemplating the commission of a crime, that in America crime does not pay.
3. **Rehabilitation**- to reform juvenile offenders so that they will return to society in a constructive rather destructive way.
4. **Incapacitation**-to protect society by locking up juveniles so they cannot victimize again.

By asking respondents about their individual views of the juvenile correctional system as well as the views of their institution (as measured by the emphasis of the facility placed on certain objectives) certain conclusions can be made about the juvenile facility directors regarding how this affects their level of job satisfaction and stress. It was therefore important to include these variables as independent variables in the analysis.

Additionally, questions were included in the survey to measure a facility director's opinion about the juveniles under their care. These questions were included in order to determine the attitude a facility director had towards the types of juveniles housed within their institution. If an officer believes that the majority of juveniles in his/her institution cannot be rehabilitated, will that affect his or her perception of the system as a whole?

Job Satisfaction and Correctional Orientation

The final question of the research was to assess the relationship between job satisfaction and correctional orientation. Correctional orientation refers to a director's position regarding issues of rehabilitation, punishment and custody within their institution. In order to measure this, several scales were used to identify the attitude of a facility director concerning issues of rehabilitation, punishment, and custody issues. These scales were adopted directly from the previous research on correctional orientation in Cullen et al. (1993), Burton et al. (1991), and Caeti et al. (1995).

Rehabilitative Ideal Scale

A six-item scale was used to measure respondent's belief in the rehabilitative ideal in juvenile justice. A reliability coefficient was conducted for this scale with an alpha of .6612 and a standardized alpha of .6796. The scale was scored so that a high score indicates a greater support for the rehabilitation ideal. The scale was calculated by adding up the scores on the individual questions and dividing by 6 (the total number of questions included in the scale). Scores on the scale could range from 1 (indicating a low support for rehabilitation) to 7 (indicating a high support for rehabilitation). The average score for this scale was 4.91 with scores ranging from 2.29 to 6. Results indicate that on average, directors tended to support rehabilitation. The individual questions regarding rehabilitation that the facility directors responded to are included in Table 13. The table also reports on the measures of central tendency for each of the six rehabilitation questions included in the scale.

Table 13: Rehabilitation Scale Questions

QUESTIONS	MIN	MAX	MEAN	MEDIAN	MODE	STD. DEVIATION
Rehabilitation programs have an important place in my institution	2	7	6.1	6	7	1.1
The best way to stop juveniles from engaging in crime is to rehabilitate them, not punish them	1	7	5.8	6	7	1.2
It would be irresponsible for us to stop trying to rehabilitate juveniles and thus save them from a life of crime	1	7	6.1	7	7	1.4
While I believe that adult criminals know what they are doing and deserve to be punished, I still support the emphasis on rehabilitation of juveniles	2	7	5.9	6	7	1.2
The rehabilitation of juveniles just does not work in the present system (RECODED)	1	7	4.9	5	5	1.3
The rehabilitation of juveniles has proven to be a failure (RECODED)	1	7	5.5	5	5	1.14

Punitive Ideal Scale

A four-item scale was used to assess the punitive ideal of facility directors. A reliability coefficient was conducted for this scale with an alpha and standardized item alpha of .6612 and .7374. Table 14 reports on the questions used to measure a director's degree of punishment orientation.

Table 14: Punishment Scale Questions

QUESTIONS	MIN	MAX	MEAN	MEDIAN	MODE	STD. DEVIATION
Conditions at my institution should be harsher to deter juveniles from future crime	1	7	2.4	2	1	1.3
Juveniles are treated too leniently by our court system	1	7	3.4	3	3	1.4
Most juveniles know full well what they are doing and thus deserve to be punished for their offenses	1	7	4	4	5	1.3
All juveniles who commit violent crimes should be tried as adults and given adult penalties	1	7	2.8	3	3	1.4
Juveniles are treated too leniently by our court system	1	7	3.5	3	3	1.2

The scale was scored so that high scores were indicative greater support for a punitive ideal. Possible scores on the scale ranged from 1 (indicating low-levels of support for punishment) to 7 (indicating high levels of support for punishment). The average score for punitive ideal was 3.22 and scores ranged from 1 to 6.6.

Custody Orientation Scale

To measure the degree of emphasis as well as the success of a respondent’s facility regarding custody and security issues an eight-item scale was utilized. These questions not only asked about a director’s own facility, but also included questions asking about their opinions regarding custody issues. An alpha level of .8579 was found for this scale, with a standardized item alpha of .8620. Table 15 describes the individual questions included in the scale including the average scores and ranges.

Table 15: Custody Scale Questions

QUESTIONS	MIN	MAX	MEAN	MEDIAN	MODE	STD. DEVIATION
Emphasis on creating conditions which protect juveniles from one another	1	10	8.8	9	10	1.6
Emphasis on creating conditions that prevent juvenile escapes	1	10	7.9	9	10	2.6
Emphasis on ensuring security and maintaining order	1	10	8.9	9	10	1.5
Emphasis on preventing the flow of contraband into the facility	1	10	7.8	9	10	2.5
Emphasis on preventing the flow of contraband within the facility	1	10	7.5	8	10	2.6
Success at preventing escapes	1	10	9.0	9	10	1.4
Success at preventing the flow of contraband into the facility	1	10	8.3	9	9	1.5
Success at preventing the flow of contraband within the facility	1	10	8.2	9	9	1.6

The Custody orientation scale was scored so that higher scores indicated a high degree of emphasis on custody and security issues. Scores could range from 1 (indicating a no

emphasis on custody and security) to 10 (indicating a high degree of emphasis on custody and security issues). The average score for this scale was 8.31 with scores ranging from 1 to 10.

Overview of the Survey Process

The survey, as mentioned earlier, is a replication of a National Juvenile Facility Director Survey conducted in 1995. The survey and all scales were adapted from this original survey. Some modifications were conducted of the original survey to insure the reliability of the scales.

The first modification of the original survey was to increase the ease of readability for respondents. The layout and presentation of the initial survey was changed. Questions were formatted so that respondents could easily check their responses on a grid style format rather than answer multiple-choice type questions. These changes were made in order to minimize the amount of time and effort required to complete the survey. Many items were included in the survey creating a long document and every effort to make the survey process easier for respondents was conducted.

The second modification that was conducted was to reformat the order of the questions in the survey. Basic demographic information was requested in the first section of the original survey. This layout was modified with the demographic information being placed in the last section of the survey for the current research. The purpose behind this modification was that respondents would be more motivated to complete the survey if the

actual questions regarding orientation, job satisfaction and stress were included prior to any demographic and/or personal questions.

After the original survey was cleaned to exclude open-ended questions and formatting issues, the survey process proceeded. As mentioned previously, all facility directors were contacted by phone prior to the first mailing. This phone contact was used to insure the facility directors were aware that a national survey was being conducted and notified of their participation in the project. The facility directors were informed that the survey would be mailed in the next few weeks and any contact information that they needed would be provided in the cover letter of the survey. The first wave of surveys was mailed three weeks after the initial contact with the facility directors. Surveys were mailed to all juvenile facility directors on the updated list received from the American Correctional Association (ACA). A response rate of 29.7% occurred after the first wave of surveys was distributed. Four months following the first mailing, an additional mailing was sent to facility directors who had not responded to the initial survey mailing. A response rate of 47.68% occurred after the second wave of surveys was distributed. To increase the response rate, one month following the second mailing phone contact was conducted for all facility directors who had not responded to the previous two mailings. Finally, a third wave of surveys was mailed soon after the phone contact with directors was concluded. For the current research, a cut-off date was issued on the data after which no additional responses were included in the dataset. Therefore, the response rate of this third and final wave is pending. This three-wave process of survey distribution was utilized to gain the largest possible number of respondents to the survey.

Of the 394 facility directors in the population, 184 returned usable questionnaires resulting in a 47.55% response rate. The surveys were coded and entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). All surveys were verified twice to insure accuracy in the data entry of the information and to eliminate coding error.

CHAPTER IV FINDINGS

Job Satisfaction Level of Juvenile Facility Directors

A five-item scale was used to determine the level of job satisfaction among juvenile facility directors. This scale of job satisfaction has been used previously, (Burton, Ju, and Wolfe, 1991; Caeti, Hemmens, and Burton, 1994; Caeti, Hemmens, Burton, and Cullen, 1997; Caeti, 2001 (forthcoming); Cullen et al., 1993; Flanagan, Johnson, and Bennett, 1996; Van Voorhis et al., 1991) with reliability coefficients at the .75 level. The level of job satisfaction was measured using questions such as “all in all, how satisfied are you with your job?” and “knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again, would you take the job you now have?” Directors responded as to their level of satisfaction, whether or not they would keep the job they have, and if they would recommend their job to a friend. These responses were combined to form an overall job satisfaction measurement. Overall, directors reported a positive attitude towards their job and the experiences they have had at their institution. Responses indicate an extremely high level of job satisfaction (56.7%) with no individuals reporting that they were not satisfied at all. In addition, three fourths of the facility directors reported they would recommend their job to a friend.

Table 16 reports on the comparisons of the job satisfaction measures between juvenile facility directors, prison wardens, and correctional officers. The numbers for these populations are drawn from Cullen et al. (1993) and Burton et al. (1991).

Table 16: Job Satisfaction Measurements

QUESTION	RESPONSES	JUVENILE FACILITY DIRECTORS	ADULT PRISON WARDENS	CORRECTIONS OFFICERS	NATIONAL AVERAGE
All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job?	Very Satisfied	57%	66.0%	25.5%	46.7%
	Somewhat Satisfied	40	30.5	51.0	41.7
	Not too Satisfied	2	2.9	19.0	8.9
	Not satisfied at all	0	.5	4.5	2.7
With regard to the kind of job you'd most like to have: If you were free to go into any kind of job you wanted, what would your choice be?	I would keep the job I now have	63	72.6	31.1	38.1
	I would want to retire and not work at all	14	12.1	9.3	1.0
	I would prefer some other job to the job I now have	22	15.3	59.6	60.0
Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide?	I would decide without hesitation to take the same job	79	78.4	50.7	63.9
	I would have some second thoughts about taking my job	16	19.5	43.4	28.3
	I would decide definitely not to take the same job	4	2.2	5.9	7.8
In general, how well would you say your job measures up to the sort of job you wanted when you took it?	My job is very much like the job I wanted	54	68.3	57.6	52.5
	My job is somewhat like the job I wanted	40	28.0	40.8	35.9
	My job is not very much like the job I wanted	5	3.8	34.9	11.6
If a good friend of yours told you he or she was interested in working in a job like yours for your employer, what would you tell him or her?	I would strongly recommend the job	72	72.5	42.8	61.8
	I would have doubts about recommending the job	22	23.6	44.7	29.7
	I would advise my friend against taking the job	5	3.8	12.5	8.6

All in all, we can compare the satisfaction levels of these differing populations in an effort to understand the differences. Both juvenile facility directors and prison

wardens have been found to have similar job satisfaction levels (57% and 66% respectively), while corrections officers reported lower levels of job satisfaction (25.5%). This finding may be a result of job status or contact with inmates. An interesting comparison is the percentage of respondents who reported they were “not too satisfied at all” with their job; juvenile facility directors in the population did not report this opinion.

Correlates/Predictors of Job Satisfaction

The literature identified two major grouping of variables that correlate with job satisfaction: individual and organizational characteristics. The following discussion reports on the general descriptive statistics as well as the results of the regression analysis for job satisfaction.

Individual Characteristics

Similar to the prior literature on job satisfaction, several individual characteristics were included in the survey to look at the Importation Model with regards to experiences in the work place. The model assumes that individuals bring ideas to the workplace as a result of their individual experiences and that these ideas serve to shape their experiences. Table 17 depicts the individual characteristics of the juvenile facility directors in the population. The mean age of the facility directors was 47.69 with respondent’s ages ranging from 27 to 65. The majority of facility directors in the population were white (77.10%). The minority breakdown is as follows; 16.20% were Black, 3.9% were Hispanic, 1.1% were Asian and 1.7% of the population considered themselves “Other”. The entire population of juvenile facility directors consisted of 22.9% minorities. In addition, 82.5% of the respondents were male.

Table 17: Individual Characteristics of Juvenile Facility Directors

<u>Age</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Mean age of Juvenile Facility Directors	47.69	-
<u>Race</u>		
White	-	77.10%
Black	-	16.20%
Hispanic	-	3.90%
Asian	-	1.10%
Other	-	1.70%
Total Minority	-	22.90%
<u>Gender</u>		
Male	-	82.50%
Female	-	17.50%

Background and Working Conditions

With respect to background and working conditions, the variables of education, military experience, experience in adult corrections, experience as treatment staff, experience as a director at another facility, as a counselor or psychologist in a juvenile facility were also collected (Table 18). This data was collected to add to the general demographic and individual characteristics collected for the population. The belief is that these individual characteristics of background and experience serve to shape an individual's experience more so than with general demographic variables.

The data indicate that 97.8% of the population attended college, with 94.9% receiving a bachelor's degree. The total years of education ranged from 12-22 years with a mean education of 17.31 years. Twelve years of education indicated completion of high school or equivalent. For each year thereafter, education increased by 1 with 16 indicating a bachelors degree, 18 a Masters degree and 22 a Doctoral degree. These

distinctions were made to allow for comparisons for those individuals who had only attended college, to those who had graduated with a Bachelor's degree.

Approximately one-third of the juvenile facility directors in the population served in the military. Of those having served in the military, 71.7% had served in the Army followed by 18.9% in the Air Force, 5.7% in the Navy and 3.8% in the Marines.

For the most part, facility directors had previous experience within the field of corrections, both at the adult and juvenile level. One-third of the population had previous adult correctional experience. Directors were asked if they had served in security staff positions or as a counselor/staff psychologist in a juvenile setting; 41.4% responded that they had worked in a security staff position and 63% indicated experience as a counselor/psychologist in a juvenile correctional setting. Almost half of the juvenile facility directors had been previously employed as a director at another correctional facility. This finding indicated that the facility directors in this population have a significant amount of experience within corrections, with a wide range of backgrounds from line to treatment staff.

The salary of the juvenile facility directors varied, with incomes ranging from \$21,600 to \$102,000 per year. The average salary for this population was \$58,716.79 per year. Individual salary ranges, grouped by state, had similar levels reported for individuals within the same state. This finding is important to note because although there is large variation in the specific salaries of facility directors (\$21,600 - \$102,000), the differences within states were not as large. Individual states tended to give similar

salaries to their juvenile facility directors, and the main variation in the total population was a state-to-state difference in salary levels.

Table 18: Background and Working Conditions of Juvenile Facility Directors

<u>Education</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Attended College	-	-	97.80%
College Graduate	-	-	94.90%
Total Years of Education	12 - 22 yrs.	17.31	-
<u>Military Experience</u>			
Served	-	-	29.80%
Branch Served			
Army	-	-	71.70%
Navy	-	-	5.70%
Air Force	-	-	18.90%
Marines	-	-	3.80%
<u>Adult Corrections Experience</u>			
	-	-	30.50%
<u>Juvenile Corrections Experience</u>			
Security Staff	-	-	41.40%
Counselor/Psychologist	-	-	63%
<u>Previously employment as a Director?</u>			
	-	-	47.50%
<u>Salary</u>			
	\$21,600 -		
	\$102,000	\$58,716.79	-

Specific Characteristics of Institution

The specific variables related to the type, size and population of their respective juvenile facilities are provided in Table 19. The data indicate that all of the facilities that responded were indeed juvenile correctional facilities conforming to the guidelines

established. All of the aforementioned facilities meet the requirements of a juvenile correctional facility as defined by the research.

The mean daily population of the facilities was 131 with facilities daily population ranging from 6 to 1240. The average maximum capacity of the facilities surveyed was 137, with maximum capacity ranging from 8 to 1240. Respondents were asked the maximum capacity of their institution as well as the average daily population; this information indicated that the majority of facilities are running at or above capacity.

Table 19: Specific Characteristics of Institution

	<u>Range</u>	<u>Mean</u>
<u>Size of Facility</u>		
Maximum Capacity	8 – 1240	137
Average Daily Population	6 – 1240	131

Correlates of Job Satisfaction

In addition to the descriptive statistics, several correlations were conducted with cross-tabulations using Pearson’s Chi-square and Spearman’s Rho. Pearson’s Chi-square is a measure of linear association between two variables. The values of this correlation coefficient can range from -1 to 1. The sign is indicative of the direction of the relationship, and the absolute value indicates the strength. Larger absolute values indicate stronger relationships. Spearman’s Rho is based on the ranks of data rather than their actual values. Similarly, the values of this correlation coefficient range from -1 to 1. The sign of this coefficient indicates the direction of the relationship between two variables, and the absolute value shows the strength. Larger absolute values indicate stronger relationships.

In order to conduct the bivariate analysis the job satisfaction scale was collapsed into a dichotomous variable (with values ranging from 0 to 1). For many of the correlation tests nominal level data is necessary, therefore these variables were collapsed into this form so that this analysis could be conducted. The job satisfaction scale was collapsed into low to moderate job satisfaction (scores ranging from 0 to 2.4) and high job satisfaction (scores ranging from 2.5 to 3).

The bivariate correlations were conducted on the following variables: age, race (collapsed into non-minority and minority), gender, total years of education, previous military experience, years in juvenile corrections, years as a director, hours in workday, average daily population of institution, salary, previous employment history, internal influences index, external influence index, state/local office influence, rehabilitation scale, punitive scale, custody scale, staff performance scale, staff employment issues index, and the staff empowerment index. The variables included in the analysis were chosen from information gathered in the prior literature on job satisfaction. Only significant correlations will be reported in the analysis. Correlations tests were conducted on the dichotomous job satisfaction scale with the results reported in Table 20. All independent variables that were used in the bivariate statistics are included in the table. Significant correlations are flagged according to their level of significance. Significant relationships were found between job satisfaction and the independent variables: age, average daily capacity of institution, maximum capacity of institution, stress, staff creativity index, staff problems index, and staff performance index.

Table 20: Table of Correlates

VARIABLES	JOB SATISFACTION
Age	.240**
Race	.103
Gender	.025
Total years of education	.083
College Graduate	-.002
Did you serve in the armed forces?	.130
Total years working in Juvenile Corrections	.077
Total years as a director	.084
How many hours in your average workday?	.114
Average daily population of your institution	.180*
Maximum Capacity of Institution	.168*
Salary Recode	.064
Have you ever been employed as security staff at a juvenile facility?	-.058
Have you ever been employed as a director at another facility?	.111
Have you ever been employed as a counselor/psychologist in a juvenile facility?	-.004
Stress Measure (I often feel that the control of my institution is slipping out of my hands)	-.254**
Punitive Scale (Dichotomous)	-.002
Rehabilitation Scale (Dichotomous)	-.043
External Influences Index	.014
Internal Influences Index	.134
Organizational Communication	.171*
Staff Employment Issues Index	-.129
Staff Empowerment Index	.071
Staff Creativity Index	.165*
Staff Problems Index	-.257**
Staff Performance Index	.422**
Staff Perceptions Scale	.070

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

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

Age

Age was positively correlated with job satisfaction, both with Pearson's and Spearman's Rho measures of association. This finding corroborates with the literature in that as age increases so does the level of job satisfaction of employees. Although, this positive relationship may occur because individuals who are dissatisfied leave the profession.

Experience

The second item, experience in the armed forces, indicated a slightly positive relationship to job satisfaction. This variable was coded with no experience=0 and experience=1. This finding indicates that experience in the military leads to slightly higher levels of job satisfaction among directors. It is important to note that only 30% of the population reported experience in the military. This low percentage may account for the slightly positive finding.

Stress

The third significant item, "I often feel like the control of my institution is slipping out of my hands," was an indicator of a director's stress was negatively correlated with job satisfaction. As a director experienced more stress in the workplace, their job satisfaction level decreased.

Juvenile Population

Using the Spearman's Rho measure of association, average daily population of the institution was positively related to the level of job satisfaction of a director. Pearson's test did not reveal this relationship at a significant level. This finding indicates

that as the average daily population increases the job satisfaction level of a facility director decreases.

Degree of influence

Both measures of association found a relationship between job satisfaction and the degree of influence the state or local office has on the day-to-day operations of a facility. Both tests indicated a slightly negative relationship between this variable and satisfaction. This finding shows that when the state or local office is highly influential in the management and administration of a facility, a director experiences lower levels of job satisfaction.

Staff issues

Finally, the staff employment issues index was negatively correlated with job satisfaction on both the Pearson and Spearman's Rho tests of association. This correlation indicates that when a director experiences a significant number of staff related issues he/she is not as satisfied with their job.

Predictors of Job Satisfaction

Multiple regression analysis was chosen to conduct the analysis on the dependent variable job satisfaction. The purpose of this test is to identify the predictive value of multiple independent variables on the dependent variable. Prior to running the regression, several assumptions of the test were examined. The six assumptions for multiple regression are that: 1) the observations are randomly selected, 2) both variables have normal distributions, 3) the two variables are measured at the interval/ratio level,

4) the variables are related in linear form, 5) the error is normally distributed, and 6) multicollinearity is not present.

Job Satisfaction Scale

In order to check for violations of assumptions for the linear regression on the job satisfaction scale, several procedures were utilized. Partial regression plots were performed for each independent variable. This test was used to look at each independent variable to verify that the data was randomly distributed. In addition, normal p-plots were conducted on the dependent variable, job satisfaction scale, and the results indicated that there was a linear relationship between the variables in the analysis.

In addition, residuals tests were conducted to measure the difference between the observed values in the model versus the values predicted by the model. Standardized residuals were used; this test divides the residual by an estimate of its standard error and have a mean of zero and a standard deviation of 1. Standardized residuals range from -3 to 2 with this specific scale receiving a range of -2.515 to 1.981 with a standard deviation of 1.001 . The final residuals test was conducted that divided the residual by the standard deviation of each case. This studentized residual has a range from -4 to 3 , with the specific test resulting in a range of -2.754 to 2.175 with a standard deviation of 1.010 . All residuals tests fell within the expected ranges.

In addition, three distances tests were run on the model. The Mahalanobis Distance Test measures how much a case's values on the independent variables differ from the average of all cases. A large Mahalanobis distance identifies a case as having extreme values on one or more of the independent variables. The Mahalanobis Test has a

larger range than other distance tests. The specific scores of this test ranged from 10.349 to 54.266, with a standard deviation of 8.811. Second, the Cook's Distance Test (Cook's d) was conducted to measure the effect of influential cases on the model. This test looks at how much the residuals of all cases would change if a particular case were excluded from the calculation of the regression. A large Cook's d indicates that excluding a case from the regression would change the results significantly. The range for this test was .000 to .090, with a mean of .010 and a standard deviation of .070. Finally, the Centered Leverage Value Test was used to measure the influence of a single point to the fit of the regression line. The Centered Leverage value ranges from 0 (no influence on the fit) to $(N-1)/N$. The Centered Leverage value had a range from .082 to .431, with a mean of .181 and standard deviation of .070.

Once the diagnostic tests were performed to check for violations of assumptions, regression analysis was conducted for the independent variable job satisfaction. Five independent variables were found to be significant in the regression analysis. Individual beta weights and significance levels are shown in Table 21. The independent variables that were found to be significantly predictive are flagged in Table 21. These five variables are combined together to form a predictive model of job satisfaction of the juvenile facility directors in the population. Through the analysis, the unique predictive power of each independent variable to the model was found as well as the combined effect of the variables in predicting the job satisfaction levels of juvenile facility directors (Table 22). Each of the variables included in the analysis are shown in Table 21.

Table 21: Coefficients

	UNSTANDARDIZED COEFFICIENTS		STANDARDIZED COEFFICIENTS	T	SIG.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.974	.724		1.346	.181
Age	.017	.006	.269	2.717	.008
Race	.184	.092	.167	1.994	.049
Gender	.184	.094	.169	1.952	.054
Total years of education	-.002	.026	-.009	-.090	.928
College Graduate	-.082	.235	-.033	-.349	.728
College Major Relate to Juvenile Corrections	.077	.079	.087	.973	.333
Did you serve in the armed forces?	.037	.090	.038	.409	.684
Average daily population of your institution	.000	.000	.093	.901	.369
What is your current salary?	.000	.000	-.025	-.235	.814
Have you ever been employed as security staff at a juvenile facility?	-.010	.088	-.011	-.115	.909
Have you ever been employed as a director at another facility?	.041	.081	.047	.511	.611
Have you ever been employed as a counselor/psychologist in a juvenile facility?	-.094	.082	-.106	-1.144	.255
Have you ever been employed in adult corrections in any capacity?	-.006	.104	-.006	-.055	.956
I often feel that the control of my institution is slipping out of my hands.	-.414	.122	-.300	-3.404	.001
State or local central office influence on the day-to-day operations of your institution	-.021	.018	-.111	-1.164	.247
Internal Influences Index	.033	.028	.105	1.147	.254
External Influences Index	.012	.023	.048	.508	.612
Custody Scale	-.031	.029	-.103	-1.075	.285
Staff Employment Issues Index	-.111	.038	-.352	-2.873	.005
Staff Empowerment Index	-.101	.062	-.176	-1.630	.106
Dichotomous Rehab Scale	-.027	.113	-.020	-.240	.811
Dichotomous Punish Scale	.121	.073	.139	1.661	.100
Staff Perception Scale	.424	.163	.374	2.595	.011

Table 22: Model Summary

REGRESSION STATISTICS				CHANGE STATISTICS					DURBIN-WATSON
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	
.617	.381	.243	.3783	.381	2.760	23	103	.000	2.033

The first variable, age, was found to contribute to job satisfaction with a beta of .017 and a standardized beta of .269. As the age of the facility director increased so did their level of job satisfaction.

Race was also found to be predictive of job satisfaction with a beta of .184 and a standardized beta weight of .167, with minority directors having higher levels of job satisfaction.

The staff employment index that measured the difficulty of directors in hiring and retaining qualified staff was found to decrease job satisfaction. When directors scored high on this scale, indicating problems with staff employment, their job satisfaction decreased significantly ($\beta = -.352$).

The stress measure, "I often feel that the control of my institution is slipping out of my hands," was also found to be a significant predictor of job satisfaction according to the model. A high score on this scale was indicative of lower job satisfaction of directors.

Finally, the Staff Perceptions Scale, which measured the influence of staff issues regarding creativity, performance, general problems and communication, predicted the level of job satisfaction of facility directors. A high score on this scale indicated higher levels of job satisfaction for the directors.

Using the five independent variables found to be significant in the model the total regression was able to predict 38.1% of the variance in the job satisfaction levels of juvenile facility directors (Table 22).

Job Satisfaction and Perceptions

Three items will be addressed regarding how job satisfaction relates to a juvenile facility director's perceptions within their institution. The three items or categories that will be addressed are stress, perception of the juveniles within the institution, and perceptions of staff within the institution.

Stress

Table 23 reports on the relationship between the dichotomous job satisfaction measure and the single item stress question "I often feel that the control of my institution is slipping out of my hands." The table identifies the percentage of respondents who reported low to moderate satisfaction versus high job satisfaction levels as a response to the job satisfaction scale. Results indicate that the majority (60.8%) of directors who were highly satisfied with their jobs disagreed with the statement. While almost all of the directors (90.8%) disagreed with the stress item it is important to see the distribution of responses. Although stress is not the only variable that contributes or is affected by job satisfaction, it does account for some of the effects.

Table 23: Stress Measure

			DICHOTIMOUS SATISFACTION SCALE		TOTAL
STRESS ITEM			Low to moderate job satisfaction	High job satisfaction	
I often feel that the control of my institution is slipping out of my hands	Disagreed With Statement	Count	51	104	155
		% of Total	29.8%	60.8%	90.6%
	Agreed With Statement	Count	12	4	16
		% of Total	7.0%	2.3%	9.4%

The single item stress measure was also used in the regression analysis of job satisfaction. This independent variable was included in order to assess the specific affect that stress had on an individual's level of job satisfaction. Results indicate that stress is negatively related to job satisfaction, with a standardized beta of $-.300$ at a significance level of $.001$. As stress levels increase for this population their level of job satisfaction decreases. Aside from issues regarding staff, the stress item accounted for the second largest contribution to the predictive model of job satisfaction.

Juveniles

We asked the facility directors to assess the juveniles they had in their care on a variety of items. Table 24 reports that the average of responses indicated directors felt that 51.9% of their juvenile population would be rehabilitated due to their participation in treatment programs. In addition, directors (on average) felt that 39.5% of juveniles in their institution would recidivate after release. The results are consistent with a more rehabilitative attitude, however the results also exhibited wide variation on several items. Interestingly, the number of juveniles estimated to be rehabilitated was similar the number estimated to recidivate. In addition to the average percentages, the median values of the percentages are also included. These figures are used to compare the averages from the middle scores in the population. For most questions these figures are similar, but there is some discrepancy with regard to the questions regarding deterrence, juveniles who are predators, and percentages of juveniles who are chronic trouble makers. These differences indicate that there may be some variation in the responses.

Table 24: Facility Director's Assessment of the Juvenile Population in Their Institution

<u>Item</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>
What percentage of juveniles in your institution you believe are dangerously violent and should not be released?	8.1%	5.0%
What percentage of juveniles in your institution you believe will be rehabilitated because of participation in treatment?	51.9	50.0
What percentage of juveniles in your institution you believe will be deterred by their institutional experience?	17.2	10.0
What percentage of juveniles in your institution you believe will recidivate?	39.5	35.0
What percentage of juveniles in your institution are predators and victimize other juveniles in the facility?	10.2	5.0
What percentage of juveniles in your institution need to be protected from other juveniles in the institution?	13.2	10.0
What percentage of juveniles in your institution might be called chronic trouble-makers?	20.9	10.0

Additional analysis was conducted on the questions regarding a facility director's estimate of the juveniles in their population. These responses were correlated with the dichotomous job satisfaction scale and are shown in Table 25. Results indicate that four of the percentage questions are significantly correlated with a director's level of job satisfaction. Specifically, issues relating to violent offenders, rehabilitation, recidivism, and chronic offenders related to an individual's job satisfaction. When a director believed that his/her juvenile population was dangerously violent, they experienced lower levels of job satisfaction. High job satisfaction occurred with directors who believed a high percentage of the juveniles under their care could be rehabilitated. The third significant correlation was found with regards to recidivism. High estimates of potential recidivism by juveniles was negatively correlated with job satisfaction. Finally, directors who believed a high number of juveniles in their institution were chronic trouble-makers had

lower levels of job satisfaction. These findings indicate that when a facility director has a dangerous and chronic population their level of job satisfaction may be lower.

Table 25: Correlations of Juvenile Population

VARIABLE	JOB SATISFACTION
What percentage of juveniles in your institution you believe are dangerously violent and should not be released?	-.168*
What percentage of juveniles in your institution you believe will be rehabilitated because of participation in treatment?	.277**
What percentage of juveniles in your institution you believe will be deterred by their institutional experience?	.046
What percentage of juveniles in your institution you believe will recidivate?	-.230**
What percentage of juveniles in your institution are predators and victimize other juveniles in the facility?	-.143
What percentage of juveniles in your institution need to be protected from other juveniles in the institution?	.049
What percentage of juveniles in your institution might be called chronic trouble-makers?	-.173*

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

Staff Issues

Finally, experiences with staff seem to be a logical affect of job satisfaction. As noted previously, a director’s behaviors, attitudes, and ultimately their satisfaction levels serve to shape the climate of the institution as a whole. While experiences with staff were found to be predictive of job satisfaction levels, it is understandable that in turn job satisfaction levels will influence the staff as well. The relationship between staff and a director is in no way one sided.

Table 26 reports on the relationship between job satisfaction and several staff related variables. The correlations indicate that both the Staff Performance Index and Staff Creativity Index are positively related to job satisfaction. In addition, the Staff

Problems Index showed a negative relationship to the dichotomous job satisfaction measure. When a director experiences problems with his or her staff, their level of job satisfaction decreases. These findings indicate that staff issues contribute to a director's job satisfaction.

Table 26: Staff Correlations

VARIABLE	JOB SATISFACTION
	.
Staff Performance Index	.422**
Staff Creativity Index	.165*
Staff Problems Index	-.257**
Staff Employment Issues Index	-.123
Staff Empowerment Index	.046

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed).

In addition to the bivariate correlations between job satisfaction and issues related to staff, staff issues were included in the regression analysis of job satisfaction. When the staff issues indexes and scales were included in the regression analysis, the Staff Employment Issues Index and the Staff Perceptions Scale were found to significantly contribute to job satisfaction with standardized beta weights of -.111 and .424. These findings indicate that as problems with staff increase the level of job satisfaction of a juvenile facility director decreases. Similarly, when a director has good experiences with their staff it contributes to higher job satisfaction. This finding indicates that issues regarding staff are an important determinate of a facility directors perception of his/her job and ultimately their job satisfaction level.

Job Satisfaction and Correctional Orientation

Several scales were used to assess the correctional orientation of juvenile facility directors. More specifically, measures of rehabilitation, punishment, and custody orientation were used to gather a general assessment of the attitude of the directors towards the criminal justice system.

Rehabilitative Ideal

Using a six-item scale, the directors were asked questions regarding their attitudes toward rehabilitation in their own institution as well as the success of rehabilitation in juvenile corrections in general. Responses indicated that directors had a high degree of support for the rehabilitative ideal, with 45.9% of respondents indicating that they “very strongly agreed” to statements such as “rehabilitation programs have an important place in my institution,” and 54.6% supporting the statement “it would be irresponsible for us to stop trying to rehabilitate juveniles.” In addition, questions such as “the rehabilitation of juveniles just does not work in the present system” received a general disagreement by directors.

Punitive Ideal

A five-item scale was utilized to determine director’s level of punitiveness. Responses indicated that directors had a low level of support for punishment. Items such as “conditions at my institutions should be harsher to deter juveniles from future crime,” and “all juveniles who commit violent crimes should be tried as adults and given adult penalties” received low support from the directors. While directors believe that juveniles need to be punished, generally they did not view punishment as a major goal of the

juvenile correctional system. In terms of conditions at a director's own facility, 86.9% disagreed that conditions should not be harsher to deter juveniles from future crime.

Custody Orientation

Using an eight-item scale, the level of emphasis placed on custody issues by facility directors was measured. This scale measured the degree of emphasis an individual director places on custody issues as well as the success of his or her institutions at accomplishing this. The degree of emphasis was measured with questions such as, "ensuring security and maintaining order," and "creating conditions which protect juveniles." Responses to these questions indicate that overall directors have a high level of support for custody and security issues. The most frequently reported response (47.5%) was that the directors placed a very great emphasis on custody issues. In order to measure the success of a director's institution on custody issues, questions regarding preventing escapes as well as preventing contraband into and within the facility were used. Again, results (45.6%) indicate a high level of support for these custody issues. The directors believed that their facilities were highly successful at the goals of custody.

Goals of Juvenile Corrections

Finally, the juvenile facility directors were asked to rank the four goals of corrections (rehabilitation, deterrence, incapacitation and retribution) in order to assess their personal beliefs about how the correctional system should work. Directors were asked to rank the four goals of corrections in order of importance. Responses ranged from 1 (being most important goal) to 4 (being the least important goal). Table 27 reports on the responses of facility directors to the goals of juvenile corrections. Seventy percent of

the facility directors ranked rehabilitation as the most important goal while only 2.8% ranked retribution as their most important goal in terms of the goals of the juvenile justice system. Most directors ranked rehabilitation as being the most important goal in juvenile corrections followed by deterrence, incapacitation, and retribution. Only 2.8% ranked rehabilitation 4th and only 2.8% ranked retribution 1st.

Table 27: Percentages of Ranks by Goals of Juvenile Corrections

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Rehabilitation</u>	<u>Deterrence</u>	<u>Incapacitation</u>	<u>Retribution</u>
1	70.20%	17.70%	12.70%	2.80%
2	24.30%	48.60%	20.40%	6.10%
3	2.80%	30.40%	38.70%	26.30%
4	2.80%	3.30%	28.20%	64.80%

* With 1 indicating the most important goal, and 4 being the least important goal

Finally, analysis was conducted on the dichotomous job satisfaction scale where all respondents were grouped into categories of low to moderate job satisfaction and high job satisfaction according to the job satisfaction scale. Comparisons were made between those directors that reported high and low job satisfaction to the responses they made regarding the goal of rehabilitation to juvenile justice. Table 28 shows the results of this analysis. The analysis compares satisfaction levels of facility directors with how they rated the four goals of corrections. More than half of the juvenile facility directors fell into the high job satisfaction category with the dichotomous scale. Of these individuals, the majority reported rehabilitation as the primary or most important goal of the juvenile system. While only 2 reported it being the least important goal.

Table 28: How important is rehabilitation to the juvenile correctional system?

HOW IMPORTANT IS REHABILITATION TO THE JUVENILE CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM (1 = MOST IMPORTANT, 4 = LEAST IMPORTANT GOAL)	1ST	2ND	3RD	4TH	TOTAL
Low to moderate job satisfaction	40	17	2	3	62
High job satisfaction	81	21	3	2	107

The purpose of the current research was to address the determinates and affects of the job satisfaction levels of juvenile facility directors. The four questions of concern were to assess the level of job satisfaction, the predictors and correlates, the affects of job satisfaction and the relationship between job satisfaction and correctional orientation. Chapter Five will address the implications of the findings to the field of juvenile corrections and identify where future research should focus. Overall, the results of the current research should shed light on the topic of job satisfaction of juvenile facility directors.

CHAPTER V DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

By looking at the attitudes and perceptions of juvenile facility directors we are able to see how juvenile justice policy is implemented. Knowing the job satisfaction levels of these individuals can be a step forward in understanding how attitudes and behaviors serve to shape institutional policy. Facility directors are in a unique position in that their actions serve to shape the rest of the organization. If a director is dissatisfied with his or her job it will reflect onto the greater population of the institution, on staff and juveniles alike. Their attitudes shape the administration and management of each facility in this country. By using a national survey of juvenile facility directors to study the correlates and predictors of job satisfaction we are able to look at this entire population. A self-administered questionnaire was used to study the population whereby respondents answered questions regarding their jobs as facility directors and specific attitudes that they had towards their jobs. By using a national survey we are able to add to existing research on the administration and management of correctional facilities in this country. Several topics were addressed in the survey including; correctional orientation, beliefs about the juvenile justice system, job satisfaction levels and stressors within their positions as juvenile facility directors. This analysis specifically addresses the topic of job satisfaction levels of juvenile facility directors; the correlates and predictors of job satisfaction; the affects of job satisfaction on perceptions of the staff, juveniles, and their jobs; and it's relationship to correctional orientation.

Limitations

As with any study, the current research has several limitations. The first of these limitations is a product of conducting survey research in general. While utilizing a survey to conduct research does allow for a large number of individuals to respond, it cannot yield the most accurate findings. Obviously, the most accurate way to assess the actions and attitudes of individuals is to view them in context. Ideally, to correctly identify how a juvenile correctional facility is managed on a day-to-day basis would be to visit the facility itself and observe how the institution is run. A director's responses to how their institution is run may not accurately portray how the facility is actually managed. This problem affects the validity of your findings in any survey research. Nonetheless, this survey focuses on the top administrators at a juvenile correctional facility who are responsible for the administration and management of all programs and policies within the institution. By studying these top-level administrators we can hope that their responses will be the most accurate representation of what goes on in their individual facilities.

The second limitation of the current research relates directly to the population under study. A strict definition of a juvenile correctional facility was used to conduct the research. A juvenile correctional facility was defined as a publicly funded, secure institution housing youths post-adjudication. This definition excluded all drug treatment centers, group homes and detention centers. The purpose of this strict definition was to include only those facilities that housed juvenile offenders for extended periods of time at a post-adjudication stage.. This definition may have excluded many juvenile correctional

facilities. There are varying definitions of what a juvenile correctional facility is from state-to-state. In addition, many states have adopted the use of privatization of correctional facilities. Privately owned and operated facilities were not included in this analysis and therefore could account for a large discrepancy in the data. Although the strict definition used may lead to some inaccuracies within the population, we are confident that the facility directors who were included fit into our definition.

While several limitations on the current research exist, the findings are essential to the field of juvenile corrections. This research was able to sample a population not previously studied before in an attempt to build upon the prior literature on the topic. Research in corrections in this country has traditionally focused on the experiences of line personnel working within the adult system. The current study was able to survey a national population of administrators within the juvenile correctional system. The conclusions of the research can help to fill the gaps in the existing literature regarding the attitudes and satisfaction levels of juvenile facility directors in this country.

Results

The purpose of this research was to assess the correlates and predictors of job satisfaction of juvenile correctional administrators in the United States. The major topics of discussion were the level of job satisfaction; the correlates and predictors of job satisfaction; the affect of job satisfaction on the perceptions of staff, juveniles, and their jobs; and the relationship between job satisfaction and correctional orientation. In order to address these topics several questions were used to guide the research.

The specific research questions included:

1. What is the level of job satisfaction of juvenile facility directors?
2. What are the correlates/predictors of the job satisfaction of juvenile facility directors?
3. How does job satisfaction affect the perceptions of juvenile facility directors?
4. How does job satisfaction affect/relate t the correctional orientation of juvenile facility directors?

Level of Job Satisfaction of juvenile facility directors

Analysis indicates that the majority of juvenile facility directors (57%) are very satisfied with their jobs, with 40% indicating they are somewhat satisfied, and 2% reporting not too satisfied with their positions. It is important to note that no directors in the population reported that they were “not satisfied at all” with their position as a juvenile facility director. These findings are similar to the prior literature indicating that correctional administrators tend to have high levels of job satisfaction as compared to other individuals within the field. More specifically, the prior literature focuses on the adult system and line staff within correctional institutions. The findings of the current study can be used to compare the experiences of individuals within the corrections system in general. By comparing these differing populations we may be able to understand why administrators are more satisfied than their line-staff counterparts in the juvenile system. One’s initial impression would be that higher salary levels of key

administrators would be significant in explaining their higher rates of job satisfaction, but the current analysis found that salary was not predictive of this satisfaction. Indeed, more research is necessary to explain the differences between line-staff and directors in order to understand this discrepancy.

Correlates/ Predictors of Job Satisfaction

Similar to the prior literature, various general demographic factors do have a significant predictive value in estimating the level of job satisfaction of juvenile facility directors.

Individual Characteristics

Both age and race were found to significantly predict a portion of the regression model used. Age was found, as expected, to be positively related to job satisfaction, both at the bivariate and multivariate levels. As facility directors increase in age so does their level of job satisfaction. This finding could relate to the fact that directors who feel job dissatisfaction leave the field of juvenile corrections. Race was positively related to job satisfaction in the regression analysis. In the analysis, race was used as a dichotomous variable whereby all minorities were placed in a single category with non-minorities in another. The relationship between race and job satisfaction was found with the minority category. Unlike the previous research, minority status was found to predict job satisfaction. This finding corroborates with the Importation model in corrections literature, which states that staff (in the literature it is line staff) import their own ideas about the world into the work place. This importation clouds an individuals experience in

the workplace because they see their experiences there in the light of their importation. Finally, gender has been linked to higher levels of job satisfaction. Females have more positive attitudes toward the amenability to treatment of juveniles and therefore have higher satisfaction levels within the workplace. Although a small proportion of the population (17.5%) were female, gender was not significantly related to job satisfaction in the current research.

The prior literature pointed to other demographic factors as contributing to the job satisfaction levels of corrections personnel. The research on educational attainment and job satisfaction has been mixed at best. Some research identifies that education is negatively related to satisfaction, while others report no significant predictive power or correlations. The hypothesis of a negative relationship assumes that the more educated officer will move away from a correctional setting into a more rehabilitative setting such as probation and/or community based services programs. Although the majority of the population (94.9%) of the population graduated college, educational attainment was not related to job satisfaction in the multivariate analysis. While education did not affect a facility director's level of satisfaction, military experience was correlated with higher job satisfaction. Those individuals who had experience in the military (roughly 30%) scored higher on the scales of job satisfaction. Finally, salary has been linked to the job satisfaction levels of correctional employees. The assumption is that as salary increases so does the level of job satisfaction of an employee. This hypothesis assumes that individuals within the system value monetary rewards for their jobs. The current research did not replicate this finding. Conclusions can be made about the priorities of juvenile

facility directors from this finding. If salary is not a major predictor of satisfaction for these individuals, their motives for staying in the profession could be more altruistic. Finally, stress was negatively correlated with the job satisfaction of facility directors. This finding supports the prior literature in asserting that high levels of stress result in lower levels of job satisfaction for individuals.

Organizational Characteristics

Factors within the workplace were identified in the literature as important in understanding job satisfaction. The basis of the hypothesis was the Work Prisonization model of corrections research. This model asserts that individuals do not bring their own ideas into the work place, but rather experiences at work shape their attitudes and beliefs about their jobs. Experiences in the work setting serve to overpower any individual differences that may be present in the individual. Both at the bivariate and multivariate level, this hypothesis was verified. Factors within the work place, especially issues related to staff, significantly affect a facility director's level of job satisfaction.

Significant correlations were found with the staff employment issues index, which measure the degree to which a director experienced problems regarding the hiring and retaining of qualified staff. When directors scored low on this index (indicating they did not experience staff employment issues) their level of job satisfaction was higher. This finding can be interpreted to mean that the ability to maintain qualified staff is not only a major goal of facility directors, but significantly related to their satisfaction with their jobs. An additional variable, degree of influence of state or local office, was found to be negatively correlated with job satisfaction in the bivariate analysis. This finding indicates

that as the state or local office exerts more control over a facility director their level of job satisfaction decreases. This finding relates to issues of autonomy and decision-making authority. When a director feels as if he/she is not in a part of the decision-making process within his/her institution they become dissatisfied.

With respect to the regression analysis, the Staff Perception Scale predicted a director's level of satisfaction. The staff Perception scale measured the perception a director has of his or her staff involving issues of performance, creativity, general staff problems, and organizational communication. Findings indicate that when facility directors scored high on this index (indicating a high opinion of staff performance and communication within the organization) their levels of job satisfaction increased ($\beta = .374$). This finding is significant because it directly links a facility director's levels of satisfaction to their staff as opposed to other variables related to the work environment.

The second major finding in the regression was that the Staff Employment index was predictive of job satisfaction ($\beta = -.352$). This finding is significant because not only do staff issues relation to the satisfaction levels of directors, but the maintaining of qualified staff at the institution affects satisfaction. Questions regarding staff employment issues have rarely been addressed in the previous literature.

A third significant finding in the regression had to do with organizational stressors. The statement "I often feel that control of my institution is slipping out my hands" was used to identify the impact of stress on a facility director. This variable was negatively correlated with job satisfaction. When a director felt as if he or she had lost control of the workings of their institution, their levels of job satisfaction significantly

decreased. In terms of the regression analysis, this independent variable significantly contributed to the overall model for prediction ($\beta = -.300$).

Although the current study validated the previous literature and the influence of work related variables to job satisfaction; the findings indicate a more specified definition of work related variables. Previously the emphasis of work related variables has focused on physical aspects of the institution such as; size of facility, average daily population, security level and background of the individual; experience in the military, previous experience in adult corrections or as security staff the current finding support an emphasis on interactions within the workplace. The most significant variables related to and predictive of job satisfaction of facility directors were experiences with staff. This finding is a fundamental shift from that of the prior literature on job satisfaction.

Job Satisfaction and Perceptions

The analysis focus on three major categories of variable related to a director's perceptions within their facility. Specifically, stress, perceptions of juveniles, and attitudes regarding staff were addressed as being affected by a director's level of job satisfaction. Directors who reported higher levels of job satisfaction responded low to the measure of stress. This finding is understandable considering that stress was found to be predictive of job satisfaction in the regression analysis. Maintaining low levels of stress is a key factor in your satisfaction levels at your job, regardless of the position you hold. Second, perception of juveniles within the institution was predicted to influence job satisfaction. The only comparison that can be made is that the majority of directors

reported that most juveniles within their institution could be rehabilitated. Finally, the relationship between a director and their staff was identified. Do directors who are satisfied with their jobs have a different perception of their staff than those who are not satisfied? This question was not directly addressed by the research, only the impact of staff on satisfaction. In order to fully understand this relationship, further research must be conducted that examines the differences between directors with high and low levels of job satisfaction and their relationship to their staff.

Job Satisfaction and Correctional Orientation

The hypothesis prior to conducting the research was that an individual's correctional orientation would influence their degree of job satisfaction. Correctional orientation, either rehabilitative or punitive, refers to the emphasis an individual places on either of these specific goals of the juvenile correctional system. The juvenile justice system in general has a rehabilitative stance towards delinquents. This orientation runs counter to the general assumptions and issues within the corrections system where punishment and custody are primary goals. Conflict due to the mixing of these two goals of punishment and rehabilitation has been linked to lower levels of job satisfaction. The current research found that correctional orientation, either rehabilitative or punitive, is not significantly predictive of the job satisfaction levels of juvenile facility directors. This finding is paramount for future research in the area of juvenile corrections because it contradicts much of the previous assumptions made in the literature.

Implications of Findings

The major problem with the prior literature in corrections is its lack of attention to the juvenile system. Much of the literature focuses on adult populations and the experiences of line staff within organizations rather than looking at the administration and management of criminal justice. The experiences of correctional administrators in the juvenile system are fundamentally different than those of the adult correctional system. Additionally, much of the research is small in scale focusing on local and state level organizations. This research attempts to bridge the gap in the prior literature by looking at the entire population of juvenile facility directors in the United States.

The unique nature of the current project sheds light on certain assumptions that have traditionally been made about the administration and management of correctional facilities. Demographic factors have traditionally been associated with research on job satisfaction. The importation model assumes that people bring into the work environment certain ideas and perceptions that serve to shape their attitudes in the workplace. This hypothesis was not verified with the current study. Only the factors of age and race were significantly related to job satisfaction. The focus of prior research on the adult correctional system has led many to assume that the same factors affect juvenile administrators as their adult counterparts. The results here indicate that this assumption is incorrect. Just as we should treat juveniles in the criminal justice system differently than adults, so should we differentiate between adult and juvenile correctional administrators.

Correctional orientation has been correlated with levels of job satisfaction; specifically individuals supporting a punitive ideal tend to have higher levels of job satisfaction. Once again, this finding was not found in the present research. Punishment was not significantly correlated with job satisfaction, nor was any other form of correctional orientation.

The hypothesis that work variables predict levels of job satisfaction within juvenile correctional administrators was found in the current research. The emphasis of work variables in the current research focused on the relationship between staff issues and job satisfaction. This is a finding not previously identified in the literature on job satisfaction. The effect of staff issues on satisfaction accounted for the majority of predictive power in the regression model.

How a facility director interprets the actions and performance of his or her staff predicts satisfaction levels. While general work variables have been significant predictors of the job satisfaction of adult correctional personnel, more specific definitions of these variables are needed when identifying the satisfaction levels of juvenile administrators. This research identifies that the general work variables that are correlated with other correctional staff satisfaction levels must be more specific when applying it to juvenile administrators. Work variables for correctional administrators in the juvenile system must focus specifically on staff related issues. This finding addresses the differences between the juvenile and adult correctional systems in that the expectation within juvenile institutions may be higher than for their adult counterparts. If juvenile correctional personnel have the additional duty of insuring treatment programs are implemented

within the facility, the director may place more importance on their roles than are accorded to staff at the adult level. With qualified staff comes a smooth running facility and this may directly influence how satisfied an administrator is with his or her position.

Once again, this finding points to the idea that the adult and juvenile correctional systems are fundamentally different from one another and assumptions within one cannot necessarily be applied to the other. We cannot cut and paste what works and what doesn't work in the adult system into the juvenile system and hope that it will be effective. The juvenile correctional system is fundamentally different from its adult counterpart and each should be addressed independently.

This research is a step in asserting the importance of the juvenile correctional system within the framework of corrections. The administration and management of juvenile correctional institutions in this country is fundamental in understanding how the juvenile justice system works. The attitudes and beliefs of correctional administrators directly shape the workings of each institution. If a director is not satisfied with his or her job what climate is that creating for the rest of the institution? How does the level of job satisfaction translate into the long-term turnover rates of institutions? Although this research found that the most influential factor relating to job satisfaction is the experiences with staff within the institution; more detailed research regarding the long-term effects of job satisfaction are necessary in order to understand the full impact of this phenomena. Research into the relationship between staff and administration may be influential in determining how problems between these two groups directly lead to lower satisfaction levels.

APPENDIX

**National Juvenile Facility Director Survey
2000**

**Dr. Tory J. Caeti, Ph.D.
Project Director**

**University of North Texas
Department of Criminal Justice
(940) 565-4591**

Instructions: Please fill out the entire survey (questions are printed on both sides of the pages) and return the survey in the enclosed pre-addressed, postage paid envelope. Thank you for your time and your input.

Check three (3) things about being a facility director that you most dislike? Please or X your response.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Administrative and managerial duties.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accountability and decision-making (being held responsible, being the bad guy, justifying decisions, deadlines).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Budget, funding, cost issues, lack of equipment or resources.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Constraints (barriers to progress, barriers to change, limitations on the job).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Crisis intervention and management.
<input type="checkbox"/>	External attitudes —influences and pressures (community, parents, other agencies).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Facility design and conditions.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Job itself (salary, hours, workload).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Juvenile issues (dealing with repeat offenders, violence, disturbances).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lack of contact or communication with staff/youth.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Lack of support —lack of empowerment, lack of control, lack of respect.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Legal constraints (policies and procedures, lawsuits, federal regulations).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Overcrowding.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Paperwork and reports, meetings, audits, red tape, accreditation, bureaucracy.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Political and upper-administrative problems (public relations, court involvement, dealing with the media, dealing with central office, lack of coordination or disorganization, etc).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Programmatic issues (program failure, client failure, disciplinary process, etc).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Staff issues (disputes, evaluation, disciplining, motivating, training, turnover, unions, etc).
<input type="checkbox"/>	Stress, frustration, anxiety.

Check three (3) things about being a facility director that you most like? Please or X your response.

<input type="checkbox"/>	Ability to affect and change lives —helping others, impacting juveniles, implementing change.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accepted as expert, putting expertise to work.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Accomplishments.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Atmosphere.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Challenge.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Control, being in charge.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Creativity and innovation , being visionary.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Diversity and variety of job.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Exciting.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Flexibility and freedom.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Independence.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Job-itself —job security, benefits, autonomy, hours, salary.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Leadership and administrative responsibilities —decision-making, problem solving, authority, supervising, planning/directing, organizing.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Location of facility.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Policy and program development —improving program, ability to develop plans, setting goals and the agenda.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Public relations.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Respect, credibility, prestige.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Results and success, effective facility.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Sense of satisfaction —value and worth, sense of appreciation.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Working with juveniles —caring for, counseling, teaching, being a role model, inspiring.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Working with staff —training, supervising, coordinating, teamwork, motivating, evaluation and feedback.
<input type="checkbox"/>	Working with the community —public relations, coordinating volunteers, community projects.

If you were going to hire a director to run your institution, check the three (3) most important qualities you would look for in a potential candidate.

Please or your response.

Ability to work with juveniles	Fair, consistent, credible, sincere
Ability to work with, develop, and train staff	Financial and budgeting skills
Administration, leadership, and management skills	Hard working, perseverance, positive outlook
Care, concern, empathy, commitment to juveniles	Interpersonal skills, team builder, motivator, role model
Communication skills (verbal and written), ability to listen	Knowledge or experience in the juvenile system
Counseling and clinical treatment skills	Organization and planning skills
Creativity	Patience and tolerance
Dependable, reliable, trustworthy	Problem-solving, crisis and stress management skills
Discipline, firmness	Public relations skills
Education	Sense of humor
Ethics and values, integrity and honesty	Vision, intelligence, intuition, common sense

What are the three (3) most important factors that limit your ability to be an effective facility director?

Please or your response.

Admission restrictions and guidelines	Effectiveness not always defined	Maintaining experienced / professional staff
Aftercare options	Inadequate funding	Personal characteristics
Budget process and constraints	Inadequate training	Policies and procedures
Bureaucracy	Inexperience	Political environment
Civil service system	Lack of interagency cooperation	Size of facility and youth population
Community attitude and support	Lack of partnership with union	Time constraints
Continual change	Lack of resources	Treatment and placement issues
Court system and regulations	Limited decision making authority	Workload

Identify two juvenile correctional institutions, either in your state or nationally, that you consider to be high quality institutions.

- | | |
|------------------|----------|
| Institution Name | Location |
| 1. _____ | _____ |
| 2. _____ | _____ |

Check the three (3) characteristics of these high quality institutions you value most.

Please or your response.

Qualities	Qualities
Accredited	Outstanding leadership and administration
Clean and well maintained	Outstanding staff
Clear standards and goals—the focus / emphasis	Positive atmosphere
Community based services, community involvement	Professionalism
Communication between administration, staff, and juveniles	Proper aftercare
Consistency	Safe and secure environment
Facility itself—size, location, number of juveniles	Variety of services
Highly structured	Well funded and supported
Institutional programming—the goals, design, implementation, etc of the treatment program	Other _____

On a scale of one to ten, with ten being the rating for the high quality institutions named above, what grade would you give your institution?

MY INSTITUTION'S SCORE _____

On a scale of one to ten (1 = no influence; 10 = very great influence), indicate what degree of influence each of the following exert on the day-to-day operations of your institution.

Please or **X** your response over the number.

Courts	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
State or Local Central Office	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Director (Yourself)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Top Institution Administrators (Excluding Director)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Correctional Staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Juvenile Clients	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Parents of Juvenile Clients	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
General Public	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

On a scale of one to ten (1 = no emphasis; 10 = very great emphasis), indicate the degree of emphasis you give to each of the following activities in the day-to-day operation of your institution.

Please or **X** your response over the number.

Providing programs to help juveniles learn new skills	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Creating conditions which protect juveniles from one another	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Providing activities to keep juveniles busy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Creating conditions that prevent juvenile escapes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Providing adequate space and needed services to juveniles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Ensuring that institutional rules are followed by juveniles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Ensuring rules and procedures are followed by facility staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Ensuring that juveniles follow their treatment plan	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Ensuring that juveniles follow behavioral expectations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Ensuring security and maintaining order	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Preventing the flow of contraband into the facility	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Preventing the flow of contraband within the facility	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Involving juveniles in rehabilitative treatment programs	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

On a scale of one to ten (1= not successful at all; 10 = totally or completely successful), rank the success of your institution in achieving the following goals.

Please or **X** your response over the number.

Preventing escapes	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Preventing flow of contraband into the facility	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Preventing flow of contraband within the facility	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Help juveniles to learn new skills	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Protecting younger juveniles from older juveniles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Following legally mandated procedures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Punishing juveniles for crimes that caused their incarceration	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Providing juveniles with activities that occupy their time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Helping juveniles cope with the conditions of confinement	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Teaching juveniles how to behave appropriately	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Rehabilitating juveniles through their treatment plan	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Deterring juveniles from committing crimes in the future	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

Distribute 100 points among the following options in a way that reflects the relative importance you believe each goal or activity should receive in the day-to-day operation of the ideal juvenile institution:

Points you would assign (totaling 100)	Goal or Activity
	Preventing escapes
	Maintaining order within the juvenile facility
	Involving juveniles in rehabilitation programs (counseling, educational programs)
	Keeping juveniles busy by having them work
	Punishing juveniles for the crimes they committed
	Other (please specify) _____

On a scale one to seven (1=Very Strongly Disagree; 7=Very Strongly Agree), respond to each of the following items.

Please or your response over the number.

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree
I often felt that the control of my institution is slipping out of my hands.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The problems of my institutions are accurately portrayed in the local media.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Conditions at my institution should be harsher to deter juveniles from future crime	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Volunteers from the community play an important part in programming at my institution.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
There are few people outside of the institution with whom I can talk about my job.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Rehabilitation programs have an important place in my institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Juveniles are treated too leniently by our court system.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Juveniles need a clear message concerning what is and what is not appropriate behavior	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The location of my facility makes it easy for family members to visit juveniles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Generally speaking, juveniles do not have enough say in determining institutional policy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree
Local newspaper coverage of the activities at institutions such as mine should be encouraged	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Control of correctional institutions should be left to institutional administrators and not the courts.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
We need to provide more activities to occupy the juveniles' time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Juveniles do not have enough opportunities to give me their ideas about institutional problems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Carefully providing for the rights of juveniles in disciplinary matters has a negative impact on discipline at my institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The conditions at my institution are accurately portrayed in the local media	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

I am often invited to speak at local civic groups about activities at the institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Conditions at my institutions are such that when juveniles leave, they have a positive outlook on their lives	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The best way to stop juveniles from engaging in crime is to rehabilitate them, not punish them.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It would be irresponsible for us to stop trying to rehabilitate juveniles and thus save them from a life of crime	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
While I believe that adult criminals know what they are doing and deserve to be punished, I still support the emphasis on rehabilitation of juveniles.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most juveniles who commit crimes know full well what they are doing and thus deserve to be punished for their offenses	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
All juveniles who commit violent crimes should be tried as adults and given adult penalties	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Juveniles are treated too leniently by our criminal justice court system.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The rehabilitation of juveniles just does not work in the present system	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The rehabilitation of adult criminals just does not work.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The rehabilitation of juveniles has proven to be a failure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

We would like to know what you think the goals of the juvenile correctional system should be. Please rank each of the following statements in order of importance. Rank the most important goal as 1, the next most important goal as 2, and so on. Use each rank only once!

Rank You Would Assign, 1 – 4	Juvenile Correctional Goals
	Retribution —to pay juvenile offenders back or punish them for the harm they caused society.
	Deterrence —to teach juveniles, as well as other people contemplating the commission of a crime, that in America crime does not pay.
	Rehabilitation —to reform juvenile offenders so that they will return to society in a constructive rather than a destructive way.
	Incapacitation —to protect society by locking up juveniles so they cannot victimize again.

Please indicate your degree of support for the following juvenile justice policies.

Please or your response over the number.

	Oppose a great deal	Oppose a little	Favor a little	Favor a great deal
I support the death penalty for certain juveniles convicted of murder	1	2	3	4
I support the transfer of juveniles accused of serious crime to adult court	1	2	3	4
I favor incarceration past age 21 for juveniles convicted of serious crime	1	2	3	4
I favor fingerprinting and photographing of juveniles for tracking purposes	1	2	3	4
Juvenile records should be kept and allowed into evidence in adult court	1	2	3	4
I support an increase in the use of fixed length (determinate) sentences	1	2	3	4
I support and increase in the use of indeterminate sentences for juveniles	1	2	3	4

In a number of states, juvenile facility crowding is a severe problem. Which of the following solutions to facility crowding would you favor or oppose?

Please or **X** your response over the number.

	Oppose a great deal	Oppose a little	Favor a little	Favor a great deal
Diversion of more offenders into community corrections programs	1	2	3	4
Shortening sentence lengths	1	2	3	4
Increasing the ability of a parole authority to release low risk offenders	1	2	3	4
Raising taxes to build more institutions	1	2	3	4
Using private companies to build and run institutions	1	2	3	4

The issue of privatization has received a great deal of attention in recent times. We should like to know which of the following you would favor or oppose.

Please or **X** your response over the number.

	Oppose a great deal	Oppose a little	Favor a little	Favor a great deal
Having private vendors supply specific support services like food service or medical care.	1	2	3	4
Having private vendors supply rehabilitation services, like educational programs or psychological counseling.	1	2	3	4
Having private businesses set up facility industries that pay juveniles a normal wage for their work.	1	2	3	4
Having private companies help finance facility construction.	1	2	3	4
Having private companies build and operate facilities.	1	2	3	4

Now we would like to know your views on several correctional issues. Please state to what extent you favor or oppose each of the following policies.

Please or **X** your response over the number.

	Oppose a great deal	Oppose a little	Favor a little	Favor a great deal
Eliminating parole and the indeterminate sentence.	1	2	3	4
Expanding educational and vocational training programs for juvenile offenders.	1	2	3	4
Expanding psychological counseling programs.	1	2	3	4
Mandatory life sentences for habitual juvenile offenders.	1	2	3	4
Elimination of the death penalty for juveniles	1	2	3	4

The juvenile population is comprised on a variety of offenders. We would like to know your assessment of the juvenile population in your institution. Please indicate the percentage for each question.

	Percentage (can range from 0% – 100% for each question)
What percentage of juveniles in your institution do you believe are dangerously violent and should not be released into society?	
What percentage of juveniles in your institution do you believe will be rehabilitated (will not return to crime) because of the participation in institutional treatment programs (e.g., counseling, work training, education)?	
What percentage of juveniles in your institution do you believe will be deterred or scared straight by their institutional experience?	
What percentage of juveniles in your institution do you believe will recidivate and be back in the criminal justice system?	
What percentage of the juveniles in your institution are predators and victimize the other juveniles in the facility.	
What percentage of the juveniles in your institution need to be protected from other juveniles in the institution?	
What percentage of the juveniles in your institution might be called chronic trouble-makers?	

We would like to ask you a few questions about your staff and organization.

Please or **X** your response over the number.

	Very Strongly Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Very Strongly Agree
In general, management could do a better job of communicating with staff.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Communication between management and staff is excellent.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
There are many people on my staff with whom I can openly discuss the problems of my job	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Generally speaking, staff should have a say in determining procedures designed to implement institutional policy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Staff should have more opportunities to give me input into the design of institutional procedures	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No matter how explicit I make my directives, staff always find a way to get around them.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I can generally trust my staff to handle matters when I am away from the institution.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Staff are encouraged to be creative in performing their jobs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Many staff would rather cover up a mistake than attempt to correct it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Many staff try to look good rather than communicate freely with management	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Staff are encouraged to problem solve on their own and implement solutions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Staff are rewarded for being creative and problem solving in this organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most staff have a positive outlook on doing their jobs.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Staff do a good job of communicating with the juveniles	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
It is difficult to get the staff to change the way they do things in my institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I find it difficult to hire qualified staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
My institution has a problem in retaining qualified staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
The staff are the most valuable resource in my institution	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I find I spend more time handling staff problems than I do juvenile problems	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I want staff at my institution to be more sensitive to providing for juveniles' daily needs than they are now.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Please tell us about yourself

1. Age _____ 2. Place of Birth _____

3. Race WHITE BLACK HISPANIC ASIAN OTHER 4. Gender MALE FEMALE

5. Total Years of Education _____ 6. State graduated from high school _____

7. Did you attend college? YES NO (if no, skip to question 12) 8. State attended college _____

9. College Graduate? YES NO 10. If yes, what year did you graduate? _____

11. College major: Please or **X** your response.

Juvenile Justice or Juvenile Corrections	Corrections	Criminal Justice, Criminology, Administration of Justice
Social Work	Education / Special Ed	Rehab, Counseling, Nursing, Vocational Rehab
Business, Human Resources, Communications	Psychology / Psychiatry	Sociology
Natural Sciences—Science, Biology, Chemistry	Arts and Humanities—English, Liberal Arts, Music, Journalism	Social Sciences—Political Science, Public Admin, Anthropology, Economics, History

12. Did you serve in the Armed Forces? YES NO (if no, skip to question 15)

13. Branch Army Navy Air Force Marines Coast Guard 14. Years served _____ to _____

15. Total years working in juvenile corrections _____ 16. Total years as a Director _____

Note: THE TERM STAFF THROUGHOUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE REFERS TO THE WORKERS WHO ARE DIRECTLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SUPERVISION AND TREATMENT OF THE JUVENILES, NOT SOMEONE SUCH AS A KITCHEN STAFF OR OUTSIDE SUPPORT.

17. Do you have meetings with representatives of a formally recognized staff organization? YES NO

If yes, how frequently As Needed Daily Bi -Weekly Weekly Bi -Monthly Monthly Quarterly Bi -Annually Annually

18. Do you have meetings with a formally recognized group of juveniles? YES NO

If yes, how frequently As Needed Daily Bi -Weekly Weekly Bi -Monthly Monthly Quarterly Bi -Annually Annually

19. How many hours in your average workday? _____

Check three activities that take up most of your day and specify the hours you spend on that activity.

Please or **X** your response and indicate the hours next to your mark (mark only 3).

hours	Activity	hours	Activity	hours	Activity
	General office work / paperwork		Education		Physical facility problems
	Budgeting and finance		Grievances		Problem solving / crisis manage
	Case management / Counseling		Intake, assessment, screening		Public relations / tours and inspections

	Dealing with families		Management & leadership tasks		Staff issues and staff training
	Dealing with state office		Meetings		Supervision and monitoring / dealing with juveniles

We would like to ask you a few questions about your feelings toward your job of facility director and about your background.

Please or your response.

All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your job	Response			
	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Not too satisfied	Not satisfied at all
With regard to the kind of job you'd most like to have: If you were free to go into any kind of job you wanted, what would your choice be?	I would keep the job I have now	I would want to retire and not work at all	I would prefer some other job to the job I have now	
Knowing what you know now, if you had to decide all over again whether to take the job you now have, what would you decide?	I would decide without hesitation to take the same job	I would have second thoughts about taking the same job	I would decide definitely not to take the same job	
In general, how well would you say that your job measures up to the sort of job you wanted when you took it?	My job is very much like the job I wanted	My job is somewhat like the job I wanted	My job is not very much like the job I wanted	
If a good friend of yours told you that he or she was interested in working in a job like yours for your employer, what would you tell him or her?	I would strongly recommend the job	I would have my doubts about recommending this job	I would advise my friend against taking this job	

How long have you been at your present facility? from (mo/yr): _____ to (mo/yr): _____

Name of your Institution: _____ State where institution is located: _____

Maximum capacity of your institution? _____ Average daily population of your institution? _____

What is your current salary? _____

Type of Facility: JUVENILE CORRECTIONAL FACILITY JUVENILE DETENTION FACILITY JUVENILE GROUP HOME
JUVENILE DAY TREATMENT FACILITY JUVENILE RANCH OR CAMP ADULT FACILITY

Have you ever been employed:

As security staff in a juvenile facility YES NO As a counselor / psychologist in a juvenile facility YES NO
As a director at another facility YES NO In adult corrections in any capacity YES NO

I would like a copy of the 2000 Juvenile Facility Director's Survey Results sent to me. YES NO

**Thank you for participating in the survey.
Please feel free to add any additional comments you might have**

Don't forget to mail this survey back in the enclosed postage-paid envelope provided!

REFERENCES

- Anshel, Mark H. (2000). A Conceptual Model and Implications for Coping with Stressful Events in Police Work. Criminal Justice and Behavior 27, 3:375-400.
- Applegate, B.K., Cullen, F.T., Fisher, B.S. (1997). Public Support for Correctional Treatment: The Continuing Appeal of the Rehabilitative Ideal. The Prison Journal 77: 237-258.
- Baldwin, J. Norman, Harris, Louis M. (1999). Voluntary Turnover of Field Operations Officers: A Test of Confluency Theory. Journal of Criminal Justice 27, 6: 483-493.
- Bazemore, Gordon, Dicker, Todd J. (1994). Explaining Detention Worker Orientation: Individual Characteristics, Occupational Conditions, and Organizational Environment. Journal of Criminal Justice 22, 4: 297-312.
- Bazemore, Gordon, Feder, Lynette (1997). Judges in the Punitive Juvenile Court: Organizational, Career and Ideological Influences on Sanctioning Orientation. Justice Quarterly 14, 1: 87-112.
- Burton, V.S., X. Ju, R.G. Dunaway, and N.T. Wolfe. (1991). The Correctional Orientation of Bermuda Prison Guards: An Assessment of Attitudes Toward Punishment and Rehabilitation. International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice 15: 71-80.
- Bynum, Timothy S., Greene, Jack R., Cullen, Francis T. (1986). Correlates of Legislative Crime Control Ideology. Criminal Justice Policy Review 1, 3: 253-267.
- Caeti, T.J., C. Hemmens, and V.S. Burton. (1994). Rehabilitate or Punish? Results from the 1994 Juvenile Facility Director Survey. Paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences Annual Meeting
- Caeti, T.J., C. Hemmens, V.S. Burton, and F.T. Cullen. (1997). Role Conflict in Juvenile Correctional Facilities. Paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences Annual Meeting.
- Caeti, T.J. (2001). Management of Juvenile Correctional Facilities. Management Quarterly (forthcoming).

- Crouch, Ben M., Alpert, Geoffrey (1980). Prison Guards' Attitudes Toward Components of the Criminal Justice System. Criminology 18, 2: 227-236.
- Cullen, Francis T., Golden, Kathryn M., Cullen John B. (1983). Is Child Saving Dead? Attitudes Toward Juvenile Rehabilitation in Illinois. Journal of Criminal Justice 11: 1-13.
- Cullen, F.T., B.G. Link, N.T. Wolfe, and J. Frank. (1985). The Social Dimensions of Correctional Officer Stress. Justice Quarterly 2: 505-533.
- Cullen, Francis T., Cullen John B., Wozniak, John F. (1988). Is Rehabilitation Dead? The Myth of the Punitive Public. Journal of Criminal Justice 16: 306-317.
- Cullen, Francis T., Lutze Faith E., Link, Bruce G., Wolfe, Nancy Travis (1989). The Correctional Orientation of Prison Guards: Do Officers Support Rehabilitation? Federal Probation 53: 33-42.
- Cullen, Francis T., Skovron, Sandra Evans, Scott, Joseph E., Burton, Jr., Velmer S. (1990). Public Support for Correctional Treatment. Criminal Justice and Behavior 17, 1: 6-18.
- Cullen, F. T., E.J. Latessa, V.S. Burton, and L.X. Lombardo. (1993). The Correctional Orientation of Prison Wardens: Is the Rehabilitative Ideal Supported? Criminology 31: 69-92.
- DiLulio, J.J. (1987). *Governing Prisons: A Comparative Study of Correctional Management*. New York: New York Free Press.
- Farkas, Mary Ann (1999). Correctional Officer Attitudes Toward Inmates and Working with Inmates in a "Get Tough" Era. Journal of Criminal Justice 27, 6: 495-506.
- Farmer, Richard E. (1977). Cynicism: A Factor in Corrections Work. Journal of Criminal Justice 5: 237-246.
- Ferdinand, Theodore N. (1994). Juvenile Justice: On the Right Path? Legal Studies Forum 18, 3: 251-260.
- Flanagan, Timothy J., Johnson, W. Wesley, Bennett, Katherine. (1996). Job Satisfaction Among Correctional Executives: A Contemporary Portrait of Wardens of State Prisons for Adults. *Prison Journal*: 74, 1: 385-397.
- Gordon, Jill A. (2001) An Examination of Correctional Staff Attitudes in Virginia Juvenile Institutions. Paper presented at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences Annual Meeting.

- Grusky, Oscar (1959). Role Conflict in Organization: A Study of Prison Camp Officials. Administrative Science Quarterly 3 (March): 452-472.
- Hepburn, John R., Albonetti, Celesta (1980). Role Conflict in Correctional Institutions. Criminology 17, 4: 445-459.
- Hoath, David R., Schneider, Frank W., Starr, Meyer W. (1998). Police Job Satisfaction as a Function of Career Orientation and Position Tenure: Implications for Selection and Community Policing. Journal of Criminal Justice 26, 4: 337-347.
- Jurik, Nancy C. (1985). Individual and Organizational Determinants of Correctional Officer Attitudes Toward Inmates. Criminology 23, 3: 523-539.
- Jurik, Nancy C., Halemba, Gregory J. (1984). Gender, Working Conditions and the Job Satisfaction of Women in a Non-Traditional Occupation: Female Correctional Officers in Men's Prisons. The Sociological Quarterly 25(Autumn): 551-556.
- Kauffman, Kelsey (1981). Prison Officers' Attitudes and Perceptions of Attitudes. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 18: 272-291.
- Lambert, Eric G., Barton, Shannon M., Hogan, Nancy Lynne. (1999). The Missing Link Between Job Satisfaction and Correctional Staff Behavior: The Issue of Organizational Commitment. American Journal of Criminal Justice 24, 1: 95-116.
- Liou, Kuotsai Tom (1995). Role Stress and Job Stress Among Detention Care Workers. Criminal Justice and Behavior 22, 4: 425-436.
- Loverich, Nicholas P., Reisig, Michael D. (1998). Job Attitudes Among Higher-Custody State Prison Management Personnel: A Cross-Sectional Comparative Assessment. Journal of Criminal Justice 26, 3: 213-226.
- McCorkle, Richard C. (1993). Research Note: Punish and Rehabilitate? Public Attitudes Toward Six Common Crimes. Crime and Delinquency 39, 2: 240-252.
- Mitchell, Ojmarrh, Mackenzie, Doris Layton, Styve, Gaylene J., Gover, Angela R. (2000). The Impact of Individual, Organizational, and Environmental Attributes on Voluntary Turnover Among Juvenile Correctional Staff Members. Justice Quarterly 17, 2: 333-357.
- Philliber, Susan (1987). Thy Brother's Keeper: A Review of the Literature on Correctional Officers. Justice Quarterly 4, 1: 9-37.

- Pollak, Charlotte, Sigler, Robert (1998). Low Levels of Stress Among Canadian Correctional Officers in the Northern Region of Ontario. Journal of Criminal Justice 26, 2: 117-128.
- Poole, Eric D., Regoli, Robert M. (1980). Role Stress, Custody Orientation and Disciplinary Actions. Criminology 18, 2: 215-226.
- Robinson, David, Porporino, Frank J., Simourd, Linda (1997). The Influence of Educational Attainment on the Attitudes and Job Performance of Correctional Officers. Crime and Delinquency 43, 1: 60-77.
- Sigler, Robert T. (1988). Role Conflict for Adult Probation and Parole Officers: Fact or Myth. Journal of Criminal Justice 16: 121-129.
- Stohr, Mary K., Loverich Jr., Nicholas P., Menke, Ben A., Zupan, Linda L. (1994). Staff Management in Correctional Institutions: Comparing DiLulio's "Control Model" and "Employee Investment Model" Outcomes in Five Jails. Justice Quarterly 11, 3: 471-497.
- Toch, Hans, Klofas, John (1982). Alienation and Desire for Job Enrichment Among Correction Officers. Federal Probation 46 (March): 35-44.
- Whitehead, John T., Lindquist, Charles A. (1989) Determinants of Correctional Officers' Professional Orientation. Justice Quarterly 6, 1: 78-87.
- Whitehead, John T., Lindquist, Charles, A. (1992). Determinants of Probation and Parole Officer Professional Orientation. Journal of Criminal Justice 20:13-24.
- Whitehead, John T., Lindquist, Charles A. (1996). Correctional Officer Job Burnout: A Path Model. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 23, 1: 23-42.
- Wright, Kevin N., Saylor, William G. (1992). A Comparison of Perceptions of the Work Environment Between Minority and Non-Minority Employees of the Federal Prison System. Journal of Criminal Justice 20: 63-71.
- Van Voorhis, Patricia, Cullen, Francis T., Link Bruce G., Wolfe, Nancy Travis (1991). The Impact of Race and Gender on Correctional Officers' Orientation to the Integrated Environment. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 28, 4: 472-500.
- Zhao, Jihong, Thurman, Quint, He, Ni (1999). Sources of Job Satisfaction Among Police Officers: A Test of Demographic and Work Environment Models. Justice Quarterly 16, 1: 153-172.