

Correctional Officer Turnover: Of Maslow's Needs Hierarchy and Herzberg's Motivation Theory

By Ikwukananne I. Udechukwu, DBA

This article discusses correctional officer turnover in terms of traditional theories of motivation. It does so by calling on the content theories of Maslow's hierarchy of needs and Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. These theories are applied to the work situation of correctional officers in one southern U.S. state's correctional agency.

Undoubtedly, many organizations know that employee turnover negatively impacts productivity. Mobley¹ described employee turnover as a potentially costly phenomenon facing many organizations. The study of employee turnover can be conceptually understood by assessing work attitudes such as job satisfaction. Several studies have found *job satisfaction* to be related to employee turnover, particularly voluntary turnover.² Other work attitudes that have also been shown to impact turnover include organizational commitment, intentions to leave, and perceived alternative employment.³

Lambert⁴ noted that job satisfaction and other variables such as organizational commitment were the most widely studied variables linked to voluntary turnover. Other researchers who have focused on voluntary turnover have debated whether organizational commitment precedes job satisfaction, or vice versa.⁵ Whether intention to leave an organization precedes alternative job offers, or vice versa, has also been contended.⁶

This article does not delve into these relevant theoretical arguments. Rather, this article focuses on how the concepts of Maslow hierarchy of needs and Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory can be applied to understanding the problem of high correctional officer turnover by shedding light on work attitudes such as satisfaction. While Maslow suggested that needs, which drive behaviors associated with work attitudes (e. g., satisfaction), can be assigned to various levels, Herzberg made the distinction that needs that influence work attitudes can be met intrinsically or extrinsically. Thus, applying each theory provides a unique perspective on satisfaction in the form of the level and the type of satisfaction to be measured.

Nonetheless, it is quite obvious that current research has moved well beyond these traditional motivational theories. However, given the high rate of turnover for correctional officers in the southern U.S. state studied, this author hopes that revisiting these core, or parent, theories on work attitudes, can provide some meaningful insight into the issue. In fact, while this article was being prepared, Ramlall⁷ had begun this process by providing a more general and conceptual application of these and other motivation theories as a way to focus on employee retention within organizations. This article, then, follows Ramlall's lead but focuses more narrowly on only two of the theories and on a specific job class in a specific state agency.

Turnover in this article refers to *voluntary turnover*. Lambert⁸ described voluntary turnover as a consequence of employees initiating the termination of their employee–organization relationship. Previous work on the topic has revealed that voluntary turnover for correctional officers at one state correctional agency in 2002 accounted for 77% of the total correctional officer turnover; and for 2003, it was 76%. Similarly, in the Texas prison system, in the four years preceding 2002, the security force attrition rates exceeded 20%.⁹ Without further belaboring the point, the issue of high correctional officer turnover is widespread.

Turnover is expensive monetarily and costly in many other ways. The direct and indirect costs are generally classified as separation costs, learning costs, and acquisition costs.¹⁰ Unfortunately, many organizations fail to either acknowledge turnover as a legitimate organizational problem or challenge or to even bother assessing the impact and consequences of the turnover costs on their strategic and day-to-day operations.¹¹

One of several ways to visualize turnover costs in a correctional setting is to focus particularly on the salaries of correctional officers who have left the organization, since this is, perhaps, one of the more obvious and apparent indicators of the effect of voluntary turnover. Salaries are a cost of conducting business and an indication employee replacement value. That is, salaries reflect elements of separation costs, acquisition costs, and learning costs.

Jobs are created with knowledge, skills, and abilities (KSA) in mind, and both the position and its associated KSAs subsequently reflect the quality of employee hired. The employee will be trained and gain valuable experience over time, which costs money and personal investment, but the organization will lose the dollars and experience when the employee leaves the job.

Table 1 shows the 2003 turnover rates and total salary (direct cost) data for correctional officers who left employment in the state studied for this article. Analysis revealed that there is a strong positive correlation between the total monthly pay for correctional officers and their total monthly turnover rates. In essence, turnover costs money. What the table does not show is whether money was the primary reason for the departure of the correctional officers and this article does not attempt to answer that question. However, other information presented below suggests that elements of extrinsic job satisfaction may contribute to voluntary turnover. In fact, Farkas¹² noted, "Officers attributed their job satisfaction to the extrinsic aspects of the job, including pay and job benefits." What is most important to keep in mind, however, is that correctional officer turnover remains high, and an attempt to understand why this

occurs using traditional motivation theories may be important for discovering why it occurs at all.

Table 1: 2003 Monthly Turnover Rates and Associated Costs for Correctional Officers in One Southern U.S. State

Monthly turnover rates (%)	Total monthly salary costs for leaving officers (U.S. dollars)
January: 1.860	2,307,881.38
February: 1.080	1,425,965.86
March: 1.350	2,031,504.13
April: 1.650	2,580,526.74
May: 1.570	2,399,198.28
June: 1.620	2,389,822.75
July: 1.570	2,333,208.48
August: 1.690	2,756,735.98
September: 1.310	2,301,734.34
October: 1.720	2,605,758.21
November: 1.230	2,081,290.09
December: 1.350	2,027,207.29
Total: 18.000%	27,240,833.53

The state agency studied provided information on the reasons why their correctional officers voluntarily left. As with other organizations, this agency uses elaborate exit interviews to gather this type of information. However, exit interviews do have their problems, one of which is whether all those interviewed report their true reasons for departure and whether the exit interviews will actually capture the information meaningfully. However, the information provided is indicative of elements associated with job satisfactions.

Information gathered from the agency's intranet indicate that 45% of correctional officers who voluntarily left had a high school diploma, 34% had some college experience, 9% had some technical training, and 6% had a bachelor's degree. The highest percentage of those who voluntarily left, 42%, did so voluntarily because of other job opportunities. A full 16% of the respondents who voluntarily left concluded that better job offers most influenced their decisions to leave.

Thirteen percent of those officers who voluntarily left indicated that they loved the correctional agency because of job security, while 14% did not like the agency because of infrequent pay increases, 13% felt the efforts were not rewarded, and 12% felt their entry salary were too low. By far, Stunningly, 80% declared that they were willing to work for the agency again.

Job security, pay increases, and salaries, which were noted in how the employees felt about their jobs, are typically characterized as extrinsic components of job

satisfaction. Given that 80% of the correctional officers who left had the willingness to work for the agency again, lack of organizational commitment probably was not a large factor in people's decision to leave. Therefore, viewing the extrinsic factors of job satisfaction through the traditional motivation theories of Maslow's hierarchy of needs and Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory is the focus of this article. The theoretical frameworks are necessary because voluntary turnover cannot be studied by itself. Voluntary turnover exists because employees exhibited behaviors and attitudes that demonstrated their levels of job satisfaction with the organization.

It is likely that studies of satisfaction will continue to be associated with studies of voluntary turnover. For this reason, it is important to continue to focus on some of the traditional theories that have defined the emergence of job satisfaction as a relevant variable. Locke¹³ has classified the fundamental theories governing the understanding of job satisfaction into *process theories and content theories*. Here, the focus will be on content theories and how two of the most traditional ones have molded the understanding and use of job satisfaction.

Why Correctional Officers?

Stemming from his own professional experience, the author finds the job of a correctional officer to be a thankless one, replete with many reasons for an officer to remain infinitely unhappy while working in less-than-hospitable conditions. The environment in which a correctional officer functions is saddled with many dangers and populated primarily by prison inmates. The primary responsibility of a correctional officer is to hold inmates in involuntary confinement against their will.¹⁴ A trip to one of the prisons where correctional officers functioned that the author took while preparing this article was quite a sobering experience. Unrestrained inmates with anti-authoritarian behavior were also functioning around the officers who had no credible means of defending themselves against any unforeseen acts of violence by the inmates, beyond the radios they carry around.

Because correctional officers, just as employees in other organizations, will either like or dislike their jobs, and given the often-inhospitable conditions in which they have to work, it is intuitive to suggest that some correctional officers will voluntarily leave the organization. In the agency studied, they do so at high rates. Correctional officers are an especially telling case study for voluntary turnover for several reasons noted below.

First, Lambert¹⁵ summarized the core need for studying correctional officers' job satisfaction by noting, "Correctional staff are the most important asset of any correctional agency. In fact, they are the heart and soul of any correctional organization. Many staff, however, voluntarily quit. The cost of this turnover is high for correctional organizations. Nonetheless, correctional staff turnover has generated only limited research." Granting this, the importance of the satisfaction levels of correctional officers cannot be overemphasized.

Second, correctional officers are public sector employees, shift workers, and security staff. Though in some settings, private sector correctional institutions exist,

and they hire private correctional officers. The focus of this article is on the public sector correctional system because such systems account for a greater portion of the correctional officer jobs. Thus, a public system could potentially undermine public safety if it ignores correctional officers' satisfaction.

Third, as earlier noted, increased pay and incentives may not have slowed the turnover of correctional officers. Approximately 20% of correctional officers employed by the agency studied leave their job each year. It has been estimated that it costs at least 150% of an employee's salary to replace an employee. Ramlall¹⁶ noted that the costs of turnover can be estimated at between the leaving employee's one-year pay and benefits and that person's two-year pay and benefits. Traditional motivation theories may provide some explanation as to why increases in salary have failed to curtail high annual turnover rates for correctional officers.

Fourth, correctional officers perform their duties in an environment where they have to manage and supervise individuals held against their will.¹⁷ "Attitudes of inmates are notoriously 'anti-authority' and 'anti-rule,' which means officers must be on the alert for misconduct and rule violations," Farkas wrote.¹⁸ Further, correctional officers must control significant numbers of inmates with limited resources, and do so by making instant decisions with a wide range of discretion.¹⁹ The nature of this environment is likely to decrease the level of satisfaction of a correction officer faced with the challenges of incarcerating inmates.

Satisfaction

On a general basis, it is important to study of satisfaction—predominantly studied as job satisfaction—from a humanitarian perspective and a utilitarian perspective.²⁰ The humanitarian perspective of job satisfaction suggests that people deserve to be treated fairly and appropriately, and that the level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of employees may reflect the extent to which employees experience good treatment in an organization.²¹ Satisfaction may also be indicative of the emotional and psychological well being of the employees.²²

The utilitarian perspective of job satisfaction presupposes that the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of employees can lead to behaviors that affect the functioning of the organization.²³ One example of what this would mean is that increased productivity within an organization is a reflection of one of many positive outcomes of satisfied employees, while absenteeism and sabotage are negative outcomes of dissatisfied employees.

According to Spector,²⁴ "Job satisfaction is simply how people feel about their jobs and the different aspects of their jobs. It is the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs." Much of contemporary research on satisfaction, specifically job satisfaction, has focused on the cognitive process of satisfaction rather than employees' physical and psychological needs.²⁵ This article shifts the focus of satisfaction from the cognitive process to that of psychological needs defined by content theories.

Satisfaction may encompass facets such as tasks, pay, promotions, recognition, benefits, and working conditions.²⁶ Other facets of satisfaction may include supervision, co-workers, and company and management.²⁷ Many researchers have considered these facets and conceptualized satisfaction as either intrinsic or extrinsic while further understanding that satisfaction is the extent to which a worker feels positively or negatively (i.e., “satisfied” or “dissatisfied”) about his or her job.²⁸ Intrinsic satisfaction, specifically job satisfaction, reflects the experience of an employee having feelings of accomplishment and self-actualization from performing work.²⁹ Extrinsic satisfaction, specifically job satisfaction, reflects the experience of an employee feeling positively about the rewards, which may be any form of compensation and job security, extended to him or her by the organization for performing work.³⁰

However, satisfaction studies would be incomplete without mentioning content and process theories. Mentioned earlier is the fact that Maslow’s and Herzberg’s theories, which are content theories, have been very important in shaping contemporary understanding of satisfaction by describing the level and type of needs associated with the behaviors that demonstrate satisfaction. Process theories are equally important for forming and elucidating understandings of satisfaction, but they do not seem as compelling to this author as the theories of motivation suggested by Maslow and Herzberg. On this note, this article diverges from Ramlall’s³¹ approach, which was more general and not specific to any job class. However, further research into the implications of process theories in shaping the concept of satisfaction are as imperative in building other lines of thought. Ramlall³² creates the impetus in his work to forge ahead in the study of process theories.

Process Theories

Process theories tend to identify the “specific needs or values most conducive to job satisfaction.”³³ According to Eccles,³⁴ process theorists “focus on how individuals’ expectations and preferences for outcomes associated with their performance, actually influence performance.” These theorists are interested in how individual behavior is energized, directed, maintained, and stopped.³⁵ Considering Adam’s equity theory, Vroom’s expectancy theory, Skinner’s reinforcement theory, and Locke’s goal setting theory is helpful in understanding process theories.³⁶

Content Theories

According to Locke,³⁷ content theories attempt to “specify the particular needs that must be attained for an individual to be satisfied with his or her job. Two motivation theories are most prominent in the study of content theories—Maslow’s hierarchy of needs and Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory.³⁸

Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs

During his career, Abraham Maslow, who was born in New York in 1908, was prominent for rebelling against psychoanalysis and the animal-centered studies in behaviorism.³⁹ In fact, he proposed that psychology should focus on the entire person and how

people act. He eventually became one of many pioneers in humanistic psychology, which came to be labeled, “psychology as the third force.”⁴⁰ What is instructive about this revolution is that it marked the advent of applied psychology and theoretical and systematic understandings of variables that affect humans in the contemporary workplace.

Above all, Maslow believed that humans aspire to self-actualized states.⁴¹ He further identified five basic needs that motivate individuals: psychological, safety, love or belongingness, esteem, and self-actualization. Writing in the *Psychological Review* in 1943, Maslow stated, “human needs arrange themselves in hierarchies of prepotency. That is to say, the appearance of one need usually rests on the prior satisfaction of another more proponent need. Man is a perpetually wanting animal. Also, no need or drive can be treated as if it were isolated or discrete; every drive is related to the state of satisfaction or dissatisfaction of drives.”⁴² Figure 1 illustrates the basic needs highlighted by Maslow, with 5 being the lowest-order need and 1 being the highest-order need.

Figure 1: Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs

1. Self-actualization
 2. Esteem
 3. Love or belongingness
 4. Safety
 5. Physiological
-

Given the high and costly turnover rates for correctional officers, it can be argued that the officers’ met or unmet needs create the potential for dissonance between their levels of satisfaction and the challenges they face in incarcerating inmates. Since some correctional officers may be motivated intrinsically by the need to assert authority over inmates, the dissonance between officers’ level of satisfaction and the challenges of incarcerating those inmates is potentially reduced because, for them, some physiological need is being met. On the other hand, those whose motivation is to pay student loans, pay mortgages, or make car payments, asserting authority over inmates may likely create a high level of dissonance between their levels of extrinsic satisfaction and the tasks of incarcerating belligerent inmates because there is some level of physiological dissatisfaction. Given these scenarios, one officer is likely to elevate to the next level of need—safety—while the other is likely to remain at the same level of unsatisfied physiological needs. The unmet psychological need may contribute to creating the impetus to leave employment as a correctional officer.

However, Maslow also suggested that satisfied needs are not motivators. as According to him, as lower-levels needs are satisfied, they no longer drive behavior, and, consequently, higher-order needs take over as the motivating force.⁴³ The first three levels of needs, that is from 5 to 3 as shown in Figure 1, appear to be the most likely attainable for most correctional officers. The inability of a job as a correctional

officer to provide esteem or self-actualization is further aggravated by the fact that correctional institutions are typically located in remote areas so inmates attempting to escape will have a formidable challenge. The remoteness simultaneously creates social and economic challenges to the correctional officer (e.g., extended drive to work).

Beyond that economic developments in the areas where correctional facilities are located are minimal, at best. Commercial housing and transportation are generally scarce. When such developments become available, few developers see any incentives in building structures close to potential security concerns. Even when development exists around a facility, property values tend to remain extremely low because of perceptions of crime risks. Consequently, options available for correctional officers become limited, and driving more than 40 miles back and forth from work is not unheard of. With rising global gas prices, the average annual salary of a new correctional officer recruit of \$25,000 not only heightens the dissonance between tasks and satisfaction, but provides the platform for classifying such satisfaction into levels of needs.

If and when a correctional officer's physiological needs are met at least up to 80%, as Maslow suggested, safety become the next need. Safety issues are a recurring problem inside and outside of any prison facility. A correctional officer must hold up to their best ability on a daily basis, even when the stress from ranting and ravings of belligerent and potentially violent inmates echo unceasingly within the prison walls. Such stresses could potentially lead to a violent overreaction by a correctional officer on a supervisor or a colleague or an inmate. Also, inmates have been known to consistently attack officers with improvised weapons, thus, heightening the safety needs of correctional officers. Once again, this unsatisfied need may arguably create the impetus for an officer to consider leaving the agency. At this level, whether the safety need is met or unmet determines if the next proponent need of love or belongingness will be attained.

For correctional officers whose dissonance between their safety needs and the challenges of incarcerating inmates is reduced, love and belongingness would naturally be the next step. In an environment of almost military precision, creating a sense of love and belongingness, usually through teamwork, is very difficult. This is true even though most correctional systems operate on a command-and-control basis, which should, in theory, foster teamwork to the same extent the military does.

Because promotional opportunities or any real career ladder exists for most correctional officers, officers tend to compete furiously with each other for such opportunities as elevation to captain, deputy warden, and warden. This creates a workplace environment of survival-of-the-fittest set within an even larger, even more competitive world of belligerent inmates. Any feelings of love and belongingness are easily squashed in this situation, and social identity theory, which also helps explain the lack of teamwork among correctional officers, becomes a figment of officers' imagination.

Many officers become disillusioned, and, faced with the reality of a dead-end career, ultimately, leave. In contrast, the military has actively addressed this need for

love and belongingness by creating promotional opportunities and defined career paths, thus reducing unnecessary competition and rivalries within the rank and file.

This author suggests that the last two levels of needs, esteem and self actualization, are rarely, if ever met, in a correctional setting by most correctional officers, except for those who, through fate or faith, end up as captains, deputy wardens, and wardens. Unfortunately, each prison in the agency studied has between 100 and 500 correctional officers who must aspire one day to become the next of a few dozen higher-level jailers. The slim probability of realizing such an aspiration leads many correctional officers to conclude they will neither have self-esteem from their career or ever become self-actualized in a correctional setting.

Because correctional settings have yet to address the esteem and self-actualization needs of officers, high correctional officer turnover will continue to be a reality. Correctional officers' satisfaction is dictated by the levels of needs their job meets. The last two levels, which are rarely ever attained in a correctional setting, tie perfectly into the last discussion on love and belongingness. When promotional opportunities and a realistic career ladder remain largely unavailable, the officer arrives at a sense of frustration, which more often than not, results in the officer actually leaving. That a sense that the need for self-actualization is not being met is a reason a correctional officer would have for leaving remains a debatable area since few correctional officers ever progress far enough for this to become an issue.

What is most important about Maslow's work is its recognition of a need to order, or scale, human needs and its recognition of human activity as an important area ripe for the application of sophisticated psychology theories and techniques that are today dubbed "management studies" among other rubrics. Understanding the problems associated with assuming the role of a correctional officer requires scaling of the needs that the job can and will meet. This scaling will, in turn, lead to a better understanding how decisions to leave are prompted by the job either meeting or not meeting officers' needs. Fortunately, the correctional agency studied is a pacesetter in this regard, in that it has made exit interviews accessible through its intranet to capture the needs and satisfaction levels of officers who are leaving.

Maslow's need theory is typically described and illustrated as a vertical scale or a pyramid. This makes the theoretical framework useful as means for measuring some type of satisfaction, particularly job satisfaction. In fact, of the concept of satisfaction is meaningless unless there is some form of measuring or recognizing it. Since needs explain behavior, and behavior reflects attitude, the study of satisfaction naturally inherits the attribute of being measured on some scale. For example, a correctional officer who recently left his or her agency may be asked why he or she left. The officer may note that he or she left because of dissatisfaction with some aspect of the job or the organization. A need had driven the behavior, and the behavior had formed the attitude of leaving. The needs are reflected in their levels of the correctional officer's satisfaction, and that focusing on those needs is equally important.

In fact, in contemporary satisfaction research, the information provided by the exiting correctional officer would be meaningless until it is measured or scaled through either surveys, exit interviews, or phone interviews. Maslow's hierarchy intended his

hierarchy to be a measure like any other. Therefore, explaining correctional officer satisfaction in terms of a hierarchy of needs is possible and important.

However, this author finds Maslow's theory deficient for fully explaining the type of satisfaction considered, which reflects the types of needs that drive the type of behavior, which forms the attitude. Rather, Maslow's theory focuses on only the levels of need, and not the type of need. The distinction between the types of needs reflected in satisfaction was later addressed by Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory.

Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory

It is not uncommon for prominent events in one's lifetime to transform one's perception and view of the world, as the horrors of concentration camps in Germany during World War II did for Frederick Herzberg.⁴⁴ In line with Maslow's diversion of psychology studies from animals to humans, Herzberg advocated the diversion of psychology studies from the insane to the sane,⁴⁵ and his work would later influence some work concepts we know today, such as "job context" and "job content." Herzberg was born in 1923 in Massachusetts.

Unlike Maslow's theory, Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory argues that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction result from different causes. According to Herzberg, satisfaction depends on *motivators*, while dissatisfaction is the result of *hygiene factors*.⁴⁶ He defined motivators as intrinsic to the job, and he defined hygiene factors as extrinsic to the job.⁴⁷ He also succinctly created a distinction between satisfaction and dissatisfaction.⁴⁸

Herzberg⁴⁹ noted, "factors involved in producing "job satisfaction" and motivation are separate and distinct from the factors that lead to "job dissatisfaction." Since separate factors need to be considered, depending on whether "job satisfaction" or "job dissatisfaction" is being examined, it follows that these feelings are not opposites of each other. The opposite of "job satisfaction" is not "job dissatisfaction" but rather, no job satisfaction; and similarly, the opposite of "job dissatisfaction" is not "job satisfaction," but no "job satisfaction."

Considering the work situation of correctional officers in light of Herzberg's assertions, it would appear that at each need, it could be characterized as creating either satisfaction or dissatisfaction, since both are complementary and distinct components. What this means is that it is not enough to recognize that correctional officers have unmet or met needs. Identifying, as best as possible, which needs create satisfaction and which create dissatisfaction is equally as important. The data presented at the beginning of this article not only show the level of unmet needs but the type of unmet need, which were characterized as extrinsic components of job satisfaction.

Motivators deal with aspects of work itself and include work, promotion, achievement, responsibility, and recognition.⁵¹ Hygiene factors reflect the "context in which the work itself was performed, to include working conditions, interpersonal relations, company politics and salary, and supervision."⁵² The work of correctional officers, as earlier noted, involves working with recalcitrant inmates, and the internal and external environments, also as earlier described, can be grossly inhospitable.

Figure 2: Types of Satisfaction as Understood According to Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory of Motivation



Conclusion

Herzberg's work clearly describes satisfaction horizontally and created the distinction between types of satisfaction. Herzberg suggested that if an employee experiences a low level of job satisfaction, it does necessarily imply that the employee is dissatisfied (see Figure 2). Equally, if an employee experiences a low level of job dissatisfaction, it does not imply that the employee is satisfied.

On the other hand, Maslow's theory describes satisfaction vertically and leads analysts to scale each need as absolutely met or unmet, strictly satisfied or not satisfied. It clearly illustrates the importance of measuring, or scaling, needs or satisfaction that result in the behavior, which form the attitude of leaving. This means the study of satisfaction, especially for correctional officers, not only requires a distinction of the type of satisfaction to be as useful as possible, but also a study of the level of satisfaction through needs.

Most of all, it appears correctional officer will remain a job class plagued by high turnover. Given that inmates will continue to be difficult to manage and that this must be balanced against the motivational needs of the officers, there will always be officers who will voluntarily leave. As a result, a deliberate and aggressive attempt should be made to create a defined career path and feasible promotional opportunities for correctional officers, just as the military has done for its rank and file.

Finally, and based on the author's own experiences, it is advisable to include in correctional officers' exit interviews questions that capture components of organizational commitment and any other relevant work attitudes associated with turnover. Information collected in such interviews should then be made available via organizational intranet. Both conducting exit interviews and sharing results will eliminate the spirit of denial that pervades perception of correctional officer turnover, which sometimes prevents management from acting on important information, quickly. Even when this information is available, management almost always assumes that pay increases will be the best solution to voluntary turnover, while ignoring less expensive components of satisfaction such as encouraging creativity and innovation.

The agency studied for this article has set a very good example by providing real-time intranet access for its management when they choose to address the work needs of their most stubborn human resource problem in their most important job class—voluntary turnover for correctional officers. Other correctional agencies can learn from this. However, given that exit interviews have problems that have earlier been noted,

occasional data gathering through surveys can buttress the data that has been collected through exit interviews.

Notes

- ¹ Mobley, W. H. (1982). *Employee turnover: Causes, consequences, and control*. Philippines: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- ² Mobley, W. H., Griffeth, R. W., Hand, H. H., & Meglino, B. M. (1979), op cit.
- ³ Mobley, W. H., Griffeth, R. W., Hand, H. H., & Meglino, B. M. (1979). Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86: 493-522, Steers, R. M., & Mowday, R. T. (1981). Employee turnover and the post decision accommodation process. In B. M. Shaw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.) *Research in organizational behavior*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press; Michaels, C. E., & Spector, P. E. (1982). Causes of employee turnover: A test of the Mobley, Griffeth, Hand, and Meglino model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67: 53-59; Arnold, H. J., & Feldman, D. C. (1982). A multivariate analysis of the determinants of job turnover. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 67: 350-360; Lee, T. W., & Mowday, R. T. (1987). Voluntarily leaving an organization: An empirical investigation of Steer's and Mowday's model of turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 30, 721-743.
- ⁴ Lambert, E. G. (2001). To stay or quit: A review of the literature on correctional officer turnover. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 26, 61-76.
- ⁵ Vanderberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. (1992). Examining the causal order of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of Management*, 18, 153-167.
- ⁶ Ou, W. (2004). Movement capital: Does intention to leave come before alternative job offers? *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship*, 9, 162-170.
- ⁷ Ramlall, S. (2004). A review of employee motivation theories and their implications for employee retention within organizations. *Journal of America Academy of Business*, 5, 52-63.
- ⁸ Lambert, E. G. (2001), op cit.
- ⁹ Castlebury, G. (2002). Correctional officer recruitment and retention in Texas. *Corrections Today*, 64: 80-84.
- ¹⁰ Mobley, W. H., Griffeth, R. W., Hand, H. H., & Meglino, B. M. (1979), op cit.
- ¹¹ Ibid.
- ¹² Farkas, M. A. (2001). Correctional officers: What factors influence work attitudes? *Corrections management Quarterly*, 5, 20-26.
- ¹³ Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and consequences of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297 - 1350). Chicago: Rand-Mcnally.
- ¹⁴ Farkas, M. A. (2001), op cit.
- ¹⁵ Lambert, E. G. (2001), op cit.
- ¹⁶ Ramlall, S. (2004), op cit.
- ¹⁷ Farkas, M. A. (2001), op cit.
- ¹⁸ Farkas, M. A. (2001), op cit.
- ¹⁹ Ibid.
- ²⁰ Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- ²¹ Ibid.

- ²² Ibid.
- ²³ Ibid.
- ²⁴ Ibid.
- ²⁵ Ibid.
- ²⁶ Locke, E. A. (1976), op cit.
- ²⁷ Ibid.
- ²⁸ Bhuian, S. N., Al-Shammari, E. S., & Jefri, O. A. (1996). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction and job characteristics: An empirical study of expatriates in Saudi Arabia. *International Journal of Commerce and Management*, 57, 57-79; Locke, E. A. (1976), op cit.
- ²⁹ Bhuian, S. N., Al-Shammari, E. S., & Jefri, O.A. (1996), op cit.
- ³⁰ Ibid.
- ³¹ Ramlall, S. (2004), op cit.
- ³² Ibid.
- ³³ Locke, E. A. (1976), op cit.
- ³⁴ Eccles, S. (2003). The relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment as perceived by irrigation workers in a quasi irrigation company in Jamaica. Michigan: ProQuest Information and Learning Company. (UMI No. 3096346).
- ³⁵ Ibid.; Ivancevich, J., & Matterson, M. (1990). *Organizational behavior and management*. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin.
- ³⁶ Eccles, S. (2003), op cit.; Gibson, J., Ivancevich, J., & Donnelly, J. (1991). *Organizations: Behaviors, structures, and processes*. Burr Ridge, IL: Irwin; Rakich, J., Longest, B., & Darr, K. (1992). *Managing health service organizations*. Baltimore, MD: Health Professional Press.
- ³⁷ Locke, E. A. (1976), op cit.
- ³⁸ Ibid.
- ³⁹ Wren, D. A., & Greenwood, R.G. (1998). *Management innovators*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- ⁴⁰ Ibid.
- ⁴¹ Ramlall, S. (2004), op cit.
- ⁴² Ott, S. J. (1996). *Classical readings in organizational behavior*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace.
- ⁴³ Ott, S. J. (1996), op cit.
- ⁴⁴ Wren, D. A. & Greenwood, R.G. (1998), op cit.
- ⁴⁵ Ibid.
- ⁴⁶ Locke, E. A. (1976), op cit.
- ⁴⁷ Herzberg, F. (1996). One more time: How do you motivate employees? In S. J. Ott (Eds.), *Classical readings in organizational behavior* (pp. 76 - 85). Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace & Company. (Original work published 1968)
- ⁴⁸ Ibid.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Locke, E. A. (1976), op cit.

⁵² Ibid.

Author

Ikwukananne I. Udechukwu, DBA

553 Pinecrest Drive
Riverdale, GA 30274
(770) 907-3514
udechukwu@hotmail.com

Dr. Ikwukananne Udechukwu recently completed his doctorate in business administration at NOVA Southeastern University in Florida. He received a master's of public administration degree from Valdosta State University in Georgia.. He has served as a classification and compensation analyst for the Georgia Department of Corrections, the Georgia Department of Human Resources, and the University System of Georgia. His most recent publication are in the *Journal of Applied Management and Entrepreneurship* and the *Human Resource Development Review*. His research interests are in the areas of human resources management, qualitative thinking, and the impact of business and economics in public education.