

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

Document Title: Work and Family Support Services for Correctional Officers and Their Family Members; A National Survey

Author(s): Robert P. Delprino Ph.D.

Document No.: 192292

Date Received: February 01, 2002

Award Number: 99-FS-VX-0002

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Work and Family Support Services for Correctional Officers and Their Family Members:

A National Survey

A2292

C.1

Robert P. Delprino, Ph.D.

Department of Psychology

Buffalo State College, S.U.N.Y.

1300 Elmwood Ave.

Buffalo, NY 14222

PROPERTY OF

National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)

Box 6000

Rockville, MD 20849-6000

This project was supported under award number 99FSVX0002 from the National Institute of Justice, Office of Sponsored Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Work and Family Support Services for Correctional Officers and Their Family Members: A National Survey

Executive Summary

Through a national survey of correctional agencies this study identified the extent and nature of organizational support programs for correctional officers and their family members. Participants included the primary adult and juvenile correctional agencies in the 50 United States, the District of Columbia, the Federal Bureau of Prisons and U.S. territories. A response rate of 63.3% was obtained representing 76 agencies from the 120 agencies contacted to participate in the study.

The survey "Work and Family Support Services for Correctional Officers Questionnaire," which was developed for this study, was used to identify services provided, the individuals that provide services, the organizational impact of programs, agencies' obstacles to the use of services, and steps agencies take to enhance services and programs for officers and their family members. Comparisons are made based on the type of agency (i.e. 3 groups; Adult, Juvenile, Both Adult and Juvenile) and size of the agency (i.e. 4 groups; Group 1: 31-220 officers; Group 2: 309-941 officers; Group 3: 1,014-3,745 officers; Group 4: 4,199-25,945 officers).

Employee assistance programs were the most common form of service that agencies offered to its members. The programs and services that are provided by organizations seem to focus primarily on the officer and it appears that little if any information is available to identify the effectiveness and utilization of existing programs. Less attention and resources are given to addressing the officer's family members' concerns. Correctional agencies have not fully addressed the impact that a career as an officer can have on the family. Also it seems that agencies have not recognized the resource that family members can be to assist in minimizing the potential negative consequences that a career as a correctional officer can have on the well-being of the officer, family and the organization.

Work and Family Support Services for Correctional Officers and Their Family Members: A National Survey

**Robert P. Delprino, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
Buffalo State College, S.U.N.Y.**

I. Introduction

Work place stress is more commonly associated with certain occupations (Jex, 1998; Lowman, 1997). In the field of corrections, significant resources in the past have been focused on assisting inmates and addressing their educational and family needs. It appears that fewer resources or programs have been provided which focus on the welfare of correctional officers and their family members.

A number of surveys and reports conducted in the 1980's identified sources and the impact of work related stress from the officers' perspective (Brodsky, 1982; Kinsell & Shelden, 1981; Launay & Fielding, 1989). Although to a lesser degree, the impact that a career in corrections can have on family life was also acknowledged in the 1980's (Cheek, 1983).

More recent studies in the 1990's have investigated the satisfaction which officers have with their job and with some recognition of the role that the organization can play in mitigating or exacerbating stress experienced by officers (Grossi, Keil, & Vito, 1996; Hepburn & Knepper, 1993; Walters, 1996). Although satisfaction with one's job and stress are individual experiences, the organization in which an individual works can impact the degree of stress experienced and how the employee copes with the stress that is experienced (Finn, 1998; Quick, Quick, Nelson, & Hurrell, 1997).

While stress may be an inherent part of correctional officers' occupation, it is possible that correctional organizations can offer support in the way of programs. Such programs can assist officers and their family members to minimize the potential negative impact that work related stress may have on the officer and their family members. The goal of the national survey presented in this report was to identify the extent and nature of such programs that exist in correctional agencies. To

date, no such information has been collected on a national level. While the collection of such empirical data does not provide a comprehensive answer to addressing officers' and family members' stress, such information is of value. Identification on a national level of programs currently used by correctional agencies provides a benchmark of the extent, nature and effectiveness of work and family programs in correctional institutions and provides agencies with models of programs that could be implemented. In addition information on current programs can prompt other agencies to implement programs that best meet their needs. Correctional agencies need to identify and implement programs that will be most effective in responding to officers' and family members' concerns to make best use of limited financial and community resources.

The following sections present the development of the Work and Family Support Services for Correctional Officers Questionnaire, the sample to which it was distributed and a summary of the findings.

II. Development of the Work and Family Support Services for Correctional Officers Questionnaire

A. Survey Development

The Work and Family Support Services for Correctional Officers Questionnaire consists of 89 items (Appendix A). Fourteen items requested demographic information on the agency and individual responding to the survey. The remaining items requested information in the following areas:

- | | |
|---|------------|
| 1. Types of Services Provided | (33 items) |
| 2. Service Providers | (10 items) |
| 3. Organizational Impact | (5 items) |
| 4. Agencies' Obstacles to Use of Services | (12 items) |
| 5. Agencies' Enhancement of Services | (15 items) |

Items for the Work and Family Support Services for Correctional Officers Questionnaire were developed for this project and based on the Work and Family Support Services for Law Enforcement Questionnaire (Delprino, O'Quinn & Kennedy, 1997). Modifications were made to the earlier questionnaire based on feedback provided by seven professionals working in the field of

corrections. These professionals represented both federal and national organizations that work with and represent correctional officers and agencies.

B. Method and Sample Development

A goal of the survey was to identify the extent of support programs that currently exist in correctional agencies on a national level. Therefore, the sample consisted of the primary state adult and juvenile department of correction agencies in the 50 United States, the District of Columbia, the Federal Bureau of Prisons and U.S. territories. The services of the Criminal Justice Institute were enlisted to identify key individuals from these agencies and to assist in eliciting these individuals to respond. A copy of the survey along with a cover letter (Appendix B) and return fax transmission sheet from the Criminal Justice Institute were sent via fax to all of the 60 members of the Association of State Correctional Administrators and the 62 members of the Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators. The 122 individuals identified were based on membership lists from the fall of year 2000. These lists also included two individuals who represented correctional agencies in Canada. Two responses were received from Canadian correctional agencies but were not included in the analysis for this report. Therefore the sample consisted of 120 corrections agencies in the United States and its territories.

The survey was distributed twice. The first distribution of the survey resulted in 54 responses. The survey was faxed to non-respondents six weeks after the initial distribution. The second distribution resulted in 22 more useable responses. Therefore analysis is presented based on responses from 76 correctional agencies out of 120 agencies, which represents a 63.3% response rate.

C. Participants

While the survey was directed to members of the Association of State Correctional Administrators the Council of Juvenile Correctional Administrators, it appears that other individuals in the organization completed the survey.

The job title of respondents to the survey varied, but the majority had a job title that was associated with human resources (40.8%, n=31) such as Human Resource Manager or Director of Personnel. Respondents were predominantly male (56.6.3%, n=43; female, 41.9%, n=31) and had an average of 13.4 years of working experience in corrections with an average of 5.6 years in their current job. As a group, respondents were well educated with 90.6% (n=67) reporting an Associates Degree or higher college education experience. The majority of respondents reported to possess a Graduate Degree (51.4%, n=38) as their highest level of education.

Of the 75 responders that identified the type of agency in which they work, 48% (n=36) identified their organization as an adult agency, 38.7% (n=29) identified their organization as a juvenile agency, and 13.3% (n=10) identified their organization as an adult and juvenile agency.

III. Results

Results are presented from three perspectives:

1. Total respondents (n=76)
2. Type of agency (i.e. 3 groups; Adult, Juvenile, Both Adult and Juvenile)
3. Size of agency as defined by the number of officers in an agency (i.e. 4 groups; Group 1: 31-220 officers; Group 2: 309-941 officers; Group 3: 1,014-3,745 officers; Group 4: 4,199-25,945 officers)

The four groups that define size of the agency were formed based on the number of officers.

The raw score of the number of officers in an agency was transformed into quartiles. Minor modifications were made in the groupings for two agencies. For example, the second quartile (second group) ended with an agency that reported 933 officers. The third quartile (third group) began with an agency that reported 941 officers followed by an agency that reported 1,014 officers. To better represent the groups, the agency with 941 officers was included in the second quartile grouping (second group).

A. Officer Demographics and Turnover Rates

The total number of correctional officers working at the responding agencies ranged from 31 to 25,945 officers with the average being 3,257 officers. A breakdown of the number of officers by

gender, ethnicity and rank for all respondents is presented in Table 1. Tables 2 and 3 present the gender, ethnicity and rank by the type of agency and the size of the agency.

The ratios of correctional officer per number of inmates, officer turnover rates and the average number of retirements of officers for type and size of agency are presented in Tables 4 and 5 respectively. For the total group, the mean number of the ratio of one officer per number of inmates was 5.70 ($n=73$, $SD=2.94$) and ranged from a ratio of 1.10 to 15. There were no significant differences in this ratio base on type or size of agency.

For the 57 agencies that responded to the question of officers' turnover rate, the average percentage of turnover was 18.35% ($SD=.12$) and ranged from 2% to a high of 48%. Comparisons of agency turnover rates identified that the turnover rate for officers at juvenile facilities (24.95%) was statistically higher than adult facilities (14.17%) ($F(2, 53) = 5.40$, $p < .01$). There were no significant difference based on the size of the agency.

Less than half of the respondents ($n=34$) provided information about retirement. Overall the number of retirements reported ranged from 0 to 575 with an average of 49.54 ($SD = 105.48$) reported by 34 agencies that responded to this item in the survey. No significant differences in the number of retirements were identified based on the type of agency. In terms of size, larger agencies (Group 4) did report significantly greater number of retirements than smaller agencies (Group 1) ($F(3,32) = 3.56$, $p < .05$).

As indicated in Table 6, it was reported that the majority of officers leave the organization in the first two years of employment (1st year, 45.8%, 2nd year, 25.4%). This trend was similar regardless of the type or size of the agency. Participants were asked to identify some of the primary reason why officers leave the organization. Participants provided 137 responses to this question. Responses were content analyzed. The most common response for offices leaving was financial considerations ($n=23$). The next two primary reasons cited included retirement ($n=12$) and work

hours/overtime (n=11). Stress and family consideration were recorded only 5 times each as a response to this item (See Table 7).

B. Work and Family Support Services

The primary focus of this survey was to identify the extent and nature of services currently available. Availability of mental health services were reported by 86.7% (n=65) of the 75 agencies that responded to this item (item 15). The majority of respondents (60.27 %, n=44) identified an employee assistance programs as the type of mental health service that is most commonly available for officers.

Two way contingency table analyses were conducted to evaluate if type or size of agency was related to availability of mental health services. No significant differences were found based on size of the agency. However, type of agency and availability of mental health services were significantly related, (Person χ^2 (2, N=74)= 8.27, p=.016, Cramer's V = .33). The proportions of Adult, Juvenile and Combined Adult Juvenile agencies that provided mental health services were .94, .72 and 1.00 respectively. Follow-up pairwise comparisons were conducted to evaluate the difference among these proportions. The only pairwise comparison that was significant was between Adult and Juvenile agencies. The probability of an agency having mental health services was about 1.3 times (.94/.72) more likely for an Adult agency than a Juvenile agency.

While the majority of agencies provided mental health services, few had a formalized psychological services unit as part of the agency. Only 35.1% (n=26) of the 74 agencies that responded to this item (item 16) reported having a unit. Agencies did not differ significantly on availability of a formalized psychological services unit based on type or size.

In addition to the general question of the availability of mental health services and the existence of a formalized psychological services unit, participants were asked to identify the existence of 31 specific types of services. The services presented included:

1. Employee Assistance Program (EAP)
2. EAP specifically designed for corrections
3. Counseling
4. Child care on a 24-hour basis
5. Marital support groups
6. Child support groups
7. Stress reduction programs
8. Hypertension clinics
9. Health and wellness program
10. Group therapy
11. Post-inmate assault counseling
12. Counseling for officer who carried out capital punishment
13. Training/seminars on domestic violence
14. Stress education for C.O. recruits
15. Stress education for officers on the job
16. Critical incident response on a 24-hour basis
17. Correctional officer crisis telephone service on a 24-hour basis
18. Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus.
19. Peer support
20. Short-term counseling (under 6 months) related to personnel killed in the line of duty
21. Long-term (6 months or more) counseling related to personnel killed in the line of duty
22. Family issues related to firearm safety
23. Seminars on alcohol, drug use, gambling, or overeating
24. Programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits
25. Programs geared toward work and family issues throughout an officer's career
26. Mental health treatment provided independently by health insurance
27. Exercise facilities
28. Time off during work to use exercise facilities
29. Programs pertaining to the diagnosis/treatment of organizational stress
30. Family orientation programs
31. Flexible work scheduling

Participants were also requested to identify how these services are provided. As identified by Finn and Tomz (1997) there are three basic options for organizational relationships between a stress program and the agency it services. These options include in-house programs, external programs and hybrid programs. An in-house program is defined as a service that exists as a separate unit within the agency or as a special operation of an existing unit. An external program is defined as a service provided by an individual or group under contract with the agency. A hybrid program is defined as a combination of in-house and external program, for instance a program that is overseen by a department employee that also uses some contracted external sources for services.

Tables 8, 9 and 10 present breakdowns of the availability of the 31 services for the total number of agencies, by type of agency and by size of the agency respectively. The tables also identify in what form (in-house, external, hybrid) services are provided.

For clarity, the presentation that follows will focus predominantly on the overall availability of the 31 services presented in the survey. The most popular available service overall was Employee Assistance Programs (n=71, 93.4%). More than half of the agencies provide this serve as an external program (n=45, 59.2%). The next most common available service was mental health treatment provided by insurance (n=69, 92%). Similar to available EAPs, this service is commonly provided externally (n=57, 76%).

The services provided by more than 75 percent of the responding agencies included:

1. Employee Assistance Programs (EAPs)	93.4%
2. Mental health treatment provided independently by health insurance	92.0%
3. Post-inmate assault counseling	82.2%
4. Counseling	81.1%
5. Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus.	78.7%

A number of services were reported to be fairly common. Service that were identified as being available by more than 50 percent of the respondents included:

1. Critical incident response on a 24-hour basis	69.7%
2. Health and wellness program	68.5%
3. Stress reduction programs	68.1%
4. Stress education for officers on the job	65.3%
5. Short-term counseling (under 6 months) related to personnel killed in the line of duty	62.2%
6. Exercise facilities	62.2%
7. Stress education for C.O. recruits	61.6%
8. Peer support	58.7%
9. Seminars on alcohol, drug use, gambling, or overeating	57.3%
10. Flexible work scheduling	52.1%

Seven of the ten programs listed above are provided predominantly in-house. Programs to address the death of personnel in the line of duty or provide information on alcohol, drug use, gambling and overeating are more likely to be provided by an individual or group under contract with the agency. Stress reduction programs were slightly more likely to be offered as a hybrid program.

The following list represents services that were identified as available by between 25 percent and 50 percent of the agencies surveyed.

1. Long-term (6 months or more) counseling related to personnel killed in the line of duty	43.8%
2. Programs pertaining to the diagnosis/treatment of organizational stress	43.8%
3. Training/seminars on domestic violence	42.5%
4. Counseling for officer who carried out capital punishment	42.2%
5. Programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits	37.8%
6. Programs geared toward work and family issues throughout an officer's career	37.8%
7. Correctional officer crisis telephone service on a 24-hour basis	36.0%
8. EAP specifically designed for corrections	29.8%
9. Family orientation programs	27.4%
10. Marital support groups	27.0%
11. Group therapy	27.0%

When these programs are offered, they are likely to exist as in-house programs. Three services were identified as more commonly to be offered as external programs and included marital support groups, long term counseling involving a line of duty death and a 24-hour crisis telephone service.

Service that were identified as least likely to exist in a correctional agency included:

1. Child support groups	22.0%
2. Hypertension clinics	16.7%
3. Family issues related to firearm safety	13.9%
4. Time off during work to use exercise facilities	8.1%
5. Child care on a 24-hour basis	4.1%

For those agencies that did provide a service, participants were asked to identify if the service was also made available to family members. Unfortunately, the majority of respondents that indicated their agency provided a service did not identify if the service was also available for family members. Therefore the information provided of the availability of programs to family members should be interpreted with caution. For example, 71 of 76 responding agencies (93.4%) identified that EAPs are available (See Table 7). Of the 71 agencies that report providing this service, only 64 identified if the program was also available to family members. For this service, 84.4% of the agencies (54 of 64) reported that the service was also available for family members. If the 7 agencies that did not respond to the question of availability of EAPs to family members did respond

in the negative, the percentage of agencies that provide EAPs to family members would drop to 76.1% (54 of 71) members.

It appears however that high availability of programs in agencies does not necessarily mean that programs will be available to family members (See Table 11). Of the 31 services presented, 15 are available in more than half of the agencies that responded to the survey. However for only 5 of these programs (EAP, Mental health treatment provided independently by health insurance, Counseling, Short-term counseling related to personnel killed in the line of duty, Post-inmate assault counseling) did 50% or more of the agencies also make the service available to family members.

Other services offered by at least half of the agencies (Critical incident response on a 24-hour basis, Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus, Seminars on alcohol, drug use, gambling, or overeating, Stress reduction programs, Health and wellness program) are reportedly made available to family members by between 30 and 45 percent of agencies. It appears that popular services such as stress education for officers on the job and stress education for recruits are rarely provided to family members.

Two way contingency table analyses were conducted to evaluate the relationship between the type of agency and the availability of the 31 specific services presented (See Table 12).

Significant differences based on the type of agency were found for the following 11 services:

1. Marital support groups
2. Group therapy
3. Post-inmate assault counseling
4. Counseling for officer who carried out capital punishment
5. Critical incident response on a 24-hour basis
6. Correctional officer crisis telephone service on a 24-hour basis
7. Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus.
8. Short-term counseling (under 6 months) related to personnel killed in the line of duty
9. Family issues related to firearm safety
10. Programs pertaining to the diagnosis/treatment of organizational stress
11. Family orientation programs

Follow-up pairwise comparisons indicate that these 11 services are less likely to be found in Juvenile facilities.

Two way contingency table analyses were also conducted to evaluate the relationship between the size of the agency and the availability of the 31 specific services presented (See Table

13). Significant differences based on the size of the agency were found for the following 8 services:

1. Child support groups
2. Health and wellness program
3. Group therapy
4. Counseling for officer who carried out capital punishment
5. Stress education for C.O. recruits
6. Correctional officer crisis telephone service on a 24-hour basis
7. Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus.
8. Short-term counseling (under 6 months) related to personnel killed in the line of duty

Follow-up pairwise comparisons of the differences among the proportions of the agencies that provide these services indicate that smaller agencies are less likely to offer these 8 services.

C. Service Providers

Eight titles of common service providers were presented in the survey. Respondents were asked to identify the number of providers with each title and if any of these providers were also sworn officers. The titles service providers included:

1. Certified Drug/Alcohol Counselor
2. Chaplain
3. Employee Assistance Program Coordinator
4. Peer Supporters
5. Psychiatrist
6. Psychologist
7. Social Worker
8. Civilian Volunteers

Table 14 presents the mean number of providers and the number of agencies that have providers with each title by type and agency, size of agency and for all agencies. EAP Coordinator was reported as the most common service provider, with 40 agencies identifying EAP Coordinator as a provider. Two agencies reported to have 97 EAP Coordinators. Other common providers included Chaplains (n=22) and Peer Supporters (n=18). The maximum number of Chaplains and Peer Supporters reported for single agencies were 217 and 3,500 respectively. Mental health

professionals such as Psychiatrist (n=4), Certified Drug/Alcohol Counselor (n=5) or Social Workers (n=7) were less likely to be identified as providers of services.

The mean number of each provider did not differ significantly by the type of the agency (Adult, Juvenile, Adult and Juvenile). However comparisons of the mean number of providers by the size of the agency (Group 1 - 31 to 220 officers, Group 2 - 309 to 941 officers, Group 3 - 1,014 to 3,745 officers, Group 4 - 4,199 to 25,945 officers) indicated that the number of EAP Coordinators for the four groups did differ significantly ($F(3,35) = 3.38, p < .05$). Post-hoc comparison identified that the mean number of EAP Coordinators for Group 3 was significantly smaller than mean number of Coordinators in Group 4. Although not statistically significant, the mean number of EAP Coordinators for Group 3 was also smaller compared to Groups 1 and 2 that represent agencies with fewer officers. This trend is also true of the mean values for the number of Peer Supporters.

Respondents were given the opportunity to identify other providers not listed. Titles presented included nurse and critical incident stress team. The survey also asked if providers were sworn officers. Few of the providers were identified as also being sworn officers. As would be expected, most Peer Supporters were also sworn officers (82.4%, n=14, 17 responses to item). Providers of services reported least likely to be sworn officers were Psychologists (17.6%, n=3, 17 responses to item) and EAP Coordinators (19.4%, n=7, 36 responses to item).

Of the 69 agencies that responded to the question of specifying qualifications for those who provide services, the majority (75.4%, n=52) reported that the agency had specific qualifications. The requirement of qualifications did not differ for type or size of the agency. Some form of specialized training, certification or a State license appeared to be the most desirable qualifications. Fewer agencies required a Masters or Doctorate degree of those who would provide services.

D. Organizational Impact

Participants were asked to identify on a 5 point Likert scale (1=to a very slight extent, 5= to a very large extent) the degree to which they believed that correctional officers' work and family concerns impact the agency. The mean rating for all agencies to this question was 3.68 (SD=.75, n=76) indicating a perception that work and family stress can have a slightly more than moderate impact on the agency. While the size of the agency did not impact this perception, the type of agency did. A one-way analysis of variance to evaluate the relationship between the type of agency and perception of impact was significant ($F(2,72) = 3.68, p < .05$). Post hoc comparisons indicate that stress is perceived to have a greater impact in Adult facilities.

Any program to assist officers and their family members can only be fully successful if it operates within an organizational culture that is supportive of the program. While almost all agencies reported having a mission statement (98.7, n=74), very few included in their mission statement any reference to work and family issues for correctional officers (13.2%, n=9).

To gain some understanding of the impact that the organization can have on services, a series of questions were asked that identified agencies' obstacles and facilitation of services. Twelve items requested the identification of obstacles to the use of services in the agency and included:

1. Funding
2. Lack of personnel who can provide the service
3. Viewpoint of policy making body
4. Viewpoint of correctional officers
5. Legal concerns of any type
6. Stigma associated with seeking assistance
7. Confidentiality issues
8. Lack of union support
9. Lack of input from officers in regards to program development
10. Accessibility and privacy of service location
11. Managers may use program to target some officers for disciplinary action
12. Family members do not support or are suspicious of services

Using a 5 point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree) respondents identified the degree to which each item was a perceived obstacle to the use of services. The reliability of this scale as measured by coefficient alpha was .86. Table 15 contains the mean scores for each item by

total, type of agency and size of agency. Overall the items presented were not identified as being significant obstacles to the use of service. Only three items received overall mean ratings over 3 (Funding, $M=3.72$, $SD=1.27$; Stigma, $M=3.32$, $SD=1.14$; Lack of personnel to provide service, $M=3.19$, $SD=1.26$) indicating a moderate perception that these three possible obstacles influence the use of services. As a group respondents did not perceive that managers used programs to target offices for disciplinary action. This item received the lowest mean rating of all 12 items ($M=1.89$, $SD=1.04$). There were no significant differences in mean score ratings based on the size of the agency. There was however a significant difference in the perception of the policy making body as an obstacle to the use of services based on the type of agency ($F(2, 65) = 3.17$, $p < .05$). Respondents from juvenile facilities perceived policy making bodies to be a greater obstacle ($M=3.19$, $SD=1.30$) compared to respondents from adult agencies ($M=2.44$, $SD=1.11$).

Respondents were also asked to identify steps their agency took to facilitate the development, awareness or acceptance of services. The survey included the following 15 items in reference to facilitation:

1. Training at the academy level
2. Provide funding for services and programs
3. Provide officer space for service/program provided
4. Allow officers to use job time to train as peer supporters
5. Allow offices to do peer support work while on the job
6. Newsletters that advertise the service/program
7. Provide information on the benefit of programs to facilities
8. Provide information on the benefit of programs to officers
9. Provide information on the benefit of programs to family members
10. Collaborate with local union in developing and increasing awareness of programs
11. Public policy statement of support from administration
12. Mandate confidentiality
13. Allow officers to attend counseling appointments while on duty
14. Train supervisors on access, use and referral of agency services
15. Increase number of family programs offered

Participants were requested to make one of three responses to each of the 15 items (Yes, No, Unsure) to identify if their agency took that step to facilitate the use of services. Table 16 contains the frequency and percentage of agencies that reported their agency did take the step to facilitate the

use of services by total, type of agency and size of agency. Three of the 15 items were identified as being performed by more than 80 percent of the respondents to those items and included:

- | | |
|--|-------|
| 1. Mandating Confidentiality | 89.3% |
| 2. Provide information to officers of the benefits of programs | 82.7% |
| 3. Training at the Academy Level | 82.6% |

Other reported common activities taken to facilitate development, awareness or acceptance of services included:

- | | |
|---|-------|
| 1. Provide information on the benefit of programs to facilities | 78.4% |
| 2. Train supervisors on access, use and referral of agency services | 75.7% |
| 3. Newsletters that advertise the service/program | 75.7% |
| 4. Public policy statement of support from administration | 74.0% |
| 5. Provide funding for services and programs | 73.5% |
| 6. Provide officer space for service/program provided | 67.6% |
| 7. Allow officers to attend counseling appointments while on duty | 62.2% |

The following five activities were less likely to be conducted by the responding agencies:

- | | |
|--|-------|
| 1. Allow officers to do peer support work while on the job | 56.0% |
| 2. Allow officers to use job time to train as peer supporters | 54.1% |
| 3. Provide information on the benefit of programs to family members | 47.4% |
| 4. Collaborate with local union in developing and increasing awareness of programs | 31.8% |
| 5. Increase number of family programs offered | 20.3% |

Analyses were conducted to evaluate if type or size of agency was related to the likelihood that an agency would take steps to facilitate services. The type of agency was significantly related to the likelihood that an agency would:

- | | |
|---|---|
| Train at the Academy Level | $\chi^2 (2, N=68) = 9.83, p < .01, \text{Cramer's } V = .38$ |
| Provide information on benefits to family members | $\chi^2 (4, N=75) = 10.46, p < .05, \text{Cramer's } V = .26$ |
| Train supervisors on access, use and referral | $\chi^2 (4, N=73) = 10.73, p < .05, \text{Cramer's } V = .27$ |

Follow-up pairwise comparisons indicated that training at the academy level and training of supervisors on the access and use of referral were more likely to occur at Adult rather than Juvenile agencies. The probability of providing information on the benefits of programs to family members were more likely to occur in Adult and Juvenile agencies than agencies that dealt just with juveniles.

Similarly, the size of the agency was significantly related to the three same facilitation steps:

Train at the Academy Level	$\chi^2 (3, N=67)= 19.88, p<.001, \text{Cramer's } V=.55$
Provide information on benefits to family members	$\chi^2 (6, N=74)= 14.57, p<.05, \text{Cramer's } V=.31$
Train supervisors on access, use and referral	$\chi^2 (6, N=72)= 12.56, p<.05, \text{Cramer's } V=.30$

Follow-up pairwise comparisons indicated that these three steps to facilitate services are more likely to take place at larger agencies rather than agencies with smaller numbers of officers.

Of the 68 agencies that responded to the question of plans to enlarge or implement programs that address work and family issues within the next two years, less than half (47.1%, n=32) indicated plans to do so. There were no significant differences in plans to implement services based on the type of agency. It appears however that the size of the agency does impact plans to implement programs ($\chi^2 (3, N=67)= 7.79, p<.05, \text{Cramer's } V=.34$). The largest agencies are more likely to implement and enlarge programs that address work and family issues.

Participants were also asked to identify if their agencies keep utilization statistics or have conducted any impact study of programs' effectiveness. While a little more than half of the agencies reported keeping utilization statistics (n=37, 53.6%), very few agencies (n=8, 11.9%) conducted impact studies and did not plan to do so in the future (n=12, 22.6%). These findings did not differ for the type or size of agency.

IV. Discussion

A goal of the national survey presented in this report was to add to the knowledge and understanding of the impact that a career as a correctional officer can have on the well being of officers and their family members. Specifically, this survey benchmarked the existence of organizational programs that are available to officers and family members. Organizations differ in the extent to which they create or ameliorate stress (DeWolf & Winnubst, 1987; Murphy & Schoenborn, 1989). Support programs provided by the organization can assist in minimizing the

potential negative effects that a career in corrections may have on an officer, family member or the organization.

From an organizational point of view, one indication of organizational distress may be the rate of turnover of its employees. Research studies indicate that employee turnover is related to an employee's satisfaction with their job (Jenkins, 1993; Mowday, Koberg, & McArthur, 1984) and commitment to the organization (Koslowsky, 1991; Shore, Newton, & Thorton, 1990). Also evidence suggests that work stress can lead to increased turnover and absenteeism (Dwyer, & Ganster, 1991; Mayesm & Ganster, 1988). In the current study, reported organization turnover of correction officers ranged from 2% to 48% with an average of 18.35% for the 57 agencies that responded to this item. The reported turnover rate identified from the survey was similar to turnover rates identified for correctional officers in other publications (American Correctional Association, 2001; "Staff Hiring and Retention," 2001) which reported turnover rates for some agencies as high as 68 percent.

Turnover may offer some positive benefits to the organization and improve the quality of its human resources if overpriced or unproductive employees leave and make room for new, vital personnel (Quick, Quick, Nelson, & Hurrell, 1997). However, there are costs associated with turnover, and given some of the high turnover rates reported in this survey and other studies, these costs can be significant. Costs associated with turnover can include separation cost (i.e., administration functions, separation pay, unemployment tax), replacement cost (i.e., recruitment, interview, testing, medical examination), and training cost (i.e., information literature, formal training) (Cascio, 1991).

It appears that turnover occurs early in the officer's career. It was reported that 71.3% of officers that leave do so in the first two years of employment. It is interesting that of the 30 categorized reasons given as to why officers leave the organization (see Table 7), stress and family considerations, while in the top ten, were not offered as the primary reasons. It was reported that

financial consideration, retirement, work hours, overtime, relocation, shifts and lack of career opportunities played a greater role in officers' decision to leave. These reasons represent organizational issues that could be addressed through the implementation of formal career development programs, job enrichment programs or by giving employees some discretion in the hours they work.. Research has shown that workers who chose to work a particular shift have fewer difficulties than workers who were involuntarily assigned to a work shift (Barton, 1994). Related to this is the finding reported by Slate, Vogel, and Johnson (2001) that correctional employees who perceived themselves to have meaningful input into decisions were less occupationally stressed. It appears that programs offered by an organization may be able to influence an employee's decision to stay or leave. In the survey presented in this report, there was a significant negative correlation between the number of services offered by the organization and the turnover rates of officers ($r(55) = -.23, p < .05$). In other words, organizations that provided more of the 31 services presented in the survey also reported lower turnover rates of their officers.

In terms of services, the majority of agencies reported providing mental health services for their officers (86.7%, n=65) but few reported the existence of a formalized psychological services unit (35.1%, n=26). It appears that correctional agencies seek assistance for their officers primarily from external sources such as external EAPs. EAPs appear to be well established programs in the majority of agencies (93.4%, n=71). Given the return in investment that EAPs provide in terms of improved attendance, reduced use of the health plan and greater productivity (Klarreich, Diguseppe, & Dimattia, 1987) it is not surprising that many agencies would view EAPs as a cost effective means to provide services to officers. Other common services provided by a majority of the agencies included counseling for inmate assault, and exposure to the HIV virus.

As indicated in the "Results" section of this report, many agencies did not identify if services were also made available for family members. This may be an indication that agencies do not recognize the link between officer and family members stress, or that agencies do not view the stress

experienced by officers' family members as a responsibility that the agency needs to address. Even programs that seemed to be commonly provided by agencies such as stress education for officers on the job and stress education for recruits were not reported to be widely available to family members (See Table 11). In general, programs commonly offered by agencies focused more on the officer compared to family members. Programs that included family members or had a family theme such as work and family issues programs, family orientation programs, marital and child support groups, family firearm safety and child care were the least likely of the 31 programs presented to be available in correctional agencies. It may be fair to say that more established programs exist in correctional facilities that address the family concerns and issues of inmates rather than address such concerns of officers and their families.

By not giving greater attention to the correctional officer family, as indicated by limited program availability to family members as well as limited inclusion of family topics in services provided, correctional agencies are missing a potentially powerful resource in addressing correctional officer stress. Family members are typically the first to notice changes in the officer and can play a crucial role in assisting the officer to seek help (Finn, 2001). Although they may not be trained mental health professionals, training family members to notice signs that the job may be having a negative effect on the officer, coupled with awareness of resources can empower family members to guide the officer towards assistance that is needed. Also, family members can be a primary support for the officer. By being informed of the job and its challenges, family members can better understand what the officer must deal with on a daily bases and be less likely to add to the officer's stress.

Some differences were identified as to the availability of programs based on the type of agency (Adult, Juvenile, Both Adult and Juvenile) and size of the agency (Group 1: 31-220 officers; Group 2: 309-941 officers; Group 3: 1,014-3,745 officers; Group 4: 4,199-25,945 officers). It was not surprising that some programs were more likely to be found in larger agencies than smaller.

Perhaps larger agencies have greater resources to provide the services identified (See Table 13). It was less clear why some services were more likely to exist in Juvenile facilities (See Table 12). Overall, there is not a clear explanation as to why some differences were identified in the availability of service as well as in turnover rates and overall availability of mental health services based on the type and size of the agency. These differences however do call attention to the need to tailor programs to the needs of the organization. One approach or one program will not satisfy the needs of all organizations. Each organization will have unique characteristics of the organization and employees that need to be identified. Implementing organization, group and individual diagnosis techniques from the field of organizational development can assist in implementing programs that match the specific needs of officers, family members and the organization (Huse & Cummings 1985).

In addition to assessing needs, the success of programs can also be aided by identification of the appropriate individuals or occupations to implement and provide services. In this study, service providers were identified. EAP coordinators were reported to be the most common service provider by agencies. Given the extensive reported use of EAPs, this finding is expected. Other providers such as Chaplains, Psychologists and Peer Supporters were less commonly found to provide services in correctional agencies. Very few agencies reported utilizing Social Workers, Certified Drug/Alcohol Counselors, Psychiatrists, or Civilian Volunteers to provide services to officers or their family members.

While the survey identified the number of providers, it did not identify the specific services offered by each provider. It may be beneficial to identify the core job functions for each provider. This information can offer guidance to the provider as to how they can establish themselves as a resource and best provide services to officers, family members and the agency. For example based on this survey, it appears that correctional psychologists have not experienced the same level of acceptance as police psychologists have experienced in law enforcement organizations. Only 19

correctional agencies reported using Psychologists to provide services to officers and family members. The use of psychologists by police agencies is fairly common and Police Psychology is a well-established field (Reese, 1995; Blau, 1994). Bartol and Bartol (1994) comment that psychologists have been active in correctional systems much longer than they have been in courts or in law enforcement settings, but their track record of successful change, particularly in the institution has not been remarkable. This is explained by the authors as a results of the overworked, underpaid and sometimes undertrained personnel in addition to outmoded and overcrowded conditions which can challenge the psychologist's ability to function effectively within the agency. In the survey presented in this report, Psychologists were reported less likely to also be sworn officers. In Police Psychology there is a growing trend of psychologists who are or were police officers. Perhaps the field of correctional psychology could benefit from also having psychologists who are sworn officers. Providers who are also members of the force and understand the culture may gain credibility more easily and as a result be more effective in providing services.

There apparently is a need for qualified individuals to provide services. "Lack of personnel who can provide services" received one of the three highest means ratings of the 12 obstacles to the use of services presented in the survey. The other two obstacles, which received the highest mean ratings, included "funding" issues and the "sigma associated with seeking assistance." Respondents indicated that the concern managers would use a program to target officers for disciplinary action was not an obstacle to the use of programs. "Confidentiality" also received a relatively low rating. It is possible that if officers rather than a member of the administration or management responded to these items, confidentiality and disciplinary concerns would be identified to be more of an issue. The importance of confidentiality and the fear that seeking assistance can impact job advancement or result in social ostracism are perceived concerns in both corrections and law enforcement (Finn, 2001; Weiner, 1986).

When asked to identify steps that the agency takes to facilitate the awareness, development and acceptance of services, "mandating confidentiality" was reported as the primary step taken by a majority of agencies. In addition, many agencies reported that they facilitate services by providing officers with information about the benefits of programs and introducing training or programs at the academy level. These are both important steps to allow officers to buy into programs and raise awareness of what services are available.

In law enforcement, the academy has been referred to as a psychological crucible in which occupational identities are formed (Bahn, 1984). Similarly in corrections, the training academy can play a crucial role in forming ideas, values and attitudes in the new recruit. There is a great deal of formal and informal learning that takes place. As part of being socialized, new recruits may learn to fear or distrust others and come to believe that only colleagues can be trusted and relied upon. This may be a valuable truth for officers as they work in the correctional setting, however such a belief system does have a down side. A potential negative consequence is that the officer may carry this belief into their personal lives and thereby be unlikely to seek out assistance with personal or family related problems from available resources. Offering some form of awareness training at the academy level and providing information to officers as to the benefits of services could make the officer and family more resistant to the potential negative effects of the job and more willing to use available services.

It appears that it is fairly common for agencies to facilitate programs for training supervisors on access, use and referral of agency programs. The key role that supervisors play in the world of work should not be underestimated. The research on socialization and training indicates that it is co-workers and supervisors that play a vital role in filling in the gaps between formal training and the real world (Feldman, 1977; Louis, Posner & Powell, 1983 see Goldstein p 388). Supervisors can have a significant impact on minimizing the negative effects of the job for the officer and family members by monitoring employees' performance and guiding them as needed to appropriate

services. Results presented by Thomas and Ganster (1995) indicate that specific organizational approaches such as supervisory support may alleviate many effects of work-family conflict and thereby play a mediation role in employee's ability to deal with stress resulting from the conflict. Greenhaus, Bedeian and Mossholder (1987) provided evidence that perceptions of a nonsupportive work environment were associated with low levels of marital satisfaction, quality of life and higher levels of work-family conflict.

Considering the roles that a supervisor can play as teacher, coach and counselor, the supervisor can have a pivotal role in reducing the newer officer's stress. One of the agencies that responded to the survey indicated that they have allocated all of their limited resources to the development of a strong field-training officer program and leadership training. The investment the agency is making is based on the belief that front-line supervisors are an effective mechanism to promoting a positive staff culture. It is not enough to just have family supportive programs. Employees must know that the programs exist and supervisors must support their use.

Innovative policies and programs cannot yield their intended effects if they exist within an unsupportive culture (Friedman & Galinsky, 1992). Only a little more than half of the respondents indicated that they allow peer supporters to train and meet with employees while on the job. Although there may be some financial costs involved with allowing peer supporters to conduct their activities while they are working, such activity could go a long way in selling the message that the organization is committed to and supportive of programs that can promote the welfare of its officers. Such activities could also result in a positive financial impact for the organization in terms of improved employee performance.

Similarly, agencies could acknowledge a commitment to assisting employees maintain a healthy balance between work and family life by including a reference to work and family issues in the organizational mission statement. This is a simple and inexpensive way to transmit a positive staff culture, yet only nine agencies in this study indicated the inclusion of such a reference in the

mission statement. While it appears that agencies are taking steps to enhance the support of programs from the officer's perspective, they seem to fall short in addressing family issues and including the family to a great degree. Results obtained from the survey indicate that correctional agencies are less likely to proactively try to sell programs to family members by providing them with information on the potential benefits of programs to family members. Also of the 15 steps for facilitation presented in the survey, "increase the number of family programs offered" ranked last in terms of actions correctional agencies took to facilitate the development, awareness and acceptance of programs.

Correctional organizations could benefit from empirical evidence that identifies the value of the programs and services made available to officers and their family members. Unfortunately, based on the results obtained in this study, it appears that almost no agencies conduct impact studies nor plan to do so in the future. Only a little more than one half of the agencies reported even keeping any form of program utilization statistics. Without such information the real value of programs can not be clearly identified. The lack of this information also impedes the development of effective programs and can makes it difficult to encourage agencies to adopt policies that include services for families.

The goal of the national survey presented in this report was to identify the extent and nature of organizational support programs for correctional officers and their family members and add to the knowledge of correctional officers' and family members' stress. This study provides information from an organizational perspective. A complement to this work would be an investigation of support services from officers' and family members' perspectives.

For correctional officers the organization has been identified as a major source of stress (Finn, 1998). Therefore, it makes sense to investigate what steps organizations are taking and can take to promote a healthier workplace. It may not be possible to eliminate all workplace stress for officers. Given the nature of the job, it appears that stress may be an inherent part of the correctional

officer's occupation. However it may be possible that through the development and implementation of organizational programs for officers and their family members that correctional agencies can promote healthier organizations. Unhealthy work environments can have a significant human and financial cost.

The development of healthy workplaces in corrections is not a simple process nor just an organizational challenge. The challenge falls upon all stake holders and includes officers, family members, union representatives, administrators, supervisors and service providers. It appears that the ultimate challenge is to create an organizational culture that promotes well-being, in which employees are viewed as assets and given an opportunity and support to be productive. As indicated by the results presented in this report, correctional agencies have begun to make some progress in addressing officer well-being. It appears however that not all agencies have reached the same level of progress, and many agencies need to give greater attention to the inclusion of the officer's family as a potential ally in addressing the issues.

References

- American Correctionla Association (2001). 2001 directory of adult and juvenile correctional department, institutions, agencies and probation and parole authorities. Lanham, Maryland: Author.
- Bahn, Charles. (1984). Police socialization in the eighties: Strains in the forging of an occupational identity. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 12.
- Barton, J. (1994). Choosing to work at night: A moderating influence o individual tolerance to shift work.. Journal of applied Psychology, 79, 449-454.
- Bartol, C.R., & Bartol, A.M. (1994). Psychology and law. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Blau, T.H. (1994). Psychological services for law enforcement. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Brodsky, C.M. (1982). Work stress in correctional institutions. Journal of Prison andJail Health, 2(2), 74-102.
- Cascio, W.F. (1997). Costing human resources: The financial impact of behavior in organization. Boston, MA: PSW-Kent.
- Delprino. R.P., O'Quin, R.K., & Kennedy, C.L. (1997). Identification of work and family services for law enforcement personnel. (NCJ Publication Number 171645). United States Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- DeWolf, C. J, & Winnubst, J.M. (1987). Stress in the working situation. In B.M. Bass, P.D. Drenth, & P. Weissenberg (Eds.), Advances in organizational psychology: An international review (pp. 43-57). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Dwyer, D.J., & Ganster, D.C. (1991). The effects of job demands and control on employee attendance and satisfaction, Journal of Organizational Behavior, 12, 595-608.
- Feldman D.C. (1977). The role of initiation activities in socialization. Human Relations, 30, 977-990.
- Finn, P., & Esselman Tomz, J. (1997). Developing a law enforcement stress program for officers and their families. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Finn, P. (1998). Correctional officer stress: a cause for concern and additional help. Federal Probation, 65-74.
- Finn, P. (2001). Addressing correctional officer stress programs and strategies: Issues and practices. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Friedman, D.E., & Galinsky, E. (1992). Work and family issues: a legitimate business concern. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), Work, families, and organizations, pp. 168-207. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Greenhaus, J.H. & Beutell, N.J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. Academy of Management Review, 10, 76-88.

Grossi, E.L., Keil, T.J., & Vito, G.F. (1996). Surviving the joint: Mitigating factors or correctional officer stress. Journal of Crime and Justice, 14 (2), 103-120.

Hepburn, J.R., & Knepper, P.E. (1993). Correctional officers as human service workers: The effect on job satisfaction. Justice Quarterly, 10 (2), 315-335.

Huse, E.F., & Cummings, T.G. (1985). Organizational development and change. New York, NY: West.

Jenkins, J.M. (1993). Self-monitoring and turnover: The impact of personality on intent to leave. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 14, 83-91.

Jex, S.M. (1998). Stress and job performance. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kinsell, L.W., & Shelden, R.G. (1981). A survey of correctional officers at a medium security prison. Corrections Today, 40-43, 46-51.

Klarreich, S.H., Diguseppe, R., & Dimattia, D.J. (1987). Cost effectiveness of an employee assistance program with rational-emotive therapy. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18, 140-144.

Koslowsky, M. (1991). A longitudinal analysis of job satisfaction, commitment, and intention to leave. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 40, 405-415.

Launay, G.L., & Fielding, P.J. (1989). Stress among prison officers: Some empirical evidence based on self report. The Howard Journal, 28 (2), 138-147.

Louis, M.R., Posner, B.Z., & Powell, G.N. (1983). The availability and helpfulness of socialization practices. Personnel Psychology, 36, 857-866.

Loman, R.L. (1997). Counseling and psychotherapy of work dysfunctions. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Mayes, B.T., & Ganster, D.C. (1988). Exit and voice: A test of hypotheses based on flight responses to job stress. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 9, 199-216.

Mowday, R.T., Koberg, C.S., & McArthur, A.W. (1984). The psychology of the withdrawal process: A cross-validation test of Mobley's intermediate linkage model of turnover in tempo samples. Academy of Management Journal, 27, 79-94.

Murphy, L.R., & Schoenborn, T.F. (Eds.). (1989). Stress management in work settings. New York: Praeger.

Quick, J.C., Quick, J.D., Nelson, D.L., & Hurrell, J.J. (1997). Preventive stress management in organizations. American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Reese, J.T. (1995). A history of police psychological services. In M.I. Kurke, & E.M. Scrivner (Eds.), Police psychology in the 21st century (pp. 31-44). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Shore, L.M., Newton, L.A., & Thornton, G.C. (1990). Job and organizational attitudes in relation to employee behavioral intentions. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 11, 57-67.

Slate, R.N., Vogel, R.E., & Johnson, W.W. (2001). To quit or not to quit: Perceptions of participation in correctional decision making and the impact of organizational stress. Corrections Management Quarterly, 5(2), 68-78.

Staff hiring and retention. (2001). Correction Compendium, 26, 6-22.

Thomas, L.T. & Ganster, D.C. (1995). Impact of family-supportive work variables on work-family conflict and strain: A control perspective. Journal of Applied Psychology, 80, 6-15.

Weiner, B. (1986). Confidentiality and the legal issues raised by the psychological evaluation of law enforcement officers. In J.T. Reese, & H.A. Goldstein (Eds.), Psychological services for law enforcement. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

TABLES

Table 1
Characteristics of Officers for All Agencies

Gender	Ethnic Group				Rank	
	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	Supervisory	Non-Supervisory
All Agencies (n=76)						
Female						
<u>n</u> ^a	62	63	57	58	55	60
<u>M</u>	407	361	71	15	66	848
<u>SD</u>	681	659	226	30	99	1480
Male						
<u>n</u> ^a	62	62	58	59	55	60
<u>M</u>	1952	533	283	65	377	2555
<u>SD</u>	3237	802	827	167	562	4228

Note. Values of Means and Standard Deviations are rounded to nearest whole number.
^a The number of agencies that responded to the item.

Table 2
Characteristics of Officers Based on Type of Agency

Gender	Ethnic Group				Rank	
	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	Supervisory	Non-Supervisory
Adult Agencies (n=36)						
Female						
<u>n</u> ^a	33	33	30	31	26	30
<u>M</u>	634	566	124	25	102	1305
<u>SD</u>	847	831	303	38	126	1855
Male						
<u>n</u> ^a	33	33	29	32	26	30
<u>M</u>	3187	822	531	111	605	4260
<u>SD</u>	3856	965	1122	218	674	5234
Juvenile Agencies (n=29)						
Female						
<u>n</u> ^a	23	24	21	21	22	23
<u>M</u>	75	81	12	4	19	161
<u>SD</u>	84	155	25	5	28	216
Male						
<u>n</u> ^a	23	23	22	21	22	23
<u>M</u>	146	123	33	8	59	273
<u>SD</u>	143	185	78	11	73	299
Adult and Juvenile Agencies (n=10)						
Female						
<u>n</u> ^a	6	6	6	6	7	7
<u>M</u>	430	351	10	5	79	2748
<u>SD</u>	436	453	15	5	73	1337
Male						
<u>n</u> ^a	6	6	7	6	7	7
<u>M</u>	2084	523	40	19	533	2748
<u>SD</u>	2733	638	69	20	555	2915

Note. Values of Means and Standard Deviations are rounded to nearest whole number. One respondent did not identify agency by type.

^aThe number of agencies that responded to the item.

Table 3
Characteristics of Officers Based on Size of Agency

Gender	Ethnic Group				Rank	
	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	Supervisory	Non-Supervisory
Group 1 (31 to 220 Officers, n=16)						
Female						
<u>n^a</u>	15	15	13	13	14	15
<u>M</u>	21	12	1	4	6	34
<u>SD</u>	16	19	3	7	4	18
Male						
<u>n^a</u>	15	15	14	13	14	15
<u>M</u>	54	23	4	17	16	81
<u>SD</u>	46	30	5	42	12	43
Group 2 (309 to 941 Officers, n=22)						
Female						
<u>n^a</u>	14	14	14	14	15	15
<u>M</u>	105	53	12	4	16	177
<u>SD</u>	64	84	18	5	12	103
Male						
<u>n^a</u>	14	14	14	14	15	15
<u>M</u>	294	93	63	11	74	439
<u>SD</u>	169	113	149	17	32	190
Group 3 (1,014 to 3,745 Officers, n=18)						
Female						
<u>n^a</u>	15	15	13	13	9	12
<u>M</u>	260	241	27	15	39	516
<u>SD</u>	153	338	42	16	41	354
Male						
<u>n^a</u>	15	15	13	14	9	12
<u>M</u>	1110	270	107	56	166	1272
<u>SD</u>	739	236	143	71	118	437

Table 3 continued:

Gender	Ethnic Group				Rank	
	White	Black	Hispanic	Other	Supervisory	Non-Supervisory
Group 4 (4,199 to 25,945 Officers, n=18)						
Female						
<u>n</u> ^a	17	17	16	17	16	17
<u>M</u>	1136	988	218	34	167	2345
<u>SD</u>	968	934	395	48	119	2106
Male						
<u>n</u> ^a	17	17	16	17	16	17
<u>M</u>	5745	1519	879	156	1054	7464
<u>SD</u>	4208	904	1426	287	607	5378

Note. Values of Means and Standard Deviations are rounded to nearest whole number. Two respondents did not identify the number of officers who work for their agencies.

^aThe number of agencies that responded to the item.

Table 4
Ratio of Correctional Officer Per Number of Inmates, Turnover Rate And Average Retirement By Type of Agency

Type of Agency	n ^a	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Ratio of Officer Per Number of Inmates			
Adult	34	5.25	2.20
Juvenile	29	6.09	3.63
Adult and Juvenile	9	5.86	3.11
Turnover Rate of Officers			
Adult	30	14.17	.10
Juvenile	18	24.95	.13
Adult and Juvenile	8	20.89	.12
Average Number Retirements of Officers			
Adult	14	38.36	54.73
Juvenile	13	17.42	35.84
Adult and Juvenile	6	57.67	65.01

Note. Turnover rate is recorded as mean percentage.

^a The number of agencies that responded to the item.

Table 5
Ratio of Correction Officer Per Number of Inmates, Correction Officer Turnover Rate And
Average Retirement by Size of Agency

Size of Agency	n ^a	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Ratio of Officer Per Number of Inmates			
Group 1	16	6.72	2.89
Group 2	21	5.33	3.92
Group 3	17	5.81	2.18
Group 4	18	5.09	2.28
Turnover Rate of Officers			
Group 1	7	22.10	.09
Group 2	17	23.77	.12
Group 3	14	13.44	.11
Group 4	17	16.06	.13
Average Number Retirements of Officers			
Group 1	7	1.57	.79
Group 2	10	22.85	39.69
Group 3	6	22.00	25.56
Group 4	10	131.00	167.80

Note. Turnover rate is recorded as mean percentage. Group 1 represents agencies with 31 to 220 officers, Group 2 represents agencies with 309 to 941 officers, Group 3 represents agencies with 1,014 to 3,745 officers, Group 4 represents agencies with 4,199 to 25,945 officers.

^a The number of agencies that responded to the item.

Table 6
Stage of Employment When Officers Leaves Organization.

Category	Time with Organization									
	1 st year Percentage	n ^a	2 nd year Percentage	n ^a	3 rd year Percentage	n ^a	4 th year Percentage	n ^a	5 th year or more Percentage	n ^a
Total	45.8	27	25.4	15	8.5	5	3.4	2	16.9	10
Adult	59.3	16	22.2	6	-	0	3.7	1	14.8	4
Juvenile	30.4	7	26.1	6	21.7	5	4.3	1	17.4	4
Adult and Juvenile	44.4	4	33.3	3	-	0	-	0	22.2	2
Group 1	14.3	2	42.9	6	21.4	3	7.1	1	14.3	2
Group 2	50.0	9	27.8	5	11.1	2	-	0	11.1	2
Group 3	63.6	7	27.3	3	-	0	9.1	1	-	0
Group 4	60.0	9	6.7	1	-	0	-	0	33.3	5

Note. Group 1 represents agencies with 31 to 220 officers, Group 2 represents agencies with 309 to 941 officers, Group 3 represents agencies with 1,014 to 3,745 officers, Group 4 represents agencies with 4,199 to 25,945 officers.

*The number of agencies that responded to the item.

Table 7

Primary Reasons Why Officers Leave the Organization

Reason	Frequency of Responses
1. Financial considerations	23
2. Retire	12
3. Work hours/overtime	11
4. Career change/ other employment	9
5. Relocation	9
6. Shifts	8
7. Decide that job is not for them	7
8. Lack of career opportunities	5
9. Stress	5
10. Personal considerations	5
11. Family considerations	5
12. Residential and commuting considerations	4
13. Dismissed (disciplinary removals)	4
14. Lack of support (problems with) supervisors	4
15. Advancement	3
16. Promotion	3
17. Health considerations	3
18. Not a clear understanding of job	2
19. Educational opportunities (return to school)	2
20. Failure in test period	2
21. Relocation of spouse/family	2
22. Unsatisfied	1
23. Burn out	1
24. Skills and abilities not used adequately	1
25. Staff conflicts	1
26. Lack of communication/feedback	1
27. Staff shortages	1
28. Job demands	1
29. Not certified	1
30. Dealing with offenders	1

Note. This table represents responses to item number 6 of the survey. 34 agencies provided 137 responses to this item. The 137 responses were categorized into the 30 reasons presented in this table.

Table 8

Availability of Programs for Officers and Family Members for All Agencies

Service	Total		
	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b
1. Employee Assistance Program (EAP)			
Provided: In-House	11	14.5	76
External	45	59.2	
Hybrid	15	19.7	
Total	71	93.4	
Provided: To Family Members	54	84.4	64
2. EAP specifically designed for corrections			
Provided: In-House	9	12.2	74
External	6	8.1	
Hybrid	7	9.5	
Total	22	29.8	
Provided: To Family Members	17	81.0	21
3. Counseling			
Provided: In-House	8	10.8	74
External	33	44.6	
Hybrid	19	25.7	
Total	60	81.1	
Provided: To Family Members	38	74.5	51
4. Child care on a 24-hour basis			
Provided: In-House	0	0	74
External	3	4.1	
Hybrid	0	0	
Total	3	4.1	
Provided: To Family Members	2	66.7	3
5. Marital support groups			
Provided: In-House	1	1.4	74
External	17	22.9	
Hybrid	2	2.7	
Total	20	27.0	
Provided: To Family Members	15	78.9	19
6. Child support groups			
Provided: In-House	1	1.4	73
External	14	19.2	
Hybrid	1	1.4	
Total	16	22.0	
Provided: To Family Members	12	75.0	16

Table 8 continued:

Service	Total		
	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b
7. Stress reduction programs			
Provided: In-House	17	23.6	72
External	13	18.1	
Hybrid	19	26.4	
Total	49	68.1	
Provided: To Family Members	16	35.6	45
8. Hypertension clinics			
Provided: In-House	1	1.4	72
External	10	13.9	
Hybrid	1	1.4	
Total	12	16.7	
Provided: To Family Members	5	41.7	12
9. Health and wellness program			
Provided: In-House	21	28.8	73
External	12	16.4	
Hybrid	17	23.3	
Total	50	68.5	
Provided: To Family Members	13	31.0	42
10. Group therapy			
Provided: In-House	2	2.7	74
External	18	24.3	
Hybrid	0	0	
Total	20	27.0	
Provided: To Family Members	12	63.2	19
11. Post-inmate assault counseling			
Provided: In-House	19	26.0	73
External	17	23.3	
Hybrid	24	32.9	
Total	60	82.2	
Provided: To Family Members	28	52.8	53
12. Counseling for officer who carried out capital punishment			
Provided: In-House	13	20.3	64
External	6	9.4	
Hybrid	8	12.5	
Total	27	42.2	
Provided: To Family Members	10	41.7	24

Table 8 continued:

Service	Total		
	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b
13. Training/seminars on domestic violence			
Provided: In-House	13	17.8	73
External	5	6.8	
Hybrid	13	17.8	
Total	31	42.5	
Provided: To Family Members	6	19.4	31
14. Stress education for C.O. recruits			
Provided: In-House	33	45.2	73
External	5	6.8	
Hybrid	7	9.6	
Total	45	61.6	
Provided: To Family Members	3	7.9	38
15. Stress education for officers on the job			
Provided: In-House	26	36.1	72
External	5	6.9	
Hybrid	16	22.2	
Total	47	65.3	
Provided: To Family Members	8	20.0	40
16. Critical incident response on a 24-hour basis			
Provided: In-House	37	48.7	76
External	3	3.9	
Hybrid	13	17.1	
Total	53	69.7	
Provided: To Family Members	19	44.2	43
17. Correctional officer crisis telephone service on a 24-hour basis			
Provided: In-House	9	12.0	75
External	13	17.3	
Hybrid	5	6.7	
Total	27	36.0	
Provided: To Family Members	21	87.5	24
18. Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus.			
Provided: In-House	25	33.3	75
External	18	24.0	
Hybrid	16	21.3	
Total	59	78.7	
Provided: To Family Members	19	39.6	48

Table 8 continued:

Service	Total		
	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b
19. Peer support			
Provided: In-House	37	49.3	75
External	3	4.0	
Hybrid	4	5.3	
Total	44	58.7	
Provided: To Family Members	7	21.1	33
20. Short-term counseling (under 6 months) related to personnel killed in the line of duty			
Provided: In-House	8	10.8	74
External	23	31.1	
Hybrid	15	20.3	
Total	46	62.2	
Provided: To Family Members	30	71.4	42
21. Long-term (6 months or more) counseling related to personnel killed in the line of duty			
Provided: In-House	2	2.7	73
External	23	31.5	
Hybrid	7	9.6	
Total	32	43.8	
Provided: To Family Members	21	72.4	29
22. Family issues related to firearm safety			
Provided: In-House	8	11.1	72
External	2	2.8	
Hybrid	0	0	
Total	10	13.9	
Provided: To Family Members	2	20.0	10
23. Seminars on alcohol, drug use, gambling, or overeating			
Provided: In-House	11	14.7	75
External	21	28.0	
Hybrid	11	14.7	
Total	43	57.3	
Provided: To Family Members	13	37.1	35
24. Programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits			
Provided: In-House	18	24.3	74
External	8	10.8	
Hybrid	2	2.7	
Total	28	37.8	
Provided: To Family Members	10	40.0	25

Table 8 continued:

Service	Total		
	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b
25. Programs geared toward work and family issues throughout an officer's career			
Provided: In-House	14	18.9	74
External	9	12.2	
Hybrid	5	6.8	
Total	28	37.8	
Provided: To Family Members	12	46.2	26
26. Mental health treatment provided independently by health insurance			
Provided: In-House	5	6.7	75
External	57	76.0	
Hybrid	7	9.3	
Total	69	92.0	
Provided: To Family Members	48	85.7	56
27. Exercise facilities			
Provided: In-House	42	56.8	74
External	1	1.4	
Hybrid	3	4.1	
Total	46	62.2	
Provided: To Family Members	10	24.4	41
28. Time off during work to use exercise facilities			
Provided: In-House	5	6.8	74
External	0	0	
Hybrid	1	1.4	
Total	6	8.1	
Provided: To Family Members	1	14.3	7
29. Programs pertaining to the diagnosis/treatment of organizational stress			
Provided: In-House	16	21.9	73
External	7	9.6	
Hybrid	9	12.3	
Total	32	43.8	
Provided: To Family Members	6	27.3	22
30. Family orientation programs			
Provided: In-House	16	21.9	73
External	1	1.4	
Hybrid	3	4.1	
Total	20	27.4	
Provided: To Family Members	16	84.2	19

Table 8 continued:

Service	Total		
	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b
31. Flexible work scheduling			
Provided: In-House	35	47.9	73
External	0	0	
Hybrid	3	4.1	
Total	38	52.1	
Provided: To Family Members	5	19.2	26

Note. **In-House** is defined as the service exists as a separate unit within the agency or as a special operation of an existing unit. **External** is defined as services are provided by an individual or group under contract with the agency. **Hybrid** is defined as a combination of in-house and external programs, for instance a program that is overseen by a department employee that also uses some contracted external sources for services. **To Family Members** is defined as those agencies that officer the service and also make it available to family members. Figures presented in the **Percentage** column are rounded to the nearest tenth.

^a Percentage of responses

^b Number of agencies that responded to the item

Table 9

Availability of Programs for Officers and Family Members by Type of Agency

Service	Adult			Juvenile			Adult & Juvenile		
	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b
1. Employee Assistance Program (EAP)									
Provided: In-House	3	8.3	36	5	17.2	29	3	30.0	10
External	21	58.3		19	65.5		4	40.0	
Hybrid	10	27.8		2	6.9		3	30.0	
Total	34	94.4		26	89.7		10	100.0	
Provided: To Family Members	28	90.3	31	16	69.6	23	9	100.0	9
2. EAP specifically designed for corrections									
Provided: In-House	7	20.6	34	1	3.4	29	1	10.0	10
External	4	11.8		2	6.9		0	0	
Hybrid	1	2.9		3	10.3		3	30.0	
Total	12	35.3		6	20.7		4	40.0	
Provided: To Family Members	9	75.0	12	4	80.0	5	4	100.0	4
3. Counseling									
Provided: In-House	2	5.9	34	4	13.8	29	2	20.0	10
External	17	50.0		10	34.5		5	50.0	
Hybrid	10	29.4		6	20.7		3	30.0	
Total	29	85.3		20	69.0		10	100.0	
Provided: To Family Members	22	81.5	27	9	56.3	16	6	85.7	7
4. Child care on a 24-hour basis									
Provided: In-House	0	0	34	0	0	29	0	0	10
External	1	2.9		2	6.9		0	0	
Hybrid	0	0		0	0		0	0	
Total	1	2.9		2	6.9		0	0	
Provided: To Family Members	0	0	1	2	100	2	0	0	0

Table 9 continued

Service	Adult			Juvenile			Adult & Juvenile		
	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b
5. Marital support groups									
Provided: In-House	0	0	34	1	3.4	29	0	0	10
External	12	35.3		4	13.8		1	10.0	
Hybrid	2	5.9		0	0		0	0	
Total	14	41.2		5	17.2		1	10.0	
Provided: To Family Members	11	78.6	14	3	75.0	4	1	100.0	1
6. Child support groups									
Provided: In-House	0	0	33	1	3.4	29	0	0	10
External	10	30.3		3	10.3		1	10.0	
Hybrid	1	3.0		0	0		0	0	
Total	11	33.3		4	13.8		1	10.0	
Provided: To Family Members	9	75.0	12	2	66.7	3	1	100.0	1
7. Stress reduction programs									
Provided: In-House	9	27.3	33	5	17.9	28	3	30.0	10
External	5	15.2		6	21.4		2	20.0	
Hybrid	11	33.3		5	17.9		3	30.0	
Total	25	75.8		16	57.1		8	80.0	
Provided: To Family Members	11	42.3	26	3	23.1	13	2	33.3	6
8. Hypertension clinics									
Provided: In-House	0	0	34	1	3.6	28	0	0	10
External	8	23.5		2	7.1		0	0	
Hybrid	0	0		1	3.6		0	0	
Total	8	23.5		4	14.3		0	0	
Provided: To Family Members	5	55.6	9	3	100.0	3	0	0	0
9. Health and wellness program									
Provided: In-House	8	18.6	43	7	25.0	28	5	50.0	10
External	6	14.0		5	17.9		1	10.0	
Hybrid	10	23.3		5	17.9		2	20.0	
Total	24	55.8		17	60.7		8	80.0	
Provided: To Family Members	9	39.1	23	3	23.1	13	1	20.0	5

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 9 continued

Service	Adult			Juvenile			Adult & Juvenile		
	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b
10. Group therapy									
Provided: In-House	1	2.9	34	0	0	29	1	10.0	10
External	14	41.2		3	10.3		1	10.0	
Hybrid	0	0		0	0		0	0	
Total	15	44.1		3	10.3		2	20.0	
Provided: To Family Members	10	66.7	15	1	50.0	2	1	50.0	2
11. Post-inmate assault counseling									
Provided: In-House	9	25.7	35	5	18.5	27	5	50.0	10
External	11	31.4		6	22.2		0	0	
Hybrid	12	34.3		6	22.2		5	50.0	
Total	32	91.4		17	63.0		10	100.0	
Provided: To Family Members	19	65.5	29	5	33.3	15	4	50.0	8
12. Counseling for officer who carried out capital punishment									
Provided: In-House	10	32.3	31	1	4.2	24	2	25.0	10
External	5	16.1		0	0		0	0	
Hybrid	6	19.4		0	0		2	25.0	
Total	21	67.7		1	4.2		4	50.0	
Provided: To Family Members	9	50.0	18	0	0	2	1	33.3	3
13. Training/seminars on domestic violence									
Provided: In-House	6	17.6	34	5	17.9	28	2	20.0	10
External	2	5.9		3	10.7		0	0	
Hybrid	7	20.6		4	14.3		2	20.0	
Total	15	44.1		12	42.9		4	40.0	
Provided: To Family Members	4	25.0	16	1	8.3	12	1	33.3	3
14. Stress education for C.O. recruits									
Provided: In-House	19	52.8	36	6	22.2	27	7	70.0	10
External	1	2.8		3	11.1		1	10.0	
Hybrid	3	8.3		4	14.8		0	0	
Total	23	63.9		13	48.1		8	80.0	
Provided: To Family Members	3	14.3	21	0	0	9	0	0	7

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 9 continued

Service	Adult			Juvenile			Adult & Juvenile		
	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b
15. Stress education for officers on the job									
Provided: In-House	14	38.9	36	6	23.1	26	6	66.7	9
External	1	2.8		3	11.5		0	0	
Hybrid	11	30.6		5	19.2		0	0	
Total	26	72.2		14	53.8		6	66.7	
Provided: To Family Members	8	36.4	22	0	0	11	0	0	6
16. Critical incident response on a 24-hour basis									
Provided: In-House	19	52.8	36	11	37.9	29	7	70.0	10
External	2	5.6		1	3.4		0	0	
Hybrid	7	19.4		3	10.3		2	20.0	
Total	28	77.8		15	51.7		9	90.0	
Provided: To Family Members	14	58.3	24	2	18.2	11	3	42.9	7
17. Correctional officer crisis telephone service on a 24-hour basis									
Provided: In-House	5	13.9	36	1	3.6	28	3	30.0	10
External	9	25.0		2	7.1		1	10.0	
Hybrid	3	8.3		1	3.6		1	10.0	
Total	17	47.2		4	14.3		5	50.0	
Provided: To Family Members	14	87.5	16	3	100.0	3	3	75.0	4
18. Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus.									
Provided: In-House	12	33.3	36	6	21.4	28	7	70.0	10
External	8	22.2		8	28.6		1	10.0	
Hybrid	10	27.8		4	14.3		2	20.0	
Total	30	83.3		18	64.3		10	100.0	
Provided: To Family Members	13	52.0	25	4	26.7	15	2	28.6	7
19. Peer support									
Provided: In-House	17	48.6	35	11	37.9	29	8	80.0	10
External	2	5.7		1	3.4		0	0	
Hybrid	3	8.6		1	3.4		0	0	
Total	22	62.9		13	44.8		8	80.0	
Provided: To Family Members	7	35.0	20	0	0	7	0	0	5

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 9 continued

Service	Adult			Juvenile			Adult & Juvenile		
	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b
20. Short-term counseling (under 6 months) related to personnel killed in the line of duty									
Provided: In-House	3	8.3	36	3	11.1	27	2	20.0	10
External	14	38.9		4	14.8		4	40.0	
Hybrid	9	25.0		4	14.8		2	20.0	
Total	26	72.2		11	40.7		8	80.0	
Provided: To Family Members	18	75.0	24	5	50.0	10	7	100.0	7
21. Long-term (6 months or more) counseling related to personnel killed in the line of duty									
Provided: In-House	0	0	36	1	3.7	27	1	10.0	10
External	15	41.7		4	14.8		4	40.0	
Hybrid	4	11.1		3	11.1		0	0	
Total	19	52.8		8	29.6		5	50.0	
Provided: To Family Members	13	72.2	18	3	50.0	6	5	100.0	5
22. Family issues related to firearm safety									
Provided: In-House	5	14.3	35	0	0	26	3	30.0	10
External	5	14.3		0	0		0	0	
Hybrid	0	0		0	0		0	0	
Total	10	28.6		0	0		3	30.0	
Provided: To Family Members	2	33.3	6	0	0	1	0	0	3
23. Seminars on alcohol, drug use, gambling, or overeating									
Provided: In-House	7	20.0	35	3	10.3	29	1	10.0	10
External	10	28.6		7	24.1		4	40.0	
Hybrid	4	11.4		5	17.2		2	20.0	
Total	21	60.0		15	51.7		7	70.0	
Provided: To Family Members	9	47.4	19	3	30.0	10	7	16.7	6
24. Programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits									
Provided: In-House	11	31.4	35	4	14.3	28	3	30.0	10
External	6	17.1		2	7.1		0	0	
Hybrid	1	2.9		1	3.6		0	0	
Total	18	51.4		7	25.0		3	30.0	
Provided: To Family Members	7	38.9	18	2	40.0	5	1	50.0	2

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 9 continued

Service	Adult			Juvenile			Adult & Juvenile		
	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b
25. Programs geared toward work and family issues throughout an officer's career									
Provided: In-House	8	22.9	35	3	10.7	28	3	30.0	10
External	4	11.4		3	10.7		1	10.0	
Hybrid	3	8.6		2	7.1		0	0	
Total	15	42.9		8	28.6		4	40.0	
Provided: To Family Members	6	40.0	15	4	57.1	7	2	66.7	3
26. Mental health treatment provided independently by health insurance									
Provided: In-House	3	8.3	36	1	3.6	28	1	10.0	10
External	27	75.0		22	78.6		7	70.0	
Hybrid	4	11.1		2	7.1		1	10.0	
Total	34	94.4		25	89.3		9	90.0	
Provided: To Family Members	27	90.0	30	16	80.0	20	4	80.0	5
27. Exercise facilities									
Provided: In-House	19	54.3	35	13	46.4	28	9	90.0	10
External	1	2.9		0	0		0	0	
Hybrid	2	5.7		1	3.6		0	0	
Total	22	62.9		14	50.0		9	90.0	
Provided: To Family Members	4	19.0	21	6	50.0	12	0	0	7
28. Time off during work to use exercise facilities									
Provided: In-House	3	8.6	35	2	7.1	28	0	0	10
External	0	0		0	0		0	0	
Hybrid	0	0		1	3.6		0	0	
Total	3	8.6		3	10.7		0	0	
Provided: To Family Members	0	0	4	1	33.3	3	0	0	0
29. Programs pertaining to the diagnosis/treatment of organizational stress									
Provided: In-House	6	17.0	35	4	14.8	27	5	50.0	10
External	4	11.4		2	7.4		1	10.0	
Hybrid	3	8.6		3	11.1		3	30.0	
Total	13	37.1		9	33.3		9	90.0	
Provided: To Family Members	5	50.0	10	1	14.3	7	0	0	4

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 9 continued

Service	Adult			Juvenile			Adult & Juvenile		
	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b
30. Family orientation programs									
Provided: In-House	9	27.3	33	2	7.1	28	5	50.0	10
External	1	3.0		0	0		0	0	
Hybrid	2	6.1		1	3.6		0	0	
Total	12	36.4		3	10.7		5	50.0	
Provided: To Family Members	10	83.3	12	3	100.0	3	3	75.0	4
31. Flexible work scheduling to met family demands									
Provided: In-House	15	42.9	35	15	55.6	27	5	50.0	10
External	0	0		0	0		0	0	
Hybrid	1	2.9		2	7.4		0	0	
Total	16	45.7		17	63.0		5	50.0	
Provided: To Family Members	1	8.3	12	2	18.2	11	2	66.7	3

Note. **In-House** is defined as the service exists as a separate unit within the agency or as a special operation of an existing unit. **External** is defined as services are provided by an individual or group under contract with the agency. **Hybrid** is defined as a combination of in-house and external programs, for instance a program that is overseen by a department employee that also uses some contracted external sources for services. **To Family Members** is defined as those agencies that officer the service and also make it available to family members. Figures presented in the **Percentage** column are rounded to the nearest tenth..

^a Percentage of responses

^b Number of agencies that responded to the item

Table 10

Availability of Programs for Officers and Family Members by Size of Agency

Service	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		Group 4					
	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b				
1. Employee Assistance Program (EAP)												
Provided: In-House	3	18.8	16	3	13.6	22	3	16.7	18	2	11.1	18
External	10	62.5	14	14	63.6	22	9	50.0	18	10	55.6	18
Hybrid	0	0	4	4	18.2	6	5	27.8	6	6	33.3	6
Total	13	81.3	21	21	95.5	17	17	94.4	18	18	100.0	18
Provided: To Family Members	7	63.6	11	16	84.2	19	14	87.5	16	16	94.1	17
2. EAP specifically designed for corrections												
Provided: In-House	0	0	22	2	9.1	22	5	29.4	17	2	11.8	17
External	2	12.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	23.5	4
Hybrid	0	0	4	4	18.2	0	0	0	3	3	17.6	3
Total	2	12.5	6	6	27.3	5	5	29.4	9	9	52.9	9
Provided: To Family Members	0	0	1	6	100	6	4	100.0	4	7	70.0	10
3. Counseling												
Provided: In-House	3	18.8	16	2	9.5	21	3	17.6	17	0	0	18
External	10	62.5	4	4	19.0	6	6	35.3	13	13	72.2	13
Hybrid	2	12.5	8	8	38.1	4	4	23.5	3	3	16.7	3
Total	15	93.8	14	14	66.7	13	13	76.5	16	16	88.9	16
Provided: To Family Members	6	50.0	12	9	81.8	11	8	80.0	10	15	83.3	16
4. Child care on a 24-hour basis												
Provided: In-House	0	0	16	0	0	22	0	0	18	0	0	18
External	0	0	2	2	9.1	1	1	5.6	0	0	0	0
Hybrid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	0	0	2	2	9.1	1	1	5.6	0	0	0	0
Provided: To Family Members	0	0	0	2	100.0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0
5. Marital support groups												
Provided: In-House	1	6.3	16	0	0	22	0	0	17	0	0	17
External	1	6.3	3	3	13.6	3	3	17.6	8	8	47.1	8
Hybrid	0	0	1	1	4.5	1	1	5.9	0	0	0	0
Total	2	12.5	4	4	18.2	4	4	23.5	8	8	47.1	8
Provided: To Family Members	1	50.0	2	3	100	3	3	100.0	3	7	77.8	9

This document is a research report submitted to the U.S. Department of Justice. This report has not been published by the Department. Opinions or points of view expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

Table 10 continued

Service	Group 1			Group 2			Group 3			Group 4		
	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b		Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b		Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b		Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b	
6. Child support groups												
Provided: In-House	0	0	16	1	4.5	22	0	0	17	0	0	16
External	1	6.3		2	9.1		3	17.6		7	43.8	
Hybrid	0	0		0	0		1	5.9		0	0	
Total	1	6.3		3	13.6		4	23.5		7	43.8	
Provided: To Family Members	1	100.0	1	2	100.0	2	2	66.7	3	7	77.8	9
7. Stress reduction programs												
Provided: In-House	5	31.3	16	2	9.5	21	7	41.2	17	2	12.5	16
External	2	12.5		5	23.8		1	5.9		4	25.0	
Hybrid	2	12.5		6	28.6		4	23.5		7	43.8	
Total	9	56.3		13	61.9		12	70.6		13	81.3	
Provided: To Family Members	2	25.0	8	2	20.0	10	3	30.0	10	8	53.3	15
8. Hypertension clinics												
Provided: In-House	0	0	16	1	4.8	21	0	0	17	0	0	16
External	1	6.3		2	9.5		3	17.6		4	25.0	
Hybrid	1	6.3		0	0		0	0		0	0	
Total	2	12.5		3	14.3		3	17.6		4	25.0	
Provided: To Family Members	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	100	2	3	50.0	6
9. Health and wellness program												
Provided: In-House	5	31.3	16	6	28.6	21	5	29.4	17	5	29.4	17
External	1	6.3		6	28.6		1	5.9		4	23.5	
Hybrid	2	12.5		4	19.0		3	17.6		6	35.3	
Total	8	50.0		16	76.2		9	52.9		15	88.2	
Provided: To Family Members	2	28.6	7	3	27.3	11	2	28.6	7	6	40.0	15
10. Group therapy												
Provided: In-House	0	0	16	0	0	22	0	0	17	2	11.8	17
External	1	6.3		2	9.1		5	29.4		8	47.1	
Hybrid	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
Total	1	6.3		2	9.1		5	29.4		10	58.8	
Provided: To Family Members	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	75.0	4	7	63.6	11

Table 10 continued

Service	Group 1			Group 2			Group 3			Group 4		
	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a	n ^b
11. Post-inmate assault counseling												
Provided: In-House	3	18.8	16	6	30.0	20	6	33.3	18	4	22.2	18
External	5	31.3		2	10.0		2	11.1		7	38.9	
Hybrid	4	25.0		8	40.0		5	27.8		7	38.9	
Total	12	75.0		16	80.0		13	72.2		18	100.0	
Provided: To Family Members	1	10.0	10	9	60.0	15	6	60.0	10	11	68.8	16
12. Counseling for officer who carried out capital punishment												
Provided: In-House	0	0	16	3	17.6	17	5	38.5	13	4	22.2	18
External	0	0		0	0		0	0		6	33.3	
Hybrid	0	0		2	11.8		1	7.7		5	27.8	
Total	0	0		5	29.4		6	46.2		15	83.3	
Provided: To Family Members	0	0	0	1	25.0	4	2	40.0	5	7	50.0	14
13. Training/seminars on domestic violence												
Provided: In-House	1	6.3	16	5	23.8	21	4	23.5	17	3	17.6	17
External	3	18.8		1	4.8		1	5.9		0	0	
Hybrid	3	18.8		2	9.5		1	5.9		6	35.3	
Total	7	43.8		8	38.1		6	35.3		9	52.9	
Provided: To Family Members	0	0	7	2	28.6	7	1	16.7	6	3	30.0	10
14. Stress education for C.O. recruits												
Provided: In-House	6	37.5	16	5	25.0	20	9	50.0	18	13	72.2	18
External	1	6.3		2	10.0		2	11.1		0	0	
Hybrid	4	25.0		1	5.0		0	0		2	11.1	
Total	11	68.8		8	40.0		11	61.1		15	83.3	
Provided: To Family Members	0	0	8	0	0	7	0	0	9	3	21.4	14
15. Stress education for officers on the job												
Provided: In-House	6	37.5	16	4	22.2	18	7	38.9	18	9	50.0	18
External	1	6.3		2	11.1		1	5.6		1	5.6	
Hybrid	3	18.8		5	27.8		2	11.1		6	33.3	
Total	10	62.5		11	61.1		10	55.6		16	88.9	
Provided: To Family Members	0	0	8	1	10.0	10	2	25.0	8	5	35.7	14

Table 10 continued

Service	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		Group 4					
	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b				
16. Critical incident response on a 24-hour basis												
Provided: In-House	7	43.8	16	11	50.0	22	9	50.0	18	10	55.6	18
External	1	6.3		0	0		0	0		2	11.1	
Hybrid	2	12.5		2	9.1		3	16.7		5	27.8	
Total	10	62.5		13	59.1		12	66.7		17	94.4	
Provided: To Family Members	0	0	7	5	50.0	10	4	40.0	10	10	66.7	15
17. Correctional officer crisis telephone service on a 24-hour basis												
Provided: In-House	0	0	16	3	14.3	21	4	22.2	18	2	11.1	18
External	0	0		1	4.8		4	22.2		7	38.9	
Hybrid	0	0		3	14.3		0	0		2	11.1	
Total	0	0		7	33.3		8	44.4		11	61.1	
Provided: To Family Members	0	0	0	5	100	5	5	71.4	7	10	90.9	11
18. Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus.												
Provided: In-House	5	31.3	16	6	27.3	22	6	33.3	18	8	44.4	18
External	2	12.5		6	27.3		3	16.7		7	38.9	
Hybrid	3	18.8		5	22.7		4	22.2		3	16.7	
Total	10	62.5		17	77.3		13	72.2		18	100.0	
Provided: To Family Members	3	33.3	9	4	30.8	13	4	44.4	9	8	50.0	16
19. Peer support												
Provided: In-House	8	50.0	16	9	40.9	22	11	61.1	18	8	47.1	17
External	0	0		1	4.5		1	5.6		1	5.9	
Hybrid	1	6.3		2	9.1		0	0		1	5.9	
Total	9	56.3		12	54.5		12	66.7		10	58.8	
Provided: To Family Members	0	0	6	1	14.3	7	3	33.3	9	3	27.3	11
20. Short-term counseling (under 6 months) related to personnel killed in the line of duty												
Provided: In-House	1	6.7	15	4	18.2	22	1	5.6	18	2	11.1	18
External	5	33.3		3	13.6		4	22.2		11	61.1	
Hybrid	3	20.0		3	13.6		5	27.8		3	16.7	
Total	9	60.0		10	45.5		10	55.6		16	88.9	
Provided: To Family Members	5	55.6	9	5	62.5	8	7	87.5	8	13	81.3	16

Table 10 continued

Service	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		Group 4					
	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b				
21. Long-term (6 months or more) counseling related to personnel killed in the line of duty												
Provided: In-House	0	0	15	2	9.1	22	0	0	18	0	0	18
External	4	26.7	4	4	18.2	5	5	27.8	18	9	52.9	18
Hybrid	3	20.0	1	1	4.5	3	3	16.7	0	0	0	0
Total	7	46.7	7	7	31.8	8	8	44.4	9	9	52.9	18
Provided: To Family Members	3	42.9	7	3	75.0	4	6	85.7	7	9	90.0	10
22. Family issues related to firearm safety												
Provided: In-House	2	13.3	16	1	4.8	22	1	5.6	18	4	23.5	18
External	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5.6	1	1	5.9	18
Hybrid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Total	2	13.3	1	1	4.8	2	2	11.1	5	5	29.4	18
Provided: To Family Members	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	100	1	1	16.7	6
23. Seminars on alcohol, drug use, gambling, or overeating												
Provided: In-House	2	12.5	16	1	4.5	22	5	27.8	18	2	11.8	17
External	4	25.0	6	6	27.3	4	4	22.2	6	6	35.3	17
Hybrid	4	25.0	3	3	13.6	0	0	0	4	4	23.5	17
Total	10	62.5	10	10	45.5	9	9	50.0	12	12	70.6	17
Provided: To Family Members	1	14.3	7	2	28.6	7	2	33.3	6	7	53.8	13
24. Programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits												
Provided: In-House	3	20.0	15	4	18.2	22	4	22.2	18	6	35.3	18
External	1	6.7	2	2	9.1	2	2	11.1	3	3	17.6	18
Hybrid	0	0	2	2	9.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Total	4	26.7	8	8	36.4	6	6	33.3	9	9	52.9	18
Provided: To Family Members	2	66.7	3	1	16.7	6	2	40.0	5	5	50.0	10
25. Programs geared toward work and family issues throughout an officer's career												
Provided: In-House	1	6.7	15	3	13.6	22	4	22.2	18	6	35.3	17
External	1	6.7	3	3	13.6	1	1	5.6	4	4	23.5	17
Hybrid	2	13.3	1	1	4.5	1	1	5.6	1	1	5.9	17
Total	4	26.7	7	7	31.8	6	6	33.3	11	11	64.7	17
Provided: To Family Members	3	100	3	1	16.7	6	2	40.0	5	6	50.0	12

Table 10 continued

Service	Group 1			Group 2			Group 3			Group 4		
	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b		Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b		Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b		Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b	
26. Mental health treatment provided independently by health insurance												
Provided: In-House	1	6.7	15	2	9.1	22	2	11.1	18	0	0	18
External	13	86.7		14	63.6		14	77.8		14	77.8	
Hybrid	1	6.7		2	9.1		0	0		4	22.2	
Total	15	100.0		18	81.8		16	88.9		18	100.0	
Provided: To Family Members	10	90.9	11	10	62.5	16	11	91.7	12	15	100	15
27. Exercise facilities												
Provided: In-House	10	66.7	15	7	31.8	22	12	66.7	18	12	70.6	18
External	0	0		0	0		1	5.6		0	0	
Hybrid	1	6.7		2	9.1		0	0		0	0	
Total	11	73.3		9	40.9		13	72.2		12	70.6	
Provided: To Family Members	4	44.4	9	2	25.0	8	2	18.2	11	1	8.3	12
28. Time off during work to use exercise facilities												
Provided: In-House	2	13.3	15	1	4.5	22	1	5.6	18	1	5.9	17
External	0	0		0	0		0	0		0	0	
Hybrid	1	6.7		0	0		0	0		0	0	
Total	3	20.0		1	4.5		1	5.6		1	5.9	
Provided: To Family Members	1	33.3	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
29. Programs pertaining to the diagnosis/treatment of organizational stress												
Provided: In-House	2	14.3	14	6	28.6	21	3	16.7	18	5	27.8	18
External	0	0		2	9.5		2	11.1		2	11.1	
Hybrid	4	28.6		1	4.8		0	0		4	22.2	
Total	6	42.9		9	42.9		5	27.8		11	61.1	
Provided: To Family Members	1	16.7	6	0	0	4	1	50.0	2	4	44.4	9
30. Family orientation programs												
Provided: In-House	2	13.3	15	3	14.3	21	6	33.3	18	5	29.4	17
External	0	0		0	0		1	5.6		0	0	
Hybrid	1	6.7		0	0		1	5.6		1	5.9	
Total	3	20.0		3	14.3		8	44.4		6	35.3	
Provided: To Family Members	3	100	3	2	66.7	3	6	100	6	5	83.3	6

Table 10 continued

Service	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3		Group 4	
	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b	Frequency	Percentage ^a n ^b
31. Flexible work scheduling to met family demands								
Provided: In-House	10	71.4	14	54.5	22	38.9	18	35.3
External	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hybrid	1	7.1	0	0	0	0	1	5.9
Total	11	78.6	12	54.5	7	38.9	7	41.2
Provided: To Family Members	4	50.0	8	0	8	0	4	16.7

Note. **In-House** is defined as the service exists as a separate unit within the agency or as a special operation of an existing unit. **External** is defined as services are provided by an individual or group under contract with the agency. **Hybrid** is defined as a combination of in-house and external programs, for instance a program that is overseen by a department employee that also uses some contracted external sources for services. **To Family Members** is defined as those agencies that officer the service and also make it available to family members. **Group 1** represents agencies with 31 to 220 officers, **Group 2** represents agencies with 309 to 941 officers, **Group 3** represents agencies with 1,014 to 3,745 officers, **Group 4** represents agencies with 4,199 to 25,945. Figures presented in the **Percentage** column are rounded to the nearest tenth.

^a Percentage of responses

^b Number of agencies that responded to the item

Table 11

Services Provided by 50 Percent or More of Agencies and Availability to Family Members

Service	Offered by Agency	Available to Family
	Percentage	Percentage
Employee Assistance Program (EAP)	93.4	84.4
Mental health treatment provided independently by health insurance	92.0	85.7
Counseling	81.1	74.5
Short-term counseling related to personnel killed in the line of duty	62.2	71.4
Post-inmate assault counseling	82.2	52.8
Critical incident response on a 24-hour basis	69.7	44.2
Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus.	78.7	39.6
Seminars on alcohol, drug use, gambling, or overeating	57.3	37.1
Stress reduction programs	68.1	35.6
Health and wellness program	68.5	31.0
Exercise facilities	62.2	24.4
Peer support	58.7	21.1
Stress education for officers on the job	65.3	20.0
Flexible work scheduling	52.1	19.2
Stress education for C.O. recruits	61.6	7.9

Table 12

Relationship Between Services and Type of Agency

Service	χ^2	df	N	Cramer's V
1. Employee Assistance Program (EAP)	1.42	2	75	.14
2. EAP specifically designed for corrections	2.12	2	73	.17
3. Counseling	5.44	2	73	.27
4. Child care on a 24-hour basis	1.12	2	73	.12
5. Marital support groups	6.27*	2	73	.29
6. Child support groups	4.41	2	72	.25
7. Stress reduction programs	3.11	2	71	.21
8. Hypertension clinics	3.44	2	71	.22
9. Health and wellness program	1.45	2	72	.14
10. Group therapy	9.29**	2	73	.36
11. Post-inmate assault counseling	10.90**	2	72	.39
12. Counseling for officer who carried out capital punishment	22.85***	2	63	.60
13. Training/seminars on domestic violence	.05	2	72	.03
14. Stress education for C.O. recruits	3.48	2	73	.22
15. Stress education for officers on the job	2.25	2	71	.18
16. Critical incident response on a 24-hour basis	7.45*	2	75	.32
17. Correctional officer crisis telephone service on a 24-hour basis	8.62*	2	74	.34
18. Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus.	6.56*	2	74	.30
19. Peer support	4.39	2	74	.24
20. Short-term counseling (under 6 months) for personnel killed in the line of duty	8.12*	2	73	.33
21. Long-term (6 months or more) counseling for personnel killed in the line of duty	3.86	2	72	.23
22. Family issues related to firearm safety	7.37*	2	71	.32
23. Seminars on alcohol, drug use, gambling, or overeating	1.12	2	74	.12
24. Programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits	4.94	2	73	.26
25. Programs geared toward work and family issues throughout an officer's career	1.41	2	73	.14
26. Mental health treatment provided independently by health insurance	.62	2	74	.09
27. Exercise facilities	5.03	2	73	.26
28. Time off during work to use exercise facilities	1.13	2	73	.13
29. Programs pertaining to the diagnosis/treatment of organizational stress	10.53**	2	72	.38
30. Family orientation programs	7.67*	2	71	.33
31. Flexible work scheduling	1.59	2	71	.15

*p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .001

Table 13

Relationship Between Services and Size of Agency

Service	χ^2	df	N	Cramer's V
1. Employee Assistance Program (EAP)	5.17	3	74	.26
2. EAP specifically designed for corrections	6.60	3	72	.30
3. Counseling	5.34	3	72	.27
4. Child care on a 24-hour basis	2.81	3	72	.20
5. Marital support groups	6.31	3	72	.30
6. Child support groups	7.84*	3	71	.33
7. Stress reduction programs	2.66	3	70	.20
8. Hypertension clinics	1.06	3	70	.12
9. Health and wellness program	7.94*	3	71	.33
10. Group therapy	16.52***	3	72	.48
11. Post-inmate assault counseling	5.69	3	72	.28
12. Counseling for officer who carried out capital punishment	24.80***	3	63	.63
13. Training/seminars on domestic violence	1.30	3	71	.14
14. Stress education for C.O. recruits	7.94*	3	72	.33
15. Stress education for officers on the job	5.41	3	70	.28
16. Critical incident response on a 24-hour basis	6.93	3	74	.31
17. Correctional officer crisis telephone service on a 24-hour basis	14.61**	3	73	.45
18. Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus.	7.76*	3	74	.32
19. Peer support	.67	3	73	.10
20. Short-term counseling (under 6 months) for personnel killed in the line of duty	8.39*	3	73	.34
21. Long-term (6 months or more) counseling for personnel killed in the line of duty	1.91	3	72	.16
22. Family issues related to firearm safety	4.95	3	71	.26
23. Seminars on alcohol, drug use, gambling, or overeating	3.00	3	73	.20
24. Programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits	2.63	3	72	.19
25. Programs geared toward work and family issues throughout an officer's career	6.41	3	72	.30
26. Mental health treatment provided independently by health insurance	6.05	3	73	.29
27. Exercise facilities	6.33	3	72	.30
28. Time off during work to use exercise facilities	3.40	3	72	.22
29. Programs pertaining to the diagnosis/treatment of organizational stress	4.08	3	71	.24
30. Family orientation programs	5.28	3	71	.27
31. Flexible work scheduling	6.21	3	70	.30

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 14

Service Providers

Provider	Type of Agency			Size of Agency				Total
	Adult	Juvenile	Adult & Juvenile	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	
Certified Drug/Alcohol Counselor								
Mean	4.50	4.00	1.00	6.00	2.00	-	3.33	3.60
Standard Deviation	3.54	2.83	-	-	-	-	3.21	2.70
n ^a	2	2	1	1	1	0	3	5
Chaplain								
Mean	37.28	22.09	15.00	2.14	34.57	13.67	62.10	27.66
Standard Deviation	68.31	64.88	9.90	2.19	80.00	3.51	87.23	62.01
n ^a	9	11	2	7	7	3	5	22
Employee Assistance Program Coordinator								
Mean	14.48	10.62	33.00	5.33	13.75	2.20	32.07	16.15
Standard Deviation	26.87	26.51	31.12	7.71	33.66	1.55	31.82	27.34
n ^a	21	13	5	6	8	10	15	40
Peer Supporters								
Mean	603.55	907.25	37.50	52.0	726.40	46.33	868.50	601.28
Standard Deviation	1227.33	1728.86	38.89	56.57	1550.66	46.48	1376.02	1214.05
n ^a	11	4	2	2	5	3	8	18

Table 14 continued

Provider	Type of Agency			Size of Agency				Total
	Adult	Juvenile	Adult & Juvenile	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	
Psychiatrist								
Mean	10.67	1	-	1.00	-	1.00	15.50	8.25
Standard Deviation	13.43	-	-	-	-	-	14.75	11.98
n ^a	3	1	-	1	0	1	2	4
Psychologist								
Mean	39.44	33.38	4.00	1.33	53.40	6.50	180.42	72.13
Standard Deviation	88.72	90.76	2.83	0.52	114.40	7.78	310.00	189.11
n ^a	8	8	2	6	5	2	6	19
Social Worker								
Mean	7.17	1.00	1.00	1.00	-	1.00	110.37	63.50
Standard Deviation	5.48	0.00	-	0.00	-	-	206.47	157.26
n ^a	3	2	1	2	0	1	4	7
Civilian Volunteers								
Mean	9.00	15.50	5.00	30.00	5.00	-	9.00	11.25
Standard Deviation	-	20.51	-	-	-	-	-	12.92
n ^a	1	2	1	1	1	0	1	4

Note. Group 1 represents agencies with 31 to 220 officers, Group 2 represents agencies with 309 to 941 officers, Group 3 represents agencies with 1,014 to 3,745 officers, Group 4 represents agencies with 4,199 to 25,945 officers.

^a The number of agencies that report having a provider with the title who provides services to officers and family members.

Table 15

Perceived Obstacles Related to the Use of Services

Obstacle	Type of Agency			Size of Agency				Total
	Adult	Juvenile	Adult & Juvenile	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	
Funding								
Mean	3.63	3.81	4.10	3.71	4.00	3.62	3.38	3.72
Standard Deviation	1.39	1.17	.88	1.20	1.18	1.02	1.67	1.27
n ^a	32	26	10	14	21	16	16	69
Lack of personnel who can provide the service								
Mean	3.03	3.35	3.50	3.29	3.48	3.06	2.69	3.19
Standard Deviation	1.26	1.38	.71	1.27	1.40	1.12	1.14	1.26
n ^a	32	26	10	14	21	16	16	69
Viewpoint of policy making body								
Mean	2.44	3.19	2.50	2.50	3.19	2.69	2.19	2.71
Standard Deviation	1.11	1.30	1.08	1.34	1.25	1.20	.98	1.23
n ^a	32	26	10	14	21	16	16	69
Viewpoint of correctional officers								
Mean	2.94	2.74	3.40	3.07	2.62	2.88	3.19	2.93
Standard Deviation	.95	1.13	1.07	1.10	1.16	.96	.91	1.04
n ^a	32	27	10	15	21	16	16	70
Legal concerns of any type								
Mean	2.84	2.85	3.00	2.80	3.05	2.69	2.63	2.85
Standard Deviation	1.04	1.05	.82	1.01	1.03	.95	.89	1.00
n ^a	31	26	10	15	19	16	16	68

Table 15 continued

Obstacle	Type of Agency			Size of Agency				Total
	Adult	Juvenile	Adult & Juvenile	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	
Stigma associated with seeking assistance								
Mean	3.55	2.89	3.60	3.20	3.14	3.07	3.75	3.32
Standard Deviation	1.06	1.09	1.26	1.01	1.24	1.28	.93	1.14
n ^a	31	27	10	15	21	15	16	69
Confidentiality issues								
Mean	2.78	2.67	2.90	2.60	2.71	2.75	2.81	2.76
Standard Deviation	1.31	1.18	1.52	1.18	1.38	1.34	1.17	1.27
n ^a	32	27	10	15	21	16	16	70
Lack of union support								
Mean	2.21	2.54	2.63	2.62	2.28	2.25	2.20	2.38
Standard Deviation	1.05	1.03	.74	.87	1.18	.86	.94	1.02
n ^a	29	26	8	13	18	16	15	64
Lack of input from officers in regards to program development								
Mean	2.50	2.69	3.20	2.80	2.40	2.63	2.87	2.68
Standard Deviation	.95	.97	1.14	1.08	.94	.96	1.06	1.00
n ^a	32	26	10	15	20	16	15	68
Accessibility and privacy of service location								
Mean	3.00	2.38	2.60	2.07	3.00	2.69	2.81	2.70
Standard Deviation	1.34	1.06	1.17	.96	1.30	1.35	1.05	1.23
n ^a	32	26	10	15	20	16	16	69

Table 15 continued

Obstacle	Type of Agency			Size of Agency				Total
	Adult	Juvenile	Adult & Juvenile	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	
Managers may use program to target some officers for disciplinary action								
Mean	1.87	1.93	1.90	1.87	2.00	1.75	1.81	1.89
Standard Deviation	1.16	.96	.99	.99	1.14	.93	1.05	1.04
n ^a	32	27	10	15	21	16	16	70
Family members do not support or are suspicious of services								
Mean	2.28	2.42	2.40	2.00	2.62	2.20	2.38	2.35
Standard Deviation	1.02	.95	1.07	.93	.97	1.01	1.02	.98
n ^a	32	26	10	15	21	15	16	69

Note. Group 1 represents agencies with 31 to 220 officers, Group 2 represents agencies with 309 to 941 officers, Group 3 represents agencies with 1,014 to 3,745 officers, Group 4 represents agencies with 4,199 to 25,945 officers. Each item was rated on a 5 point scale (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree).

^a The number of agencies that responded to the item.

Table 16

Step Taken to Facilitate the Use of Services

Facilitation	Type of Agency			Size of Agency				Total
	Adult	Juvenile	Adult & Juvenile	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	
Training at the academy level								
Frequency ^a	31	17	8	7	18	14	17	57
Percentage ^b	96.9	65.4	80.0	46.7	90.0	93.3	100.0	82.6
n ^c	32	26	10	15	20	15	17	69
Provide funding for services and programs								
Frequency ^a	22	18	9	9	14	11	15	50
Percentage ^b	68.8	69.2	100	69.2	66.7	68.8	93.8	73.5
n ^c	32	26	9	13	21	16	16	68
Provide officer space for service/program provided								
Frequency ^a	23	17	10	9	17	10	13	50
Percentage ^b	65.7	60.7	100	60.0	77.3	55.6	76.5	67.6
n ^c	35	28	10	15	22	18	17	74
Allow officers to use job time to train as peer supporters								
Frequency ^a	21	11	8	7	12	9	12	40
Percentage ^b	58.3	40.7	80.0	50.0	54.5	50.0	66.7	54.1
n ^c	36	27	10	14	22	18	18	74
Allow offices to do peer support work while on the job								
Frequency ^a	22	12	8	8	11	8	13	42
Percentage ^b	61.1	42.9	80.0	53.3	50.0	44.4	72.2	56.0
n ^c	36	28	10	15	22	18	18	75

Table 16 continued

Facilitation	Type of Agency			Size of Agency				Total
	Adult	Juvenile	Adult & Juvenile	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	
Newsletters that advertise the service/program								
Frequency ^a	29	17	9	9	14	14	17	56
Percentage ^b	82.9	60.7	90.0	60.0	66.7	77.8	94.4	75.7
n ^c	35	28	10	15	21	18	18	74
Provide information on the benefit of programs to facilities								
Frequency ^a	29	18	10	10	17	13	17	58
Percentage ^b	82.9	64.3	100.0	66.7	77.3	72.2	94.4	78.4
n ^c	35	28	10	15	22	18	18	74
Provide information on the benefit of programs to officers								
Frequency ^a	32	19	10	10	18	15	17	62
Percentage ^b	88.9	67.9	100.0	66.7	81.8	83.3	94.4	82.7
n ^c	36	28	10	15	22	18	18	75
Provide information on the benefit of programs to family members								
Frequency ^a	19	9	8	6	7	8	13	36
Percentage ^b	52.8	31.0	80.0	37.5	31.8	44.4	72.2	47.4
n ^c	36	29	10	16	22	18	18	76
Collaborate with local union in developing and increasing awareness of programs								
Frequency ^a	10	7	4	2	5	6	7	21
Percentage ^b	34.5	25.0	50.0	14.3	26.3	35.3	46.7	31.8
n ^c	29	28	8	14	19	17	15	66

Table 16 continued

Facilitation	Type of Agency			Size of Agency				Total
	Adult	Juvenile	Adult & Juvenile	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	
Public policy statement of support from administration								
Frequency ^a	26	17	10	9	14	12	18	54
Percentage ^b	74.3	63.0	100.0	64.3	63.6	66.7	100.0	74.0
n ^c	35	27	10	14	22	18	18	73
Mandate confidentiality								
Frequency ^a	33	25	8	12	20	16	17	67
Percentage ^b	91.7	89.3	80.0	80.0	90.0	88.9	94.4	89.3
n ^c	36	28	10	15	22	18	18	75
Allow officers to attend counseling appointments while on duty								
Frequency ^a	22	17	6	12	12	11	9	46
Percentage ^b	62.9	60.7	60.0	80.0	54.5	64.7	50.0	62.2
n ^c	35	28	10	15	22	17	18	74
Train supervisors on access, use and referral of agency services								
Frequency ^a	29	16	10	9	13	14	18	56
Percentage ^b	80.6	59.3	100.0	64.3	59.1	77.8	100.0	75.7
n ^c	36	27	10	14	22	18	18	74
Increase number of family programs offered								
Frequency ^a	9	4	2	1	4	2	7	15
Percentage ^b	26.5	13.8	20.0	6.3	18.2	11.8	38.9	20.3
n ^c	34	29	10	16	22	17	18	74

Note. Group 1 represents agencies with 31 to 220 officers, Group 2 represents agencies with 309 to 941 officers, Group 3 represents agencies with 1,014 to 3,745 officers, Group 4 represents agencies with 4,199 to 25,945 officers. Responses to each item included Yes, No, Unsure.

- ^a The number of agencies that responded yes to the statement.
- ^b The percentage of agencies that responded yes to the statement.
- ^c The total number of agencies that responded to the item.

APPENDIX A

**SURVEY
WORK AND FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES FOR
CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS**

WORK AND FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES FOR CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

The purpose of this survey is to better understanding how correctional agencies are addressing work and family issues for officers and their family members. This work is supported by the American Correctional Association and in part by a grant from the National Institute of Justice. **All information provided will remain confidential.** The goal is not to identify specific agencies but instead to identify overall trends. For each item below, please circle your response. Some sections ask you to write in information or may include more detailed instructions. Please read them before proceeding with that section. If you would like to receive an executive summary of the results of this study, please include your mailing address in the space provided in this survey.

Name of Agency _____

1. Identify the type of agency you work in:

- a Adult b Juvenile

2. Please indicate the number of correctional officers in your agency: _____

3. Please write in the number of male and female correctional officers in your agency in each category:

ETHNIC GROUP								RANK				Training Level	
White		Black		Hispanic		Other		Supervisory		Non-Supervisory		Training Level	
M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F

4. Please write in the ratio of 1 correctional officer per number of inmates, and your agency's turnover rate:

Ratio of 1 Correctional Officer per No. of Inmates	Turnover Rate of Correctional Officers

5. In terms of the turnover rate of correctional officers, when do the majority of officers leave your organization?

- a. by the 1st year b. by the 2nd year c. by the 3rd year d. by the 4th year e. by or beyond the 5th year

6. What are some of the primary reasons officers leave your organization?

- a.
- b.
- c.
- d.

7. On average in your organization, how many officers retire on a yearly bases from a career as a correctional officer?

8. Does your agency have a mission statement?

- a. Yes
- b. No

9. Does the mission statement include a reference to work and family issues for correctional officers?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Please provide us with information about the person responding to this questionnaire.

9. Job Title _____

10. Number of years in current job. _____

11. Number of years working in corrections. _____

12. Gender. a. Male b. Female

13. Highest level of education. a. High School b. Some College c. Associates Degree
 d. Bachelor's Degree e. Some Graduate Work d. Graduate Degree

14. If you would like to receive an executive summary of this survey, please provide an address:

15. Does your agency provide any type of mental health service to correctional officers?

- a. Yes
- b. No

16. Does your agency have a formalized psychological services unit?

- a. Yes
- b. No

17. The following is a list of services that may be offered by your agency.

A. For each service, please indicate if the service is offered. If it is offered, tell us how it is offered using the descriptions below (In-House, External, Both),

1. Not Provided

2. Not Sure ?

3. In-House - the service exists as a separate unit within the agency or as a special operation of an existing unit.

4. External - Services are provided by an individual or group under contract with the agency.

5. Both in-house and external - A combination of in-house and external programs, for instance a program that is overseen by a department employee that also uses some contracted external sources for services.

B. Next indicate if the service is also offered for officers' family members

Service	A. Not Provided Not Sure Program is provided :					B. Also provided to family members?	
	1	2	In-House	External	Both	1 Yes	2 No
7.1 Employee Assistance Program EAP)	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
7.2 EAP specifically designed for corrections	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
7.3 Counseling	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
7.4 Child care on a 24-hour basis	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
7.5 Marital support groups	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
7.6 Child support groups	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
7.7 Stress reduction programs	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
7.8 Hypertension clinics	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
7.9 Health and wellness programs	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
7.10 Group therapy	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
7.11 Post-inmate assault counseling	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
7.12 Counseling for officer who carried out capital punishment	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17.13 Training/seminars on domestic violence	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17.14. Stress education for C.O. recruits	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17.15 Stress education for officers on the job	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17.16 Critical incident response on a 24-hour basis.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17.17 Correctional officer crisis telephone service on a 24-hour basis	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17.18 Counseling for officer exposed to the HIV virus.	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17.19 Peer support	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17.20 Short-term counseling (under 6 months) related to personnel killed in the line of duty	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17.21 Long-term (6 months or more) counseling related to personnel killed in the line of duty	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17.22 Family issues related to firearm safety	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17.22 Seminars regarding alcohol, drug use, gambling, or overeating	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17.23 Programs geared toward work and family issues for recruits	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17.24 Programs geared toward work and family issues throughout an officer's career	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17.25 Mental health treatment provided independently by health insurance	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17.27 Exercise facilities	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17.28 Time off during work to use exercise facilities						1 Yes	2 No
17.29 Programs pertaining to the diagnosis/treatment of organizational stress (e.g. shifts, leadership)	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17:30 Family orientation programs (e.g. spouse awareness; visiting facility)	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No
17:31 Flexible work scheduling (e.g. modify officer's shifts to meet family demands	1	2	3	4	5	1 Yes	2 No

18. Write in the number of individuals with the titles listed below who provide services to correctional officers or family members within your agency:

Title	Number of Providers	Are Any Providers also Sworn Officers?		
18.1 Certified Drug/Alcohol Counselor		a. Yes	b.No	c. Not Sure
18.2 Chaplain		a. Yes	b.No	c. Not Sure
18.3 Employee Assistance Program Coordinator		a. Yes	b.No	c. Not Sure
18.4 Peer Supporters		a. Yes	b.No	c. Not Sure
18.5 Psychiatrist		a. Yes	b.No	c. Not Sure
18.6 Psychologist		a. Yes	b.No	c. Not Sure
18.7 Social Worker		a. Yes	b.No	c. Not Sure
18.8 Civilian Volunteers		a. Yes	b.No	c. Not Sure
18.9 Other		a. Yes	b.No	c. Not Sure
18.10 Other		a. Yes	b.No	c. Not Sure

19. Using the scale below, indicate to what extent the following are obstacles or problems related to the use of services in your agency:

	Strongly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Moderately Agree	Strongly Agree
19.1 Funding	1	2	3	4	5
19.2 Lack of personnel who can provide the service	1	2	3	4	5
19.3 Viewpoint of policy making body	1	2	3	4	5
19.4 Viewpoint of correctional officers	1	2	3	4	5
19.5 Legal concerns of any type	1	2	3	4	5
19.6 Stigma associated with seeking assistance	1	2	3	4	5
19.7 Confidentiality issues	1	2	3	4	5
19.8 Lack of union support	1	2	3	4	5
19.9 Lack of input from officers in regards to program development	1	2	3	4	5
19.10 Accessibility and privacy of service location	1	2	3	4	5
19.10 Managers may use program to target some officers for disciplinary action	1	2	3	4	5
19.12 Family members do not support or are suspicious of services	1	2	3	4	5

Please make additional comments and /or list other barriers to the use of services:

20. Indicate if your agency takes any of the following steps to facilitate the development, awareness or acceptance of services.

	YES	NO	UNSURE
20.1 Training at the academy level	1	2	3
20.2 Provide funding for services/programs	1	2	3
20.3 Provide office space for programs and/or services providers	1	2	3
20.4 Allow officers to use job time to train as peer supporters	1	2	3
20.5 Allow officers to do peer support work while on the job	1	2	3
20.6 Newsletters that advertise services/programs	1	2	3
20.7 Provide information on benefits of services to facilities	1	2	3
20.8 Provide information on benefits of services to officers	1	2	3
20.9 Provide information on benefits of services to family members	1	2	3
20.10 Collaborate with local union in developing and increasing awareness of programs	1	2	3
20.11 Public policy statements of support from administration	1	2	3
20.12 Mandate confidentiality	1	2	3
20.13 Allow officers to attend counseling appointments while on duty	1	2	3
20.14 Train supervisors on access, use and referral of agency services	1	2	3
20.15 Increase number of family programs offered	1	2	3

Please add any additional comments and or steps your agency uses to facilitate services:

21. Are there plans to enlarge or implement the use of programs that address work and family issues within the next two years?

1 Yes 2 No

22. Does your agency specify qualifications for those who provide services?

1 Yes 2 No

If yes what are the qualifications, circle all that apply

1 Doctorate (Ph.D., Ed.D, ect..)

3. State license

5. Specialized training

2 Masters (MA, MSW, ect..)

4. Certification

6. Other (please specify)

23. Does your program keep utilization statistics?

1 Yes 2 No

24. Has your agency conducted an impact study of programs effectiveness?

1 Yes 2 No

If no do you plan to do so within the next year?

1 Yes 2 No

25. To what degree does correctional officers' work and family stress issues impact your agency?

To a Very Slight Extent

1

2

3

4

To a Very Large Extent

5

Any additional comments:

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX B

SURVEY COVER LETTER

Dear Colleague:

As you are aware, working in corrections can be very challenging. Those who choose a career as a correctional officer face a number of issues not typically found in other occupations. These issues may include shift work, understaffing, threat of assault, and a corrections public image.

In recognition of the potential strain that an occupation in corrections can place on officers and their family members, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) is trying to address the concerns of officers and their family members. We are assisting them to identify the existence of programs that may be offered by correctional agencies to assist officers and their family members to better cope with the challenges they face.

Your response to the *Work and Family Support For Correctional Officers* survey will allow for the identification of programs that currently exist across the country to offer support to officers and their family members. Your response is very important and will remain confidential. The goal of this study is not to identify specific agencies but to identify overall trends.

The survey will take approximately 20 to 30 minutes to complete. Please fax the completed survey by September 22nd to us at (860)704-6420. A return cover fax sheet is included for your convenience.

NIJ plans to present the results of this study at future correctional meetings. A final report of this study will also be published and sent to you.

Thank you for your cooperation and participation in this important survey. Please contact DR. Robert Delprino of Buffalo State College, SUNY at (716) 878-6669 for additional information. He is working with NIJ on this study, and he will be happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Sincerely,

PROPERTY OF
National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS)
Box 6000
Rockville, MD 20849-6000

Attachments