

University of Nevada, Reno

**Exploring Parole and Probation Staff Perception: Job Satisfaction, Organizational Trust,  
and Work-Family Conflict**

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of Masters of Arts in Criminal Justice

by

Chelsea Hines

Dr. Matthew Leone/ Thesis Advisor

May 2023



THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

We recommend that the thesis  
prepared under our supervision by

**CHELSEA HINES**

entitled

**Exploring Parole and Probation Staff Perception: Job  
Satisfaction, Organizational Trust, and Work-Family  
Conflict**

be accepted in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of

**MASTERS OF ARTS**

Dr. Matthew Leone  
*Advisor*

Dr. Mia Abboud Holbrook  
*Committee Member*

Dr. Clayton Peoples  
*Graduate School Representative*

Markus Kemmelmeier, Ph.D., Dean  
*Graduate School*

May, 2023

## **Abstract**

Community corrections staff, primarily those employed by parole and probation departments, are vital to the rehabilitation and reintegration of offenders who are released under supervision. Previous research concerned with parole and probation has been centered around the techniques of supervision and offender rehabilitation. Few studies within corrections have provided insight into how parole and probation staff members perceive the organizational and occupational stressors of their workplace; a topic heavily focused upon in studies of traditional correctional settings. Using survey data taken from 199 parole and probation staff members in Nevada, we explore the differences in perceptions between sworn and unsworn (administrative) staff members as they relate to job satisfaction, organizational trust and work-family conflict. These findings provide partial support for the notion that job type influences the way that employees experience both their organization and their occupation.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Matthew Leone, for his invaluable guidance and support throughout my academic journey. I could not have achieved this without his belief in me, expertise and encouragement. I would also like to thank my committee members, Drs Clayton Peoples and Mia Holbrook for their support and their insight. Their efforts have made this a better thesis and have made me a better student.

I would also like to give a special thanks to James. Without his unwavering support and encouragement, I would not have pushed myself to pursue this degree or thesis. Thank you for your endless love, the pep talks, the late nights and pushing me to be my best.

## Table of Contents

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Introduction .....                                      | 1  |
| Literature Review .....                                 | 3  |
| History of Parole and Probation .....                   | 3  |
| <i>Parole</i> .....                                     | 4  |
| <i>Probation</i> .....                                  | 6  |
| Parole and Probation Staff.....                         | 7  |
| <i>Administrative Staff</i> .....                       | 8  |
| <i>Parole and Probation Officers</i> .....              | 10 |
| Organizational Trust.....                               | 12 |
| Work-Family Conflict.....                               | 14 |
| Job Satisfaction .....                                  | 17 |
| Gaps in the Literature .....                            | 18 |
| Research Methods .....                                  | 19 |
| Research Focus .....                                    | 19 |
| Procedures and Participants .....                       | 21 |
| Dependent Variables .....                               | 23 |
| Independent Variable .....                              | 24 |
| Results.....  | 25 |
| Discussion and Conclusion.....                          | 29 |
| <i>Discussion</i> .....                                 | 29 |
| <i>Limitations</i> .....                                | 31 |
| <i>Implications</i> .....                               | 32 |
| <i>Conclusion</i> .....                                 | 34 |
| References .....  | 35 |
| Appendix A: Job Satisfaction Survey Questions.....      | 47 |
| Appendix B: Organizational Trust Survey Questions ..... | 48 |
| Appendix C: Work-Family Conflict Survey Questions ..... | 50 |
| Appendix D: Informed Consent.....                       | 53 |
| Appendix E: Communications Sent to Participants .....   | 54 |
| Original Invitation Email.....                          | 54 |

Reminder email..... 54

Survey Closing Email ..... 55

## Introduction

The field of corrections has been an area of interest within scholarly research for decades because of the unique circumstances associated with this imprisonment. Those within this occupation are tasked with handling a population of violent, high risk and involuntarily confined individuals (Lambert et al., 2021; Armstrong & Griffin, 2004). In consideration of the hostile conditions that institutional and federal prison workers must deal with, there has been a growing body of research detailing how workplace factors as well as organizational policies and systems affect staff. Several concepts that have been explored within corrections includes relationships between job satisfaction, job stress, and organizational trust. Moreover, much of the research done within corrections has focused on those working within prisons or jails, while overlooking those working within the community corrections field, such as parole and probation.

Parole and probation have evolved into the largest form of supervision within the criminal justice system (Phelps, 2018) and has been deemed a successful alternative to alleviate overcrowding in jails and prisons (Martin & Zetter, 2021; Phelps, 2013; Phelps, 2017; Garland et al., 2014). Prior to punitive legislation that was passed to combat rising crime in the 1980s and 1990s, parole and probation officers were handling offenders that were either low-level or non-violent cases that were deemed to not be a threat to the public (Martin & Zettler, 2021; Petersilia, 1998). However, to alleviate overcrowded prisons, Taxman et al. (2004) notes that caseloads began to “increasingly mirror the prison population” (p. 3). Resulting in a diverse and complicated convergence of ex-offenders for parole and probation officers to manage and assist.

Nevertheless, this inadvertent shift in the supervised population has not resolved the problem of mass incarceration; instead, it has inadequately dispersed the population and overwhelmed another sector of corrections (DeMichele & Payne, 2007), resulting in expanded formal social controls (Phelps, 2017).

Unfortunately, even with this population shift to communal supervision for criminals, there has been little focus on the staff, who work within community corrections. Unlike other correctional officers, those that work within parole and probation are responsible for maintaining their normal office workload in addition to their offender caseload. The tasks that are expected of them include one-on-one visits with their probationers/parolees, court appearances and reports, securing resources for the ex-convict while monitoring for violations and recidivism (DeMichele & Payne, 2007; Gaymen & Bradley, 2013; Rhineberger-Dunn & Mack, 2019). When they are faced with staff shortages, whether it be a sworn officer or administrative staff member, the remaining employees are responsible for picking up the extra work to maintain the standards of operation (Tidmarsh, 2021; Hopkins, 1983).

Much like parole and probation officers, administrative and non-custodial staff are another severely understudied group within the field of corrections. Although they are not typically tasked with handling parolees, probationers and prisoners as regularly as sworn officers, they are still expected to maintain the daily operations of the organization, providing support to superiors and community officers alike. While most non-custodial staff have different workloads and goals within their daily job tasks, they are still faced with similar conflicts that “may make organizational performance expectations appear ambiguous and often culminate in greater externally imposed procedural constraints on employee action” (Wright & Davis, 2003, p. 75). While these staff may not be expected to complete tasks within the field as sworn officers are, they will be expected to take on additional work, without additional compensation, as well as handle many administrative tasks that are required by state and federal guidelines.

It has been well documented that correctional officers experience several adverse effects because of their profession. Some of the most prevalent ones that Lambert et al. (2017) points



out are high levels of stress, lower job satisfaction and decreased life satisfaction. Although these variables have not been extensively studied among non-custodial prison staff, these trends are of concern for all staff—including the parole and probation officers that supervise the prison population within the community. Considering that “few other organizations are charged with the central task of supervising and securing an unwilling and potentially violent population” (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004, p. 577), parole and probation organizations should be included within the discussion of corrections research.

Regardless of the scope or role that staff play within community corrections, they are necessary pieces of the organization and are subjected to the same bureaucratic workplace. Because of this, our research will be analyzing whether parole and probation officers experience the organization differently than those that work as either non-custodial or administrative staff. Specifically, our study examines the differences of work-family conflict, organizational trust and, job satisfaction among sworn officers and non-sworn staff within the Nevada Department of Parole and Probation. The present study intends to expand the limited literature surrounding the profession of community corrections, as well as provide insight on how different employee groups respond to the realities of the workplace.

## **Literature Review**

### **History of Parole and Probation**

Although parole and probation are often and erroneously used interchangeably to describe supervised release of offenders, these programs were created independently of one another to assist offenders in different ways. Phelps (2013) describes the difference between the two as, “like parole, probation involves the supervision of individuals in their home communities... [however] probation is a court-imposed sanction given in lieu of imprisonment

rather than as a form of additional post release supervision” (p. 52). Through the years, the philosophy that originated these programs has shifted from a rehabilitative approach into a control-oriented system that is focused on revocation and heavy supervision.

The growth of parole and probation first appeared positive since it was intended to lower the prison and jail populations while simultaneously reintegrating offenders back into society. However, many states and jurisdictions began using parole and probation as an additional sanction and not solely as an alternative to imprisonment. Researchers found that proposals to expand parole and probation increased the “overall punishment by drawing in more low-level cases...and making these individuals more likely to be incarcerated in the future due to increased restrictions and monitoring” (Phelps, 2013, p. 52). The rehabilitative model that was used in the beginning centered on maintaining a smaller group of offenders under one person’s supervision has been lost in translation with the growing crime control methods and surging imprisonment rates of the 1980s and 1990s (Martin & Zettler, 2021).

It is important to note that even though many do not understand the separation between parole and probation, several states and jurisdictions have parole and probation officers defined separately. Typically, probation officers work with offenders who have been court-ordered to probation, while parole officers work with those who have been released early from their prison sentence (Rhineberger-Dunn & Mack, 2019). However, in some states, such as Nevada, there is no distinction between parole and probation staff members. Instead, they are all hired as Department of Public Safety officers, and thus their assignments within the agency can vary. Therefore, parole and probation will be used simultaneously throughout this thesis.

### ***Parole***

The first recorded use of parole occurred within 1840, when a British Navy captain, Alexander Machonochie, created a system he coined the “ticket to leave” system (Bayens &

Smykla, 2013). The goal behind this arrangement was to sufficiently track and move offenders through the crime control process and allow them to gain freedoms by earning points through good behavior and a healthy work ethic. The typical stages of this process required the criminal to start within incarceration and end with conditional release (parole) and once they have proven that they are not a threat to the public; the goal being that they may eventually be fully released and regain their freedoms.

This idea of allowing inmates to earn their freedom and reintegrate into society using conditional release soon reached beyond Great Britain, and was implemented within Irish prisons and quickly expanded to the United States of America. Within forty years of the creation of the “ticket to leave” system, the Elmira Reformatory located in New York initiated the first parole program known to the United States criminal justice system. However, with the application of this new model being used within prisons, it ushered in an era of new penology that shifted the paradigm from being treatment focused into an additional axis of inmate control.

For decades, parole was used to manage prison populations to keep them from increasing beyond design capacity. In the 1970s, however, the American prison system became inundated in the worst way—by mass incarceration including those that were re-arrested while on parole. Unfortunately, the increase in prison population, paired with significantly more parolees being released, resulted in standards of supervision not being maintained and inmates being ill-prepared to reintegrate into society.

These compounding issues of prison populations exceeding capacity and parole officers’ caseloads growing, resulted in the government implementing more restrictions and crime control policies—in hopes that it would curtail the rising problem. However, while these punitive approaches increased the supervision of those out on release, it resulted in parole offices sending

many convicts back to prison for revocations and their resources were stretched even thinner with growing caseloads (Phelps, 2018). Unfortunately, the standards of parole conditions continued to be stacked and resources for treatment were limited, resulting in parole officers (and probation officers alike) in the burdensome position of balancing being a social worker with serving as a rule enforcer (Gayman & Bradley, 2012).

### ***Probation***

The philosophy of probation has been around in the United States and England since the mid-1800s; however, it is the American, John Augustus, that is recognized as the ‘father of probation’ (Globokar & Toro, 2017). Through his rehabilitative work with drunks and other low-level offenders, Augustus was able to broker probation for nearly 2,000 adults and children before his death, thus shifting how low offenders were to be handled within the criminal justice process (Bayens & Smykla, 2013). Instead of them being institutionally punished, those that attained probation were able to avoid a jail sentence and seek rehabilitation through their work and repentance for their actions.

Augustus inspired the first implementation of a systematic probation system in Boston, which then led to Massachusetts being the first state to pass laws regarding probation in 1837 (Globokar & Toro, 2017; Wiggins et al., 2022). These initial laws empowered the mayors within the cities to control the terms and conditions of those that were on communal supervision, however, as more states adopted these programs, the responsibility of compliance was shifted to the county correctional offices and courts, as well as administrative staff (Bayens & Smykla, 2013). Expansion of probation resulted in different standards and guidelines across jurisdictions and would continue to change through the years as more states passed legislation authorizing the use of it (Bayens & Smykla, 2013).

Since 1980, there had been a steady increase of offenders that have been placed under probation with the recorded highest being 4.2 million people between 2005 and 2009 (Kaeble, 2021). Nevertheless, while there has been a decline in the number of inmates that are being released on probation (and parole) in recent years (Bayens & Smykla, 2013; Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2021; Kaeble, 2021), there is still concern about the volume of offenders that one officer is expected to manage. As the caseload sizes and need of the offenders' increase, the probation officer is bound to experience less job satisfaction, more role overload and heightens the stress that they are placed under. However, the mere size of their caseload was not the only stressor for officers. An additional concern is the type of cases that they are assigned to handle and the needs of the individual offender.

### **Parole and Probation Staff**

Many people are familiar with the notion of mass incarceration that has been a topic of discussion since the 1970's, however, few have discussed the endemic surge of parole and probation supervision that has followed. The reliance on parole and probation departments is illustrated in the fact that “nearly 4.3 million—or one in every 53 U.S. adult residents—were on probation [or parole], compared to just under 1.6 million incarcerated in state and federal prisons” in 2016 (Phelps, 2017, p. 54). As a consequence of this, the capacity has been strained across parole and probation departments within the United States and has ushered in an era of “mass community supervision” (Wiggins et al., 2022).

Staff within community corrections are pivotal to the success of these communal supervision programs and are responsible for a myriad of duties to maintain the smooth operation of the organization. Corrections itself is a unique area considering that staff are responsible for a carceral population, however, all staff are equally subjected to the federal and state guidelines

that must be followed. As Lambert et al., (2021) states in their research of correctional staff “[t]hese actors are all part of the same organizational team and are all worthy of our attention, regardless of the specific role they play” (p. 92).

### *Administrative Staff*

Administrative staff handle a multitude of mundane tasks that need to be completed for the effective operation of the parole and probation office. This includes, but is not limited to, the handling of human resource issues, sending letters and notices to parolees, tracking down documents, obtaining information from prisons, and retrieving records from the court (Tidmarsh, 2021). However, because the department was unable to support increasing parole and probation population (Phelps, 2018) administrative staff were tasked to complete report write-ups regarding offenders and background investigation requests and submissions, to alleviate the burden from sworn officers.

Subsequently, administrators that work within the Department of Parole and Probation may also be responsible for an administrative caseload of offenders who don’t necessarily require contact with a sworn community correction officer. Those who are placed on an administrator’s case load may have absconded, need to submit progress reports, or have an active warrant that needs to be filed (Bayens & Smykla, 2013). Nevertheless, while administrative staff are not working directly with high-risk populations, they still experience high turnover and are subject to the same systemic exposure that affects their levels of job satisfaction and organizational trust within their occupation.

Unlike sworn officers, public sector employees are found to have lower job satisfaction because of the nature of their work along with lacking autonomy, fulfillment and self-actualization in their careers (Wright & Davis, 2003; Paine, et al. 1966; Porter & Mitchell, 1967). Researchers have noted that routine and repetition adversely affect administrative staff’s job

satisfaction (Wright & Davis, 2001). With little room for change or decision-making regarding the procedures of tasks, it results in stagnant feelings and little autonomy within the work (Sánchez-Sánchez & Fernández Puente, 2020; Wright & Davis, 2003). While there are adequate resources and benefits that are provided within their employment, some administrative staff within the public sector struggle with their overall working conditions, remarking that “mobility [is] somewhat of a problem, mixed feelings about promotions, and a variety of responses on income and size of the workplace” (Hopkins, 1983, p. 116).

Consequently, public sector employees are not just the victims of governmental standards of operation within their departments. Wright & Davis (2003) found that since administrative staff working within the public sector are consistently attempting to balance external forces and conflicting goals since they are not only public funded but they also suffer from constantly changing political motivations. In addition to these external influences, the work environment is subjected to rigid checks-and-balances as well as scrutiny from taxpayers and the media (Sánchez-Sánchez & Fernández Puente, 2020). While many of these factors affecting these administrators and non-custodial staff are extrinsic, they may affect employee perception of job satisfaction and organizational trust (Lambert et al., 2021; Wright & Davis, 2001; Hansen & Host, 2012).

Although administrative staff are not often the focal point of academic inquiry, especially when research is being conducted regarding community corrections, it is important to note that they are also facing crippling turnover rates. Researchers have found that length of employment within government organizations vary greatly, with many leaving within five years (Lambert & Paoline, 2008; Hopkins, 1983), thus illustrating the persistent issue that plagues other public sector jobs—they are not able to keep employees and are thus not meeting their described

expectations. This leads to the secondary issue of expending scarce resources to train staff, and then losing these employees who possess “institutional knowledge and experience, which cannot be obtained in a short period of time” (Cho & Song, 2017, p. 45).

### ***Parole and Probation Officers***

Parole and probation officers, referred to simply as officers here, are responsible for a variety of tasks regarding the workload and caseload that they are assigned. As mentioned previously, one of their main tasks is to monitor those that have been sentenced to community supervision. However, several studies have found that officers are being overwhelmed by the demands of the job, the bureaucracy and crime control regulations (Tidmarsh, 2021; Phelps, 2013; Lewis et al., 2012).

Before the era of mass incarceration and crime control, officers were tasked with reintegrating offenders back into society, providing resources and ensuring that they don't recidivate. However, as the number of offenders being placed on parole or probation continued to rise, policies, guidelines, training, and resources did not keep pace. The role of a probation officer has undergone a significant shift from merely supervising offenders' adherence to court orders to becoming an active participant in facilitating behavioral change. (Lewis et al., 2012; Taxman, 1999). This resulted in officers now being involved in every step of an offenders' journey toward reform. Lewis et al., (2012) summarized the immersion that officers are experiencing:

From their initial involvement with a case during the pre-sentence investigate stage, probation officers are exposed to varying aspects of trauma as they read police reports, interview victims, and assess offender' criminal and social histories. After sentencing, field officers regularly meet with offenders and conduct home visits where they often bear witness to dysfunctional lives. In order



to be most effective, probation officers also establish and develop relationships with the spouse, children, friends and collateral individuals involved in the offender's life (68).

In addition to this to these personal entanglements, officers are required to complete a complex collection of tasks related to the offender's conditions of release as ordered by the courts.

Although advances in technology over the years have made it more efficient for monitoring to take place, it does not save officers time due to increases in caseloads (Martin & Zettler, 2021). Instead, these innovations—such as GPS monitoring, curfews, breathalyzers in vehicles equipped with cameras, and social media—create additional complexity and result in more systems for the officer to learn how to operate, apply, check and interpret. If an officer is able to determine that there was a violation of these often complex conditions of release, and if so, what actions should be taken.

The implementation of these different devices has been revolutionary for compliance; however, officers still find themselves not being able to handle their high caseload and workload. Tidmarsh (2021) surveyed probation officers in England and Wales regarding the challenge of balancing the bureaucratic pressures and their work in the field with offenders. Throughout the statements made by probation officers, there was a theme of feeling overwhelmed by the paperwork and reports that they must complete and not being able to spend enough time building rapport and helping those on their caseload.

## Organizational Trust

Schoorman et al. (2007) acknowledged that “trust is not necessarily mutual and is not reciprocal” (p. 347) thus illustrating that trust is a temperamental characteristic and is not guaranteed within any relationship—whether it be romantic, social, or bureaucratic. Trust, like job satisfaction, is multidimensional and dependent on the situation in which it is being applied (Pirson & Malhotra, 2011). To better understand how trust can affect an employee’s perception of their career, researchers have been interested in organizational trust specifically, which is described as “trust in the employing organization” (Schoorman et al., 2007).

Recurrently, organizational trust has been tied closely with the ability and willingness to be vulnerable, which was proffered by Mayer et al. (1995) who stated: “trust is not taking risk *per se*, but rather it is a *willingness* to take risk” (p. 712). Using this framework, Cho and Song (2017) defined organizational trust as “a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of another” (p. 51; Rousseau, 1998). Zand (1972) stated that organizational trust is “the conscious regulation of one’s dependence on another that will vary with the task, the situation, and the other person” (p. 230). Keena et al., (2022) explained organizational trust as “the employee’s confidence that the organization will perform an action that is beneficial or at least not detrimental to him or her” (p. 150).

Trust is a guiding principle and foundation of organizations and the work environment (Lambert et al., 2021). However, scholars have noted that trust is not absolute and operates on a continuum instead of this notion that a person or organization is trustworthy or not (Mayer et al., 1995). Despite organizational trust’s importance within the workforce, it must be earned and cannot be demanded or expected by management (Lambert et al., 2017). It must be cultivated

over time with the consistency of an organization's actions. As with personal relationships, employees will expect that they will be mutually respected within the organization and that they will not be taken advantage of for advancement of the company or superiors.

Increased levels of organizational trust have been shown to reduce turnover intent, promote communication, increase job satisfaction (Lambert et al., 2021), and amplify autonomy (Hasche et al., 2020; Paliszkievicz, 2011). Promoting organizational trust throughout a corporation is critical for an employer because it influences and determines one's behavior, interpretations, attitudes, and perceptions of their interactions with their colleagues and superiors (Zand, 1972). Typically, organizational trust refers to not only the trust that is held between a subordinate and their supervisor or a subordinate and the organization in which they are employed; but also, what is represented within "its procedures, norms and decisions" (Archimi et al., 2018, p. 911).

Conversely, a breach of trust creates not only a negative work environment, but also consequentially makes the employee feel distrustful of the organization, and not open to their proposed goals, suggestions, or criteria and methods for measuring progress (Zand, 1972). Several reasons have been found to diminish trust in management and the overarching institution, such as role ambiguity, role overload, micromanaging, moral conflicts, and lack of resources (Lewis et al., 2012; Lambert et al., 2017).

Regardless of its fluidity, it is pivotal that trust is maintained within correctional environments since employees are dealing with potentially dangerous and unstable populations. Making them particularly more vulnerable than those that don't work in corrections. Some scholars have found that if distrust is anticipated, then others will act in ways that are not in one's best interests, and may even engage in harmful behavior (Lewicki et al., 1998). Without

organizational trust between the employee and the organization, animosity amongst the workers may arise if there is belief that they are being treated unfairly, which can result in counterproductive behavior being exhibited. Moreover, decreased organizational trust has been found to create a wary work environment, affecting not only how the employee perceives the organization and co-workers, but also how they interpret situations that they may be placed in (Zand, 1972).

### **Work-Family Conflict**

When considering the well-being of correctional officers, there has been noteworthy research regarding how work-family conflict manifests, and its effects on those working with carceral populations. Work-family conflict (WFC) was defined by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) as “a form of inter-role conflict in which the role pressures from the work and family domains are mutually incompatible in some respect. That is, participation in the work (family) role is made more difficult by participation in the family (work) role” (p.77). However, regardless of its reciprocity, researchers have found that work is more detrimental to personal life for those working within corrections (Lambert & Hogan, 2010; Kinman et al., 2017). To better understand this incompatibility between the two domains researchers determined there to be three main types of work-family conflict: time-based, strain-based and behavior-based (Lambert et al., 2020; Triplett et al., 1999).

**Time-based.** Time-based conflicts happen when an officers’ commitments to work or their caseload interferes with obligations within their personal life. This strain can be found most within professions that require mandatory overtime or within careers that require the staff to be on-call (Lambert et al., 2006).

**Strain-based.** Strain-based conflict occurs when officers take the job home with them, whether it be stress, problems or emotions, and let it affect how they interact with those around them (Lambert et al., 2006). An example of this is when an officer has a confrontation at work, whether it be with an offender or superior, and the feelings of irritability, apathy and disconnectedness continue at home thus creating conflict.

**Behavior-based.** Lastly, behavior-based conflict is described by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985), as “specific patterns of in-role behavior [that are] incompatible with expectations regarding behavior in another role” (p. 81). Behavior-based conflict can be illustrated in how the role of a parent is to be nurturing and kind, whereas the role of an officer requires toughness and detachment (Lambert et al., 2010).

Lambert et al. (2010) explains that a reason work impacts an officers’ personal life negatively is in part because distinct demands of working in corrections may cause some staff members to adopt work roles that do not align with their roles at home, where emotional interaction is paramount and vulnerability are commonplace. Previous research has also found that, in addition to WFC causing strains within their personal life, it has been linked to burnout (Lambert et al., 2010), lowered job satisfaction (Lambert et al., 2006) and increased job stress (Vickovic & Morrow, 2020). Interestingly though, research has noted that while organizational stressors increase WFC for the employee, there has been evidence that the occupation itself exacerbates conflict, particularly through one’s working personality.

The first introduction of the working personality was presented by Jerome Skolnick (1966), who believed that police officers developed a working personality of suspicion, authority, seclusion and mistrust to cope with organizational pressure and restraints. While these are similar circumstances that plague correctional organizations, both police officers and

correctional officers base their personality around danger and authority. Regrettably, the behaviors required within their occupation bleeds into other domains.

Higgins et al., (2021) theorized that WFC amongst correctional officers could be the product of their occupational subculture and their working personality; considering that “occupational culture provides a body of knowledge and values that are interconnected with the shared experiences of staff and provides information to individuals on how to think, feel and act” (p. 89). This working personality, whether crafted within corrections or policing, aided staff in handling trauma and hardships within their occupations and constructed a subculture.

Within corrections, research has noted that working personalities are often created to emanate authority and callousness to offenders—which is also relevant to officers within community corrections. Nevertheless, the internalization of these personalities is not welcomed in setting with friends and family, thus causing strain and conflict within personal relationships; mostly manifesting as behavior- or strain-based conflict. Higgins et al., (2021) noted several examples of conflict that affects officers such as: officers tended to become emotionally absent and reclusive because of witnessed trauma or violence; justifying authoritative and controlling techniques with their children; misunderstanding and disconnecting from family members to protect them from potentially traumatizing stories or experiences. While these are just some examples that seem to be commonplace, it is important to note that strain-based and “behavior-based conflict is more common in male-dominated, interdependent jobs where employees are required to manage people who may be uncooperative, hostile, or aggressive” (Kinman et al., 2017, p. 229).

## Job Satisfaction

Researchers and employers alike have had significant interest in the concept of job satisfaction because studies have demonstrated a correlation between job satisfaction and productivity, work attendance, employee turnover, retirement, and psychological detachment from work. (Camp, 1994, p. 280; Hopkins, 1983). The consensus throughout several studies has been that low job satisfaction can critically impact an organization's performance and operation regardless of the occupation (Lee et al., 2020). The literature surrounding job satisfaction is diverse and produced by several disciplines, such as criminal justice, psychology, and public administration. Thus, there is not a single definition used for job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction has been described in various ways; however, many scholars agree that the main concept of it is one's affect towards their job (Masal & Vogel, 2016; Hogan et al., 2013; Lambert et al., 2021). Locke (1976) describes it as, "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (p. 1304). Some scholars have argued that this definition fails to capture the complexity of the topic and shallowly summarizes workers, their needs, and the other factors that affect one's levels of satisfaction (Hodson, 1991; Camp, 1994). Camp (1994) also notes that the definition above does not consider the variability and irregularity of the individual or their job.

Considering that job satisfaction is multidimensional and defined by its measurement (Hopkins, 1983; Camp, 1994) it is best to view job satisfaction as "any combination of physiological, psychological, and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, 'I am satisfied with my job'" (Hoppock, 1935, p. 47). Although there is concern that these measures are limited to an individual and occupational level, they provide insight into what factors promote and hinder employee satisfaction. Hackman and Oldham's (1975) survey

regarding job diagnostics found that there were five key components to promote job satisfaction—skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback from the job itself. Whereas, Smith et al. (1969) opted to create a job descriptive index to obtain an overall measure of one's satisfaction with their job. They found that job satisfaction was influenced by several factors, including satisfaction with supervision, co-workers, work itself, pay and promotional opportunities (Camp, 1994, p. 286), which researchers have found more accurate because it highlights the components of job satisfaction to a structural core.

While the use of measures and weight of the variables is debatable, surveys have found that job satisfaction is positively linked to favorable work results, adherence to organizational regulations and objectives, as well as life satisfaction (Lambert & Hogan, 2010), making the stakes high for organizations. Moreover, organizations should promote job satisfaction to protect their staff and optimize efficiency and resources to limit some of the most common issues that plague workers such as burnout, absenteeism, turnover intent, and turnover. (Lambert & Hogan, 2010; Hopkins, 1983). This exemplifies why job satisfaction research has spanned several disciplines and how job satisfaction is essential to an organization's success.

### **Gaps in the Literature**

In the United States, community supervision has been heavily relied upon to reduce prison and jail overcrowding. However, research has shown that correctional officers and staff can be negatively impacted by their work environment and job demands. While there have been studies conducted on correctional employees, there is limited understanding of how community correctional staff are affected by their occupation and organization. Parole and probation officers work with caseloads similar to those of correctional officers, yet there is little research exploring their impact. Furthermore, administrative and non-custodial staff members are often excluded



from corrections literature, despite research in other fields demonstrating how their roles can be affected by bureaucratic strain and role significance. Although there are more studies being conducted in Europe and Canada on how parole and probation officers are affected, there is still a gap in knowledge on how different job types within the organization are impacted by the demands of the job and bureaucratic structure.

## **Research Methods**

### **Research Focus**

This study will investigate whether sworn officers and non-sworn staff/ administrators are significantly different when determining their levels of work-family conflict, job satisfaction and organizational trust. These variables have been selected because of their influence on staff's view of their job and their employing organization. While high levels of job satisfaction and organizational trust are positive indications of a healthy work environment, it is important to determine whether these variables are affected by one's job title and expected job experience. While work-family conflict has been found to be heavily associated with officers working within corrections, it has also been predicted to be a stressor for those staff in the same facilities, regardless of their interactions with offenders.

Previous research within corrections has focused primarily on officers working within prisons or jails, however, there has been scarce literature regarding those working within community corrections and even less on the non-custodial staff working for these organizations. Therefore, this study expands the limited research to beyond those working within incarcerated settings and considers their self-reported job satisfaction, organizational trust and work-family conflict.

**Hypothesis 1:** Job satisfaction will be significantly higher for administrative staff.

Although low job satisfaction has been found to affect both administrative staff and officers alike, this hypothesis is rooted in the fact that officers will be affected more heavily by other factors—such as burnout and the sometimes poor alignment between personal and organizational values and goals. Previous literature has also noted that job satisfaction is increased when employees have autonomy, decision-making abilities and that their role is defined, which are easier to obtain for administrative staff, since their job is typically rooted in standards and manuals. Whereas officers face consistent change with their caseload and pressure from organizational and legislative policy change. Considering these factors, it is believed that because of this, officers will rate their job satisfaction lower than their administrative counterparts.

**Hypothesis 2:** Work-family conflict is predicted to have a larger negative impact on parole/probation officers rather than administrative staff.

This hypothesis was derived from existing literature that found that officers—whether they are police or correctional—experience high levels of work-family conflict. Although there has not been much research concerning work-family conflict and community correctional officers, the similarities in their profession and population they supervise suggests that the findings will be similar to previous studies involving correctional officers. Moreover, administrative staff typically only interact with their colleagues and handle the bureaucratic portion of the organization. Therefore, the absence of contact with offenders and lack of need to apply aggressive tactics leads us to believe that they will not have lower levels of work-family conflict when compared to sworn officers.

**Hypothesis 3:** Administrative and non-custodial staff will report higher levels of organizational trust in comparison to those that are sworn officers.

This hypothesis was based on the copious amounts of research concerning how employees view their organization and how that determines the amount of trust that they will have in it. Verburg et al. (2018), captures this notion by stating that while organizational trust is built on a variety of attributes, one of the most important ones are that the organization is competent and reliable while not jeopardizing the employee's well-being.

It is believed that because of the type of work that administrative staff conduct, that they will have more trust within the organization, since they are not placed at risk and communication with the organization is entrenched in their operation. Whereas, parole and probation officer may have a difficult time believing that the organization is competent or has their well-being in mind when they are not only facing staffing shortages and high workloads, but are also dealing with inconsistent and possibly volatile individuals. Additionally, officers may have a difficult time understanding or knowing why certain standards and processes must be completed when they have other areas of their job, they find more important. Therefore, because of the stark differences with how these two job groups interact with the agency, it is believed that administrative staff will have higher trust in the organization.

### **Procedures and Participants**

For the present study, employees have been split into two separate groups. First are those that will be referred to as administrative staff. This will include all staff members who did not identify as sworn officers, which can include (but not limited to) administrators, supervisors, or treatment staff. While those who did identify as sworn officers were determined to be parole and probation officers.

The data for this thesis was collected from a survey that was sent to 400 staff members employed within the Parole and Probation department in the state of Nevada. The survey

consisted of a multitude of questions used to measure attitudes, demographic information, subjective norms and relative information regarding occupational and organizational variables. The total number of respondents completing the survey was 199, capturing 49.5% of the total sample. About 52.8% of the participants were women, 42.2% were men and 5.0% preferred not to answer the question. The mean age was 41.97, with the youngest being 24 years old and the oldest being 78 years old. About 49.2% of the respondents indicated that they were sworn officers (parole and probation officer), while an additional 4.1% indicated that they planned on becoming a sworn/academy trained officer. The average length of tenure in the current position was 3.94 years, and ranged from 0 to 24 years. Regarding highest educational level achieved, 9.5% of the participants indicated that they had earned a high school diploma or general education degree (GED), 24.1% indicated that they completed some college coursework but did not earn a degree, 13.1% indicated that they had earned an associate or vocational degree, 45.2% indicated that they had earned a bachelor's degree, and 8% indicated that they had earned a master's level degree. About 28.1% indicated that they supervised other staff members.

The survey was reviewed and approved by the University of Nevada, Reno Institutional Review Board (IRB) on September 29<sup>th</sup>, 2022. This survey link was then distributed via email using contact information provided by a contact from the Department of Parole and Probation, which included employees holding different ranks and job titles. Qualtrics was used to build, send and gather the submissions—this also included the acknowledgement of their informed consent placed at the beginning of the survey. This preamble to the survey notified all staff members that their participation in the survey was voluntary, anonymous, explained the purpose of this questionnaire, and informed them that they could exit the survey at any time if they so desired. The survey was open for participation from November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2022 until December 9<sup>th</sup>,

2022 (to account for time off for the holidays). Those that did not start or finish the survey received follow up emails every two weeks during the duration of the study.

### **Dependent Variables**

The dependent variables utilized in this thesis were job satisfaction, organizational trust and work-family conflict. All the dependent variables were measured by Likert scales, where the respondents indicated their degree of agreement (or disagreement) on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). Scale scores for each variable were calculated by taking the sum of the items for the individual variable, with higher numbers indicating increased levels of the variable being measured.

Job satisfaction was measured by four job-positive items. Responses to these items were summed together to form an additive index and had an internal reliability of .94, as measured by Cronbach's alpha. Organizational trust was measured using seven items and had a Cronbach's alpha of .909, while work-family conflict was measured using fourteen items, resulting in a Cronbach's alpha of .902.

Additionally, since work-family conflict has three dimensions, time-based conflict, strain-based conflict, and behavior-based conflict, all three types were first combined within the analysis, then each individual scale was calculated. Time-based conflict was measured by three items, yielding a Cronbach's alpha of .749. Strain-based conflict was measured using eight items and produced a Cronbach's alpha of .874. Behavior-based conflict was measured using three items, resulting in a Cronbach's alpha of .868.

**Table 1 . Descriptive statistics.**

| Variable           | Description  | N   | Min. | Max. | Med. | Mean  | St. Dev. |
|--------------------|--|-----|------|------|------|-------|----------|
| Sworn Officer      | 49% sworn officer (= 1)<br>51% non-sworn officer (= 2)   | 199 | 1    | 2    | 2    | 2.0   | 0.50     |
| Gender             | 42% male (= 1)<br>53% female (= 2)<br>5% no answer (= 4)   | 199 | 1    | 4    | 2    | 1.68  | .723     |
| Age                | Age in years   | 192 | 24   | 78   | 41   | 41.88 | 10.18    |
| Tenure             | Tenure in years in current position  | 195 | 0    | 24   | 2    | 3.94  | 4.22     |
| Education          | 10% High School Diploma/ GED (= 2)<br>24% Some College-no degree (= 3)<br>13% Associates/Vocational Degree (= 4)<br>45% 4-year Bachelors Degree (= 5)<br>8% Master's Level (= 6) | 199 | 2    | 6    | 5    | 4.18  | 1.17     |
| Job Sat.           | 4-item additive index, $\alpha = .94$  | 199 | 4    | 24   | 18   | 16.65 | 4.88     |
| Org. Trust         | 8-item additive index, $\alpha = .91$  | 199 | 8    | 48   | 35   | 34.20 | 8.59     |
| WFC                | 14-item additive index, $\alpha = .90$   | 199 | 14   | 84   | 38   | 37.93 | 12.05    |
| Time-Based WFC     | 3-item additive index, $\alpha = .75$  | 199 | 3    | 18   | 6    | 7.11  | 3.01     |
| Strain-Based WFC   | 8-item additive index, $\alpha = .87$  | 199 | 8    | 48   | 21   | 21.37 | 7.52     |
| Behavior-Based WFC | 3-item additive index, $\alpha = .87$  | 199 | 3    | 18   | 9    | 9.45  | 3.71     |

St. Dev. Stands for standard deviation, WFC stands for work-family conflict, and  $\alpha$  represents Cronbach's alpha coefficient for internal reliability.

## Independent Variable

The way that sworn and administrative staff in the Nevada Department of Parole and Probation differ in their perception of the workplace is the primary focus of the current study. As previously discussed, research has rarely compared these job groups when studying corrections. There is reason to believe that, because of the different occupational and organizational stressors affecting these two groups, that their responses regarding the perceptions of their organization will differ. The independent variable of interest was whether or not the respondent was a sworn officer. This was measured by a single question asking: Are you a sworn/academy trained officer? If they answered “yes” then they were coded as 1 and determined to be a sworn officer. Those that answered “no” were coded as 2 and determined to be a non-sworn staff member.

Personal variables of gender, age, tenure and highest educational degree were included more as control variables rather than explanatory. To review how descriptive variables were coded, see Table 1.

## Results

The descriptive statistics for the study variables are presented in Table 2. The median and the mean were similar to one another for the variables, indicating that the variables are normally distributed. Additionally, the Cronbach's alpha coefficients, a measure determining internal reliability, were 0.60 or higher, which is deemed acceptable (Carmines and Zeller, 1979).

The correlation matrix is present within Table 2. Only job satisfaction was found to have a statistically significant correlation with job position. Non-sworn officers were more likely to report higher levels of job satisfaction than sworn officer staff. All four measures of work-family conflict had negative correlations with job position. Organizational trust, work-family conflict, time-based WFC, strain-based WFC and behavior-based WFC all had non-significant correlations with job position.

**Table 2** Correlation Matrix

| Variable     | 1.     | 2.     | 3.    | 4.    | 5.      | 6.      | 7.      | 8.     | 9.     | 10.    | 11. |
|--------------|--------|--------|-------|-------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|-----|
| 1. Gender    | 1      |        |       |       |         |         |         |        |        |        |     |
| 2. Age       | .006   | 1      |       |       |         |         |         |        |        |        |     |
| 3. Education | -0.44  | -.023  | 1     |       |         |         |         |        |        |        |     |
| 4. Sworn     | .411** | .107   | .075  | 1     |         |         |         |        |        |        |     |
| 5. Tenure    | -.077  | .334** | .016  | -.084 | 1       |         |         |        |        |        |     |
| 6. Job Sat   | .097   | .009   | -.021 | .153* | -.189** | 1       |         |        |        |        |     |
| 7. OrgT      | -.107  | -.013  | .044  | .019  | -.176*  | .609**  | 1       |        |        |        |     |
| 8. WFC       | -.077  | .009   | .040  | -.109 | .152*   | -.553** | -.479** | 1      |        |        |     |
| 9. Time      | .051   | -.117  | .114  | -.004 | -.007   | -.362** | -.277** | .728** | 1      |        |     |
| 10. Strain   | -.080  | .011   | .032  | -.117 | .163*   | -.463** | -.444*  | .943** | .588** | 1      |     |
| 11. Behavior | -.128  | .101   | -.028 | -.111 | .171*   | -.563** | -.432** | .747** | .361** | .560** | 1   |

Education stands for educational level, Sworn stands for whether the staff are sworn officers, Job Sat stands for job satisfaction, OrgT stands for organizational trust, WFC stands for work-family conflict, Time stands for time-based work-family conflict, Strain stands for strain-based work-family conflict, Behavior stands for behavior-based work-family conflict. See Table 1 for a description of variables.

\*p≤.05, \*\*p≤0.1

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed to compare how job satisfaction, organizational trust and work-family conflict separately effected community correctional staff based on their job type. Compared to probation/parole officers, those working within the administrative group reported lower levels of job satisfaction and organizational trust, but

reported higher levels of work-family conflict. The results of the ANOVA analyses are reported in Table 3a.

Hypothesis 1 proposed that staff members who were not sworn/academy officers would have higher ratings of job satisfaction when compared to their sworn/academy trained counterparts. Table 4 presents the means and standards deviations for job satisfaction between the two job type groups. Being a sworn officer produced a significant effect upon job satisfaction,  $F(1, 197) = 4.71, p = 0.31, \eta^2 = 0.23$ . After the significant main effect, comparisons were conducted to show the differences between those that were sworn and unsworn staff. Results of these comparisons showed that when comparing by job type, sworn/academy officers were significantly different from ( $M = 15.81, SD = 4.96$ ) non-sworn staff members ( $M = 17.30, SD = 4.73$ ).

The second hypothesis states that work-family conflict is predicted to have a larger negative impact on parole/probation officers rather than administrative staff. Table 4 presents the means and standard deviations for work-family conflict in relation to job type. The questions and responses coded for the work-family conflict variable had a mean of 39.53 ( $SD = 11.57$ ) for those that indicated they were sworn/academy trained officers, while the group that indicated they were not sworn/academy trained officers had work-family conflict mean of 36.89 ( $SD = 12.67$ ). Signifying that those employed as officers within the Department of Parole and Probation report higher levels of work-family conflict than those that are non-custodial or administrative. There were no statistically significant differences between the group means as determined by one-way ANOVA ( $F(1, 197) = 2.35, p = .127$ ), indicating that job type did not interact with the level of work-family conflict experienced by the staff member.



**Table 3a.** ANOVA Analyses of Variables**Independent Variable:** Are you a sworn/academy trained officer?

|                        |                           | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Job Satisfaction Total | Between Groups (Combined) | 110.56         | 1   | 110.559     | 4.712 | .031 |
|                        | Within Groups             | 4622.405       | 197 | 23.464      |       |      |
|                        | Total                     | 4732.97        | 198 |             |       |      |
| Organizational Trust   | Between Groups (Combined) | 5.022          | 1   | 5.022       | .070  | .792 |
|                        | Within Groups             | 14207.581      | 197 | 72.120      |       |      |
|                        | Total                     | 14212.603      | 198 |             |       |      |
| Work-Family Conflict   | Between Groups (Combined) | 346.534        | 1   | 346.534     | 2.351 | .127 |
|                        | Within Groups             | 29038.210      | 197 | 147.402     |       |      |
|                        | Total                     | 29384.744      | 198 |             |       |      |

A secondary analysis of work-family conflict was conducted to account for the three different types of conflict measured, which is presented in Table 3b. Time-based strain had a reported mean of 7.17 (SD = 2.85) for staff that were sworn officers, while those that were not sworn officers had a mean of 7.14 (SD = 3.22). There were no statistically significant differences between the group means as determined by one-way ANOVA ( $F(1, 197) = .003, p = .954$ ), indicating that job type did not influence the level of time-based strain experienced by staff members.

Similarly, stress-based strain had a reported mean of 22.43 (SD = 7.34) for sworn staff members, whereas unsworn staff members had a mean of 20.64 (SD = 7.83). Again, there were no statistically significant differences between the group means as determined by one-way ANOVA ( $F(1, 197) = 2.75, p = .099$ ), indicating that job type did not affect the level of stress-based conflict experienced by staff members. It is important to note that the means for strain-based conflict are higher than the other types of conflict because it had more questions that contributed to the index. For context, strain-based was an additive index of eight questions, while time-based and behavior-based WFC both had additive indexes of three questions. Lastly, behavior-based strain had a reported mean of 9.93 (SD = 3.48) for staff members who indicated they were sworn officers, while those that indicated they were non-sworn staff had a mean of 9.10 (SD = 3.93). There were no statistically significant differences between the group means as

determined by one-way ANOVA ( $F(1, 197) = 2.48, p = .117$ ), indicating that job type did not affect the level of behavior-based conflict that staff members endured.

**Table 3b.** ANOVA Analyses of WFC Types  
**Independent Variable:** Are you a sworn/academy trained officer?

|                    |                           | Sum of Squares | df  | Mean Square | F     | Sig. |
|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Time-based WFC     | Between Groups (Combined) | .031           | 1   | .031        | .003  | .954 |
|                    | Within Groups             | 1828.823       | 197 | 9.283       |       |      |
|                    | Total                     | 1828.854       | 198 |             |       |      |
| Strain-based WFC   | Between Groups (Combined) | 158.48         | 1   | 158.48      | 2.748 | .099 |
|                    | Within Groups             | 11361.168      | 197 | 57.671      |       |      |
|                    | Total                     | 11519.648      | 198 |             |       |      |
| Behavior-based WFC | Between Groups (Combined) | 34.229         | 1   | 34.229      | 2.478 | .117 |
|                    | Within Groups             | 2721.51        | 197 | 13.815      |       |      |
|                    | Total                     | 2755.739       | 198 |             |       |      |

The third hypothesis posited that administrative and non-custodial staff will report higher levels of organizational trust in comparison to those that are sworn officers by calculating the mean of their scores on the 9 items in the organizational trust scale. Overall scores for this scale ranged from 8 to 48 ( $M = 34.13, SD = 8.47$ ), with higher scores representing higher levels of trust within the organization. As can be seen in Table 4, there was a slight overall difference in levels of organizational trust between those that worked as sworn/academy trained officers ( $M = 33.97, SD = 8.56$ ) and those that were not sworn/academy trained officers ( $M = 34.29, SD = 8.42$ ). While illustrating a slight difference regarding organizational trust between the two job types, there were no statistically significant differences between sworn and unsworn officers, ( $F(1, 197) = 0.070, p = .792$ ), indicating that job type did not interact with organizational trust as predicted.

In summary, results showed that job type—whether the staff was sworn or unsworn—was not significant when considering organizational trust and work-family conflict. Whereas, job satisfaction varied significantly between parole and probation staff members that were sworn or non-sworn.

Table 4. Means and standard deviation on variables in relation to job type

| <i>Are you a sworn/academy trained officer?</i> |                    | <i>Job Satisfaction</i> | <i>Organizational Trust</i> | <i>Work-Family Conflict</i> | <i>Time-Based WFC</i> | <i>Strain-based WFC</i> | <i>Behavior-based WFC</i> |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Yes   | Mean               | 15.81                   | 33.97                       | 39.53                       | 7.17                  | 22.43                   | 9.93                      |
|   | Standard Deviation | 4.96                    | 8.56                        | 11.57                       | 2.85                  | 7.34                    | 3.48                      |
| No  | Mean               | 17.29                   | 34.29                       | 36.89                       | 7.15                  | 20.64                   | 9.10                      |
|   | Standard Deviation | 4.73                    | 12.67                       | 8.42                        | 3.22                  | 7.83                    | 3.93                      |
| Total   | Mean               | 16.56                   | 34.13                       | 38.19                       | 7.16                  | 21.52                   | 9.51                      |
|   | Standard Deviation | 4.89                    | 8.47                        | 12.18                       | 3.04                  | 7.63                    | 3.73                      |

## Discussion and Conclusion

### *Discussion*

Parole and probation staff are tasked with helping offenders with their rehabilitation and assist in their reintegration back into society, while protecting the community from further victimization (Taxman et al., 2004). While the number of offenders on parole and probation has been steadily increasing since the 1980s, there has been limited research conducted on the staff involved in the process. Instead, much research regarding parole and probation focuses on the officer's caseload and the effects of them working closely with offenders.

The goal of this study was to examine the potential differences in job satisfaction, organizational trust and work-family conflict among sworn and unsworn employees within Nevada's Department of Parole and Probation. Based on a thorough review of the literature concerning federal and community corrections, as well as our variables, we formulated three broad hypotheses. The basis of this study was to determine the difference between those that are officers and those that are administrators within this organization, we also wanted to highlight the need for research regarding those in community corrections. While the data supported our hypotheses, only one was strongly supported and significant after running our analyses—administrative staff had higher job satisfaction than those that were sworn officers.

Although there was not further analyzes to determine what factors increased the administrative staff's job satisfaction in relation to officers, it could be tied to several causes. One is that organizational trust positively affects job satisfaction. Therefore, since administrative

staff can place trust in the organization, they will view it more pleasantly than the officers that do not feel that it is acting in their best interest. In addition to this, administrative staff seldomly must interact with offenders in person. This could be another influencer to why they have higher job satisfaction, given that they are not being placed in potentially dangerous and unpredictable positions. Instead, they can have routine and build relationships within the office, since their work is primarily desk work.

Although our other two hypotheses did not produce significant results, it's worth noting that the data still supported our inquiry. In regards to work-family conflict, past research has shown, that officers tend to experience more work-family conflict compared to employees in other positions within the organization. Given this consistency with other findings, it can be assumed that officers struggle with separating their work life from their home life, often leading to an inability to find balance (Vickovic & Morrow, 2020). Officers often feel that they are not able to share their experiences with their loved ones and therefore build a subculture amongst their colleagues to understand the unique qualities of their occupation—thus further immersing them into their career and crafting their working personality (Skolnick, 1966). The concern regarding this coping mechanism is that officers are at higher risk to internalize aggressive and compliance-based tactics, thus creating conflict between within their home life (Lambert et al., 2021). On the other hand, these strategies are not commonly employed by other personnel in corrections or community corrections, which explains why parole and probation officers are more prone to work-family conflict.

Organizational trust can be bolstered by ensuring that workers perceive the organization as competent and consistent in its policies and objectives. Surprisingly, our data indicates that administrative staff have higher levels of organizational trust compared to their sworn officer

counterparts. This could be attributed to the fact that administrative staff have more predictable roles and are able to maintain routines in their work. Conversely, parole and probation officers often experience overwhelming job demands and may become disillusioned with policies and legislation that increase their stress levels. Furthermore, officers may feel distrust towards the organization due to the unpredictable nature of their caseloads and limited resources (Lewis et al., 2012). Despite this, the job security and specificity for administrative staff is likely an important factor contributing to their heightened trust in the organization. However, further research is required to investigate the impact of other variables on these employees and determine any distinct differences.

### ***Limitations***

The present study expands the existing literature but does have several limitations. This was a single study of staff conducted within the state of Nevada. Although the findings can be supported by previous research, these results are only generalizable to the staff that were studied. Additionally, these findings may be circumstantial and therefore the scope needs to be expanded to other parole and probation departments—even internationally—to determine whether replication is possible.

While the survey itself contains a plethora of information, the analyses completed were shallow in nature. Future research should explore the depths of and possible relationships that affect each variable. For example, we ran simple analyses to compare how the two groups rated their job satisfaction, which while this was found to be significant, it did not fully examine why there were differences between the two. There was no further analysis using demographic data or determining if job stress inhibited the results. This current study only measured organizational trust, job satisfaction and work-family conflict generally, it did not measure the causes or

influences. Additionally, while there was approximately a 50% response rate, this survey may not have been available to all employees within the Nevada Department of Parole and Probation. This could have been due to staff members not having active email addresses at the time or errors within the email address itself. Which could have improved the response rate and expanded the results to determine generalizability. It is evident that there is a need for more research.

### ***Implications***

The findings from this research have several policy implications that should be recognized by not only administrators within the department of parole and probation but also the policy makers. First, there needs to be increased funding and additional staff to assist with the expanding ex-offender populations which require supervision. Several studies have found that officers are inundated by their job demands resulting in the inability to maintain their workload while building the necessary rapport with their offenders. This would not only prove to increase productivity and efficiency; it would be beneficial and promote job satisfaction and organizational trust amongst workers. In addition to this, the standard of supervision would improve, since tasks could be distributed and delegated more appropriately.

Secondly, to improve the experiences of both offenders and staff members, it is important to invest in community initiatives and offender programming. This not only benefits those who are required to participate in these programs as part of their release, but also equips parole and probation staff with additional tools to assist those on their caseload. By doing so, staff members can feel more fulfilled in their roles and see themselves as agents of positive change, rather than simply enforcers.

Third, to ensure that officers and staff members are well-equipped and confident in their positions, it is important to provide them with appropriate training and resources. Studies have shown that when staff members feel prepared and knowledgeable about their role, their job satisfaction increases and their stress levels decrease (Lambert & Hogan, 2009). Additionally, investing in staff members through training promotes trust in the organization (Lambert et al., 2022) and strengthens their competence, which reduces turnover intent. This approach saves both time and money that would otherwise be spent on hiring and training new employees.

Although this study was exploratory in nature to determine whether a difference exists between sworn and unsworn employees of a single department of parole and probation, it does serve to bridge the gap in literature regarding community corrections. Overall, the research findings provide valuable insights that can inform decision-making and improve the quality of the parole and probation system. It is important for both administrators and policy makers to consider these implications and work towards creating a system that is fair and effective for all involved.

In relation to administrative staff, parole and probation officers are affected more heavily by their occupational and organizational stressors. While more analyses would need to be run on the dataset to determine where exactly these differences arise, it is evident that a relationship exists between sworn officer status and employee job satisfaction. As more research is conducted and published regarding administrative staff and officers in other locations and departments, researchers will need to note which findings and similarities are prevalent across these different agencies and sites.

## *Conclusion*

Although research has rarely completed a direct comparison of staff types within the same community based correctional organization, our findings are consistent with those in previous studies conducted in traditional correctional settings (Lambert et al., 2010; Armstrong et al., 2015; Lambert et al., 2006; Vickovic & Morrow, 2020; Higgins et al., 2021). The results of this study also illustrate that community correctional officers are prone to the same occupational stressors that traditional correctional officers experience, and the corresponding interpersonal problems that they have been found to exhibit.

We drew on surveys from parole and probation staff—including sworn officers and unsworn employees (i.e., administrative staff)—to analyze the difference in their perceptions and ratings of job satisfaction, organizational trust and work-family conflict. The findings reveal that although sworn officers and administrative staff had similar mean scores for these selected variables, that they were significantly different in regards to job satisfaction. Additionally, overall, sworn parole and probation officers reported higher work-family conflict and lower organizational trust than their unsworn administrative counterparts. This research illustrates the differences between officers and administrative staffs' feelings and perception toward their career and organization. Those that work within community corrections are tasked not only with supervising offenders attempting to socially reintegrate, but these officers must also manage public safety concerns and persistent policy change. Although these results correspond with previous studies conducted within federal and state corrections, more research is required to better understand the occupational and organizational strain employees within parole and probation departments experience—whether they are officers or support staff.



### References

- Archimi, C. S., Reynaud, E., Yasin, H., & Bhatti, Z. (2018). How Perceived Corporate Social Responsibility Affects Employee Cynicism: The Mediating Role of Organizational Trust. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 151(4), 907–921. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3882-6>
- Armstrong, G. S., & Griffin, M. L. (2004). Does the job matter? Comparing correlates of stress among treatment and correctional staff in prisons. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32(6), 577–592. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2004.08.007>
- Armstrong, G. S., Atkin-Plunk, C. A., & Wells, J. (2015). The relationship between work–family conflict, correctional officer job stress, and job satisfaction. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 42(10), 1066–1082. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854815582221>
- Artz, B. (2008). The role of firm size and performance pay in determining employee job satisfaction brief: Firm size, performance pay, and job satisfaction. *Labour*, 22(2), 315–343. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9914.2007.00398.x>
- Baldwin, J.N., & Farley, Q.A. (1991). Comparing the public and private sectors in the United States: A review of the empirical literature. In A Farazmand (Ed.). *Handbook of comparative and development public administration* (pp. 27 – 39). New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Bayens, G. J., & Smykla, J. O. (2013). *Probation, parole, and community-based corrections: Supervision, treatment, and evidence-based practices*. McGraw-Hill.
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66(1), 32–40. <https://doi.org/10.1086/222820>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2021). *Probation and parole in the United States, 2019*. U.S.

- Butler, H. D., Tasca, M., Zhang, Y., & Carpenter, C. (2019). A systematic and meta-analytic review of the literature on correctional officers: Identifying new avenues for research. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 60, 84–92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2018.12.002>
- Camp, S. D. (1994). Assessing the effects of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on turnover: An event history approach. *The Prison Journal*, 74(3), 279–305. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0032855594074003002>
- Carmines, E., & Zeller, R. (1979). Reliability and Validity Assessment. In SAGE Publications, Inc. eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412985642>
- Cho, Y. M., & Song, H. K. (2017). Determinants of Turnover Intention of Social Workers. *Public Personnel Management*, 46(1), 41–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026017696395>
- Collins, S., Coffey, M., & Cowe, F. (2009). Stress, support and well-being as perceived by probation trainees. *Probation Journal*, 56(3), 238–256. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0264550509337454>
- DeMichele, M., & Payne, B. K. (2007). Probation and parole officers speak out--Caseload and workload allocation. *Federal Probation*, 71(3), 30–35.
- Denney, A. S., Copenhaver, A., & Schwendau, A. (2019). Predicting health and wellness outcomes for probation and parole officers: An exploratory study. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 31(4), 573–591. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403419870850>
- Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs. Retrieved from <https://bjs.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh236/files/media/document/ppus19.pdf>
- Division overview. (n.d.). Nevada Department of Public Safety, Parole and Probation. <http://npp.dps.nv.gov/About/Overview/>

- Duxbury, L., Bardoel, A., & Halinski, M. (2021). 'Bringing the Badge home': exploring the relationship between role overload, work-family conflict, and stress in police officers. *Policing & Society*, 31(8), 997–1016. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2020.1822837>
- Farrow, K. (2004). Still committed after all these years? Morale in the modern-day probation service. *Probation Journal*, 51(3), 206–220. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0264550504045898>
- Ford, J. K., Weissbein, D. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2003). Distinguishing organizational from strategy commitment: Linking officers' commitment to community policing to job behaviors and satisfaction. *Justice Quarterly*, 20(1), 159–185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418820300095491>
- Garland, B., Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Kim, B., & Kelley, T. (2014). The relationship of affective and continuance organizational commitment with correctional staff occupational burnout. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41(10), 1161–1177. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854814539683>
- Gayman, M. D., & Bradley, M. S. (2012). Organizational climate, work stress, and depressive symptoms among probation and parole officers. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 26(3), 326–346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601x.2012.742436>
- Globokar, J. L., & Toro, M. (2017). The politics of punishment: A study of the passage of the 1925 Federal Probation Act. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 56(8), 534–551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509674.2017.1363113>
- Golonka, S. (2021, February 3). Nevada parole officers overloaded with cases, new state audit finds. *The Nevada Independent*. <https://thenevadaindependent.com/article/nevada-parole-officers-overloaded-with-cases-new-state-audit-finds>

- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of Conflict between Work and Family Roles. *Academy of Management Review*, 10(1), 76. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258214>
- Griffin, M. L. (2001). Job satisfaction among detention officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 29(3), 219–232. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0047-2352\(01\)00086-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0047-2352(01)00086-1)
- Griffin, M. L., & Hepburn, J. R. (2005). Side-bets and reciprocity as determinants of organizational commitment among correctional officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33(6), 611–625. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2005.08.010>
- The history of probation. (n.d.). County of San Mateo. <https://probation.smcgov.org/history-probation>
- Hackman, J. R. & Oldham, G. R. (1974). The job diagnostic survey: An instrument for the diagnosis of jobs and the evaluation of job redesign projects. Department of Administrative Sciences: Yale University.
- Hansen, J. L., & Høst, V. (2012). Understanding the Relationships Between Decentralized Organizational Decision Structure, Job Context, and Job Satisfaction—A Survey of Danish Public Managers. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 32(3), 288–308. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734371x12449023>
- Hasche, N., Höglund, L., & Mårtensson, M. (2021). Intra-organizational trust in public organizations – the study of interpersonal trust in both vertical and horizontal relationships from a bidirectional perspective. *Public Management Review*, 23(12), 1768–1788. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2020.1764081>
- Higgins, G. E., Tewksbury, R., & Denney, A. S. (2012). Validating a measure of work stress for correctional staff. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 24(3), 338–352. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403411434929>

- Higgins, E. M., Swartz, K., & Roberts, A. J. (2021). How conflict ‘bleeds over’ for correctional staff: exploring work-family conflict through correctional subculture. *Journal of Crime & Justice*, 45(1), 87–102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648x.2020.1870526>
- Hodson, D. (1991). Practical Work in Science: Time for a Reappraisal. *Studies in Science Education*, 19(1), 175–184. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057269108559998>
- Hogan, N. L., Lambert, E. G., & Griffin, M. L. (2013). Loyalty, love, and investments: The impact of job outcomes on the organizational commitment of correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 40, 355–375
- Hopkins, A. H. (1985). Work and Job Satisfaction in the Public Sector. *Southern Economic Journal*, 51(3), 955. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1057916>
- Hoppock, R. (1935). Job satisfaction. Harper.
- Jalbert, S. K., Rhodes, W., Flygare, C., & Kane, M. (2010). Testing probation outcomes in an evidence-based practice setting: Reduced caseload size and intensive supervision effectiveness. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 49(4), 233–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509671003715987>
- Kaible, D. (2021). Probation and parole in the United States, 2020. U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved March 6, 2023, from <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/ppus20.pdf>
- Katz, J. (1982). The attitudes and decisions of probation officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 9(4), 455–475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854882009004004>
- Keena, L. D., Lambert, E. G., Haynes, S. H., May, D. C., & Doty, P. A. (2022). Testing the Job Demands-Resources Model with Organizational Trust among Prison Staff. *Criminal Justice Review*, 47(2), 148–166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07340168221076789>

- Kinman, G., Clements, A., & Hart, J. A. (2017). Working conditions, work–life conflict, and well-being in U.K. prison officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 44(2), 226–239. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854816664923>
- Krupa, J. M. (2020). Examining the personal and perceived organizational characteristics associated with juvenile probation staff job satisfaction. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 48(3), 293–314. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854820977581>
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Camp, S. D., & Ventura, L. A. (2006). The impact of work-family conflict on correctional staff: A preliminary study. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 6, 371-387.
- Lambert, E., & Hogan, N. (2009). The importance of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in shaping turnover intent. *Criminal Justice Review*, 34(1), 96–118. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016808324230>
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Altheimer, I. (2010). The Association Between Work-Family Conflict and Job Burnout Among Correctional Staff: A Preliminary Study. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35(1–2), 37–55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-009-9067-1>
- Lambert E., Hogan N., Wells J., Minor K. (2017). Organizational trust and fear of injury and the correlates of organizational trust among private correctional staff. *Journal of Applied Security Research*, 12(3), 337–355. [Crossref](https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601x.2020.1762082)
- Lambert, E. G., Leone, M., Hogan, N. L., Buckner, Z., Worley, R., & Worley, V. B. (2020). To be committed or not: A systematic review of the empirical literature on organizational commitment among correctional staff. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 34(1), 88–114. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1478601x.2020.1762082>

- Lambert, E. G., Morrow, W. J., Vickovic, S. G., Leone, M. C., Keena, L. D., Haynes, S. H., & May, D. C. (2021). Work–Family conflict’s association with the work attitudes of job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among southern prison staff. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 32(8), 865–889.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/08874034211003235>
- Lambert, E. G., & Paoline, E. A. (2008). The Influence of Individual, Job, and Organizational Characteristics on Correctional Staff Job Stress, Job Satisfaction, and Organizational Commitment. *Criminal Justice Review*, 33(4), 541–564.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016808320694>
- Lambert, E. G., Qureshi, H., & Frank, J. (2022). Exploring the effects of different workplace trust variables on the work attitudes of police officers. *Police Practice and Research*, 24(2), 164–176. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2022.2113787>
- Lee, H., Robertson, P. K. J., & Kim, K. (2020). Determinants of Job Satisfaction Among U.S. Federal Employees: An Investigation of Racial and Gender Differences. *Public Personnel Management*, 49(3), 336–366. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091026019869371>
- Lewicki, R. J., McAllister, D. J., & Bies, R. R. (1998). Trust and Distrust: New Relationships and Realities. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 438.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/259288>
- Lewis, K. E., Lewis, L. S., & Garby, T. (2013). Surviving the Trenches: The Personal Impact of the Job on Probation Officers. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(1), 67–84.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s12103-012-9165-3>
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1297–1349.

- Mack, K. Y., & Rhineberger-Dunn, G. (2019). The influence of work–family conflict on job stress among two groups of community corrections staff. *Journal of Crime & Justice*, 42(3), 350–363. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0735648x.2018.1528879>
- Martin, K. D., & Zettler, H. R. (2021). An examination of probation officer tasks by officer-caseload type. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 32(7), 693–717. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403420980823>
- Masal, D., & Vogel, R. (2016). Leadership, Use of Performance Information, and Job Satisfaction: Evidence from Police Services. *International Public Management Journal*, 19(2), 208–234. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10967494.2016.1143422>
- Mayer, R., Davis, J., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An Integrative Model Of Organizational Trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709–734. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080335>
- McCarty, W. P., & Skogan, W. G. (2012). Job-related burnout among civilian and sworn police personnel. *Police Quarterly*, 16(1), 66–84. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1098611112457357>
- Norman, M. H., & Ricciardelli, R. (2021). Operational and organizational stressors in community correctional work: Insights from probation and parole officers in Ontario, Canada. *Probation Journal*, 69(1), 86–106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0264550520984253>
- Occupational employment and wage statistics. (2021, March 31). U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. <https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes211092.htm>
- Paine, F. T., Carroll, S. J., & Leete, B. A. (1966). Need satisfactions of managerial level personnel in a government agency. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 50(3), 247-249.
- Paliszkievicz, J. (2011). Inter-Organizational Trust: Conceptualization and Measurement.



- Petersilia, J. (1999). Parole and Prisoner Reentry in the United States. *Crime and Justice*, 26, 479–529.
- Phelps, M. S. (2013). The Paradox of Probation: Community Supervision in the Age of Mass Incarceration. *Law & Policy*, 35(1–2), 51–80. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lapo.12002>
- Phelps, M. S. (2017). Mass probation: Toward a more robust theory of state variation in punishment. *Punishment & Society*, 19(1), 53–73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474516649174>
- Phelps, M. S. (2018). Discourses of mass probation: From managing risk to ending human warehousing in Michigan. *British Journal of Criminology*, 58(5), 1107–1126. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azx077>
- Pirson, M., & Malhotra, D. (2011). Foundations of Organizational Trust: What Matters to Different Stakeholders? *Organization Science*, 22(4), 1087–1104. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.1100.0581>
- Porter, L. W., & Mitchell, V. F. (1967). Comparative study of need satisfactions in military and business hierarchies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 51(2), 139-144.
- Rhineberger-Dunn, G., & Mack, K. Y. (2018). Impact of workplace factors on role-related stressors and job stress among community corrections staff. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 30(8), 1204–1228. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403418787227>
- Rousseau, D. M. (1998). The ‘problem’ of the psychological contract considered. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 19(S1), 665–671. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1099-1379\(1998\)19:1](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1099-1379(1998)19:1)

- Sánchez-Sánchez, N., & Fernández Puente, A. C. (2020). Public versus private job satisfaction. is there a trade-off between wages and stability? *Public Organization Review*, 21(1), 47–67. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-020-00472-7>
- Schoorman, F. D., Mayer, R., & Davis, J. (2007). An Integrative Model of Organizational Trust: Past, Present, and Future. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 344–354. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.24348410>
- Skolnick, J. H. (1966). *Justice without trial: Law enforcement in democratic society*. New York: Wiley.
- Smith, P. C., Kendall, L., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). *The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Steel, B.S., & Warner, R.L. (1990). Job satisfaction among early labor force participants: unexpected outcomes in public and private sector comparisons. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 10(3), 4-22.
- Taxman, F. S. (1999). Proactive supervision: supervision as crime prevention. *The Journal of Offender Monitoring*, 12(2), 25–26.
- Taxman, F. S., Shepardson, E. S., & Byrne, J. M. (2004). *Tools of the trade: A guide to incorporating science into practice*. Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections. <http://www.nicic.org/Library/020095>.
- Tidmarsh, M. (2020). ‘The right kind of person for the job’? Emotional labour and organizational professionalism in probation. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 61, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijlcrj.2019.100363>

- Ting, Y. (1996). Analysis of Job Satisfaction of the Federal White-Collar Work Force: Findings from the Survey of Federal Employees. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 26(4), 439–456. <https://doi.org/10.1177/027507409602600404>
- Thistlethwaite, A. B., & Wooldredge, J. (2014). *Forty Studies that Changed Criminal Justice: Explorations into the History of Criminal Justice Research*. Pearson.
- Triplett, R., Mullings, J. L., & Scarborough, K. E. (1999). Examining the effect of work-home conflict on work-related stress among correctional officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(4), 371–385. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0047-2352\(98\)00066-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0047-2352(98)00066-x)
- U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2019). *Incarceration trends in Nevada*. Vera.org. <https://www.vera.org/downloads/pdfdownloads/state-incarceration-trends-nevada.pdf>
- Verburg, R. M., Nienaber, A., Searle, R., Weibel, A., Hartog, D. N. D., & Rupp, D. E. (2018). The Role of Organizational Control Systems in Employees' Organizational Trust and Performance Outcomes. *Group & Organization Management*, 43(2), 179–206. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601117725191>
- Vickovic, S. G., & Morrow, W. J. (2019). Examining the influence of work–family conflict on job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among correctional officers. *Criminal Justice Review*, 45(1), 5–25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0734016819863099>
- Wiggins, B. L., Rhine, E. E., Crye, B., Tu, R., & Mitchell, K. (2021). Parole Rules in the United States: Conditions of Parole in Historical Perspective, 1956–2020. *Criminal Justice Review*, 47(2), 185–207. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07340168211020811>
- Wright, B. E., & Davis, B. J. (2003). Job satisfaction in the public sector. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 33(1), 70–90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074002250254>

Zand, D. E. (1972). Trust and Managerial Problem Solving. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(2), 229. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2393957>

## Appendix A: Job Satisfaction Survey Questions

The following items ask about your job satisfaction (i.e., the degree you like or dislike your overall job).

Most days I am happy about my job.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

I find real satisfaction in my job.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

I feel satisfied with my job.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

Most days I am enthusiastic about my job.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

## Appendix B: Organizational Trust Survey Questions

The following items ask about the trust you have with your coworkers, your supervisor, and the management at your organization.

My supervisor is an honest person.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

I have a trusting relationship with my supervisor.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

My supervisor is trustworthy.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

Overall, my coworkers are trustworthy.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

There is no reason not to trust my coworkers.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

In general, I have no reason to doubt the integrity of management/administration at this organization.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

When management/administration says something, you can believe it is true.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

I trust the management and administration of the Nevada Department of Parole and Probation.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

## Appendix C: Work-Family Conflict Survey Questions

The following items ask about work-family conflict (i.e., where work issues cause problems and strain at home, and home issues cause problems and strain at work).

My job keeps me away from my home too much.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Somewhat  
Disagree

Somewhat  
agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

I often have to miss important family or social activities/events because of my job.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Somewhat  
Disagree

Somewhat  
agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

Due to all the work demands, sometimes when I come home, I am too stressed to do the things I enjoy.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Somewhat  
Disagree

Somewhat  
agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

Work makes me too tired or irritable to fully enjoy my family social life.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Somewhat  
Disagree

Somewhat  
agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

When I get home from work, I am often too stressed to participate with family or friends.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Somewhat  
Disagree

Somewhat  
agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree

I find that I frequently bring home problems from work.

Strongly  
Disagree

Disagree

Somewhat  
Disagree

Somewhat  
agree

Agree

Strongly  
Agree



The behaviors I use at work do not help me to be a better person at home.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

The behaviors I learned at work have not helped me to be a better parent, spouse, friend, and so forth.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

The behaviors that are effective at home do not seem to be effective at work.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

Because of family/social concerns, I sometimes have a hard time concentrating at work.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

Due to stress at home, I am often preoccupied with family matters at work.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

Tension from home often follows me to work.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

Due to pressures at home, it is sometimes hard for me to do my job well.

|                   |          |                   |                |       |                |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------|-------|----------------|

The uncertainty of my work schedule interferes with my family and/or social life.

|                      |          |                      |                   |       |                   |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|
| Strongly<br>Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat<br>Disagree | Somewhat<br>agree | Agree | Strongly<br>Agree |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|-------------------|-------|-------------------|

## Appendix D: Informed Consent



(775) 784-6164  
cjdept@unr.edu  
unr.edu/criminal-justice

Dear Department of Parole and Probation Employee,

This letter serves as your invitation to participate in our survey of Parole and Probation employees.

Some important things to note before taking the survey:

\*The goal of the survey is to evaluate the overall health and well-being of the employees of the Department of Parole and Probation and to determine what the agency might do to improve working conditions and other factors related to employee well-being.

\*The survey contains questions from many areas of interest to the researchers and the department. It will take you some time to get through, so plan your time accordingly.

\*You do not need to take the survey on your time. The Parole and Probation department supports your use of office time to answer the survey.

\*The survey is anonymous. Identifying information will not be asked on the survey, and there is no place on the survey for you to add your identity or any identifiable information.

\*You can exit the survey at any time.

We have utilized surveys such as this one to evaluate correctional officers in other states and to guide decisions and policy in the state where the research was conducted. Because of its anonymous nature, the survey instrument is considered "exempt" research by the Institutional Review Board at the University of Nevada, Reno.

Thank you for your participation in this important and timely research. We expect it will help to guide policy and decision-making for the department and make the Department of Parole and Probation a more effective and enjoyable work experience.

Sincerely,

Matthew Leone

Chelsea Hines


Department of Criminal Justice

## Appendix E: Communications Sent to Participants

### Original Invitation E-mail

**Subject:** Parole and Probation Survey

**Message:** Load Message Save As



Please complete the following survey and thank you for not only your participation but your continued patience.

**Follow this link to the Survey:**  
\${://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}


Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:  
\${://SurveyURL}

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:  
\${://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}

### Reminder E-mail

**Subject:** Parole and Probation Survey

**Message:** Load Message Save As



If you are receiving this email, you have either not completed or have not started the survey.

Please take a moment to complete the following survey because your feedback is valuable to us.

**THIS SURVEY WILL BE CLOSING ON FRIDAY, DECEMBER 9TH AT 5P**

We want everyone's experiences and opinions to be counted.

Thank you!

**Follow this link to the Survey:**  
\${://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:  
\${://SurveyURL}

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:  
\${://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}

## Survey Closing E-mail

**Subject:** Parole and Probation Survey

**Message:** Load Message

Save As



If you are receiving this email, you have either not completed or have not started the survey.

Please take a moment to complete the following survey because your feedback is valuable to us.

**THIS SURVEY WILL BE CLOSING TODAY (DECEMBER 9TH) AT 5P**

We want everyone's experiences and opinions to be counted.

Thank you!

Follow this link to the Survey:

[\\${://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}](#)

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:

[\\${://SurveyURL}](#)

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:

[\\${://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}](#)