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Despite its roots as a leader in juvenile justice, prison advocacy and reform, appreciation and professional support for forensic social work (FSW) has waxed and waned over the last one hundred and twenty years. It has gone from leadership in the field of criminal justice to becoming nearly invisible to the profession of social work itself. Over the last decade, FSW began experiencing a resurgence thanks to a shift in policy and practice toward treatment and diversion for justice-involved individuals. Despite FSW’s historical roots and relevance to today’s justice systems, there is a dearth of materials about who is practicing in the FSW field and their level of fit in their organization. Other information, such as how they chose their specialization, how they were educated and trained, and how various protective and deleterious (negative) factors influence that level of fit, job satisfaction, job role stress and sustainability is also essential.

Because this critically important area of practice was not well reflected in the literature, this study examined those gaps. Relying on the ecological perspective, this study used a cross-sectional design to electronically survey 384 individuals working as social workers in the core criminal and juvenile justice processes within 13 public, non-profit and proprietary agencies in Connecticut. The quantitative and qualitative findings of this research indicate that this sample of forensic social workers came from a variety of backgrounds, worked in a variety of settings,
and experienced difficulty with level of fit and job role stress. The group had moderate to high levels of secondary traumatic stress (STS), burnout (BO), and compassion satisfaction (CS) with STS and BO increasing with the number of negative factors experienced by the individual. The most predictive factors for STS, BO, and job role stress were stress over isolation from other social workers at work, resources, safety, and value inconsistencies with one’s place of work. Based on the results of this study, the suggested policy and practice implications would improve process and outcomes for the profession, the specialization, the workers, and the employers. Those changes would reduce the impact of negative factors on social workers, particularly those in custodial or other host settings, and increased protective factors (e.g. mentoring, clinical supervision, and social work training) would improve job satisfaction, recruitment and retention. Considering the important work of forensic social workers and their impact on marginalized, oppressed, and often victimized individuals entangled in the criminal and juvenile justice systems, implications for increased social work education and training through specialized forensic curricula would provide a highly educated pool of forensic social workers prepared to address the individual and social justice needs of clients.
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Introduction

[T]oo many [social workers] still are inclined to turn their eyes deliberately from the prison… the prison …a place of exile for human beings whose problems in the community are apparently insoluble, highly disagreeable, and, therefore, better put out of sight and forgotten (Pray, 1943, reprinted in Pray, 1951, p. 204).

Social work, with its humanitarian roots, should shine its light into the darkest places, and prisons and other criminal justice facilities have historically been among the darkest our country has seen. In addition to Pray’s words referring to the accused and convicted, the experiences of victims and offenders within these processes are inextricably linked and are not always mutually exclusive (Muncie, 2009).

Social work has a professional mandate to counter human oppression and promote social justice for all. The institutionalized power the criminal and juvenile justice systems have over the poor, mentally ill, addicted and marginalized members of society invites social work attention. Since its beginning, the social work profession has focused on the inequities often associated with adjudication, work with both offenders and victims, and efforts to reform the criminal justice system in the United States (Brownell & Roberts, 2002). Those historical roots grew into the practice generally known as criminal justice social work or forensic social work (FSW) (Wilson, 2010). Social work can aid the criminal justice community in “thinking of the whole person rather than her/his diagnosis, offence or sentence,” (Green, Thorpe & Traupmann, 2005, p. 149) and can apply “systemic awareness” to the “inter-relational effects of the justice system” (p. 146). Forensic social workers may work in research, policy, community organization, administration or directly with offenders, victims, families of offenders or others...
who are involved with criminal or civil law. Despite a long history within social work, today forensic social work goes largely unnoticed by the profession (Reamer, 2004). This has implications for the profession, clients and the community (Brownell & Roberts, 2002).

Social Work can be professionally and personally difficult and may take a toll on the social workers themselves. Social workers, particularly those working in criminal and juvenile justice processes, are faced with the dilemma of balancing the needs of many with those of their clients. This can challenge social work values including respecting the dignity and worth of the person, commitment to social justice, and the client’s right to self-determination (Alexander, 1997) and create stress in professional decision-making. Pressure to balance the need for public safety with the individual needs of clients may also present professional challenges (Wilson, 2010).

Despite these inherent personal and professional challenges, it is imperative for social work to remain dedicated to working in the darkest places and to, once again, pick up the charge. Why? Criminal and juvenile justice clients (both victims and offenders) are often members of a number of vulnerable and oppressed populations (Guerino, Harrison & Sabol, 2011, p. 7; Muncie, 2009). In fact, because incarceration may affect a person’s ability to make decisions free of coercion, prisoners are designated as vulnerable populations under Title 45 of the Department of Health and Human Services’ Code of Federal Regulations that governs the protection of human subjects in all research. With specific regard to social work, the National Association of Social Workers’ code of ethics (2008) states:

Social workers should act to prevent and eliminate domination of, exploitation of, and discrimination against any person, group or class on the basis of race, ethnicity, national
origin, color, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, political belief, religion, or mental or physical disability. (standard 6.04[d])

Arguably, social work education and the profession are not preparing social workers with the skills or resources to do this work. It is puzzling that forensic social work has not held a higher priority within the social work profession and social work education, particularly when corrections/criminal justice was listed among the top third of field placement categories for BSW students in 2015 (CSWE, 2016, p. 23). It would be valuable to understand more about those who have chosen this field and what they view as their needs, supports, and also challenges, and yet the social work curricula are not heeding this call.

**Problem Statement**

As noted above, social workers have been a part of criminal and juvenile justice processes since the beginning of the profession and continue to serve important roles in the lives of justice-involved individuals today. The field has experienced waxing and waning interest over the last century and a half. Historically, other countries have developed more robust forensic social work infrastructures and research agendas; however, the United States is currently experiencing a surge in research dedicated to forensic populations. While this signals an important shift, there is still a noticeable deficiency.

Despite their enduring presence working with adult and juvenile clients in the wide range of forensic processes, there has been little research done on the social workers themselves. Little is known about what factors attract and retain social workers in forensic processes, the social workers’ training and education, their beliefs and feelings, and what may impact their work both positively and negatively.
Research Overview

The purpose of the current study was to describe the population of social workers in Connecticut who are engaged in criminal and juvenile justice processes and to examine how a variety of personal, organizational and other factors influences interest in the field, retention and professional quality of life. While the forensic social work field has gained momentum in recent years and is building a base of scholarly research on the theory and practice of forensic social work, there is a gap in our understanding of forensic social workers themselves.

This study identified various factors that influenced participants’ choices to work in forensic social work, their education and training and the particular skills necessary for working in this field. This study is unique in that it is the first to 1) attempt to identify all who are working in this capacity in Connecticut and to 2) provide a platform through which the beliefs, knowledge, training and characteristics are gathered.

An anonymous online survey gathered information from both degreed and non-degreed social workers working in some capacity of forensic work in Connecticut. Beyond the exploratory objectives, this study analyzed the factors that influenced the workers and their environments as a first step toward creating a taxonomy of common objectives for educators. A blueprint for professional associations and agencies would help foster ongoing support and training to those social workers who are interested in the field of forensic social work and support any necessary changes in the working environment.

Summary

Despite the fact that many social workers are engaged in criminal and juvenile justice practices, there has been a lack of educational support to help them achieve competencies and to manage difficulties inherent to this work. This chapter introduced the importance of research on
those working in social work capacities within the criminal and juvenile justice systems and the focus of the research. The online anonymous survey was used to collect information on demographics, beliefs, values, education, skills, job satisfaction and professional quality of life. This information can be used to foster support and workforce development.
Chapter One: Background of Study and Literature Review

This study is strongly rooted in social work history and social work theory. This research was inspired by the long history of forensic social workers and researchers since the beginning of the social work profession as well as social work theory that underpins that profession. This chapter includes literature in the following order: 1) the historical roots of forensic social work, 2) definitions of forensic social work, 3) the study of forensic social work, 4) social work education, 5) specialization within the profession, and the 6) conceptual framework of the study. The chapter concludes with the significance, rationale, and justification of the study and finally the research questions and related hypotheses.

Historical Roots of Forensic Social Work

The foundation of the work that forensic social workers are engaged in today traces back to the birth of the social work profession. The early architects of forensic social work practice demonstrated the values and practices consistent with the larger profession as it still stands today. This included identifying and addressing oppressive conditions within the court and supervisory systems. Some of the early reformers and practitioners may not have clearly identified as social workers, but they embodied the value base of the profession and worked to address both person and environment while attending to the dignity and worth of the person. Although not an exhaustive review, what follows are some of the highlights of those individual and organizational contributions to the forensic social work practice we see today.

19th Century Reform

Social work’s value base and fundamental beliefs about the injustices of human oppression are tied to 19th century prison reform and juvenile justice initiatives (Brownell & Roberts, 2002 and Reamer, 2004) fueled by many individuals. In particular, Jane Addams was
instrumental in the separation of juvenile and adult defendants that led to the first juvenile court in Chicago in 1899 (Reamer, 2004). Her perspective on the bio-psychosocial model of social work practice, that “misbehavior typically is a function of the complex interaction among diverse psychological, familial, economic, environmental, and biological factors” (Reamer, 2004, p. 214), is foundational to the social work profession.

The twin roots of social work and criminal justice intertwine throughout the history of American jurisprudence. In the nineteenth century, examples of informal efforts to provide services and alternatives to incarceration were emerging to fill a need. As an example, the lives of Mr. John Augustus (1784-1859) and Mrs. Eliza (Jones) Garnaut (d. September 3, 1849) illustrate the commonalities between social work and criminal justice. Books and articles hail John Augustus, a shoemaker in Boston, as the “Father of Probation” for his years of tireless advocacy convincing the Boston court to release men, women and children into his custody so that he could provide supervision in place of incarceration (Lindner, 2006). He paid bail and provided counsel and oversight to countless people, including inebriants, and his deeds were followed in the local paper “The Liberator”. The local newspaper named him the “officer of criminals” and “the Prisoner’s Friend” for his relief of those discharged from the prison system (Anonymous, 1846, p. 128). Although considered the first probation officer, in at least one instance, the social work literature describes him as a “part time social worker” (Scheyett, Pettus-Davis, McCarter & Brigham, 2012). Considering his core beliefs in second chances, removing stigma and providing services for a variety of social issues, both seem accurate.

Another example of a nineteenth century forensic social worker was Mrs. Eliza (Jones) Garnaut, who worked as a nurse in the house of Mr. Wendell Phillips (Deese, 2005, p. 408). Mrs. Garnaut became the Matron of the Temporary Home for Destitute Females and Orphan
Children on Albany Street in Boston. A Welsh immigrant employed in the home of Mr. Phillips, Mrs. Garnaut and a black woman named Phillis Salem were the only two “domestic” members of the Boston Anti-Slavery Society (Hansen, 1993, p. 76). She was also a member the Moral Reform Society (Phillips, 1849, p. 163). Considered John Augustus’ “advisor and companion” (Phillips, 1849, p.163), Eliza Garnaut often gave up her own bed to accept Augustus’ charges. Among the hundreds of people she helped were “children left in cellars of drunken parents…[those whom she helped to] strengthen their faltering resolution and give them back to reconciled families…women ruined by love of drink…insane girls…emigrants who had neither acquaintances nor work…criminals who needed aid…fugitive slaves…[and] sick women” (Phillips, 1849, p. 163).

So captivated by her charitable work, upon Mrs. Garnaut’s death at the age of 39, Mr. Phillips wrote a eulogy that was carried by local newspapers. A portion of the tribute below encapsulates the ethics and values that social workers adhere to today:

‘The heart was the best logician.’ She saw the right with the unerring intuition of a good heart. Neither sect, class, color or [sic] country affected her feelings. In education, social reorganization, anti-slavery, the amelioration of punishments, the advancement of woman, she took a deep and intelligent interest, and felt how slight was the effect of all her toil on evils which grew from false principles. She had a good intellectual ability; sound practical sense, rare judgment, sagacity that few could deceive that probed every case, and did, what she did, intelligently. (Phillips, 1849, p. 163)

The individual contributions of these early pioneers of the 19th century bolstered the swell of people interested in reform and treatment within the criminal and juvenile justice systems and led to the amassing of group collective action.
20th Century Forensic Social Work Evolution

In response to the growing number of people interested in forensic social work practices and policies opposing human oppression, organizations such as the National Conference of Charities and Correction (NCCC) emerged in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Later known as the National Conference on Social Work, the NCCC existed from 1880-1917 (Herrick & Stuart, 2005). It developed in response to the problem of social control and human oppression surrounding the punishment of offenders. Concerns about prison reform and alternatives to incarceration and delinquency dominated the earliest meetings. NCCC advocated for changes and services that are still on today’s Forensic Social Work agenda1 (Johnson, 1908). In her presidential address before the 1910 NCCC, Jane Addams highlighted the importance of these services, but by 1917 the conference, which had dropped “correction” from its name and had an agenda with little forensic content. War, the race to professionalism, and interest in Freudian psychology shifted the conference focus (Almy, 1917). Recognition that a variety of familial problems and the desire of police around the country to release “juvenile delinquents” into the community with appropriate supervisory resources and services to women as part of the women’s bureaus within the police departments (Roberts, 1997) led to a small surge in police social work during the early part of the 20th century.

Modern forensic social work scholars recognized the importance of the early 20th century police social worker. For example, in 1978, Albert Roberts published an article for the Journal of Education for Social Work that included the history of police social work and a call for comprehensive training programs for police and social workers. This encompassed “making crucial decisions competently and professionally…[and included] specialized training leading to

---

1 For a cited list of the forensic issues covered by the NCCC during that period see Appendix G.
a working knowledge of the organizational structure and function of a broad spectrum of social
service agencies, in addition to techniques of crisis intervention” (Roberts, 1978, p. 99). One
example of an historical program that served as a blueprint for Roberts’ call for police and social
workers training was in the 1910 Los Angeles Police Department (LAPD). LAPD appointed
Alice Stebbins Wells, an assistant pastor and social worker, to the LAPD’s new Juvenile Bureau.
Almost overnight, Wells gained worldwide fame as the first U.S. “policewoman” (Appier, 2005,
p. 194) and she worked for almost thirty years in prevention. Other social work policing programs
and trainings appeared in the 1) 1920s Washington D.C. Metro Police Department, 2) the 1922
San Francisco meeting of the International Association of Police Chiefs that called for training
standards of police women that included “social work experience”, and 3) the 1931 Wickersham
Despite this swell, Roberts reported that “by the end of World War II [police social work]
seemed to have been almost completely forgotten” (1978, p. 99). Today, social work led police
interventions are sometimes called crisis intervention teams (CIT) and Law Enforcement Assisted
Diversion (LEAD) (Clifasefi, Lonczak, & Collins, 2017).

During the 1930s, reports of increased juvenile crime resulted in municipalities forming
juvenile delinquency interventions (Appier, 2005). In 1934, the Los Angeles Coordinating
Councils (LACC) created an innovative program that combined a social worker with local
Mexican boxing legend Bert Colima to provide food and a boxing club to approximately 200
boys per week rather than bringing them to the juvenile court (Appier, 2005, p. 191). While the
popularity of these programs waned during the latter half of the 20th century, they are resurging
now and are known today as diversion programs.
Whether out of a critical mass of community and stakeholder support, a desire to get maximum return from scarce resources, a recognized need to provide community services to break the cycle of drug use and recidivism, or a court decree to restore constitutional protections that have buckled under the weight of sheer volume, states and local jurisdictions have been pursuing justice practices that fall under the broad heading of “diversion.” (The Center for Health and Justice at TASC, 2013, p. 6)

Diversion programs are implemented at various decision points in the criminal and juvenile justice processes including: police-led at the arrest decision point, prosecutor-led at the charging decision point or the Court at the pretrial stage.

Due to criminal justice reform and prison rehabilitation efforts, forensic social work enjoyed another resurgence that lasted through the mid-1970s. During the 1960s and 1970s, a multitude of federal policies included social work’s role in reform, particularly for juveniles’ legal rights and due process. Some examples during the 1960s were:

- Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offences Control Act of 1961 (P.L. 87-274)
- Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (P.L. 90-351)

Each “emphasized prevention, rehabilitation, training, and research on juvenile delinquency” (Scheyett, Pettus-Davis, McCarter & Brigham., 2012, p. 440). Despite this emphasis, there was little follow through.

The 1973 NASW Delegate Assembly issued a clear statement on what they believed NASW should work to achieve in the area of criminal and juvenile justice. Because of the policies and practices that, shortly thereafter, led to the era of mass incarceration, it is worth delineating the three goals:
1) work for increased use of alternatives to incarceration to replace excessive reliance on institutions in the treatment of convicted offenders; 2) advocate that no new large-scale institutions for either adults or juveniles be countenanced and that large-scale juvenile institutions be phased out within 5 years; and 3) encourage greater emphasis on sound community treatment programs for most offenders. (NASW Delegate Assembly, 1973)

In 1974, and parallel to the above goals, the federal government passed the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (P.L. 93-415). In relation to mass incarceration and racial disparity in the United States’ prison population, this Act provided guidance on a variety of concerns gaining attention today. These concerns included deinstitutionalization, limiting incarceration periods for status offenses (those that would otherwise not be considered a crime, but for the age of the defendant), separating youth and adults in confinement and reducing the percentage of youth of color in the system (Scheyett et al., 2012, p. 440).

The 1970s and 1980s focused attention on the needs of crime victims, particularly women. Services for battered women and rape crisis services were developed. The Victims of Crime Act of 1984 was introduced by the Democratic representative from New Jersey, Peter Rubino. The Act provided for grant funding to states in order to provide monetary compensation to victims of crime, prohibited media compensation to those convicted of certain crimes, and authorized the Attorney General to provide death compensation of up to $50,000 (Victims of Crime Act of 1984). States established victim advocate offices to fulfill the mandate, thus providing another opportunity for social work involvement.

Running parallel to the important increase in services to victims of crime was a devastating shift in criminal and juvenile justice policy and practice for the accused. The 1980s shifted the focus from diversion and rehabilitation to punitive and carceral practices. The war on
drugs, war on crime, three strikes laws and a general movement toward longer prison sentences closed an avenue for diversion programming that had once been a promising arena for social work. Social workers remained in correctional facilities, community programs and in indigent defense/public defender offices. Meanwhile, public opinion shifted and it was commonly believed that treatment had not sufficiently improved the crime problem. The focus of government and communities became community protection and incarceration (Reamer, 2004).

For forensic social work, the 1980s began strong but waned by the end of the decade. In 1983, amid the proliferation of punitive policies and the educational programs that staffed them, the National Organization of Forensic Social Workers (NOFSW) was formed for the “advancement of the practice and education of forensic social work,” (Chatfield, Vaughan-Eden & Butters, 2011, p. 4). Although social justice continued to be a strong platform for social work in the 1980s, the profession ultimately backed away from criminal and juvenile justice at the national level by the close of the decade. The swing to punitive practices for those charged with offenses resulted in decreased demand for social work intervention and treatment. Ivanoff, Smyth and Finnegan (1993) posit that punishment is one of three primary factors that led to a parting of the ways. These were: 1) real or imagined dearth of skills necessary to do rehabilitative work with mandated prisoners; 2) disjuncture between the mission and goals of social work and that of correctional systems and 3) lack of education and training for correctional settings in the schools of social work (Ivanoff, Smyth, & Finnegan, 1993). In its place, a proliferation of criminal justice programs within community colleges and universities created a pool of associate and baccalaureate level criminologists who were able to provide cheaper labor and, often, a more punitive perspective (Hensley, Tewksbury, Miller & Koscheski, 2002; Lambert, Hogan, Moore, Jenkins, Jiang & Clarke, 2008; and Mackey & Courtright, 2000).
By 2005, there were over 1,000 criminal justice programs in the United States (Chaiklin, 2007). By comparison, in the late 1990s, according to McNeese and Roberts (1997), only 10% of social work programs listed criminal justice-related courses.

While the long history and tradition of helping both offenders and victims navigate and disentangle from the criminal and juvenile justice systems has been fertile ground for a strong forensic social work practice, political and historical shifts have resulted in waxing and waning of the profession’s agency in this realm. Adding to these challenges are the difficulties of professional identification among those working in the field. The rich and diverse history of serving criminal and juvenile justice-involved victims and offenders along varying areas of focus ultimately led to problems with how forensic social work has been defined. The next section looks at how scholars in the field have endeavored to define the practice in preparation for the resurgence of forensic social work practice.

**Definitions of Forensic Social Work**

Throughout its course, the practice of social work in legal settings has gone by many names and been defined both broadly and narrowly by scholars and practitioners. Some focus on the individual while others focus on the system. Varying forensic social work definitions include: educating law professionals about social work welfare issues (Barker, 1995); practices, policies and social work roles with juvenile and adult offenders and crime victims (Brownell & Roberts, 2002); and macro and micro level work within the legal field (Barker, 1995; Brownell & Roberts, 2002 and Eaves, 2002).

Both early and contemporary forensic social work scholars endeavored to define forensic social work based on population, practice types, policies governing social work practice, and the roles of the social workers. The definitions can be categorized as narrow or broad with the
former describing those who specifically work with victims and the accused (Roberts and Brownell, 1999). The latter definitions view forensic social work as social work that intersects with any policies and practices involving the law (Green, Thorpe & Traupmann, 2005; Hughes & O’Neal, 1983; Barker & Branson, 1993; NOFSW, 1997).

Maschi and Killian’s 2011 article in the *Journal of Forensic Social Work*’s inaugural issue pulled together the work of the aforementioned academics and argued for an integrative definition of forensic social work (FSW) practice that would clearly position FSW as change makers in social justice and human rights. Their definition, while broadly described as an integrative approach to social work practice, also included specific practice roles of forensic social workers:

We propose that social workers across practice settings (such as child welfare, mental health, social services, education, health, substance abuse and juvenile and criminal justice) are serving individuals, families, and communities that are impacted to some extent by policies and legal issues. Examples of legal issues that impact social workers include a child welfare worker who provides expert testimony for cases of child victims of abuse, a social worker in family services whose client is going through a divorce and custody battle for her children, a social worker in a hospice setting whose dying client has no will, or a social worker in a mental health agency whose adult client was arrested for disorderly conduct. These are just a few examples of how most practicing social workers often are faced with the psychological issues and legal issues of their clients (Maschi & Killian, 2011, p. 13).

The definition of forensic social work, for the purposes of this study, is all-inclusive and takes into account the history and practice of forensic social work. Building upon the work of
Maschi and Killian, the term forensic social work was operationalized as macro and/or micro level social work services to those served within the core adult criminal and juvenile justice processes and included the accused, the adjudicated, victims, and family members of both. “Core process” referred to institutions involved in the arrest, post arrest/pre-arraignment, pretrial, adjudication, correctional, re-entry and community corrections roles as well as the policy work, administration, grant work and research associated with those processes.

In addition to a long history and scholarly discussion of definitions, the area of forensic social work is strengthened by an emerging body of literature. The next section identifies the evolution of scholarly social work research in the area of forensic social work.

**Research on Forensic Social Workers**

A 1982 study by Hughes and O’Neal was the first survey of forensic social workers and led to the development of the National Organization of Forensic Social Work (NOFSW). Hughes and O’Neal, who were forensic examiners and Certified Forensic Clinicians themselves, sent the survey to all forensic psychiatry centers in the United States and Puerto Rico. The survey had an 85% response rate (N=340) but focused solely on clinical practice and specifically the practice of forensic examinations for competency to stand trial (Hughes and O’Neal, 1983, p. 393). The authors admitted that the other settings and practices not covered by the survey meant, “the actual number of practitioners doing forensic social work may be many times higher than the 340 indicated by the survey” (Hughes & O’Neal, 1983, p. 393). The study outlined caseload and interdisciplinary team roles within the sample but reported no demographic information. In 2011, at the yearly conference, NOFSW asked members to complete a survey of forensic social work. The data were never reported or published.
Research on Forensic Social Work

The need for research was identified early in the social work profession and within forensic practices; it has grown to encompass advances in human rights and the needs of specific forensic populations. Since Abraham Flexner’s speech on professionalism at the 1915 National Conference of Charities and Correction when he identified the need for scientific publications (Flexner, 1915), social work has endeavored to build a strong foundation of scholarly, scientific, peer-reviewed studies. Similarly, forensic social work studies are needed to ensure delivery of evidence-based practices. While the scholarly base of forensic social work history, practice and theory slowly expands, little to no attention has been given to the study of forensic social workers themselves.

Historical Evolution of Social Justice and Human Rights

There is a well-traced lineage of forensic social work history that contributed to, among other things, the aforementioned forensic social work definitions. It is important to knit the historical roots of forensic social work with the grand challenges of modern practice that encompasses human rights and social justice. Forensic historians illustrate, starting with the early 20th century roots of the friendly visitors to the poor and Jane Addams’ settlement house movement, advocacy, and work on behalf of the poor, immigrants and juveniles (Roberts & Brownell, 1999; Maschi, Violette, Scotto Rosato, & Ristow, 2009; Maschi & Killian, 2011) that forensic social work was born out of a human rights and social justice tradition. More recently, social work scholars have made the clear connection between the history and modern human rights and social justice practice (Maschi, Bradley & Ward, 2009).

Barker (2003) defined social justice in terms of equality for all members of a society along the lines of basic rights, opportunities, protections, obligations and benefits of being a part
of the society. The International Federation of Social Workers (IFSW) coined the language often cited by social workers of upholding the dignity and worth of all humans (IFSW, 2012). For some time, social work scholars have linked social justice and human rights to the need for the social work profession to address human rights violations through practice (Ife, 2001).

Within forensic social work, a number of researchers use the social justice and human rights lenses to shape forensic social work practice (Maschi & Killian, 2017; Maschi & Leibowitz, 2018; Maschi & Richter, 2017; Maschi, Leibowitz, & Killian, 2018; Barbera, 2018; McLeod, 2018) by focusing on the importance of not only working with justice-involved clients, but also simultaneously advocating for system reform to impact policies and address systemic injustices. Termed the “two-pronged approach to social welfare” (Maschi & Killian, 2011, p. 8), forensic social workers intervene on micro/psychosocial issues in conjunction with macro/legal issues, processes and systems (p. 24).

While social justice and human rights are foundational to all social work practice, these are critical issues for forensically involved populations. In forensic work, there are populations that are routinely marginalized and at risk of involvement as both victims and those charged with offenses (Muncie, 2009). In addition, there are issues specifically related to the work. The next section provides a brief overview of scholarly study in both the populations and the issues related to forensic social work.

Specific Forensic Populations and Issues

Theoretically, forensic social work interacts with all populations at some point in the human lifespan. Despite the universal impact of law on everyone, there are topics related to forensic populations about which scholarly research has provided important practice and policy guidance. Scholars within the forensic social work community have considered the needs of

The research base also addresses a variety of issues and interventions that apply to forensic work populations. For example, marginalization and disenfranchisement of the formerly incarcerated can result in struggles to find housing and employment and address health disparities. Regarding the latter, research into health disparities focuses on the challenges facing forensic social workers. These include engaging informal family and community support networks behind prison walls (Bullock, Crawford, & Tennstedt, 2003). The literature also delves into the challenges forensic social workers face in providing flexible assessment tools and interventions for the justice-involved and providing services behind bars during a time of reduced federal funding (Gates, Artiga, & Rudocentz, 2014).

Forensic social work research also provides guidance to social workers looking for evidenced-based interventions with both offenders and victims. A common theme among the intervention literature is the need for stepped up educational support in schools of social work. One example is restorative justice (RJ). RJ provides social workers with the skills to assist
victims and offenders in repairing the bonds broken within relationships and communities and is consistent with the social work values of empowerment and advocacy (Severson & Bankston, 1995; van Wormer, 2006). Four approaches to RJ are “justice-victim-offender conferencing, community reparative boards, family group conferencing, and healing circles” (van Wormer, 2006, pp. 62-64). Scholar Katherine van Wormer, who has contributed greatly to the study of restorative justice, opined that “learning about principles and practice of restorative justice is important, if social work is to provide leadership in policy innovation and program development” (2006, p. 56). Fox (2009) posits that restorative justice, and Family Group Conferences (FGC) in particular, are not only established practice interventions, but that social work educators should “consider integrating these…approaches into the social work curricula in terms of both theory and practice” (p. 61). Studies of victim/offender mediation also provide guidance for forensic social work practice. Victim-offender mediation, the process of social workers mediating conflict between crime victims and their offenders in order to negotiate a mutually agreeable restitution plan, takes both parties out of the “passive position” in which they were placed by the criminal and juvenile justice systems (Umbreit, 1993, p. 69). Mediation and restorative justice are only two examples of practice interventions for forensic social workers for which the scholarly research identifies both their importance and the lack of social work educational support.

While there is an emerging body of literature related to forensic social work populations, issues and interventions, there remains a gap in the study of forensic social workers themselves. In addition to the research gap related to the beliefs, experiences, challenges and needs of forensic social workers, social work education has failed help them achieve competency and
manage difficulties. The next section addresses the need for and lack of post-secondary forensic social work programming.

**Forensic Social Work Education**

A critical component of the current study was the level of forensic social work content previously available to the respondents. Social work, as a practice profession, relies on social work programs to provide the tools necessary for effective, ethical, evidence-based practices with (or on behalf of) clients (Treger & Allen, 1997). A recent study, although carried out with a small sample, did support the importance of specific forensic social work content in preparation for practice. In Sheehan’s qualitative study of a new Master of Social Work in Forensic Studies program in Victoria, Australia (2016), a sample of fifteen participants were interviewed about the impact of post-qualifying education in forensic social work. The social workers reported that their experience of post-qualifying education led to adaptations in the nature of their practice, the development of generic skills, which enabled them to incorporate an awareness of the effects of the justice system on mental health and to balance what are often opposing needs and considerations when working in this contested area” (p. 726).

Alternatively, in the United States, it appears that social work education has generally dedicated limited attention to forensic social work (Chaiklin, 2000, 2007; Reamer, 2004). Young (2014) noted that while “new opportunities for social work influence emerge, social work students may not be adequately prepared for work within these [forensic] settings during their educational programs” (p. 107).

NOFSW (Chatfield, Vaughan-Eden & Butters, 2011) and those contributing to the forensic social work literature advocate for increased education in this field (Dwyer, 1997; Goodman, Getzel & Ford, 1996; Isenstadt, 1995; Sarri, 1995; Young & LoMonaco, 2001; Witte,
1964). It is “imperative that the social work curriculum prepare students to work within the reality of the ever-increasing forensic world in which we all live” (Robbins, Vaughan-Eden, & Maschi, 2014, p. 174). The Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) had offered little direction or attention to the preparation of forensic social workers until the 2015 Educational Policy (EP) in which they noted the need for better forensic content in courses and curricula. Maschi and Killian made the argument that the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE)’s 2008 Educational Policy 2.1.5 called for “social workers to be competent in advancing human rights and social and economic justice… [and] is consistent with forensic social work aims” (2011, p.9). The authors went on to posit that forensic social workers are poised to “assume a pivotal leadership role [in] maneuvering change in the legal system” (Maschi & Killian, 2011, p. 9).

CSWE’s 1959 curriculum study concluded that no specialized curriculum was needed for the area of corrections, but “the correctional system warrants study as a field of social work practice because the particular configuration of social worker-client roles required by correctional service produces significant adaptations of social work method and skill” (Studt, 1959, p. 6). Since 1959, a number of policy and procedural changes have created opportunities for social work involvement. For example, the criminal justice model now includes split sentencing. Split sentencing incorporates a combination of punishments that include incarceration, probation, fines and fees, and restitution. Other changes include diversion, re-entry and increased victim services. Governmental incentives such as Justice Reinvestment\(^2\) and

---

\(^2\)According to the National Conference of State Legislatures Justice Reinvestment is a process used by a growing number of states to curb corrections costs, reduce offender recidivism and maintain public safety. The data-driven reforms have been bipartisan, cross-governmental and impactful. Policies aim to reduce spending on corrections and reinvest the savings in strategies that increase public safety and hold offenders accountable. (Lawrence, 2017, para. 1)
the Second Chance Act have greatly increased forensic social work’s potential impact. In Connecticut alone, the current administration, legislature and concerned citizens have successfully implemented a number of policies aligned with social work values. These include the Raise the Age legislation based on a growing body of neuroscientific studies, the Second Chance Society for returning citizens and the concerted efforts of Governor Dannel Malloy and his Criminal Justice Policy Advisory Committee to reduce the prison population. Each of these macro level policy changes and initiatives represent multiple opportunities for social workers educated and trained in forensic practices.

Although surveys administered between 2002 and 2011 to MSW programs reported few criminal justice practice concentrations, the offerings have since increased only minimally (CSWE, 2001 and Neighbors, Green-Faust & van Beyer, 2002). A 2013 study of criminal

---

3 The Second Chance Act was enacted into law on April 9, 2008. The purpose of the law: (a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Act are— (1) to break the cycle of criminal recidivism, increase public safety, and help States, local units of government, and Indian Tribes, better address the growing population of criminal offenders who return to their communities and commit new crimes; (2) to rebuild ties between offenders and their families, while the offenders are incarcerated and after reentry into the community, to promote stable families and communities; (3) to encourage the development and support of, and to expand the availability of, evidence-based programs that enhance public safety and reduce recidivism, such as substance abuse treatment, alternatives to incarceration, and comprehensive reentry services; (4) to protect the public and promote law-abiding conduct by providing necessary services to offenders, while the offenders are incarcerated and after reentry into the community, in a manner that does not confer luxuries or privileges upon such offenders; (5) to assist offenders reentering the community from incarceration to establish a self-sustaining and law-abiding life by providing sufficient transitional services for as short of a period as practicable, not to exceed one year, unless a longer period is specifically determined to be necessary by a medical or other appropriate treatment professional; and (6) to provide offenders in prisons, jails or juvenile facilities with educational, literacy, vocational, and job placement services to facilitate re-entry into the community. (Public Law 110–199, 2008, p. 2)

4 The Second Chance Society is an initiative in Connecticut developed by Governor Dannel Malloy that focuses on sentencing, parole and pardoning. The aims are: 1) reclassify drug offenses to send fewer non-violent individuals to jail, 2) eliminate mandatory minimums for non-violent drug possession, 3) streamline parole hearings to reduce Backlogs and make process more efficient and effective (Malloy, 2015, pp. 1-3)

5 Returning Citizens is a term that often replaces other pejorative terms for those who have previously been incarcerated. The Center for Public Justice’s Shared Justice initiative explains the stigma reduction: “On one hand, the term ‘ex-convict’ emphasizes what they’ve done, and hangs it around their neck as a millstone. It is a loaded term that categorizes a human being’s identity in past illegal activity for which they have already been punished. On the other hand, the language of, ‘returning citizen’ provides hope and honors both their humanity and their capacity to contribute to a flourishing society. It gives space for hope by acknowledging their capacity to act as a citizen despite the barriers they may face. Yet, on an even deeper level it honors their humanity by reminding them that they are not defined by past actions, rather we expect them to contribute as one citizen among many”. (Phipps, 2017, para. 8)
justice content in CSWE-accredited MSW programs (Epperson, Roberts, Ivanoff, Tripodi and Gilmer) found “the opportunities for MSW students to explore interests in criminal justice are quite limited” (p. 98). The study of one hundred ninety-two MSW programs explored the prevalence of each of three measures of criminal justice content: A dual or joint degree program, a concentration or specialization, or coursework. Only one percent of the programs included all three measures (Epperson, et al, 2013, p.103).

Epperson et al. found that while more than 40% of the programs offered at least one course relevant to criminal justice work (p. 104), when the researchers excluded the more common Social Work and the Law courses, that percentage dropped to less than one fourth of all programs (Epperson, et al, 2013, p. 104). The distinction is that law courses are a relevant overlay to all social work practice; however, the more nuanced practical application courses related to forensic work are less available. In addition, 95% (n=183) of those CSWE-accredited MSW programs had field placements in criminal justice settings (Epperson, et al, 2013, p. 103).

Providing field placement without content support is problematic.

Disparity between the number of programs offering forensic courses and forensic placements raises concerns if there is a disconnect between the educational content and the fieldwork. How are students synthesizing their placement experiences with their educational objectives and are there are faculty with the forensic knowledge to support the experiential learning relationship between field and classroom? As Epperson et al. interpret, this disjuncture in coursework:

suggests that many social workers who ultimately practice in criminal justice settings are not likely to have received specific criminal justice training as part of their MSW education, but rather learn to develop their professional identity through work experience
Within settings that may not be congruent with social work values and ethics. (2013, p. 104)

Social workers who experience on-the-job training in criminal and juvenile justice settings are likely to engage in this learning alongside or by non-social workers. Those shaping the social workers’ post-social-work-education experience and training are more likely to be the graduates of the increasingly common criminal justice programs. This overlap between those criminal justice graduates and social workers working in the criminal and juvenile justice systems may influence social work identity, values, ethics and skills.

Forensic social work education should provide the knowledge and skill base to address the **person in environment**, which includes bio-psychosocial, legal and systemic issues of justice-involved populations. This is necessary to increase recruitment possibilities (Weiss, 2003) and to compete with the proliferation of criminal justice graduates (Chaiklin, 2007) who may be filling positions that are better suited to forensic social workers.

With the recent policy shifts toward more holistic views of criminal and juvenile justice mentioned earlier, some criminal justice programs have begun to adopt more humanistic ideologies that look as if they were tailored to social work practice. These underpin the rehabilitation and diversion efforts encompassed by the Second Chance Initiative, Second Chance Society, and, to a lesser degree, Justice Reinvestment.

Research-driven programming is also on the rise. For example, prolific criminal justice scholars, such as Todd Clear of John Jay College of Criminal Justice, promote the future of the criminology profession in “evidence-based criminology” (2010, p. 1) and multi-level humanistic change. With no mention of social work, a *Journal of Community Corrections* article addressed the future of community corrections and outlined both macro and micro-level changes in order to
“promote a new era of shared responsibility in corrections that is framed within a human rights perspective and driven by an ethic of care” (Lutze, Johnson, Clear, Latessa & Slate, 2012, p. 42). Connecticut’s probation department moved in this direction by participating in programming studies that include motivational interviewing, gender-responsive services and mental health case management (Judicial Branch Court Support Services Division, 2010).

With social workers in forensic field placements and working in criminal and juvenile justice processes across the United States, the lack of educational support from the profession limits specialization. Lack of support may negatively affect practice with clients, restrict growth of the field of forensic social work, and ultimately stand in the way of leadership opportunities for social work within the criminal and juvenile justice paradigm. The next section explores models of forensic social work outside of the United States that benefited from educational and professional support for forensic social workers.

**Specialization within the Profession**

Outside of the United States, forensic social work has achieved greater progress toward being viewed as a specialist practice. In addition to the progression of forensic social work abroad, this section presents an example of how forensic social work specialization led to a criminal justice paradigm shift in one European country.

Until very recently, much of the work surrounding forensic social work as a specialist practice has come from the work of researchers in Belgium (Bauwens, 2009; Bauwens & Roose, 2017), Australia (Green, Thorpe, & Traupmann, 2005; Sheehan, 2012; Sheehan, 2016), England and Scotland (Clark, 2000; Fenton, 2012; Fenton, 2015; Lynch, 2014; Maybee, 2000; Nellis, 2000). Sheehan’s recent Australian qualitative study \( n=15 \) inquired if participants involved in the post-qualifying *Masters in Social Work Forensic Specialty program* believed forensic social
work is a specialist practice (2016). The majority of participants (12) indicated that forensic social work is a specialist practice (Sheehan, 2016, p. 732). Among the considerations were 1) the distinctive nature of their work context and role, 2) their need to understand the intersection of the issues faced by the ‘offenders’ with whom they work, laws, and mental health, 3) their specialist knowledge about advocating for clients in forensic settings, and 4) their abilities to translate risk assessments into plans for the Court while still respecting client individuality and personal wishes (Sheehan, 2016).

As conceived by Sheehan and the aforementioned researchers, a forensic social work specialization may provide critical training and education in topics including treatment needs of those involved in the juvenile and criminal justice systems, legal processes, and shaping policy and delivery systems. Integrating criminal and juvenile justice issues into a curriculum benefits all levels of practice. American forensic social work scholars began identifying classroom strategies and approaches that would benefit forensic social work students. These include self-awareness/reflection, therapeutic relationship, ethics and values, assessment, therapeutic goals, intervention, and macro policy (Maschi, Baer & Turner, 2011, p. 247).

While integrating forensics into social work education would benefit all social work practice, it may also support specialization within the field. Scotland’s shift to rely on criminal justice social work to provide the full range of services is a striking example of the capabilities of a fully-realized forensic social work specialization. In fact, NASW relied upon Scotland’s Criminal Justice Social Work Services (CJSW) as the basis for its 2010 Workforce Study entitled “Criminal Justice Social Work in the United States: Adapting to New Challenges”.
Scotland’s approach to criminal justice social work provides a model of what a justice system planned and administered by social work could accomplish (Social Work Services Group, 2004; Wilson, 2010). Scotland looked at its criminal justice system and made a strategic decision that criminal justice prevention and psychosocial services offered by CJSW are not only necessary components of its criminal justice system, but also central and integrated components of its overall system of psychosocial service delivery. The integration of CJSW into criminal justice systems resulted from the need for strategies to address the conditions that led to the cycle of arrests, re-arrests, and eventual recidivism. (Wilson, 2010, p. 8)

In addition to the professional values and skills that already exist within the social work profession, if forensic social work were supported by the existing infrastructure within social work it could lead to leadership opportunities for the profession and paradigm shifts within the United States’ criminal and juvenile justice systems.

The social work profession, National Association of Social Workers and other bodies such as state licensing boards, have long-established policies and procedures for credentialing social workers and accrediting social work programs. The profession has many years of experience in developing professional standards. It is therefore positioned to contribute this expertise in the national effort to improve outcomes in the criminal justice system. (Wilson, 2010, p. 16)

Social Work within the United States has a history of forensic social work dating back to the beginning of the profession. Support for the practice has ebbed and flowed according to historical and political changes since the late 19th century, but social workers continued to work with the accused, convicted, victims, family members, communities and within policy positions.
While social workers have continued to practice their skills in forensic placements and go on to work in forensic settings, it is largely without the support of social work education. Despite an emerging body of literature on populations and issues salient to the work that underpins the work of forensic social workers, lack of educational support and specialization may hinder the influence social work has on the future of criminal and juvenile justice. In addition to needing educational support to achieve competencies in practice, forensic social work lacks research into the beliefs, needs, experiences and factors influencing the work of the forensic social workers themselves.

This dearth of knowledge is the reason the current study is important for forensic social work. The profession needs an understanding of ways to tailor social work education in order to prepare social workers for forensic micro and macro level forensic practice and to be leaders in the field. We do know that forensic social workers are working in environments that may influence the quality of their professional experience and the services they provide to clients. In examination of that, the social work literature provides conceptual guidance on the reciprocal relationship of the person and their environment. The next section applies social work theory to better conceptualize the current study.

**Conceptual Framework of the Current Study**

**Ecological Perspective**

The ecological perspective provided the conceptual framework for this study. One of the two main perspectives derived from social work itself, it was chosen here because “social work theoretical perspectives and models and approaches are most responsive to the profession’s mission of social justice and social purpose of paying equal attention to people and their environments” (Gitterman & Rovinelli-Heller, 2011, p. 204).
The ecological perspective was first envisioned as a way to assimilate the two prongs of social work practice: treatment and reform. Developed with the natural world and the interaction between an organism and its environment in mind, the perspective “conceptualiz[ed] and emphasis[ed] the dysfunctional transactions between people and their social and physical environments” (Gitterman and Germain, 1978, p.602). The current study endeavored to also identify the functional or “protective” factors and transactions of forensic social workers within their environments while retaining the spirit of viewing all transactions in a constant state of evolution and adaptation (Gitterman & Germain, 1978).

Because forensic social work resides primarily in host settings with theoretical frameworks that may differ from those of social work, there are many implications for worker, environment and client. Ecological thinking allows forensic social workers to approach the criminal and juvenile justice processes in terms of the complex roots of the illicit behaviors and actions rather than the linear cause and effect model that drives the current system (Gitterman & Germain, 2008). Although the ecological perspective has largely been applied to understanding interactions of clients, it is premised on the transactional nature of the relationships among clients, environments and the social workers that are intervening. For this reason, ecological factors are also helpful in understanding the conditions of their work and the interactions of the workers in their host environments. Some of the key ecological components examined in this study are:

- continual transaction between person and environment and level of fit;
- the importance of the organization and organizational auspices; and
- power and control and protective factors.
Level of fit. Level of fit is the main lens for this study. It provides insight into both the forensic social worker (intellectual, emotional and motivational), his/her environment (physical space, organizations and networks) and the interdependence between the two. As in nature, the ecological perspective considers the person and his/her environment in a state of constant change and reaction to and from each other. This process of accommodation is defined not as passive adjustment to a status quo but as the active efforts of an individual over its life span to reach a goodness-of-fit with the environment, thus ensuring development and survival. (Brower, 1988, p. 412)

Ultimately, if the client, or forensic social worker in this case, perceives that there are resources within the environment to deal with on the job stress, he/she will experience a good fit with that environment and “the positive level of fit supports and resources releases the person’s potential for personal growth and sense of mastery” (Gitterman & Heller, 2011, p. 205). Alternatively, absence of perceiving access to resources in the environment results in increased discomfort and stress and a negative level of fit (Gitterman & Heller, 2011). Stress has a detrimental effect on the social worker’s practice and sustainability. The more we understand about the factors within the environment, social worker, and their level of fit, the better the opportunities for improving their work environment.

The organization. The “organization influences and shapes services” (Gitterman & Miller, 1989, p. 151). Forensic social workers interact with clients in courthouses, prisons, detention centers, probation offices, police stations, alternative incarceration centers and other locales that are prime examples of the types of places that can alter what Germain calls adaptive potential (1978a). Administrators design these facilities based on custodial concerns. The physical plant and institutional policies ensure security while discouraging unrestricted
movement and seek to limit personal space for those charged with and convicted of crimes. These limitations may also influence the forensic social workers’ practice and sustainability within the field. Germain points out that:

Spatial behaviors reflect people’s adaptive potential in transaction with the spatial aspects of their physical environment. Where the environment is supportive, creative adaptation and growth occur. Where the environment is non-protective or depriving, stress is created and growth and adaptive functioning may be impeded. (1978a, p. 522)

**The work environment.** It is also important to consider that the work environment (comprised of the size and complexity of the agency/ location and the peer, mentor and supervisory groups within that location) exerts environmental forces on the worker that can be supportive or detrimental. Just as the social worker would apply the ecological perspective and life model to working with families or groups, the model applies to the forensic social worker’s work location. Where clients are encouraged to seek support from family, peers and other groups to enhance functioning, the forensic social worker’s work environment made up of peer groups, mentors and supervisors may or may not fulfill those needs (Gitterman and Germain, 1978, p. 605). For example, the work environment of a correctional social worker may be large and complex and may not include social workers as the peer group; whereas a mental health or child protective services agency, though large and complex, may offer more peer group support made up of other social workers.

**Turf Interests.** Related to the concept of work environment, turf interests may arise when workers become preoccupied with staking out their own professional territory in settings where other professions may encroach on their duties. This may be detrimental to the worker-client relationship because “client needs are often held hostage to turf interests” (Gitterman &
Miller, 1989, p. 155). According to the ecological perspective, protective factors may ameliorate the impact of power and control issues. These include both education and training. These and other protective factors may result in more expertise, a stronger professional identity and role specification. It is important to identify which factors foster a high level of fit in criminal and juvenile justice settings.

**Social network.** Germain and Gitterman posit that the “social network” is a key factor in helping clients meet their social needs of “recognition, affirmation, and protection from social isolation…a means for identification and for socialization to the norms, values, knowledge, and belief systems of the particular culture” (1978, p. 606). In the current study, the social network refers to the aforementioned peer, mentor and supervisory groups within the work environment but also the external connections with other social workers and professional organizations. For those working in settings antithetical to the social work norms and for whom there are limited natural networks, efforts to tether the forensic social worker to outside organizations may ameliorate the impact of burnout and stress. Ultimately, the forensic social worker may positively affect the work environment itself.

In the current study, data were collected to determine the impact of protective factors and if they created a “lifeline” for forensic social workers within their transactions with their host setting and with the profession itself (Gitterman & Germain, 2008). Protective factors “buffer against life stressors by preventing them, or lessening their impact, or ameliorating them more quickly” and include personal and environmental resources (Gitterman & Germain, 2008). This study explored some of the protective factors based on the ecological perspective. These included:

- external support networks;
environmental resources such as clinical supervision, mentoring, professional support, continuing education/new skills, professional affiliation; and

- improvements to “fit” within work environment such as increased autonomy, creativity and positively impacting the organization.

Even the perception of having outside resources available to ameliorate stress makes the stressor easier to manage because it may alter the person’s appraisal of the stressor (Gitterman & Germain, 2008). Forensic social workers are confronted with destructive forces in their daily work and a better understanding of how these interact and can be ameliorated would benefit those workers, the field and the clients.

**Organizational auspices.** The concept of the organizational auspice refers to the type of agency that employs the worker. Giffords (2003) studied social service employees within three auspices (public, non-profit and proprietary) which were categorized according to “source of authority” (p. 9). Although Giffords’ 2003 and later 2009 studies pointed to those social service employees working under public auspices as reporting less professional commitment to the organization, there were additional moderating factors including age and position to consider.

**Power and control.** Hierarchy, power and control are inherent to criminal and juvenile justice organizations and are particularly tricky to navigate for forensic social workers trying to uphold professional values and the needs of the client. Social workers may be low in hierarchical rank within the organization, leading to limited authority and fewer opportunities for creativity and initiative (Gitterman & Miller, 1989)--important considerations for job satisfaction and sustainability in the field.

Forensic social workers may be susceptible to hierarchical influence within criminal and juvenile justice organizations because of interdisciplinary teamwork and reliance on others, such
as correctional officers and marshals, for personal safety. Some criminal and juvenile justice facilities are even considered quasi-military, as in the case of correctional facilities. Forensic social workers may be influenced by the pressure of being viewed as an irritant to the organization’s purpose of justice, security or punishment. As posited by Gitterman and Miller, they may rework their priorities to please the hierarchy (1989) and may be susceptible to “submissive behavior” and a “fear of being devalued” (Gitterman & Miller, 1989, p. 158). The social work profession values collaborative relationships, while most criminal and juvenile justice agencies operate within a hierarchy that relies upon order, structure and predictability (Cameron and Quinn, 2006). For these reasons, it may be difficult for forensic social workers to uphold their professional values. They may also experience dissonance when working on behalf of the client and trying to fulfill the profession’s mission of addressing social justice needs.

Personal and Environmental Impacts on Practice

The ecological perspective also provides a strong basis for understanding how various personal and environmental factors may influence the work and retention of the forensic social worker.

Deleterious (negative) effects of working as a forensic social worker. While there is scarce literature on forensic social workers in particular, both ecological perspective and social work literature provide guidance. The social work human service literature posits that working conditions, type of environment, job autonomy and value conflicts with the organization have deleterious effects on recruitment and job retention (Arches, 1991; Ewalt, 1991; Hartman 1991). These are consistent with the disadvantages posited by Gitterman and Miller in their discussion

---

6 Deeper analysis of competing values within organizations was not within the scope of this current study; however see Cameron and Quinn’s 2006 Competing Values Framework for more information on the four quadrants of organizational culture types.
of social workers within hierarchical organizations (1989) and what Germain and Gitterman term “normative conflicts” among members of the same group or organization (1978, p. 608). This study aimed to learn more about what challenges forensic social workers are facing in their practice by asking them about their activities, their beliefs, their environments and their attitudes.

Forensic nursing literature also provides some empirical research that may give further insight into the factors that negatively affect forensic social workers. Weiskopf’s 2005 qualitative study of nine forensic nurses in correctional facilities, including Connecticut, provides a rich description of the challenges that social workers in the same facilities may also face. The five common themes perceived by the forensic nurses were: 1) negotiating the boundaries between custody and caring, 2) struggling to create a caring environment, 3) striving to turn a person’s life around, 4) being in a risky situation and 5) staying vigilant (Weiskopf, 2005, p. 339).

The retention literature often cites job stress and burnout as factors that lead workers to quit. Maslach, Jackson and Leiter (1996) define burnout as “a state of exhaustion in which one is cynical about the value of one’s occupation and doubtful of one’s capacity to perform” (p. 20). In the workplace, burnout is attributed to 1) chronic imbalance between resources and demands and 2) skepticism about the organization’s missions, visions and values (Schaufeli, Leiter & Maslach, 2008, p. 209). Understanding that an employee’s burnout is on a continuum and therefore has the capacity for improvement (Schaufeli, Leiter & Maslach, 2008, p. 215) was a critical consideration in the design of the current research study.

**Protective factors for practice and sustainability.** In forensic social work settings, the worker may have limited access to opportunities for authority or affiliation and may not have a
social work supervisor. The profession could provide a lifeline to forensic social workers.

According to the literature, some possibilities include:

- professional support (Chaiklin, 2007; Healy & Meagher, 2004; O’Donnell, Farrar, Brintzenhofeszoc, Conrad, Danis, Grady, Taylor & Ulrich, 2008; Weiskopf, 2005);
- trained mentors (Collins, 1994; Cashin & Potter, 2006; Heartfield, Gibson & Nasel, 2005; Koberg, Boss, Chappell & Ringer, 1994; McKinley, 2004);
- clinical supervisors within the profession (Stalker, Mandell, Frensch, Harvey & Wright, 2007);
- education and training opportunities in Forensic Social Work (Neighbors, Green-Faust & Beyer, 2002) and
- acknowledgement that forensic social work is a vital area of practice.

Salary and benefits, particularly among state workers, may be considered an incentive to sustainability, although Herzberg (1962) posits that these are actually hygiene factors that only serve to reduce dissatisfaction rather than promote satisfaction. For the purpose of this study many respondents were state workers within the same few unions.

Among the personal factors that impact career choice and job retention are race/ethnicity (Rubin & Johnson, 1984; Abell & McDonell, 1990; Raber, Febb & Berg-Weger, 1998 and Limb and Organista, 2003), political affiliation (Smith-Osborne & Rosenwald, 2009) and gender (Small, 1980; Fortune & Hanks, 1988; Thompson & Marley, 1999 and Holley & Young, 2005).

Rationale and Justification

The Rationale for Forensic Social Work Studies. Forensic social work embodies the foundation of the social work profession by providing assistance to the most marginalized members of our society and addressing the social justice issues associated with human
oppression and the basic human rights of all people. The poor and marginalized in the United States have labored under strict and often unfair criminal laws and policies that proliferated in the latter half of the 20th century and there is a need for social work skills and advocacy.

**Legacy of Disparate Treatment for Justice-Involved Persons.** Looking at the statistics from the latter half of the 20th century, until recently, the United States had the highest prison rate of any country in the world (Walmsley, 2012) and was fraught with disproportionate minority contact and racial and ethnic disparity along the criminal and juvenile justice decision points. Specifically, by the end of 2010 one out of every 43 adults was under community supervision (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2010, p. 2). One in nine African American males between the ages of 25 and 29 was incarcerated in 2006, representing a woefully disproportionate amount of people of color in our prisons (Mauer & King, 2007). One of every 200 U.S. residents was incarcerated according to 2012 Bureau of Justice Assistance statistics (Guerino, Harrison, and Sabol, p.1). In addition, among the 100 most populous counties in the United States, public defenders handled an average of 82% of all criminal cases (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2000, p. 6). Eligibility for a public defender translates to meaning that 82% of defendants in these jurisdictions are indigent. They are poor.

**Recent Reform Movements.** Recent criminal and juvenile justice reforms have resulted in more opportunities for social workers to intervene in community treatment and supervision, advocacy and policy work. In fact, these policy initiatives have reduced the impact of the era of mass incarceration over the last five years so that fewer people are held pretrial (jail) and there are early release mechanisms for those incarcerated for non-violent crimes (prison)\(^7\). The Bureau

---

\(^7\) Most of the United States’ pretrial (jail) facilities are county—run. Connecticut is one of only six states that have a unified state correctional system that combines both pretrial and sentenced populations.
of Justice Statistics “Prisoners in 2015” estimated 1,526,800 “prisoners [are] under the jurisdiction of state and federal correctional authorities” and noted that the number of prisoners held in 2015 was the “largest decline…since 1978. (Carson & Anderson, 2016, p. 1). Despite, or perhaps because of, the decline in pretrial and sentenced persons around the country, social workers are a key component in these policy and practice changes. These figures reflect changes in diversion, no entry and early release programs. Social work intake, assessment, intervention and treatment are necessary in the efforts to reduce over-reliance on correctional facilities.

Without direct knowledge about who these social workers are, the profession is at a disadvantage for providing training, education and support to those tasked with providing these services to specialized criminal and juvenile justice populations. This study surveyed those social workers already providing these services to determine what works and what does not work in terms of preparation, attraction to the field and retention.

**Racial and Ethnic Disparity.** Social workers, including those working within the criminal and juvenile justice systems, are charged with addressing racism and oppression in the institution. This includes both awareness and action related to overt racism, institutional racism and the worker’s own internalized racism and implicit bias (NASW, 2007). There was little to no literature specific to social workers’ implicit racial bias in the criminal and/or juvenile justice systems; what exists addresses social service providers’ internalized attitudes toward welfare recipients.

A significant purpose of the current study was to measure forensic social workers’ attitudes, opinions and beliefs about race and ethnicity. This was accomplished using Abbott’s *Professional Opinion Scale (POS)* and its “Commitment to Individual Freedom” factor (1988, 1999, 2003). The majority of questions within that factor addressed the attitudes of social
workers on welfare beliefs. General racial bias questions from the 1996 State of Connecticut Judicial Branch Task Force on Minority Fairness Full Report were designed to measure racial bias in Judicial Branch staff and were used in the current study.

Significance of the Study

The current research described Connecticut’s forensic social worker population and captured both the deleterious effects and protective factors that influence their work. Beyond the descriptive aims of this research, the study identified and tested the impact of those factors on social workers in forensic positions and settings. This work may influence the education and training of social workers in forensic practice. Both theoretical and practical contributions pertain most directly to forensic social workers, but also the wider field of social work. The results of the current study will provide the profession with tools to enhance education and training for forensic social work. This study may also bolster supportive networks and give the profession an opportunity to impact the criminal and juvenile justice systems. These goals are commensurate with strengthening the profession itself.

Research Questions

Questions. In an effort to build upon the work of the social work scholars, mentioned above, who have documented the history, the definition and the future vision of the practice, this study sought to learn more about those directly involved in the practice of forensic social work in Connecticut. To that end, the research questions addressed in this study were:

Question 1: What are the demographic, employment and educational characteristics, of Forensic Social Workers in Connecticut and what led them to the criminal justice field?

Question 2: How do groups of Forensic Social Workers differ in what they report about their social justice values?
Hypothesis 1: There will be a significant difference between the Professional Opinion Scale scores of victim/offender pairings.

Hypothesis 2: Those working in the macro level of practice will have higher Professional Opinion Scale scores than those working in micro practice.

Hypothesis 3: Those working in a public auspice will report lower Professional Opinion Scale scores than those in non-profit or proprietary auspices.

Hypothesis 4: Those with high levels of political interest will have higher Professional Opinion Scale scores than those on the lower end of the spectrum.

Hypothesis 5: Those with high levels of criminal justice political interest will have higher Professional Opinion Scale scores than those on the lower end of the spectrum.

Question 3: How do the various traditionally negative and protective factors (isolation, safety, lack of resources, overlapping duties and competing values, external support, professional support, continuing education, professional affiliation and organizational auspice) impact Forensic Social Workers’ level of fit, overall job satisfaction and job-role stress?

Hypothesis 6: The more negative factors reported, the lower the scores on the Job Satisfaction Scale and Professional Quality of Life Scale.

Hypothesis 7: The more negative factors reported, the higher the scores on the Discrete Emotions Emotional Labor Scale.

Hypothesis 8: The more protective factors reported, the higher the scores on the Job Satisfaction Scale and Professional Quality of Life Scale.

Hypothesis 9: The more protective factors reported, the lower the scores on the Discrete Emotions Emotional Labor Scale.
Summary

The review of the current literature on forensic social workers reveals a gap in the literature. While there is a long-documented history of social workers in criminal and juvenile justice and an emerging body of literature on the various practice considerations within the field, there is virtually no information about the experiences, education and beliefs of the social workers themselves. The current study was designed to address the gap by describing the population and surveying how various factors influence the emotions, job satisfaction and professional quality of life of those working in criminal and juvenile justice processes in Connecticut. This study has the potential to contribute to the social work profession and the administration of criminal and juvenile justice processes by expanding on the knowledge about an integral profession within the system.
Chapter Two: Methodology

Introduction

This research study used a cross-sectional design to gather demographic and other information through an online survey in order to describe the population of those working as social workers in criminal and juvenile justice processes in Connecticut. The survey collected both quantitative and qualitative data. Using Dillman’s Tailored Design Method (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2014), the survey elicited information about worker demographics, characteristics and factors contributing to selection of forensic social work practice, types of forensic practice and attitudes about social work practice. The study also sought to examine various factors that influence stress, job satisfaction and level of fit. Information is presented in this chapter in the following order: a) research design and rationale, b) researcher role, c) sampling methodology, d) instrument, e) data collection, f) data management and planned analysis, g) verification of reliability and validity, h) data analysis plan, and, i) ethical considerations for the study.

Research Design and Rationale

This study used an anonymous online survey via Survey Monkey to collect cross-sectional data from a purposive sample of forensic social workers in Connecticut. Cross-sectional data collection examined a segment of the forensic social work population at the point in time when the survey was administered. Exploratory studies and survey research, in particular, use cross-sectional designs to identify relationships among variables at only one point in time (Monette, Sullivan & DeJong, 2005, p. 91). The technique of total population sampling was chosen because it provided a structured process of identifying all potential members of a hard to identify population using multiple resources (Laerd, 2012).
The electronic, online survey was chosen in lieu of a paper survey for a number of reasons. First, electronic web-based surveys “are the fastest growing form of surveying occurring in the United States (Dillman, Smyth & Christian, 2014, p. 301). Previous issues with internet access and connections have been improved since the initial implementation of internet surveys. Because the population is comprised of professionals working in state, private and non-profit agencies that are more likely to have access to email and computers (Dillman et al., 2014), email was the preferred mode of delivery. The majority of the agencies identified for this study were state agencies; the State of Connecticut provides centralized email capabilities to all state agencies (Department of Administrative Services, 2018, p. 1).

A second consideration in using electronic survey research was economy of scale. In addition, because this study sought access to both social workers and those who identified as social workers, online access permitted recruitment of this previously understudied population. Two screening questions identified those who fit the criteria for inclusion; therefore, distribution had to reach all possible members of this population by casting a wide net across all employees of most of the agencies. An online survey made wide distribution feasible.

Survey Monkey online survey development cloud-based software was used to design and distribute the survey. Survey Monkey’s premier membership was chosen for its ease of use, security features, customer support, robust formatting choices, advanced customization, survey logic, and data export capabilities.

There are no other published studies of forensic or criminal justice social workers with which to compare distribution mode; however, survey research has been employed in other studies of social service workers. Graham, Shier, and Nicholas’ 2016 study of workplace congruence (level of fit) employed an online survey to capture the entire population (N=2773) of
unionized Canadian social service workers and resulted in a sample of 674 (24.3% response rate) (p. 1102). The major drawback of the limited response rate was inability to generalize, however it was methodologically necessary to reach the entire population. Notably, the Canadian study was not as restricted as the current study because Graham et al. knew how many unionized workers there were.

**Researcher Role**

**Bias and Influence**

The researcher had been an employee of the Division of Public Defenders Services (PDS), one of the agencies to which the survey was administered, for eighteen years at the time of this study. Those positions included working as a social worker, a mitigation specialist and the agency researcher; however, the researcher did not supervise any potential PDS respondents. The researcher also worked on interdisciplinary teams, committees, grants and other professional activities with researchers and management of some of the agencies surveyed in this research. To safeguard against bias and influence over the potential respondents in those agencies, the researcher worked in conjunction with doctoral committee members, and IRB and human protection committees within the agencies and the University of Connecticut (UCONN) IRB.

With regard to data collection within the Division of Public Defender Services (PDS), this researcher approached PDS with a two-part plan. First, the researcher did not approach potential PDS respondents (staff) directly and at no time was the study discussed in any work-related correspondence. All discussion of the proposed study was conducted outside of work hours with the Chief Public Defender.

Second, this researcher created a separate PDS information sheet (see Appendix F). It outlined the possibilities that the researcher may be able to identify the potential PDS
respondents by their answers. It also outlined the safeguards such as reporting only aggregate
data, destruction of data at the end of the study and methodology review by the UCONN IRB
and the Chief Public Defender.

**Planning and Conducting the Study**

This researcher developed the methodology in consultation with the committee
chair/methodologist as well as phone and email consultation with the UCONN IRB. The
researcher conducted all correspondence with senior management at all potential agencies,
through phone and in-person meetings with IRB and human subject committees.

**Sampling**

There were no published studies of forensic social workers in the United States and, for
the purposes of the current study, there was no target population list of forensic social workers in
Connecticut. The current study was also largely exploratory. For those reasons, probability
sampling was not feasible. Purposive sampling provided the most rigorous sampling method in
this case.

The multi-step, multi-resource technique of total population sampling was used to
identify all members of the forensic social work population (Laerd, 2012). This technique has
been used in nursing and qualitative studies and a recent psychological study of adults with
challenging behaviors (Bowring, Totsika, Hastings, Toogood & Griffith, 2017). Similar to the
steps taken in the current study, Bowring et al., applied a “population ascertainment process” for
identifying where potential participants may be found (2017, p. 20). The following section
describes the similar process of total population sampling employed in the current study.
Agencies and Participants

The purpose of the current study was to describe the population of social workers in Connecticut who are engaged in criminal and juvenile justice processes and to examine how a variety of personal, organizational and other factors influences interest in the field, retention and professional quality of life. The criteria for inclusion as potential participants was based on the following factors:

- worked for any of the identified criminal and juvenile justice-related programs within state agencies, private agencies and non-profit agencies and identified as doing social work, or
- worked for any of the identified criminal and juvenile justice-related programs within state agencies, private agencies and non-profit agencies worked in criminal and/or juvenile justice programs within other types of agencies; and
  - had at least one of the following:
    - a social work degree,
    - worked in a social work titled position or
    - worked in a position with a social work description.

As described earlier, there was neither a list of all social workers working in criminal and juvenile justice processes in Connecticut nor a list of those who identify as forensic social workers because of their work in these fields. Consistent with the total population sample process, an initial list was created of potential locations (agencies and units) within which forensic social workers could be found.

Further effort to identify all possible job titles, and job descriptions drew on a number of resources, included are the following three steps.
• First, the researcher relied upon professional experience with the criminal and juvenile justice systems. Because this researcher had worked for a state agency as both a forensic social worker and a researcher and was very familiar with the agencies, service vendors and processes, it was possible to identify which agencies were likely involved in these processes.

• Second, the researcher searched state websites, online 501(c)(3) tax documents, annual reports and presentations and minutes from committees, including the Criminal Justice Policy Advisory Commission (CJPAC). The researcher also observed several of the CJPAC meetings.

• Third, the researcher used the information gathered to create a comprehensive list of agencies involved in the core processes of investigation, arrest, pretrial incarceration, pretrial diversion, adjudication, corrections and community corrections for adults and juveniles involved in these processes. Those resources also provided lists of units specifically assigned to forensic processes. The resources also helped to identify private and non-profit agencies which under contract to provide services to justice-involved individuals throughout those processes.

Not all agencies had enough information online to complete the above steps. Thirteen agencies did not have websites or did not have public reports that provided the information necessary to identify potential respondents. In January 2014, requests were sent to those agencies in accordance with the Connecticut Freedom of Information Act §1-200 et seq. (FOIA) (see Appendix D). Through FOIA, this researcher requested an opportunity to inspect or obtain copies of the following public records:
- The name and description of any positions, units, teams or groups of employees whose function included providing social work services (grant management, administration, research, case management, clinical counseling, non-clinical counseling, referrals, testimony, assessment/evaluation, discharge planning, re-entry or any other services commonly associated with the social work profession) in relation to the criminal justice process.

- The job descriptions and titles of any positions within the agency whose function included providing social work services (grant management, administration, research, case management, clinical counseling, non-clinical counseling, referrals, testimony, assessment/evaluation, discharge planning, re-entry or any other services commonly associated with the social work profession) and identification of any positions that called for a social work degree (BSW, MSW, PhD, DSW), social work experience, or a title that included the phrase “social worker” in relation to the criminal justice process.

- The number of employees with social work degrees (BSW, MSW, PhD, DSW), their titles and work location (e.g., facility name/location) who were employed in relation to the criminal justice process. This researcher did not request the names of the employees within the scope of the FOIA request.

- The number of employees who were licensed social workers (LCSW, ACSW or other licensing designation), their titles and work location (e.g., facility name/location) in relation to the criminal justice process. This researcher did not request the names of the employees within the scope of the FOIA request. In response to FOIA requests, two (2) agencies indicated that they did not employ anyone fitting the criteria. Those agencies were omitted
from the list of agencies with potential respondents. From that list, positions and titles that might exist within the agencies was compiled. They included, but were not limited to:

- Social worker
- Social service
- Clinical
- Clinician
- Assessment
- Re-entry
- Evaluation
- Treatment
- Case manager
- Caseworker
- Groupworker

**Sampling Plan**

Using the information gathered from online research, annual reports, tax documents, and the FOIA letters, introduction materials were distributed to directors and commissioners of all state and non-governmental agencies that fit the criteria of the study.

**Outreach to Agency Directors and Commissioners.** Following University of Connecticut (UCONN) Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval and the subsequent amended UCONN IRB approval\(^8\), letters of introduction outlining the purpose of the study were sent via

---

\(^8\) The UCONN IRB granted Exemption #X15-080 for fifty state and contracted agencies. Following pilot testing and cognitive interviewing with two social workers, the survey was reduced and an amended IRB approval was granted. The approval allowed for the reduction in survey questions by seventeen and sixteen items within existing subscales.
United States Postal Service (USPS), during May 2015, to the remaining 44 agencies and contracted vendors (see Appendix E). Within three weeks, follow-up calls and emails were made to each agency. Ultimately, four agencies declined to participate and 27 did not respond after three telephone and voicemail contact attempts. Those 31 were immediately eliminated from the study.

By June 2015, fourteen agencies and vendors remained from the original forty-four (32%). Of the fourteen, three state agencies required their own internal IRB process. The first agency, Agency A, required the researcher to complete an agency IRB application and a meeting with two members of the IRB. Approval was granted in August 2015. That process took just under four months from initial contact (See Appendix A).

The second agency, Agency B, arranged for telephone correspondence for the researcher in June 2015 followed by a conference call with the IRB in September, 2015. That process took four months from the initial contact. In response to an inquiry on the progress of an IRB decision, the researcher was informed later in September that the Agency B IRB was rerouting the study for review by senior leadership and an Agency B racial justice committee. The researcher made four additional inquiries over the course of the next seven and a half months asking for an update. In May 2016, an email response from the Agency B contact informed the researcher that Agency B would not be approving the study based on concerns that would be outlined in later correspondence to the researcher and the Dean of the University of Connecticut School of Social Work. As of the date of this defense, no correspondence has been received. The entire process with agency B spanned exactly 12 months.

The third agency, Agency C, provided a contact within their internal IRB in July 2015. The researcher was required to complete an Agency C IRB application. After submitting eleven
application modifications between August 2015 and July 2016, the Agency C IRB approved the study pending individual approval of each of the directors in the eight units/programs under the umbrella of the agency. The researcher sent emails and follow up telephone calls to each of the eight units/programs. Ultimately, none of the eight followed through on multiple contact attempts or did not respond in time. Because this process took nearly twenty months from initial contact and it had been more than a year since the initial waves of data were collected, the researcher and committee chair agreed that further efforts to include this agency in the sample were not warranted. It is worth noting that the timeframe between the data collection from the first agencies to what would have been the data collected for this particular agency (see information below on data collection waves) included many social, budgetary and political changes in the country and within the State of Connecticut that may have presented significant external validity challenges to the data.

Agreed to Participate. Agency administrators in each of the remaining 13 agencies approved the distribution process with only one requesting minor changes involving a line that instructed the potential respondent to forward the survey link to a personal computer to complete on personal time. This request was honored for the agency.

Four emails and a survey link were used to increase participation (Dillman, et al, 2014). These included 1) an introductory email, 2) an email with information about the human subject protection requirements and the survey link, 3) a follow-up email reminder, and 4) a final reminder. Despite requesting a list of all staff email addresses for each agency, eleven agencies acted as gatekeepers. They preferred to send the emails out to staff directly rather than providing the list to this researcher. Two very small agencies (fewer than 10 employees) provided email lists to this researcher for direct distribution.
Anticipated Sample Size. The goal of the study was to include all known individuals working as social workers in Connecticut who are engaged in criminal and juvenile justice processes. At the outset and based on the initial research into the original list of agencies through the internet, annual reports, committees, and FOIA responses, it was anticipated that the study would capture approximately 723 potential respondents who fit the criteria out of the 19,342 screened. Following outreach efforts, this researcher distributed approximately 6,329 emails for screening\(^9\) to the remaining 13 agencies and anticipated 330 individuals would ultimately match the criteria\(^10\). The survey began with two screening questions that asked each potential respondent to determine if he/she fit the desired respondent population.

Actual Sample Size. Of the potential respondents identified by participating agencies, 1,193 began the online survey. Following the initial two screening questions, 646 continued and began the body of the survey. There was gradual attrition throughout the survey. See Figure 2.1 for more detail.

\(^9\) Six of the responding agencies did not respond to the researcher’s request for the number of emails distributed (individuals to be screened). Without those figures, the remaining number of emails distributed was 3,357. Adding in the estimated number of employees for the six agencies who did not provide distribution totals (based on initial research of the agencies’ staff) resulted in an estimated 6,329 individuals for screening.

\(^10\) Based on initial research of those fitting the selection criteria in those agencies.
For further analysis, an independent samples t-test was used to compare identity means between the completers and non-completers for the pre-survey forensic social work identity question\textsuperscript{11}. Analysis identified a statistically significant difference ($p=.030$) between the groups. Those who completed the survey had a mean of 4.68 ($SD=2.387$) and those who did not complete the survey (non-completers) had a mean of 4.27 ($SD=2.316$) mean. Those who went on to complete the survey began the survey with greater forensic social work identity than those who did not complete the survey. Higher degrees of forensic social work identity among the completers group may indicate the final sample results are applicable to those with comparable levels of forensic social work identity in the larger population. Based on the screening design and comparisons between those who completed and those who did not complete the survey, the overall sample size was determined to be $N=384$.

\textsuperscript{11} The social work identity questions were measured on a scale of 0-10 with 0 representing only social work identity and 10 representing only forensic social work identity.
Instrument

The survey instrument included a combination of existing scales and original items and was distributed solely online. The instrument\textsuperscript{12} was tailored to the Survey Monkey format via the online survey software. This research was conducted using the Gold level membership for, among other features, advanced survey design and collection capabilities. Survey Monkey provides Secure Sockets Layer (SSL) encryption for server identification and data, the ability to mask IP addresses and provides the “https://” secure encrypted connection. All original design and changes were accomplished through Survey Monkey.

Cognitive Interviewing

The initial survey instrument was pretested using cognitive interviewing with two volunteers (Forsyth & Lessler, 1991) (see Appendix B). Both were members of the desired population. One was retired. One worked for one of the study agencies, but was instructed not to take the survey when it was distributed during data collection. Feedback from the cognitive interviews provided opportunities to clarify the language of several questions and reduce the length of the survey by seventeen questions and sixteen items within subscales.

Instrument Architecture

The survey consisted of 47 questions including two initial screening questions. The questions were primarily quantitative but also included qualitative items from 30 open-text fields (e.g. ‘other’ and ‘additional comments’) and two open-ended questions\textsuperscript{13}. To determine if the experience of taking the survey itself had a potential impact on forensic social work identification, item numbers 3 and 39 were identical. Using a ten point Likert-type scale, the

\textsuperscript{12} See Appendix C
\textsuperscript{13} “What led you to work in the criminal justice field as a social worker?” and “When thinking about the courses you took in obtaining your social work degree(s), which ONE course do you feel is the most useful in your current work within the criminal and/or juvenile justice system?”
items measured how each respondent identified with either social work or forensic social work at both the beginning and the end of the survey to determine if the experience of taking the survey itself had a potential impact on forensic social work identity.

There were also four existing scales and general racial bias questions. These were:

1. #17: Professional Quality of Life Scale (ProQOL) (Stamm, 2010)
2. #18 & #19: Discrete Emotions Emotional Labor Scale (DEELS) (Glomb & Tews, 2004)
3. #20: Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) (Koeske, Kirk, Koeske, & Rauktis, 1994)

Because the survey was lengthy, a variety of response set types was used to stimulate respondent engagement. These included seven (7) Likert-type; six (6) dichotomous; five (5) multiple choice; three that (3) asked for a length of time; three (3) matrix questions with multiple items; two (2) open-ended questions and one (1) question that asked the respondent to rank the top three of a list of items.

The remainder of items were demographic questions. Seven items based on the United States Census asked for highest level of school completed, age, gender, race/ethnicity, relationship status, religion and income. Two original questions inquired about level of political activity in Connecticut: in general and specifically related to criminal and juvenile justice.

**Domains.** The survey instrument was designed to elicit information about forensic social workers and their practices. In addition to gathering general forensic social work information, the survey gathered information within six domains. Following general forensic social work information, those domains are outlined below in this order: 1) professional
employment; 2) professional social work activities; 3) professional beliefs, feelings and actions; 4) educational background; 5) skills, values and ethics; and 6) demographics.

**General Forensic Social Work Information.** This research used a variety of methods to elicit respondent beliefs and knowledge about forensic social work and social work identity. Following the initial screening questions, Question #3 asked respondents to identify themselves on a ten-item continuum between *social worker* and *forensic social worker*.

The survey itself provided information about forensic social work within the response sets (populations, settings, professional activities, professional criminal and juvenile justice organizations, types of forensic social work educational modalities and the National Organization of Forensic Social Work (NOFSW) Mission Statement. Some items asked the respondent to consider the concept of *forensic social work*. To measure any change in identity from beginning to end, the last question (#39) before the demographic section, asked, “where do you identify yourself on a continuum between the term ‘social worker’ and ‘forensic social worker’ (still defining that term for yourself)?”

**Professional employment.** The first domain covered work settings, populations and employment sustainability. Information about length of service in the field and what led the respondent to criminal or juvenile justice work was elicited through a series of questions. *Settings* was operationalized using a question about types of settings. The survey elicited *organization* using a question that asked respondents to identify at which of the three organizational auspices (non-profit, proprietary and public) the respondent was currently, or most recently, employed.
**Professional Social Work Activities.** The next domain inquired about professional social work activities. Two items gathered information on professional membership activities. Respondents were also asked to identify the forensic populations with whom they work.

**Professional Beliefs, Feelings and Actions.** The third domain assessed respondent beliefs, feelings and actions about a variety of topics. These included beliefs and feelings about social work educational opportunities, professional support, political interest, professional quality of life and social work values.

**Educational Background.** The fourth domain, educational background, was prompted using three items. One item asked the highest level of educational attainment. The second item employed a matrix response set of yes or no answers corresponding to five items about the types of forensic coursework available in the respondent’s social work program. The latter item also included an open text field that elicited more detail for those who selected the final “other” choice. Finally, an open-ended question asked what the respondent perceived as the most useful course that he/she now uses in social work practice.

**Skills, Values and Ethics.** The fifth domain measured the skills, values and ethics related to social work practice. Both social work and forensic social work centered on specific ethical standards and mission statements. This survey domain elicited information related to the adoption and adherence of those professional social work ethics and values. Both the NASW and the NOSFW mission statements were provided within the survey and respondents were asked how each aligned with his/her own work.

Respondents were also asked to identify the major skill areas within social work education that applied to forensic social work. Finally, respondents were asked about participation in mentoring, clinical supervision and training.
Demographics\textsuperscript{14}. The final domain, placed at the end of the survey to reduce overall and per item non-response (Dillman et al, 2014), included questions about income, age, race/ethnicity, gender and marital status.

The above domains were reflected in the design of the survey. Data related to the key concepts raised by the literature were elicited within those domains in order to learn more about the work of forensic social workers.

Nominal and operational definitions of major variables\textsuperscript{15,16}

Within the domains, nine concepts identified within the literature were operationalized using specific questions and scales. This section provides both nominal and operational descriptions of these key concepts: 1) social work values, 2) implicit bias, 3) deleterious (negative) factors, 4) protective factors, 5) job satisfaction, 6) level of fit, 7) job role stress, 8) sustainability, and 9) forensic social work identity, respectively.

Social Work Values. The nominal definition of “social work values” refers to the beliefs related to the fundamental social work tenets and ethics related to client self-determination and the dignity and worth of all human beings. This was operationalized by a score on the Professional Opinion Scale (POS) (Abbott, 1988, 1999, 2003). The POS was developed based on the broad range of public policy issues advocated by the membership of NASW.

Psychometrically, Abbott’s scale reported a sufficiently high Chronbach’s Alpha of .86 among the scale’s four domains (Abbott, 1999) and is accepted as the most empirically sound measure of social work values (Greeno, Hughes, Hayward & Parker, 2007, p. 491).

\textsuperscript{14} These items were modeled after the wording and response sets contained within the United States Census.
\textsuperscript{15} The remainder variables and corresponding survey questions are located in Appendix D (Variable Table).
\textsuperscript{16} Psychometric properties of all existing instruments provided when available.
Implicit Bias. Another important concept measured in this domain was the respondent’s feelings about race and the criminal justice system. The concept of implicit bias has been developing in the social sciences and law for nearly thirty years. Greenwald and Banaji define implicit bias as “introspectively unidentified (or inaccurately identified) traces of past experience that mediate favorable or unfavorable feeling, thought, or action toward social objects” (1995, p. 8). Studies of implicit bias in criminal and juvenile justice professionals is critical because of the impact it has on discretion along the various decision points within these processes. Susan A. McCarter, Associate Professor of Social Work at UNC Charlotte and current Vice President of the National Organization of Forensic Social Workers (NOFSW) conducted research in the areas of disproportionate minority contact (2011) and implicit bias in decision-making discretion (2009). She explained that direct questioning does not elicit accurate information on racial bias in the majority of people who believe themselves to be “colorblind” (UNCC, Newswise, July 8, 2016). Identifying and addressing implicit bias is critical for those working in the criminal and juvenile justice processes.

Implicit bias was measured through a series of questions. The survey was designed to capture bias through Abbott’s Professional Opinion Scale (2003) scale and general questions taken from the 1996 survey and report on minority fairness in the State of Connecticut Judicial Branch (State of Connecticut, p. lvi).

Ten items from the 1996 survey and report on minority fairness in the State of Connecticut Judicial Branch (State of Connecticut, p. lvi) were used to measure implicit bias. The 1996 study was commissioned by the State of Connecticut Judicial Branch Task Force on Minority Fairness which was assembled in 1992 and “charged with identifying whether discriminatory treatment of racial or ethnic minorities exists within Connecticut’s Judicial
Branch” (1996, p. 1). Questionnaires were administered to judges, attorneys and court employees (1996, p. 2). In the current study, ten general questions taken directly from the Task Force questionnaires were constructed as a matrix of items for which each respondent must choose a response on a five point Likert-type scale. The original scale was transformed from a four point Likert scale by including “neither agree nor disagree”. There are arguments for both inclusion (Chronbach, 1950) and exclusion (Garland, 1991; Busch, 1993; Reid, 1990) of a neutral mid-point item. This research, particularly when eliciting implicit bias, intended to determine the intensity of belief about the ten racial/ethnic attitudinal items. Including more options aimed to increase the variance of the range of responses.

**Negative Factors.** The nominal definition of *negative factors* was theoretically derived from the ecological perspective: the presence of circumstances that negatively affected the worker within his/her work setting. The operational definition of *negative factors* included the presence of overlapping duties, safety concerns, available work resources and value/mission incongruence with the host agency. All variables were continuous.

**Protective Professional Factors.** The nominal definition of “protective professional factors” was developed using the ecological perspective: the presence of lifelines to the forensic social work profession as well as circumstances that might enhance the experience of the worker within his/her setting. The operational definition of protective professional factors was the presence of affiliation with any criminal justice related professional organization, continuing education, mentoring or clinical supervision. These included a combination of dichotomous and continuous variables.

**Job Satisfaction.** The nominal definition of “job satisfaction” was “the affective state describing feelings about one’s work” (Arches, 1991, p. 202). This research operationalized job
satisfaction using the facet-specific measurement of feelings about pay, promotions, coworkers, supervisors, opportunities, autonomy and other organizational factors (Arches, 1991) by using the existing Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) by Koeske, Kirk, Koeske and Rautkis (2004). This validated, shortened 16-item scale was normed on five sets of social workers over a three-year period (Koeske et al., 1994). The authors reported that the JSS is a reliable and valid instrument for assessing the human services, including strong construct validity and evidence of predictive validity as well as reliability in the form of a Chronbach’s alpha ranging from .83 to .88 across the five data sets (Koeske et al., 1994).

The JSS was also used on a variety of other populations including nurses and nurses’ aides (Mackenzie, Poulin, & Seidman-Carlson, 2006), vocational rehabilitation supervisors and counselors (Elpers & Westhuis, 2008) and most recently an adapted version for elementary school teachers (McCarthy, Lambert, & Reiser, 2014). The latter study (N=185) exhibited some parallels to the study of forensic social workers in that the results noted that the group that perceived a high level of classroom demand had statistically significant decreased job satisfaction scores and plans to leave the position (McCarthy et al., 2014, p. 68).

Notably, a 2009 online study of job satisfaction in social workers (N=119) used the JSS to look at the impact of organizational support, diversity and perceptions of inclusion/exclusion on job satisfaction (Acquavita, Pittman, Gibbons, & Castellanos-Brown, 2009).

**Level of Fit.** The nominal definition of *level of fit* was the balance between compassion satisfaction, burnout and compassion fatigue in a work setting. *Level of fit* was operationalized using the most recent English version the Professional Quality of Life Scale (ProQOL) by Stamm (2010). The ProQOL is a validated, 30 item self-report instrument in which higher scores relate to a higher risk for burnout (Figley & Stamm, 1996). A 2009 study of Norwegian forensic
psychiatric nurses used the ProQOL (Lauvrud, Nonstad & Palmstierna, 2009). Stamm reports good construct validity (2010).

**Job Role Stress.** The nominal definition of *job role stress* was the presence of emotional and sometimes physical distress based on beliefs, attitudes and behaviors that can influence a person by and in his/her work environment. *Emotional labor* is one manifestation of the stress of job role, particularly in host settings. It is the act of “managing emotions and emotional expression to be consistent with organizational or occupational” expectations of how one should appropriately display emotion (Glomb & Tews, 2004, p. 2). *Job role stress* was operationalized in the current research as a score on two subscales from the Discrete Emotions Emotional Labor Scale (DEELS). The DEELS measures the frequency with which the worker may feel compelled to display expressions in organizational settings, particularly feeling compelled to *fake good* or *fake bad* to clients or coworkers (Glomb & Tews, 2004). The authors report adequate convergent, discriminant and criterion-related validity in relation between the DEELS and other measures and an alpha of .91 (Glomb & Tews, 2004).

The DEELS was used most recently in a study of teachers (Taxer & Frenzell, 2015) and included a job satisfaction scale. That study was based on the research that acting/hiding increases depersonalization and emotional exhaustion (Taxer & Frenzell, 2015). The authors found that pretending to have negative emotions correlated with the emotional exhaustion component of emotional labor, an important consideration in studying social workers in host settings (Taxer & Frenzell, 2015, p. 84). This may be particularly true in custodial settings such as prisons, probation, parole and court where there can be a culture of depersonalization and negativity toward justice-involved individuals and those who “sympathize” with those individuals.
**Sustainability.** The nominal definition of *sustainability* in this study is the likelihood of remaining in a position. *Sustainability* was operationalized using three questions taken from Mittal, Rosen, & Leana’s 2009 study that looked at chronic leavers, intermittent leavers and stayers over a three-year period. Those categories were described by the authors as:

(a) stayers: those direct care workers who have been at their current jobs for the past 3 years, (b) intermittent leavers: those who have changed jobs once or twice in the past 3 years, and (c) chronic leavers: those who have changed jobs more than twice in the past 3 years. (Mittal, Rosen, & Leana, 2009, p. 625)

Mittal et al.’s qualitative study used seven focus groups (N=47) to identify key themes among the three groups (2009). Demographically, the sample was 87% female and consisted of those in direct service work within the gerontological and developmentally disabled populations (Mittal et al., 2009, p. 626). The study found, among the high retention group, that many expressed a “sense of calling” and that this “relational aspect of work and its effect on self-identity” is virtually unacknowledged in the literature (Mittal et al., 2009, p. 630). A similar sense of calling and belief in social work as well as the impact of professional identity may apply to the population in this study.

Citing Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman’s early work, Mittal et al. posited that the factors that drive desire to stay in a position and the factors that drive one to leave the position are not the same factors in inverse; i.e. there may be a dual driver model of retention and turnover (Mittal et al., 2009; Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). The questions used to elicit this information in the current study were based on the parameters of the three groups described above by Mittal et al. (2009).
Forensic Social Work Affiliation. The nominal definition of forensic social work affiliation in the current study was self-identification and the feeling of being a forensic social worker. Forensic social work affiliation was operationalized using two screening questions that aided respondents in identifying as a forensic social worker based on work and location and two identical questions asking for self-identification along a continuum. One was positioned at the beginning of the survey and one at the end. They aimed to capture any change in self-identification after taking the survey. Brownell and Roberts pointed out that forensic specialization is heralded in psychology, psychiatry and nursing, but forensic social work may not even be recognized as a specialty by those in the practice and those who “may not have previously used this new terminology” (2002, p. 361). For that reason, the definition and terminology are prominent factors in the current study.

Because the current study endeavored to fill a gap in the literature on forensic social workers, the survey encompassed many areas and concepts. To address this density, the design of the instrument mirrored the logical grouping outlined above in order to keep the respondent engaged. The following section addresses how the data were collected via the online survey.

Data Collection and Context

Data were collected via electronic survey; recruitment materials included four potential points of contact with respondents (Dillman, et al, 2014). These were initial introductory email, informational email with survey link and two follow-up reminder emails. Based on the varied timeframes it took to connect with agencies and confirm survey administration protocols, the list of state and contracted agencies was split into three waves of data collection. Staggered waves allowed the researcher to begin data collection despite delays with some agencies. Distributing
the survey to agencies in waves provided opportunities to review the data and make any necessary adjustments before subsequent waves were distributed.

Three\textsuperscript{17} separate waves of data were collected over the months between August and December 2015. An estimated six thousand three hundred twenty nine (6,329) emails for screening were distributed to thirteen (13) agencies.

All state employees and most employees of contracted agencies have work email addresses, therefore electronic surveys were distributed to respondents with valid email addresses using Dillman et al.’s email strategy (2014). While mailings to those without valid email addresses were planned in order to capture all possible respondents who may not have had email access, it was not necessary as all participating agencies indicated having full email listings for employees.

Arrangements with key contacts for each agency helped to identify the parameters of employee permissions to take the survey at work. In cases when respondents themselves chose to take the survey at home, the email contained a URL to connect to the survey from any computer. As already noted, Survey Monkey provides Secure Sockets Layer (SSL) encryption for server identification and data, the ability to mask IP addresses and provides the “https://” secure encrypted connection. All but one agency allowed employees to take the survey during work hours. That agency required language reminding employees that the survey email/link must be forwarded home for completion. In contrast, two other agencies openly encouraged employees to complete the survey at work. None of the remainder of the agencies indicated a preference for where the employees should take the survey.

\textsuperscript{17} One additional agency agreed to participate after the third wave. Emails to the two potential respondents were distributed between September 21 and December 13, 2015.
The cover and IRB-approved materials included language that assured voluntary participation and anonymity of the responses. Two information sheets were used. One used standard language for all entities and one was designed for those employed by the Division of Public Defender Services (PDS), the researcher’s employer. Although the collected data remains anonymous and were aggregated for protection of the respondents, this disclosure prompted respondents to decide for themselves if they would like to participate in the survey. The potential benefits to this subsample, which were noted on the information sheet, included the professional satisfaction of taking part in a survey that sought to elaborate on their practice and being the only defense-situated voice represented in the potential population of respondents.

Four emails were distributed to each respondent via a key contact within each of the thirteen agencies (see Appendix F) The initial email provided an introduction to the study, all required information related to voluntary participation, anticipated length of survey, and contact information for the researcher, UCONN IRB and the researcher’s committee chair. The email outlined exempt approval of the study by the UCONN IRB and permission from the Director/Commissioner/President of each organization. The second email, sent one week after the introduction, contained instructions for completing the online survey using a secure URL through Survey Monkey. A fourth email arrived three weeks after the initial email to thank and/or remind all email distribution list members to complete the survey if he/she had not already done so. The emails went to everyone each time because this researcher did not identify those who had completed the survey and the email distribution lists were only shared by two small agencies; therefore there was no way to connect a survey to any particular respondent.

The instrument was distributed via email using Survey Monkey. For the majority of the organizations, no master lists of survey respondents were provided to this researcher. With the
exception of two small agencies who provided direct email addresses, all other agencies opted to identify a key person within their organization to whom each of the four emails were distributed on the evening before the desired distribution. The key person distributed the emails to all employees of the organization and, in most cases,\textsuperscript{18} provided this researcher with only the number of emails distributed. Three years after completion of this study, the surveys, the master list and the qualitative data obtained from the open-ended questions will be destroyed.

**Data Management and Planned Analysis**

All data gathered through Survey Monkey were exported in a .csv (comma separated value) file into Microsoft Excel. After data cleaning and formatting in MS Excel, the data were imported into Statistical Package for Social Sciences 20 (SPSS) software for analysis. The data were compared to a sample of individual survey responses from each wave within Survey Monkey for consistency.

Some items within the survey required reverse scoring, summation and converting raw scores. The ProQOL-5 scale by Stamm required reverse scoring for items 1, 4, 15, 17, and 29. Following reverse coding, items were summed by subscale. The raw summed scores were then converted to a t score (2010). Three of the thirteen questions taken from the CT Judicial Branch survey subscale were also reverse coded.

Forty-one new variables were created through computation and transformation. This was necessary in instances where survey questions allowed for multiple responses, for analyses that required dichotomous variables and for computation of date and time variables.

\textsuperscript{18} As noted earlier in this chapter and in the limitation section of chapter five, six of the thirteen agencies did not respond to requests to provide the number of emails sent during each distribution.
Missing Data

Missing data within the four existing scales, and their subscales, were handled by exclusion or imputation of the mean score for the remainder of items in each case. Composite scores for each scale were calculated pre and post imputation of missing values. Comparisons detected no significant differences between the scales.

The three scenarios for missing data were that respondents: skipped all items, skipped $\geq$ 2 items, or skipped $\leq$ 2 items. Cases where all items within a scale were skipped were excluded from analysis by SPSS program default. Cases where more than three items per scale or subscale were not answered were also excluded from analysis. For the remainder of cases in each scale where there were $\leq$ 2 missing values, imputation of the mean of the remaining items per respondent was used via SPSS “Replace Missing Values” function. Across all seven existing scales, at least 80% of scale items had to be completed in order to be eligible for data imputation. See footnotes below for frequencies of the above three scenarios for each of the four scales and subscales: Professional Opinion Scale (POS)$^{19}$, Discrete Emotions Emotional Labor Scale (DEELS)$^{20}$, Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS)$^{21}$, and Professional Quality of Life Scale (PROQOL).$^{22}$

---

$^{19}$ Professional Opinion Scale (POS). The 16-item POS scale was completely skipped by four respondents. Two additional respondents were removed from POS analysis because they answered $\geq$ 14 items.

$^{20}$ Discrete Emotions Emotional Labor Subscales (DEELS). The DEELS was subdivided into two 14-item subscales that measure a) faking emotion (DEELS Fake) and displaying true emotion (DEELS True). For the former, fourteen skipped the entire scale and were excluded from analysis and an additional six respondents were manually removed from analysis because they failed to complete $\geq$ 12 items. For the DEELS True subscale, twelve who skipped the entire scale were excluded from analysis by SPSS default and an additional five respondents were removed manually for failing to complete $\geq$ 12 items within the subscale.

$^{21}$ Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS). In assessing missing values for the 17 item JSS, one was automatically excluded from analysis because the respondent skipped the entire JSS scale. No additional respondents were removed from JSS manually because the remainder answered at least 15 of the 17 items.

$^{22}$ Professional Quality of Life Scale (PROQOL). The PROQOL was comprised of three 10-item subscales: compassion satisfaction (CS), burnout (BO) and secondary traumatic stress (STS). Individual means for each respondent were calculated for imputation by each subscale rather than the average for the entire scale. This provided a more accurate assessment of means because each subscale measured a different construct. A total of 12 cases were automatically excluded, by SPSS default, from analyses using the PROQOL because those respondents failed to complete any items on the subscales. Those exclusions for CS, BO and STS were 4, 4, and 4
New Variables

Approximately 40 new variables were created through computation and transformation. This was necessary in instances where survey questions allowed for multiple responses, for analyses that required dichotomous variables and for computation of date and time variables. Appropriate dummy variables were created and the following population variables were created for analyses in Research Question 2:

(a) VICTIM/OFFENDER Works with offender only/works primarily with offender but also Victim (dichotomous)

(b) MICRO/OVERLAP/MACRO Works in micro only/an overlap of micro and macro/macro only

(c) AUSPICE ALL Works in Public auspice/nonprofit auspice/proprietary auspice

(d) PUBLIC AUSPICE/ALL OTHER Works in public auspice/all other (dichotomous)

(e) POLITICAL INTEREST lower political interest/higher political interest (dichotomous)

(f) POLITICAL INTEREST2 no political interest/some political interest/most political interest

(g) CJ/JJPOLITICAL INTEREST lower CJ/JJ political interest/higher political interest (dichotomous)

respectively. No further respondents were removed from analyses because all remaining respondents answered at ≥8 items on each subscale.
For research question 2, two composite variables were created to represent the number of protective and negative factors identified by each respondent. Seven identified protective factors and seven negative (deleterious) factors were recoded into dichotomous variables to be summed and used in the two composite variables called number of negative factors present and number of protective factors present. For five-point scales, the two affirmative responses were coded as “1=factor is present”. The neutral and disagreement points were coded “0=no factor present”.

 Verification

 Internal Validity

 Internal validity for existing subscales was calculated and compared to alpha coefficients of those scales in prior research. Although the implicit bias questions taken from the Connecticut Judicial Branch Study (1996) were not part of a scale, the researcher analyzed the thirteen items together and determine that coefficient alpha was .422. According to Tukey’s Test for Non-additivity, no single items for removal were identified as being integral to increasing $\alpha$. For that reason, the items were not utilized as a scale.

 The actual scales were found to have equal or higher coefficient alphas in this current study than in the previous research. The current study used two subscales plus two additional

\[23\] Seven protective factors: 1) external support (relationship), 2) having a mentor, 3) having clinical supervision, 4) number of professional memberships, 5) believing one’s work is vital (FSW is a specialized area of practice), 6) attending social work training outside of the agency paid by the agency, and 7) attending social work training inside the agency.

\[24\] Seven negative factors: 1) stress over resources at work, 2) stress over safety at work, 3) stress over isolation from other social workers at work, 4) experienced value inconsistencies at work, 5) experienced mission inconsistencies at work, 6) experienced overlap of duties at work, and 7) organizational auspice is public.
items from Abbott’s Professional Opinion Scale (POS). Previous studies of social workers reported coefficient alpha in the range of .68-.76 for the Support of Self Determination subscale and α of .70-.83 for the Sense of Social Responsibility subscale in several studies (Abbott, 1988, 1999, 2003; Greeno et al., 2007; Miller, 2013; Ringstad, 2014). In the current study, the scale, which measures commitment to social work values, had Chronbach’s alpha of .85 for the 16-item scale as well as α of .82 and .78 for the Support of Self Determination subscale and the Sense of Social Responsibility subscale, respectively. This is a positive indication of internal validity.

In addition, the current study’s coefficient alpha for the PROQOL, DEELS and JSS were all indicative of good to excellent internal consistency. Coefficient alpha for these scales were .75-.90, .90-.93, and .93 respectively. See table 2.1 for psychometric properties of the seven existing scales.

**External Validity**

Response rate is a common indication of external validity and the ability to generalize to the larger population. There is no list of forensic social workers in Connecticut. In preparation for the current study through internet searches, annual reports, tax documents and FOIA information resulted in the most comprehensive list of agencies, units, job descriptions and job titles thus far. Despite this progress, there are undoubtedly members of the entire population who were either a) not identified through the above process or b) were not included in the study because either they or their agencies chose not to participate in the study.
Table 2.1

*Psychometric Properties of Major Study Variables Measured by Preexisting Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$M$(SD)</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- POS</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>36.04(9.26)</td>
<td>16.00-60.00</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- JSS</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>128.78(31.52)</td>
<td>44.00-187.00</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>- .07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ProQOL BO</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>21.59(5.36)</td>
<td>34.80-86.00</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>-.55**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ProQOL STS</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>19.20(6.05)</td>
<td>28.37-80.59</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.03*</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ProQOL CS</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>38.75(6.19)</td>
<td>36.00-68.15</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>-.62**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DEELS Fake</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>23.53(9.41)</td>
<td>14.00-70.00</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- DEELS Genuine</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>26.76(11.58)</td>
<td>0.00-70.00</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

*Note:* POS=Professional Opinion Scale, ProQOL=Professional Quality of Life Scale, BO=Burnout, STS=Secondary Traumatic Stress, CS=Compassion Satisfaction, DEELS=Discrete Emotions Emotional Labor Scale. M, SD, and $\alpha$ represent mean, standard deviation and Chronbach’s Alpha, respectively.

*Note:* Differences in sample size are due to cases excluded for missing data that was not imputed.
Data Analysis

Qualitative (Open-Ended Questions): Two open-ended questions and 30 open text options for “other” responses captured qualitative data within the constructs of professional goals, fieldwork experiences, coursework, mentoring, job titles, client issues, types of courses and other response patterns that emerged.

Quantitative: Data analysis for all variables included descriptive statistics. Comparative analyses focused on the following groups: male/female; macro/micro; victim/offender (or other pairings consistent with the data); identifies as FSW/does not identify as FSW; MSW/<MSW; public/private or non-profit auspice; race/ethnicity and years in practice.

Hypothesis Testing

Question 1: What are the demographic, employment and educational characteristics, of forensic social workers in Connecticut and what led them to the criminal justice field?

In addition to descriptive, bivariate analyses examined the differences between the subgroups of forensic social workers listed above. Frequencies were run to determine the percentage of respondents who initially desired a career in forensic social work and then content analysis was used to evaluate the responses to the question “What led you to work in the CJ field as a social worker?” Multiple regression was used to determine the relationships between and contributions of race/ethnicity, level of degree, transience and salary on 1) time in current position and 2) total length of time in forensic social work. The results are presented in the next chapter entitled Chapter Three: Sample Description.

Question 2: How do groups of forensic social workers differ in what they report about their social justice values?
To test hypotheses one through five (below), independent samples t-tests and a one way ANOVA 1) compared the mean scores on the POS across the groups works with offender only/works with victims and offenders; micro/macro practice, public auspice/others, 2) compared means of the POS and level of political interest and 3) compared means of the POS and level of political interest in criminal justice.

**Hypothesis 1:** There will be a significant difference between the *Professional Opinion Scale* scores of victim/offender pairings.

**Hypothesis 2:** Those working in the macro level of practice will have higher *Professional Opinion Scale* scores than those working in micro practice.

**Hypothesis 3:** Those working in a public auspice will report lower *Professional Opinion Scale* scores than those in non-profit or proprietary auspices.

**Hypothesis 4:** Those with high levels of political interest will have higher *Professional Opinion Scale* scores than those on the lower end of the spectrum.

**Hypothesis 5:** Those with high levels of criminal justice political interest will have higher *Professional Opinion Scale* scores than those on the lower end of the spectrum.

**Question 3:** How do the various traditionally deleterious and protective factors (isolation, stress over safety, stress over lack of resources, overlapping duties, organizational auspice, competing values, mission inconsistencies, external support, professional support, continuing education inside the agency, continuing education outside the agency, professional affiliation, clinical supervision, and mentoring) impact forensic social workers’ level of fit, overall job satisfaction and job role stress?

To test hypotheses one through four related to this question, and contingent on the correlational relationships between job satisfaction and the score on the ProQOL, Pearson
product-moment correlation coefficient was used to assess the relationships between the number of factors (negative or protective) and the scores on the three dependent variables. Additional analysis using multiple regression used scores on the three dependent variables (Score on JSS, ProQOL and DEELS) to determine which of the negative or protective factors were the best predictors.

**Hypothesis 6:** The more negative factors reported, the lower the scores on the *Job Satisfaction Scale* and *Professional Quality of Life Scale*.

**Hypothesis 7:** The more negative factors reported, the higher the scores on the *Discrete Emotions Emotional Labor Scale*.

**Hypothesis 8:** The more protective factors reported, the higher the scores on the *Job Satisfaction Scale* and *Professional Quality of Life Scale*.

**Hypothesis 9:** The more protective factors reported, the lower the scores on the *Discrete Emotions Emotional Labor Scale*.

**Ethical Considerations**

The University of Connecticut Institutional Review Board (UCONN-IRB) form I was completed (Appendix C) and IRB approval was obtained prior to any data collection. All study participants were given information at the beginning of the survey and within the body of the initial emails that outlined their right to decline participation and to stop participation at any time. To safeguard anonymity, signed informed consent forms were not used in this study. Consent was implied by clicking on the survey link contained within the second email contact. The participants potentially benefited from the opportunity to contribute to the knowledge base of social work education, training and support in the area of forensic social work. The risks were minimal.
Per UCONN IRB recommendation, each agency in the sample provided a decision based on three options: a) need for researcher to pass the IRB process of that particular agency; b) no internal IRB action necessary; or c) acceptance of the UCONN’s IRB authorization through an IRB Authorization Agreement noting UCONN as the IRB of record.

Of the agencies who participated in the study, three had internal human protection review boards or committees. One of those required a separate form and meeting between the researcher and members of the committee. Two state agencies that had required internal IRB review and multiple communications over an eleven to thirteen month time-period ultimately did not participate in this research. One, after IRB review that lasted eleven months, declined to participate at all. The second agency’s IRB approved the study after thirteen months, however it required each program within the agency to also provide individual review and approval. Although some programs did engage in some discussion about subsequent approval, none of the programs ultimately responded to communications about final decisions. After the long time period involved in the IRB process with this agency and the passing of an entire year\(^1\) from the three initial waves of data collection no further attempts were made to engage these programs. More detail about the study limitations related to those agencies that did not respond or opted not to participate will be discussed in Chapter Five: Discussion.

**Summary**

This chapter outlined the methodologies used in this study. As indicated above, an online, anonymous survey was administered in a cross-sectional design. The purpose of the study was to both describe the population of social workers working in criminal and juvenile justice processes in Connecticut and to examine the factors that affect their level of fit, job

---

\(^1\) During that year (June 2015 – August 2016), there were several changes in state budget, resources, layoffs and other factors that may have influenced the responses of the respondents.
satisfaction, sustainability and job role stress. Using the comprehensive list of all state, private and non-profit agencies involved in the criminal and juvenile justice processes in Connecticut developed through FOIA and other resources, agreements for administration of the forty-eight question survey were reached with representatives of thirteen agencies. The survey measured both independent and dependent variables within nine domains in order to address three research questions and nine hypotheses. Four points of contact with each potential respondent resulted in a final sample of 384—more than originally estimated, and sufficient for the proposed analyses.

The next chapter, Chapter Three: Sample Description, responds to the first research question “What are the demographic, employment and educational characteristics, of forensic social workers in Connecticut and what led them to the criminal justice field?” The chapter provides a comprehensive description of the 384 respondents.
Chapter Three: Sample Description

Introduction

This chapter provides analysis of Research Question 1: *what are the demographic, employment and educational characteristics, of forensic social workers in Connecticut and what led them to the criminal justice field?* including an in-depth description of the sample population, descriptive and bivariate analyses. The chapter sections include, in this order: 1) sample size, 2) mode of response, 3) demographics of respondents, 4) education, 5) work setting, 6) professional activities, 7) professional practice, 8) job satisfaction and emotional labor, 9) forensic social work identification, 10) support and training experience, 11) contributions to tenure, 12) attraction to the field, 13) external validity, and 14) summary.

Sample Size

As noted in Chapter Two, of the potential respondents identified by participating agencies, 1193 began the online survey. Following the initial two screening questions, 646 continued and began the body of the survey. There were missing responses throughout the survey with 345 respondents finishing the final question. When breaking the survey into four parts, and excluding the two initial screening questions, the average responses for each section were as follows:
Table 3.1

Response Rates per Survey Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Section</th>
<th>Number of Respondents Who Began This Section</th>
<th>Average Number of Responses Per Question</th>
<th>Percentage of the 384 Respondents Who Began Section Two</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One: Work Related Questions</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>488.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two: Education, Beliefs and Values Questions</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>361.6</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three: Mentor and Supervision Questions</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>366.4</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four: Demographic Questions</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>353.3</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Survey</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>411.3</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to figure 3.1 for a depiction of the responses per question for all items in the survey.

Figure 3.1

Response Rate for All Questions across All Three Waves

---

2 One question with contingency logic that resulted in 152 responses was omitted from this calculation because it was not offered to all respondents.

3 Two questions resulted in “dips” in the response rate. The first was a question “name a course…” that resulted in 237 respondents. This low response rate was likely due to one of the following: 1) People who did not go to school for social work, 2) People who went so long ago they cannot recall, or 3) People who just did not have an opinion/response. The second question “follow up experience…” was a contingency question based on a “yes” response to the previous question.
Survey Completion Rate

The survey consisted of two initial screening questions and three distinct sections. The first screening question included an option to enter the survey if he/she worked “in a position that [he/she] consider[ed] social work related”. This design allowed the researcher to identify those respondents who may be “hidden” in a social work position with no social work degree. To further screen, section one, “work related questions” was designed using specific social work terminology and references. Section 2 began with the question about highest education level attained.

Those without social work degrees may or may not have continued on to complete the survey; however, comparisons of these two groups provided insight into the respondent population. Of the 646 respondents who passed the two initial screening questions, 59% percent (384) answered at least one question after section one (completers) and 41% did not (non-completers). Crosstabs and Chi-Square were run for all nine items within screening questions one and two as well as the pre-survey forensic social work identity question in order to determine if there were statistically significant differences ($p<.05$) between completers and non-completers.

Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MSW or Unchecked</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student in SW Program or Unchecked</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Survey FSW Identity</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An independent samples t-test was used to compare mean level of forensic social work identity (ranging from 1-10 along a continuum4) among the completers and non-completers for the pre-survey forensic social work identity question. There was a statistically significant difference \[ t(642) = -2.17, p=.030 \] between completers \((M=4.68, SD=2.387)\) and non-completers’ \((M=4.2, SD=2.32)\) mean identity scores.

Notably, those who began the survey did not all drop off at specific points; they went on to answer other questions later in the survey. Based on the screening design and the comparisons between completers and non-completers, the overall sample size was determined to be \(N=384\). For the remainder of the analyses, all percentages were based on \(N=384\) respondents who continued to respond after section one.

**Demographics**

While there is little data on the demographics of forensic social workers, the 1982 study by Hughes and O’Neal was the first survey of forensic social workers and led to the development of the National Organization of Forensic Social Work (NOFSW). Hughes and O’Neal, who were forensic examiners and Certified Forensic Clinicians themselves, sent the survey to all forensic psychiatry centers in the United States and Puerto Rico. The survey had an 85% response rate \((N=340)\) but focused solely on clinical practice and specifically the practice of forensic examinations for competency to stand trial (Hughes and O’Neal, 1983, p. 393). The authors admitted that the other settings and practices not covered by the survey meant, “the actual number of practitioners doing forensic social work may be many times higher than the 340 indicated by the survey” (Hughes & O’Neal, 1983, p. 393). The study outlined caseload and interdisciplinary team roles within the sample but reported no demographic information.

---

4 Forensic social work identity measure: 0=identifies as a social worker and 10=identifies as a forensic social worker.
2011, at the yearly conference, NOFSW asked members to complete a survey of forensic social work. The data were never reported or published.

Because of the absence of forensic social work demographic data, the current study draws comparisons based upon the 2006 NASW study of licensed social workers (National Association of Social Workers Center for Health Workforce Studies School of Public Health, 2006). The two samples were similar in most respects, with the exception of gender and education. With regard to gender, this was not surprising considering the criminal justice context has a higher proportion of males than other social work settings. Concerning education, this also made sense because the current study aimed and successfully cast a more inclusive net than only degreed social workers.

**Gender**

The sample was 67.5% female and 32.5% male (n=366). In comparison to the National Association of Social Workers (NASW) national study of licensed social workers (National Association of Social Workers Center for Health Workforce Studies School of Public Health, 2006), there was a generally a higher percentage of male respondents in the current study. The NASW national study reported that 81% of respondents were female and 19% male (NASW Center for Health Workforce Studies School of Public Health, 2006, p.3).

**Racial/Ethnic Background**

Caucasian/White was the most commonly reported race (78.1%); 14.2% identified as Black/African American and 6.8% multiple races. In addition, 84.9% of respondents who answered the ethnicity question responded that they were not of Hispanic, Latino or Spanish descent. The 2006 NASW study reported that 84.5% of licensed social workers were non-Hispanic white, 6.8% were African American and 4.3% identified as Hispanic (p. 3).
Note: LCSW refers to Licensed Clinical Social Workers

Religious Affiliation

The current survey permitted respondents to choose multiple categories, if necessary, to identify religious affiliation. All categories were collapsed and each respondent was primarily identified as Protestant, Catholic, Christian (generalized), inter/non-denominational, no religion or other. The “other” category absorbed those religious affiliations with fewer than five cases. Respondents identified as Catholic more than any other religion (41.2% of n=359).

Table 3.4 provides an overview of the collapsed religious categories and the frequency for each in the sample.

Table 3.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collapsed Religious Categories</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity Only</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter/Non-Denominational</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: LCSW refers to Licensed Clinical Social Workers

Table 3.4

Comparison of Race between Current Study and 2006 NASW Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>(Caucasian/White) 78.1%</td>
<td>84.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>(or Alaskan Native) .6%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>(of Hispanic Descent n=333) 15.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Multiple Races</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: LCSW refers to Licensed Clinical Social Workers
Age

The mean age of the respondents in this study \((n=339)\) was 44.3 years old (SD=9.7), with a range of 22.4 years to 71 years old. By comparison, the 2008 NASW Workforce study reported an average age of 45 years (NASW Center for Health Workforce Studies School of Public Health, 2006, p.3).

Relationship Status

The majority (62.5%) of respondents reported being married or in a domestic partnership/civil union (1.4%). An additional 7.3% were single, but cohabitating. Another 13.5% reported being single and never married and 13% reported being divorced.

Figure 3.2

*Relationship Status \((n=355, 29\) missing)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a Domestic Partnership or Civil Union</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, but Cohabitating with a Significant Other</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, Never Married</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NASW 2008 Workforce study reported that 65% of the social workers surveyed were either married or in a domestic partnership/civil union (NASW Center for Health Workforce Studies School of Public Health, 2006, p. 3). Similarly, 63.9% of the current sample had a were either married or in a domestic partnership or civil union. The NASW study (NASW Center for Health Workforce Studies School of Public Health, 2006, p.3) reported a higher rate of respondents who were “single/never married” (21% compared to 13.5% in this study) and a lower rate of those who were divorced (12% compared to 13% in this study).
Income

In response to the final survey question, “how much money did YOU personally earn in 2014?”, 82% of the sample fell within the categories of $80,000-$89,000 and $100,000+ yielded the highest individual percentage of responses at 18% each. Although not a direct comparison, the average amount earned per year by respondents within the NASW Workforce Study was $45K in contrast to the 50% of the current sample earning $80,000 or more per year (2006, p. 3).6

Figure 3.3

Amount Earned in 2014 (n=344, 40 missing)

Political Interest Levels in Connecticut7

Just over 64% of respondents reported voting in most Connecticut elections while 16.4% sometimes voted. Six percent of the group (22) had actively campaigned for candidates running in Connecticut, based on social issues. Room for other political interest lay in two categories: only one respondent had run for office in Connecticut and 8.2% (30) reported being “totally uninterested in state or local politics”.

---

5 The instructions for this question include further detail: “This includes money from jobs; net income from business, farm, or rent; pensions; dividends; interest; social security payments; and any other money income received by YOU. Please report the total amount of money you earned - do not subtract the amount you paid in taxes or any deductions listed on your tax return.”

6 This may be partially attributable to inflation and/or the inclusive definition of the current study.

7 “How would you describe your political interest level in Connecticut?”
Five percent (18) of respondents took the time to provide additional comments about political interest in Connecticut. Two percent (7) reported working in Connecticut but voting in their home state. Many voiced dissatisfaction with politics or the political structure while some also highlighted the importance of being involved. One person felt there is an absence of services for criminal and/or juvenile justice clients and that the government continues to support the agencies that should be providing services:

I am heavily interested in politics - The system was horrible before and now that applications for services are on the internet. Totally inaccessible for the mentally ill, the poor, cognitively challenged, elderly, and many more. Yet the agencies keep plowing ahead...with the support of government...The state has no specific treatment programs for battered women, sex workers, the sex trafficked. Private practices won't except [sic] the cases because they are too time consuming and volatile.

Some may or may not become politically involved in order to push back against specific candidates or parties. One declined to vote because Connecticut “is a pure blue state.” One person commented, “politicians do what they want and hardly consider their constituents.” While those quoted here appeared to pull away from politics because of specific candidates or parties, one person became more involved:

I am highly politically interested. I sometimes campaign for either candidates or issues unofficially. I also campaign unofficially against some candidates, like Donald Trump. I have, in the past, been elected to my local [board].

One respondent’s comments revealed skepticism about policy-related success without the involvement of influential groups such as NASW: “I have had more involvement in the past with

---

8 This could be avoided in the future by removing “in Connecticut” from the question to allow for commuters.
politics but it is time consuming and unless it is connected to the NASW or other influential group is really not able to make much of a difference”.

Table 3.5

*Political Interest Level in Connecticut (n = 365, 19 missing)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totally uninterested in state or local politics</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes vote in Connecticut elections</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I vote in most Connecticut elections</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I actively campaign for candidates and social issues in Connecticut</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have run for office in Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Comments</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CJ/JJ Issues in Connecticut.* At 90.1% (328), the overwhelming majority of the 364 respondents either closely or sometimes followed criminal and/or juvenile justice issues in Connecticut. Just under 3% (9) of respondents either campaigned on behalf of a candidate whose platform included criminal and/or juvenile justice issues or ran for office based on a platform that included those issues. Two percent (6) of respondents took the opportunity to share additional commentary. In an example of the need to be involved, one individual said “I care about and closely follow politics related to the Criminal and/or juvenile justice issues on Connecticut as well as [a neighboring state] where I live and vote.”

Some, although finding political interest important, were discouraged by the system. Some examples include: “I am interested but disheartened” and “I try to pay attention to how it affects the population I work with but I truly dislike politics!!!!!” A third group seemed to disengage because of feelings about the political system. One shared, “I hate all forms of politics and politicians. The electoral college invalidates my individual vote.” Another noted, “the system is up side [sic] down and out of touch. We need…leaders across the board.”
Education

Highest Educational Achievement

At 89.4% (343), the majority of the current sample reported having a bachelor’s or graduate degree. Only 2.6% (9) of the respondents reported having had some college but no degree and 3.6% reported having a doctoral degree. Just under 3% (10) of respondents took the opportunity to share additional information about their highest educational achievement. Of those, less than 1% (2) reported having a sixth year certificate degree in education, one had a juris doctorate and one simply identified as a “lifelong student.” Twenty seven percent (103) of the respondents reported having a social work degree. Within the initial screening question, three identified as students, 4.2% (16) reported having a BSW and 23% (88) an MSW.

Figure 3.4

Highest Level of School Completed/Highest Degree Received (n=384, 0 missing).

Other studies examining social worker demographics and highest level of education reported different findings. For example, the 2006 NASW study found that MSW was the highest degree held for 76% of respondents, 11.5% topped out with a BSW and 2.1% held the terminal degree of DSW (NASW Center for Health Workforce Studies School of Public Health,
2006, p. 3). In comparison, the current study had nearly 30% fewer respondents with graduate degrees.

**Type of Forensic Social Work Presence in Educational Experience**

A critical area of inquiry for the current study was forensic social work presence in social work education. To capture this, the survey asked respondents to describe their programs through a series of five yes/no questions. They were, 1) no specific courses but some forensic social work content within other courses - offered in my program, 2) some courses in forensic social work (or its equivalent) as electives - offered in my program, 3) a substantive area/concentration in forensic social work (or its equivalent) (typically 2-3 elective courses) - offered in my program, 4) field placements in forensic settings - offered in my program and 5) a certificate or other specialization in forensic social work (or its equivalent) - offered in my program. See Figure 3.5 for a depiction of the responses.

**Figure 3.5**

*Five Questions Regarding Forensic Social Work Presence in Educational Experience*
high/very high presence”. Nearly 20% of responses indicated there was no forensic social work education presence in social work programs. The largest percentage (47%) was those with “Low/Medium” presence and 34% of responses indicated a “High/Very High” presence.

It is noteworthy that 26 respondents chose to include commentary and others simply skipped this item. Themes within the commentary highlighted the limitations of including this question for everyone instead of including a does not apply option for those who were not social workers or may not have attended a social work program. Respondents voiced concerns in the commentary that included five responses with confusion about how the question applied to him/her, four that indicated he/she is not a social worker, eight that indicated higher education was too long ago to recall and eight that earned a non-social work degree.

A new variable was created that categorized the forensic social work presence within respondents’ social work educational programs as “no presence”, “low/medium presence”, or “high/very high presence⁹” Within this framework, most program that respondents’ experienced were considered “low/medium presence” (46.6%). See Figure 3.6 for a depiction of forensic social work presence in schools of social work.

Figure 3.6


---

⁹ Low Presence: all “no” on questions 1-5; Low/Medium Presence: “yes” on Questions 1 and 2 only; High/Very High: “yes” on question 3 only, “yes” on 1, 2 and 3; “yes” on 1 and 3; “yes” on all; “yes” on 3 and 5; “yes” on 4 and 5; “yes” on 5 only.
Desire for Forensic Social Work Career during Educational Experience

Respondents were asked whether they desired, at some point in their education, a social work career in criminal and/or juvenile justice. The responses were nearly evenly split with 53.3% of respondents indicating a desire to have a social work career in criminal and/or juvenile justice.

Work Setting

Type of Organization

Organizational auspice was operationalized in this study as working in public, non-profit or proprietary organizations. A total of 85.1% (326) reported working in a “Public: local, state or federal government agency within the executive, legislative or judicial branches”, 12.5% (48) work for “Non-profit: a 501(c)(3) agency led by a voluntary board” and .3% (1) reported working for a “Proprietary: delivers services for a profit, may be governed by a board of directors”. The large percentage of respondents working in public organizations may be explained by the small number of non-profit agencies that elected to take part in the survey. Of those that did participate, there were generally fewer employees than in the larger public organizations.

Table 3.6

Organizational Auspice (n=375, 9 missing)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Type</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public: local, state or federal government agency within the executive, legislative or judicial branches</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit: a 501(c)(3) agency led by a voluntary board</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary: delivers services for a profit, may be governed by a board of directors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Total</td>
<td>375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Setting Type

Respondents were given fourteen settings from which to choose and asked to mark each of the settings in which they work. Some settings contained fewer than ten responses: general assembly (legislative) (4) and executive branch (6). The most responses were recorded for “court pretrial stage” (171) and “adult probation” (124) and “pretrial diversion programs” (122).

While respondents were given the opportunity to choose more than one setting, the majority (51.7%) chose only one. Slightly more than 31% chose two to three settings and another 14.8% chose four to six settings. The remaining 2.1% chose seven to twelve settings. While there may be different reasons why almost half reported multiple settings, one possibility is that positions incorporate multiple responsibilities that span various locations. For example, an adult probation officer may choose “court pretrial stage” in addition to “adult probation” because the process of initiating a violation of probation (VOP) may result in testimony at a pretrial hearing in court. Further investigation is necessary to fully understand this finding.

After removing one case that could not be fit into one of the five categories, the majority of the respondents remained in Court (105) Corrections (95) and Probation (152) (figure 3.7).

---

10 For analysis purposes, responses were combined and collapsed into five mutually exclusive categories: 1) court (pretrial/court/sentencing/pretrial diversion), 2) corrections (DOC/juvenile detention/parole/halfway house/UCONN Correctional Managed Health Care), 3) probation (adult/juvenile), 4) other (Legislature/Executive Branch/Investigation/Arrest), and 5) indicates work in >2 collapsed settings.
Many respondents worked in probation and corrections. A new variable *working in a custody position* was created to capture who worked in custody and supervision positions (juvenile and adult probation, juvenile detention, adult corrections, and parole). Table 3.7 depicts that 42.1% (161) of those who worked in custody positions were captured by the survey screening question *I work in a position that I consider social work related*. Therefore, 42.1% of those working in custody settings did not fit the survey criteria for other reasons (social work student, has a BSW, has an MSW, has a social work doctorate, or has “social work” in their job description).

Table 3.7

*Crosstab of Working in Custodial Setting and Screening Question “Social Work Related”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Included because Considers Position Social Work Related</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in a Custody Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Custody setting refers to Juvenile Detention, Adult Corrections, Juvenile Probation, Adult Probation, and Parole.*
Causes of Stress in Work Environment

Respondents were given a list of 12 issues commonly related to stress in the workplace for social workers and asked to respond on a Likert-type scale\footnote{\textit{0}=Results in very much stress, \textit{1}=Results in some stress, \textit{2}=Results in very little stress, and \textit{3}=Results in no stress.} with lower scores indicating higher levels of stress reaction to the items. Table 3.8 provides an overview of the items, mean scores and standard deviations.

Table 3.8

\textit{Statistics and Frequencies of Causes of Stress in Work Environment}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>(n) (missing)</th>
<th>(m) (SD)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>interaction with coworkers from the social work profession within my place of work</td>
<td>382 (2)</td>
<td>1.73 (.849)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>\textbf{42.1}%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>interaction with coworkers from other professions within my place of work</td>
<td>380 (4)</td>
<td>1.64 (.831)</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>\textbf{39.2}%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>working in my current work environment (physical location)</td>
<td>382 (2)</td>
<td>1.68 (.918)</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>\textbf{34.6}%</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>interaction with my clients (or constituents, patients, consumers, etc.)</td>
<td>381 (3)</td>
<td>1.48 (.713)</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>\textbf{55.1}%</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>working on the types of cases (or topics, subject matter, etc.) that I work on</td>
<td>379 (5)</td>
<td>1.40 (.771)</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>\textbf{53.3}%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>my case load</td>
<td>379 (5)</td>
<td>1.31 (.841)</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>\textbf{50.4}%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>the mission of my current place of work</td>
<td>379 (5)</td>
<td>1.71 (.905)</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>\textbf{37.2}%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>my assigned duties</td>
<td>376 (8)</td>
<td>1.46 (.854)</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>\textbf{46.8}%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>working in a team with people from other professions</td>
<td>376 (8)</td>
<td>1.86 (.807)</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>\textbf{44.1}%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>my ability to make positive changes in my work environment getting performance feedback from supervisors</td>
<td>380 (4)</td>
<td>1.74 (.895)</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>\textbf{40.8}%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>paperwork and other reporting duties</td>
<td>381 (3)</td>
<td>1.81 (.923)</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>\textbf{39.6}%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.8 provides an overview of the items, mean scores and standard deviations.
Although none of the items had the majority of respondents answering in the “results in very much stress” category, respondents indicated the second highest level of stress “results in some stress” for six of the items. Those were, in order of frequency: interaction with my clients (55.1%), working on the types of cases that I work on (53.3%), my caseload (50.4%), my assigned duties (46.8%), paperwork and other reporting duties (40.1%), and the mission of my current place of work (37.2%).

**Length of Time**

*Length of Time at Current Employment.* In general, respondents had been in their current employment for more than ten years ($M=11.4$, $SD=7.4$). The tenure within the sample ranged from 4 months to 34.5 years.

*Length of Time as a Social Worker.* On average, respondents had been social workers for more years than they had been at their current employment ($M=13.8$, $SD=8.9$). Their tenure ranged from 0-34.2 years. The average career duration of social workers in the 2006 NASW Workforce study was 25-30 years (NASW Center for Health Workforce Studies School of Public Health, 2006, p. 3).

*Length of Time as a Social Worker in CJ/JJ.* On average, sample respondents had worked slightly longer as a social worker in CJ/JJ than in their current employment, but 2 years less than their average time as a social worker ($M=11.8$ years, $SD=8.1$). Tenure in this work ranged from 0-33.5 years.

**Employment Stability**

Employment stability was operationalized using Mittal, Rosen and Leana’s qualitative study of the factors associated with retention and turnover in nursing direct care workers in Pennsylvania over a three-year period (2009). The study identified three categories, 1) chronic
leavers who switched jobs more than twice in the past three years, 2) intermittent leavers who switched jobs once or twice in the past three years, and 3) stayers who worked for the same employer for more than three years. Respondents for the current study were asked to identify themselves in one of the three categories. Most respondents (85.3%) reported working for the same employer for greater than three years (i.e. stayers), an indication of employment stability. Another 12.3% had changed employers once or twice during the prior three-year period (intermittent leavers) and only 3% changed employers more than twice in the same timeframe (chronic leavers).

Eight responses of “other (unemployed, student only, etc.)” included explanations that spanned a range of situations. One person stayed home to raise his/her children while three others were recently hired after interning and/or completing school.

**Professional Activities**

**Organizational Memberships**

Organizational memberships may be a protective factor and/or a lifeline to the profession for social workers in host settings. Within the current survey, 16.4% of respondents reported carrying memberships to 2 or 3 social work organizations and 19.1% reported having 2-4 memberships in criminal and/or juvenile justice organizations. When social work and criminal justice memberships were combined, 25% of respondents within the survey population (n=376) reported having 2-4 memberships. Multiple memberships may be cost prohibitive, particularly for social work organization memberships.¹²

---

Social Work Organizations. Respondents were given the choice of twenty-nine social work-related organizations and an open text field to capture organizations not listed. The majority of respondents (297 or 79%) chose “not applicable”.

Seventy-nine respondents had memberships to 14 of the 29 organizations. Fifty-eight were members of National Association of Social Work (NASW) and six were members of the National Organization of Forensic Social Work (NOFSW). Considering that only 27% (103) of the sample reported having a social work degree, having 58 NASW members in the sample was noteworthy. The majority of the comments referred to organizations already included in the response set and a variety of committees and non-social work-related organizations.

While the survey did not ask specifically about certifications, several respondents used the comment section of the social work organizations question to share membership details. Notable memberships and certifications included art therapy, counseling, teaching, drug and alcohol certification, rehabilitation and one in oncology.

Table 3.9
Top 5 Most Frequently Chosen Social Work Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Work Organization</th>
<th>Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Social Workers (NASW)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Organization of Forensic Social Workers (NOFSW)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Association of Black Social Workers (NABSW)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council on Social Work Education (CSWE)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino Social Workers Organization (LSWO)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Case Management Association (ACMA)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criminal Justice Organizations. Respondents indicated memberships with more criminal justice organizations than social work organizations. While the majority (71.4%) of respondents reported not being a member of a criminal and/or juvenile justice organization, membership to
multiple criminal justice agencies was more prevalent than with social work organizations. Those criminal and/or juvenile organizations with the most identified members were the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) with 48 members, the American Correctional Association (ACA) with 23 members, the National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA) with 8 members and the Correctional Educational Association (CEA) with 7 members. 

It is noteworthy that, again, respondents who took the time to respond through the “other” option were eager to share additional information about local boards, committees, advisory groups, community groups and local memberships. One person reported on types of conferences he/she attended and another shared that he/she was a member of Survivors of Homicide. This and the comments under social work organizations were indicative of this population’s willingness to contribute additional information; even within an already lengthy survey.

**Professional Activities**

Another indication of the complexity of positions within the criminal and juvenile justice field was the frequent overlap of professional activities. This may indicate that social workers and others in these types of social work-related positions were tasked with a variety of micro and macro level activities. The survey sample indicated that, while micro practices such as direct clinical services and case management reflected the majority of the activities, administrative activities were also notable (see Table 3.10).
Additional commentary related to professional activities was indicative of the detailed and challenging work done by social workers and those in social work-related positions in the criminal and juvenile justice processes. One them that arose was uncertainty if all social worker roles are similar. One respondent noted “as a [social worker in a defense organization], I feel I provide clinical services to some of my clients. This may differ from the views and roles of my colleagues”.

Although the agencies have various missions, a common theme among many of the comments highlighted advocacy and clinical assessment in everyday work. Some examples included:

- “assessment, recommendations, and referral for evaluations only (no case management).
  Serve as in-house expert providing consultation and education for court personnel”,
- “court advocacy for victims of crime education and outreach fro [sic] crime victims' rights”,
- “intakes and risk assessment of offenders for prelease for parole”,
- “legal advocacy”,
- “crisis assessment/intervention”,
• “drug and alcohol assessments, group, and individual counseling”,
• “family evaluations…mediation alternative dispute resolution services”, and
• “forensic mental health evaluations of clients”.

One respondent shared a desire to apply his/her training to their current position: “I have a Masters in Forensic Psychology. I wish my job allowed me to apply more of my knowledge”. Some comments specifically identified work with victims. One person worked in “outreach and Training / Education regarding victims' rights and services [and] Victim Impact Programs through the [custodial agency]”.

**Professional Practice**

The survey gathered information about the types of practice, populations, and feelings about working in host environments where responsibilities may overlap. Included in the discussion are the Professional Opinion Scale (POS) (Abbott, 1988, 1999, 2003) and items designed to elicit implicit racial bias beliefs.

**Professional Opinion Scale (POS)**

The sixteen item (two subscales and two additional items) 5-point Likert-type\(^{13}\) Professional Opinion Scale (POS) (Abbott, 1988, 1999, 2003) measured social work values. Analyses were conducted on the full 16 items. This included the two subscales entitled *support for self-determination* and *sense of social responsibility*. Some scores were reverse coded. Higher scores indicated stronger social work values. The sample mean for the POS was in the mid-range for strength of social work values (*M*=35.89, *SD*=9.3).

While several studies have used the POS in recent years\(^{14}\), direct comparisons cannot be drawn between most of them and the current study. Other studies used various combinations of

\(^{13}\) POS Scoring 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neither Agree nor Disagree, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly Agree

\(^{14}\) Some recent studies using the POS: Miller, 2013; Osteen, 2011; and Lukens, Solomon & Sorenson, 2013.
the subscales and additional items so no direct total score comparison was drawn with the current study. Most of the studies also reported aggregate scale or subscale means, rather than individual item mean scores.

One 2014 study of MSW students included item by item comparisons and provided valuable comparisons to the current study (Ringstad). Students in Ringstad’s (2014) study attended school in a politically and socially conservative area (N=127), yet generally had higher per item means than the current study. As illustrated in Table 3.10, the items with the three highest means in the current study were, in order, *there should be a guaranteed minimum income for everyone* ($M=3.05$), *the government should not redistribute the wealth* ($M=2.82$), and *the gap between poverty and affluence should be reduced through measures directed at redistribution of income* ($M=2.98$). In comparison, Ringstad’s means were 3.34, 3.7, and 3.57 (2014, pp. 17-18), respectively.

The items with the two lowest means in the current study were *family planning services should be available to individuals regardless of income* ($M=1.78$, $SD=.93$) and *women should have the right to use abortion services* ($M=1.83$, $SD=.99$), indicating more conservative values and weaker social work values. Ringstad’s student scores on those items were higher on average ($M=4.55$, $SD=.71$) and ($M=4.28$, $SD=.96$), respectively, indicating much stronger social work values among his MSW student sample (2014, pp. 17-18).

As mentioned throughout this chapter, the current study’s sample was not primarily social work educated. Less than one quarter (23%) of the sample had an MSW and the majority had little to no forensic social work education. As discussed later in this chapter, probation and other custodial or law-enforcement related positions were highly represented in the current study. These factors could explain why the MSW student sample had higher mean scores on the POS.
items. Ringstad opined that the reason his fairly liberal sample was a function of the values that brought his respondents to an MSW program, rather than the MSW program making his respondents more liberal (2014, p. 20). Refer to Table 3.11 for the items means and standard deviations for all items on the POS used in the current study.

Table 3.11

*Professional Opinion Scale (POS) Means per Item*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POS 16 Items (with original item number)</th>
<th>n (missing)</th>
<th>M(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6: There should be a guaranteed minimum income for everyone</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>3.05(1.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: Federal Gov’t has invested too much money in the poor</td>
<td>376 (8)</td>
<td>2.55(1.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: The government should not redistribute the wealth</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>2.82(1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11: Women should have the right to use abortion services</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>1.83(.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13: Government should keep files on individuals with minority political affiliation</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>1.95(.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15: The government should not subsidize family planning programs</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>2.27(1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18: Family planning should be available to all adolescents</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>2.11(1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20: The government should provide a comprehensive system of insurance protection against loss of income because of disability</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>2.21(1.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30: Corporal Punishment is an important means of discipline for aggressive, acting out adolescents</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>2.14(1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31: Unemployment benefits should be extended, especially in areas hit by economic disaster</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>2.29(1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33: The gap between poverty and affluence should be reduced through measures directed at redistribution of income</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>2.98(1.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35: Efforts should be made to increase voting among minorities</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>2.12(1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37: Family planning services should be available to individuals regardless of income</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>1.78(.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38: Older persons should be sustained to the extent possible in their own environments</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>2.01(.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39: The child in adoption proceedings should be the primary client</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>1.99(.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40: A family should be defined as two or more individuals who consider themselves a family and who assume protective, caring obligations to one another</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>1.93(1.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POS TOTAL SCORE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.04 (9.26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implicit Racial Bias

Implicit racial bias refers to “introspectively unidentified (or inaccurately identified) traces of past experience that mediate favorable or unfavorable feeling, thought, or action toward social objects (Greenwald and Banaji, 1995, p. 8).” Studies of implicit bias in criminal and juvenile justice professionals is critical because of the impact it has on discretion along the various decision points within these processes. Six items from the Judicial Branch Task Force questionnaires asked respondents to choose a response on a five point Likert-type scale\textsuperscript{15}. Higher scores, which disagreed with the statements, indicated lower racial bias beliefs.

Table 3.12 lists the mean scores for the implicit bias questions in the current sample. Means ranged between 3.17 and 4.05, which is generally at the level of neutrality to strongly disagreeing with the six racial bias items.

Table 3.12

\textit{Item Means for Implicit Racial Bias}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implicit Racial Bias Items</th>
<th>( n )\textsuperscript{(missing)}</th>
<th>( M(\text{SD}) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Americans and Latinos are more likely to be poor because most of them don’t have the motivation or will power to improve their conditions</td>
<td>375 (9)</td>
<td>4.05(1.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If African Americans and Latinos would try harder they would be just as well off as Caucasians financially and educationally</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>4.00(1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under similar circumstances, African American and Latino men are more likely than Caucasian men to respond violently to frustration (threat, challenge, other)</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>3.75(1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over the past ten years, minorities have been given enough special programs and other opportunities, but they haven’t taken full advantage of them</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>3.70(1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor racial/ethnic minorities in our major cities have come to place less value on human life than non-minorities in similar circumstances</td>
<td>378 (6)</td>
<td>3.57(1.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for poor Africans</td>
<td>377 (7)</td>
<td>3.17(1.20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{15} Implicit bias measure: 1=Strongly Agree, 2=Agree, 3=Neither Agree Nor Disagree, 4=Disagree, and 5=Strongly Disagree.
While the sample’s means generally indicated lower racial bias beliefs, there were four questions for which more than 10% of respondents indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed with the racially biased items. In response to the item, *generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for poor African Americans to work their way out of the lower class, and so they are more likely to turn to crime*, 30% (110) of the respondents said they agreed or strongly agreed. For the item *poor racial/ethnic minorities in our major cities have come to place less value on human life than non-minorities in similar circumstances*, 18.5% (70) respondents agreed or strongly agreed. Nearly 16% (60) of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: *over the past ten years, minorities have been given enough special programs and other opportunities, but they haven’t taken full advantage of them*. For the final item, *under similar circumstances, African American and Latino men are more likely than Caucasian men to respond violently to frustration*, 11% (42) respondents indicated agreement or strong agreement.

While the responses to these four statements call for further inquiry and discussion, it is worth noting that social work education is well equipped to explore and deconstruct these types of belief systems and oppressive behaviors. In fact, bringing implicit bias into “consciousness is necessary to make objective decisions in practice” (Wahler, 2016, p. 1058).

**Macro/Micro Practice**

A new variable assigned each of the responses about activities outlined above into mutually exclusive categories of 1) micro practice, 2) both micro and macro practice (overlapping) or 3) macro practice\(^\text{16}\). Descriptive analysis revealed that 274 respondents solely

---

\(^{16}\) Variable was created by collapsing the responses according to these rules: 1= micro (direct, case management or both, 2= both micro and macro (case management plus anything else; direct practice plus anything else ) and 3= macro (admin only, legislative only, grants only, research only, policy only OR any combination of those five).
identified micro practice. By comparison, 20 respondents solely identified macro practice (some combination of administration, legislation, research, grants and policy without any direct clinical or case management. Sixty respondents fell within the overlapping micro/macro category (see figure 3.8).

Figure 3.8

*Social Work Practice Categories*

![Social Work Practice Categories Diagram](image)

**Client Populations**

Social work is a ubiquitous profession in that it is present in many settings and fields and across many populations. In the course of their work, social workers in criminal and juvenile justice settings may work with a variety of populations. To ascertain the range of populations with which these professionals work, the survey asked them to choose all applicable populations among categories including gender, adult/juvenile, victims/offenders, families, constituents, communities and community groups, and researchers. See Table 3.13 for a list of populations and the percentage of respondents who provided “yes” responses.

____________________________
Table 3.13

*Populations with whom Respondents Work (n=380, 4 missing)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percentage of Those Who Work with Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>91.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders/Accused</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>72.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families of Offenders/Accused</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities/Community Groups</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juveniles</td>
<td>36.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families of Victims</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituents (voters, taxpayers, etc.)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the population responses were not mutually exclusive, additional variables were created to further describe the survey population in terms of clients. An anecdotal perception of social workers in the criminal and juvenile justice field is that one works with only those who are identified as victims or only those charged or convicted of crimes. Within this survey population, respondents regularly chose both victim and offender populations simultaneously. This may have been influenced by the sampling methodology, but it may also indicate a more holistic view of our justice system and the populations served by social work in general. A new variable (see Figure 3.9) with mutually exclusive categories was created to ascertain how many respondents work with solely “offenders/those accused of offenses” (39.4%) and those who work with “both offenders/those accused of offenses and with victims” (56.1%). A small number of respondents indicated that they work solely with victims (13).

Figure 3.9

*Respondents who Work with “Offenders/Those Accused of Offenses” Who also Work with “Victims” (n=328, 56 missing)*
Feelings about Turf

Social workers working in the criminal and juvenile justice fields often work in host settings such as prisons, courts, law offices, police stations and others. Host settings, a common term in social work, refers to organizations “whose mission and decision making are defined and dominated by people who are not social workers” (Dane and Simon, 1991, p. 208).

Social workers in the criminal and juvenile justice fields may also work on interdisciplinary teams or among other professionals such as safety and security personnel, psychologists and psychiatrists, attorneys, investigators, law enforcement officers and others. Many of the aforementioned engage in some of the same professional activities as social workers to conduct their work. Some examples are assessment, evaluation, advocacy and referrals. These similarities and close proximity can result in overlapping duties and sometimes “turf wars”.

This survey asked respondents their level of agreement with the statement I feel other professions overlap my social work duties. Responses were measured along a scale of one to five (1=disagree strongly, 2=disagree somewhat, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree somewhat, 5=agree strongly) (see Figure 3.10). On average, the sample’s responses were within the range of agree somewhat (M=3.6, SD=1.0). The combined 63.6% of respondents who agreed somewhat or agreed strongly that other professions overlapped with their own social work duties was more substantial.
Figure 3.10

“I feel other professions overlap my social work duties” (n=379, 5 missing)

Job Satisfaction and Emotional Labor

Job satisfaction and emotional labor are key concepts in how social workers, or those who consider themselves social workers, fit into their work environment. This study measured these concepts using three separate scales. These were the a) Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) (Koeske, Kirk, Koeske, & Rauktis, 1994), b) the three part Professional Quality of Life (ProQOL) scale (Stamm, 2010), and c) the two part Discrete Emotions Emotional Labor Scale (DEELS) (Glomb & Tews, 2004).

Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS)

The JSS is a 14-item, 11-step linear Likert-type scale\(^\text{17}\) that was originally developed by three social workers and a psychologist to measure job satisfaction in the human services (Koeske, Kirk, Koeske, & Rauktis, 1994). Up to three additional items may also be used in this scale. See asterisks in Table 3.14 for specific items. With a scale mid-point of 5.5, the current sample’s means reflected a higher level of job satisfaction for both the 14-item measure

\(^{17}\) 0=very dissatisfied through 11=very satisfied in which higher scores are interpreted as higher levels of job satisfaction.
(M=7.70, SD=1.82) and the full 17-item measure that was used for all remaining analyses (M=7.58, SD=1.90).

Table 3.14

**Job Satisfaction Scale (JSS) Individual Item Mean Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Satisfaction Scale 17 Items (n=383, 1 missing)</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with your clients</td>
<td>8.67 (1.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of authority you have been given to do your job</td>
<td>7.63 (2.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your salary and benefits</td>
<td>8.24 (2.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>5.96 (3.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The challenges your job provides you</td>
<td>8.17 (2.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of supervision you receive</td>
<td>7.08 (3.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chances for acquiring new skills</td>
<td>7.39 (2.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of client contact</td>
<td>8.54 (2.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for really helping people</td>
<td>8.11 (2.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of guidelines for doing your job</td>
<td>7.34 (2.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for involvement in decision-making</td>
<td>7.24 (3.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The recognition given your work by your supervisor</td>
<td>7.01 (3.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your feeling of success as a professional</td>
<td>7.95 (2.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field of specialization you are in</td>
<td>8.44 (2.25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| JSS 14-Item Mean Score                             | 7.70 (1.81) |
| Interpersonal relations with fellow workers*       | 8.21 (2.29) |
| Amount of support from agency administration*      | 5.77 (3.18) |
| Opportunity for advanced training*                 | 7.03 |

| JSS 17-Item Mean Score                             | 7.58 (1.80) |

*Note: Additional items

Table 3.15 lists the three highest and three lowest means among the current sample. These mean scores were consistent with other measures within this study. For example, the items that brought the greatest job satisfaction were, in order, *working with clients* (M=8.67, SD=1.95), *amount of client contact* (M=8.54, SD=2.12), *field of specialization* (M=8.44, SD=2.25), and *salary/benefits* (M=8.24, SD=2.43). The “other” responses associated with this
scale are reported below. Many reflect these four items. In addition, both salary/ benefits and engaging with clients were identified as common themes for attraction to this field\textsuperscript{18}.

Table 3.15

\begin{center}
\textit{JSS Items with the Highest and Lowest Levels of Job Satisfaction (n=383, 1 missing)}
\end{center}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\hline
Item & \textit{M (SD)} \\
\hline
Working with your clients & 8.67 (1.95) \\
Amount of client contact & 8.54 (2.11) \\
Field of specialization you are in & 8.44 (2.30) \\
Your salary and benefits & 8.24 (2.42) \\
The recognition given your work by your supervisor & 7.01 (3.30) \\
Opportunities for promotion & 5.96 (3.02) \\
Amount of support from agency administration & 5.77 (3.18) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

The sample’s three lowest levels of job satisfaction were related to recognition by agency administration. From highest to lowest they were \textit{recognition from supervisor (M=7.01, SD=3.30), opportunities for promotion (M=5.96, SD=3.02), and amount of support from agency administration (M=5.77, SD=3.18)}. These themes were present in the content analyses discussed later in this chapter. Overall, the sample reported having the most satisfaction from working with clients and being compensated accordingly and the least satisfaction from recognition from administration.

Comparison to other studies was limited by three methodological differences between the current study and the others\textsuperscript{19}. These differences were inconstant use of additional items, authors’ decision to use a 7-point, rather than an 11-point scale, and only reporting aggregate means.

\textsuperscript{18} Discussed later in this chapter.
\textsuperscript{19} Other JSS studies included: Cole, Panchanadeswaran, & Daining, 2004 and Griffiths, Royse, Culber, Piescher, & Zhang, 2016.
Content Analysis of “Other” Category on JSS

In addition to the quantititative data gathered within the JSS scale, 9.7% (37) of those who completed the JSS scale provided further commentary. Content analysis and key word identifications within the responses resulted in a list of common themes. While the responses varied widely, the most common themes were administrative power and control and opportunities for advancement.

Administrative Power and Control. Many commented that their administrations yielded overwhelming power and control. For some, the agency was too large and for some the administration itself was overbearing. One person noted how their professional discretion was not always taken into consideration:

my administration does not understand some aspects of how [redacted] works and the amount of time and effort it takes to do most things. Many people making the policies have never been [redacted] and never sat with a [redacted] for even 1 day to get an idea. It is rare to ever hear that you did a good job on anything. The job satisfaction I have comes from within and knowing I did a good job or did the best I could. More and more discretion has been removed from us and we know the clients better than anyone. Our agency dictates what home visits to do and what clients to see instead of letting us use our discretion to know what to do as professionals.

Other respondents commented that the administration of their agencies yield information as “power” and their practices are often “paternalistic”.

For others, the workers and those in charge were not well connected. One person said, “administration often makes decisions about my job duties that are unrealistic and inappropriate.” Two others noted poor communication practices between the administration and
staff. One posited that poor communication “prevent[s] the department from moving ahead from status quo to excellence”.

Two others eloquently described the difficulty of working to help people when the administration is pushing for data. They said:

It seems social work is becoming more about numbers than actual people. I am in social work to help people, not crunch numbers or do data entry on databases that are not user-friendly. So, I sometimes struggle with this. Not everything can be explained neatly on a spreadsheet.

The other individual recognized the need for data collection, but expressed difficulty balancing the administrative duties expected of him/her with the duties of being a social worker: “the amount of computer entry requirements and deadlines are always increasing which take away from time with each individual, and takes us out of the field/communities we are assisting.”

**Opportunities for Advancement.** Another common theme among those who provided additional commentary after the JSS was the chance to advance to leadership positions within their agencies. Specific criticisms included advancement of less qualified candidates, gender and racial inequality and not being rewarded for hard work and dangerous conditions.

**Professional Quality of Life Scale (ProQOL)**

Two subscales and two additional items from the ProQOL (Stamm, 2010) were used to measure the corrosive conditions known as burnout (BO)\(^\text{20}\) and secondary traumatic stress.

---

\(^\text{20}\)“Burnout is the part of Compassion Fatigue that is characterized by feelings of unhappiness, disconnectedness, and insensitivity to the work environment. It can include exhaustion, feelings of being overwhelmed, bogged down, being “out-of-touch” with the person he or she wants to be, while having no sustaining beliefs” (Stamm, 2010, p. 21).
The third subscale measured compassion satisfaction (CS). Some items were reverse-scored according to instructions (Stamm, 2010). A fourth subscale, compassion fatigue (CF) was not used in the current study.

Each of the BO and STS subscales were measured using ten 5-point Likert-type items. Higher scores indicated higher levels of burnout and/or secondary traumatic stress. Table 3.16 indicates that the highest levels of burnout were associated with the items, in order of highest burnout, *feeling bogged down by the system* ($M=2.76, SD=1.25$), *because of workload* ($M=2.75, SD=1.20$), and *feeling worn out because of work as a helper* ($M=2.60, SD=1.06$). This supports earlier findings by the JSS that system or administration-level responsibilities such as caseload are consistent with poor level of fit (burnout and job satisfaction).

---

21 “Secondary Traumatic Stress is an element of compassion fatigue that is characterized by being preoccupied with thoughts of people one has helped. Caregivers report feeling trapped, on edge, exhausted, overwhelmed, and infected by others’ trauma. Characteristics include an inability to sleep, sometimes forgetting important things, and an inability to separate one’s private life and his or her life as a helper—and experiencing the trauma of someone one helped, even to the extent of avoiding activities to avoid reminders of the trauma. It is important to note that developing problems with secondary traumatic stress is rare but it does happen to many people” (Stamm, 2010, p. 21).

22 “Compassion satisfaction is characterized by feeling satisfied by one’s job and from the helping itself. It is characterized by people feeling invigorated by work that they like to do. They feel they can keep up with new technology and protocols. They experience happy thoughts, feel successful, are happy with the work they do, want to continue to do it, and believe they can make a difference” (Stamm, 2010, p. 21).

23 ProQOL BO and STS subscale measurement: 1=never, 2=rarely, 3=sometimes, 4=often, 5=very often
Table 3.16

*Individual Item Means for ProQOL BO Subscale (n=383, 1 missing)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw PROQOL Burnout (BO) Subscale (10 ITEMS)</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am happy</td>
<td>2.12 (.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel connected to others</td>
<td>2.11 (.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not as productive at work because I am losing sleep over traumatic experiences of a person I help</td>
<td>1.51 (.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel trapped by my job as a helper</td>
<td>1.70 (.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have beliefs that sustain me</td>
<td>2.08 (1.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am the person I want to be</td>
<td>2.30 (.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel worn out because of my work as a helper</td>
<td>2.60 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel overwhelmed because my case [work] load seems endless</td>
<td>2.75 (1.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel &quot;bogged down&quot; by the system</td>
<td>2.76 (1.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a very caring person</td>
<td>1.67 (.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROQOL BO</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The current sample’s secondary traumatic stress (STS) mean scores were highest for those items that point to preoccupation, being startled or separating personal life from work life. Table 3.17 illustrates that, although the STS scores were generally low, and the group mean for STS (M=19.20) was lower than that of BO (M=21.60), *preoccupation with more than one person I help* (M=3.27, SD=1.14) was the highest scored item within both subscales.

---

24 For the remainder of the analyses, the ProQOL subscales were converted to t-scores with a M=50 and SD=10 (Stamm, 2010).
Table 3.17

*Individual Item Means for ProQOL STS Subscale (n=383, 1 missing)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw PROQOL Secondary Traumatic Stress (STS) Subscale (10 ITEMS)</th>
<th>M(SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am preoccupied with more than one person I help.</td>
<td>3.27 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I jump or am startled by unexpected sounds.</td>
<td>2.25 (1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it difficult to separate my personal life from my life as a helper.</td>
<td>1.97 (.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that I might have been affected by the traumatic stress of those I help.</td>
<td>1.94 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of my helping, I have felt &quot;on edge&quot; about various things.</td>
<td>1.88 (1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel depressed because of the traumatic experiences of the people I help.</td>
<td>1.65 (.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel as though I am experiencing the trauma of someone I have helped.</td>
<td>1.55 (.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I avoid certain activities or situations because they remind me of frightening experiences of the people I help.</td>
<td>1.54 (.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a result of my helping, I have intrusive, frightening thoughts.</td>
<td>1.47 (.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can't recall important parts of my work with trauma victims.</td>
<td>1.69 (.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROQOL STS</td>
<td>19.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the third ProQOL subscale, compassion satisfaction (CS), higher scores indicated higher levels of compassion satisfaction. The sample’s CS subscale mean ($M=38.75$, $SD=6.20$), higher than either the BO or STS subscales. CS is an important factor in level of fit because it may offset or protect the worker from the impact of burnout and dissatisfaction with his/her job. In fact, Stamm notes that CS may directly influence issues with administrative duties because it represents the “pleasure [one] derives from being able to do [his/her] work well” (2010, p. 17). The CS item means listed in Table 3.18 illustrate how caring about the work one chooses and being able to help people are important to this sample. The items that reflected the highest levels of compassion satisfaction were *being able to help people* ($M=4.23$, $SD=.72$), *being happy that he/she chose to do this work* ($M=4.16$, $SD=.86$), and *feeling proud of what he/she can do to help* ($M=4.15$, $SD=.80$).
Table 3.18

*Individual Item Observed Means for ProQOL CS Subscale (n=383, 1 missing)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Raw PROQOL Compassion Satisfaction (CS) Subscale (10 ITEMS)</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I get satisfaction from being able to help people.</td>
<td>4.23 (.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel invigorated after working with those I help.</td>
<td>3.55 (.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like my work as a helper.</td>
<td>4.05 (.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am pleased with how I am able to keep up with [helping] techniques and protocols.</td>
<td>3.74 (.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work makes me feel satisfied.</td>
<td>3.73 (.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have happy thoughts and feelings about those I help and how I could help them.</td>
<td>3.65 (.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe I can make a difference through my work.</td>
<td>3.88 (.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud of what I can do to help.</td>
<td>4.15 (.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have thoughts that I am a &quot;success&quot; as a helper.</td>
<td>3.61 (.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am happy that I chose to do this work.</td>
<td>4.16 (.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROQOL CS</td>
<td>38.75 (6.20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For group scoring and interpretation purposes, raw scores were then converted to t-scores (Stamm, 2010, p. 31-34). Comparisons were based on a standardized mean of 50 (SD=10) (Stamm, 2010, p. 15). Table 3.19 illustrates the group means for the three ProQOL subscales, the standardized scores, and the percentiles.

Table 3.19

*ProQOL Statistics for BO, STS, and CS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Raw Means</th>
<th>t-Score</th>
<th>Percentile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BO</td>
<td>21.60</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>58th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>84th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results were interpreted based on the t-scores and percentiles. The profile for the sample was that of high STS, moderate BO, and moderate CS25.

---

25 This is discussed in detail in chapter five.
Discrete Emotions Emotional Labor Scale (DEELS)

Job role stress was measured using the two subscales of the Discrete Emotion Emotional Labor Scale (DEELS) by Glomb and Tews (2004). Emotional labor is the act of “managing emotions and emotional expression to be consistent with organizational or occupational” expectations of how one should appropriately display emotion (Glomb & Tews, 2004, p. 2). Each subscale was comprised of fourteen 5-point Likert-type items.

The DEELS “genuine” measured the frequency with which the respondent felt compelled to display actual expressions of emotion in their work setting, with higher scores corresponding to higher instances of having problems related to keeping emotions hidden.

For the current study, table 3.20 illustrates the split between hiding genuine negative (top 9 items) and genuine positive emotions (bottom 5 items). The sample means for each item were lower for hiding positive emotions. This is the healthier alternative and represents less job role stress. The two emotions that were most hidden by the sample were irritation ($M=2.89$, $SD=1.29$) and aggravation ($M=2.55$, $SD=1.27$).

---

26 DEELS “genuine” measurement: 1=I never feel this, 2=I never keep this to myself, 3=I keep this to myself a few times a week, 4=I keep this to myself a few times a day, 5=I keep this to myself many times a day
Table 3.20

*Item Means for the DEELS “genuine” Subscale (n=367, 17 missing)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEELS (Genuine) 14 Items</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irritation</td>
<td>2.89 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>2.12 (1.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>2.12 (1.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>1.96 (1.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disliking</td>
<td>2.29 (1.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravation</td>
<td>2.55 (1.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>1.38 (1.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate</td>
<td>1.33 (1.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distress</td>
<td>1.81 (1.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>1.60 (1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>1.90 (1.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contentment</td>
<td>1.76 (1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>1.54 (1.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>1.49 (0.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEELS “Actual” Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The DEELS “Fake” subscale measured how often the respondent felt compelled to *fake good* or *fake bad* to clients or coworkers,\(^{27}\) with higher scores corresponding to higher levels of emotional labor. The latter is an important concept in understanding the job role stress the forensic social worker may feel, particularly in host settings that are custodial or supervisory rather than therapeutic. Having to act or hide emotions in order to acclimate to a host setting can result in depersonalization and emotional exhaustion (Taxer & Frenzell, 2015).

The sample exhibited higher scores for faking positive emotions than faking negative emotions, meaning that, as a group, they more often pretended to be *enthusiastic* \((M=2.41, SD=1.24)\) or *happy* \((M=2.37, SD=1.27)\). In terms of faking negative emotions at work, the items

---

\(^{27}\) DEELS “Fake” measurement: 1=I never express this when I DO NOT FEEL IT, 2=I express this a few times a months when I DO NOT FEEL IT, 3=I express this a few times a week when I DO NOT FEEL IT, 4=I express this a few times a day when I DO NOT FEEL IT, 5=I express this many times a day when I DO NOT FEEL IT.
that the sample was most likely to fake were *irritation* \((M=1.54, SD=.95)\) and *aggravation* \((M=1.52, SD=.90)\).

Table 3.21

*Items Means for the DEELS “Fake” Subscale*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEELS (Fake) 14 Items</th>
<th>(n) (missing)</th>
<th>(M) (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irritation</td>
<td>365 (19)</td>
<td>1.54 (.953)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>365 (19)</td>
<td>1.35 (.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>365 (19)</td>
<td>1.38 (.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>363 (21)</td>
<td>1.31 (.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disliking</td>
<td>363 (21)</td>
<td>1.47 (.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravation</td>
<td>365 (19)</td>
<td>1.52 (.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>365 (19)</td>
<td>1.26 (.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate</td>
<td>365 (19)</td>
<td>1.24 (.75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distress</td>
<td>365 (19)</td>
<td>1.39 (.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td>365 (19)</td>
<td>2.25 (1.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>365 (19)</td>
<td>1.93 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contentment</td>
<td>364 (20)</td>
<td>2.15 (1.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td>365 (19)</td>
<td>2.37 (1.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>365 (19)</td>
<td>2.41 (1.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEELS “Fake” Total</td>
<td>365 (19)</td>
<td>23.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Forensic Social Work Identification (Pre and Post Survey)**

The term “forensic social work” was defined in the body of the survey, but for the purposes of the two questions eliciting responses about forensic social work identity, the questions instructed the respondents to define the term for themselves. Within the survey population, 371 respondents answered both the pre-survey forensic social work identification question\(^{28}\) and the post survey forensic social work identification question\(^{29}\). A one-sample t-test (excluding cases list wise to account for missing values) used to compare pre- and post

\(^{28}\) “Right now, where do you identify yourself on a continuum between the term ‘social worker’ and ‘forensic social worker’ (defining that term for yourself)?”

\(^{29}\) “Right now, where do you identify yourself on a continuum between the term ‘social worker’ and ‘forensic social worker’ (still defining that term for yourself)?”
survey means revealed a statistically significant \((p < .05)\) finding that the means within the group increased from 4.695 to 5.574 (see Table 3.22).

Table 3.22

One-Sample t-Test for Pre/Post Survey Forensic Social Work Identity (Original Variable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(t)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(PRE) Right now, where do you identify yourself on continuum between term &quot;SW&quot; and &quot;FSW&quot;</td>
<td>37.813</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.695</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(POST) Right now, where do you identify yourself on continuum between term &quot;SW&quot; and &quot;FSW&quot;</td>
<td>48.698</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>5.574</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The higher mean score post-survey indicates a higher level of forensic social work identity in comparison to social work identity. The survey did introduce forensic social work terminology and information. The survey also called upon the respondent to reflect on not only practice but also identity and may have contributed to a higher sense of forensic social work identity for the survey population, on average, by the end of the survey.

Two new variables were created to collapse both pre- and post-survey measurement of forensic social work identity into three categories: 1) identifies more as a social worker, 2) identifies equally as both social worker and forensic social worker and 3) identifies more as a forensic social worker. Table 3.22 on the following page illustrates that the pre-survey responses resulted in 42.7% choosing the neutral category, 33.7% identifying more as a social worker and less than one quarter (24%) identifying as more of a forensic social worker.
Table 3.23

*Forensic Social Work Identity (Pre) Recoded into Three Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifies more as SW</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies as both SW and FSW equally</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies more as FSW</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The new variable for post-survey responses (Table 3.13) indicated that the neutral category remained fairly stable (43.4% compared to 42.7% pre-survey). The percentage of those who identified more as a forensic social worker was higher in the post-survey responses (38.3% compared to 24%).

Table 3.24

*Forensic Social Work Identity (Post) Recoded into Three Categories*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifies more as SW</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies as both SW and FSW equally</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifies more as FSW</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-sample t-Test (excluding cases list wise) was used to compare means for the two new variables among those who answered the pre-survey question and the post-survey question. As indicated in Table 3.25, the mean increased for the same group following completion of the Forensic Social Work survey; suggesting stronger identification with forensic social work after completing the survey.
Support and Training Experience

Mentor Experience

Theoretically, having a mentor is designated as a protective factor in this study. Respondents were asked if they had a mentor in the field of criminal and/or juvenile justice while working as a social worker. The term mentor was defined in the survey as “someone formally connected to you by/through a school or organization”. See Table 3.26 below for more detail.

Table 3.26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentor from the Field of Criminal and/or Juvenile Justice</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Yes</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>384</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive analyses indicated that fewer than half of the sample (41%) who responded to this question indicated they had a mentor from the field of criminal and/or juvenile justice. Of those, a follow up question asked them to indicate whether having a mentor was a positive
experience in their social work in criminal/juvenile justice career. Of the 152 who completed the question, a total of 94.1% agreed somewhat or agreed strongly.

The comments offered by many of the respondents in the “other” category were also enlightening. Although mentor was not defined by point in education or career, two comments alluded to the possibility that mentorships are often developed with new employees or students rather than throughout one’s career. One person noted “when I first started in my position, I had a mentor in the office who I could go to for help related to my job and duties”. Another recognized the temporary nature of mentoring for some: “while I have had mentors within my professional life, as I have evolved professionally, the connection to my mentors has diminished or been lost.”

Another comment highlighted the overlapping roles that can occur in times of downsizing. “Since we no longer have interns in the facility, I have ‘mentored’ a few of the new staff who were working the same job during a training period.

Several comments focused on mentoring in educational settings through professors, placements and undergraduate advisors. While a few mentioned a mentor while job shadowing a boss, supervisor or an administrator, many identified specific job descriptions where they found mentors. These included an adult probation officer, within the Department of Correction, in Parole, in Transitional Supervision, in Bail and Family Services. No one made specific references to social work mentors.

The most poignant comment exemplified the importance of mentoring and the impact a good mentor can have on someone in this field:

In the past, I have had incredible mentors who possessed classic leadership qualities.

They valued input and were invested in my success. They were so experienced and
secure that questions were not seen as challenges and they would never place me in a
position to do something without carefully considering what they were asking me to do. I
had faith and trust in them as human beings and leaders. They were dedicated to helping
clients and doing the right thing vs promoting themselves.

**Training and Clinical Supervision Experience**

Providing training, receiving training and participating in clinical supervision may act as
protective factors against job stressors. The survey defined clinical supervision as “receiving
supervision from a licensed clinical social worker either towards the requirements of being
licensed yourself or solely for the purpose of supervision.” Among those who answered the
cluster of clinical supervision and training questions, 54.7% of respondents ($n=349$, 35 missing)
had “participated in a training/conference (outside of work) paid by [his/her] agency on the
topic of social work.” Nearly 68% of respondents ($n=355$, 29 missing) said they had attended
training sponsored within their agency on the topic of social work (see Figure 3.11). Common
concerns about training opportunities were shared within the commentary. These included
administrative struggles with applying for reimbursement or getting improved for training. One
respondent paid for his/her own training and another referenced budgetary cuts:

> [W]hen I first started there was more of emphasis on training, however with the
increasing cuts in the state budget each term, the funding [sic] for training of staff has
diminished and is no longer a priority. If you want to attend outside training or seminars,
you have to take time off for this, so many people chose not to. In addition, it can be
difficult to get approved time off so this makes it harder for people to even attend on their
own.
Fewer respondents had experience with clinical supervision. The majority (57.5%) had not received clinical supervision; even fewer (26.6%), had provided clinical supervision. Respondents’ detailed commentary in “other” sections noted that lack of clinical supervision resulted in an array of concerns including 1) boundary issues, 2) countertransference, 3) “clinical incompetence”, and 4) hiring non-clinical and inexperienced social workers.

Two responses, in particular, illustrated how seriously social workers take their work and needs for supervision. The first respondent said he/she “welcome[d] the opportunity to go to trainings of all sorts to expand my knowledge base, as well as to refresh and update my knowledge and skills in order to remain competent in my job.” The second respondent noted, “it would be good to meet regionally with other social workers and a supervisor to discuss challenges, cases, and changes in the field as well as community involvement to better serve our clients and uphold the values of the field.”

**Contributions to Tenure**

In response to research question one, the survey asked about length of time in CJ/JJ social work and in current job. Multiple regression analysis examined the contributions of
race/ethnicity, level of education, transience and salary on a) time in current position and b) total length of time in forensic social work.

**Length of Time in Forensic Social Work.** The results of a regression indicated that two statistically significant predictors explained 28.3% of the variance in length of time in forensic social work \([R^2=.283, F(6,148)=11.139, p<.001]\). The two strongest predictors were job stability, as defined by \(\geq 3\) years in the same job (Mittal, Rosen and Leana, 2009) \((\beta = -.372, p<.001)\), and having a salary of \(\geq \$50K\) \((\beta = .237, p<.05)\). Stability and compensation are significant contributors when trying to predict how long an individual has worked in forensic social work.

Length of time was measured in years. Each time stability at current position increased, length of time in forensic social work increased by 136 days (.372 years). Moreover, each time salary over \$50K increased length of time in forensic social work increased by 84 days (.237 years). Stability and better compensation are indicators of how long an individual works in forensic social work. Education and race/ethnicity were not statistically significant predictors in the model.

**Time in Current Position.** The results of the regression indicated that three predictors explained 28.3% of the variance in how long an individual was in his/her current position \([R^2=.283, F(6,177)=13.050, p<.001]\). The first predictor, identifying as Caucasian/White, significantly predicted length of time in current position \((\beta = -.201, p<.05)\). The second, stability in current position, was (not surprisingly) a statistically significant predictor \((\beta = .422, p<.001)\) of length of time in current position. The third, salary of \$50K or more \((\beta = .197, p<.005)\), significantly predicted length of time in current job.

The regression model indicated for identifying as Caucasian/White, resulted in an increase of 73.4 days (.201 years) in current position. As stability increased, time in current
position increased by 154 days (.422 years). Finally, as salary (≥ $50K) increased, time in current job increased by 72 days (.197 years). This indicates that race, having job stability and being compensated well (over $50K) were all indicators of how long individuals stayed in their current job. While the former raises concerns about recruitment and retention practices for people of color, the latter two predictors made sense intuitively. Level of education was not a significant predictor of how long individuals worked in their current job.

Attraction to the Field

A content analysis of the open-ended (qualitative) question what led you to work in the criminal justice field as a social worker led to three broad categories of motivation: a) helping, b) educational, and c) practical. The overwhelming majority, 331 (86.2%) of the sample responded to the question. Their motivations ranged from the practical, such as needing a job, to the passionate, such as being led to social work by “God” or feeling “suited” for this work.

Helping. The most common theme was the desire to help others. For some, helping was a way to serve and they used terms such as “public service,” “supporting the community,” “giving back,” “giving a voice,” and “social justice.’ Consistent with the social work tradition of helping the most marginalized members of society, one respondent explained,

I was drawn into the field because I see a need to help individuals that would not otherwise have support, navigate through important life circumstances. I view myself as a change agent and feel that the field gives me a chance to evoke change and help people improve their situations.

Many respondents’ comments used social work and social justice vocabulary to explain what led them to the work. For example, one person eloquently said,
I had always been drawn to work with vulnerable populations underserved and marginalized by society... [and] found that applying or combining clinical formulations to forensic assessments and further advocating implementation of helping systems as satisfying promotion of social work values.

For one individual, personally witnessing human oppression inspired him/her to the field. After being raised “bi-lingual and in the housing projects of a very tough neighborhood ...I was tired of seeing the system blame a culture for a persons (sic) actions, completely ignoring family, environment and socio-economics.”

Not all were drawn to the work from a purely service perspective. Many shared stories of other helping motivations. Some desired to help specific populations such as the mentally ill, dually diagnosed, juveniles and those suffering from trauma. Some wanted to help others “rehabilitate” or get on the “right path.” Although most did not cite specific helping modalities, two terms used were “mitigation” and “mediation.”

Some respondents were motivated to help because of personal feelings of satisfaction and reward. On person shared, “I get my reward in seeing them progress from when they came in to them leaving with a smile on their face.” For at least one person, the initial personal satisfaction from helping became too personal. After starting work with victims of domestic violence, the personal experience of seeing his/her mother a victim of domestic violence became overwhelming.

Personal connections and experiences, similar to that of the domestic violence example above, were common within the helping theme. Some respondents entered the field because of recommendations by friends, coworkers and family (13). Twenty-six others shared personal stories about themselves or family members involved in the criminal and/or juvenile justice
system. Some had parents or other relatives who worked as police officers, probation officers or social workers. Others came to the work to help victims after having had a family member murdered or having experienced his/her mother being a victim of domestic violence.

Some had experienced the justice system first hand. Some grew up in impoverished or targeted areas and felt the need “to give back to my community.” One person came to the field because he/she was not satisfied with the help a family member had received. He/she said, “I have had family who were incarcerated and it seemed they never received the help they should have. It made me want to make a difference and help people equally.” One individual was falsely accused of a crime “[s]o I guess my life experiences led to my interest and learning about our CJ system, and I wanted to impact it.”

**Educational.** Not all sample respondents cited helping as the primary motivation for the work. For some, it was an intellectual interest in one or both of the fields of social work via educational opportunities. Respondents identified having an interest in either criminal justice or in social work and the law (27) as a primary motivation. Many shared happiness to discover a field where social work and law overlapped. One person stated,

> I have always been fascinated with the law and social work. At one point, I wanted to return to school for my law degree but with my current position I can practice social work within the context of the law, which has been a wonderful compromise.

As referenced throughout this study, education is an important tool in preparing professionals for practice. Notably, the overwhelming majority 255 (77%) of the respondents who answered the question shared that coursework and internships played a role in leading them to this field. The most common studies included social work, criminal justice, psychology, forensic psychiatry, and sociology.
Thirty-nine specifically noted internships. This is critical because many were unaware of forensic social work as students and found the field by chance. One person found forensic social work during an internship in another social work specialty. “I was interning in a child and family agency and my supervisor recommended that I look into working in criminal justice as a social worker. I discovered early on it was a perfect fit for me.” Others were considering law when they discovered forensic social work. He/she said “[i]t was an aspect of social work I was unaware existed until I started interning [in the legal field]. I love the aspect of mixing social work with the law.” The following comment illustrated how those who would be suited for forensic social work are sometimes drawn into criminal justice studies:

While in college, I interned in the criminal justice field. I was exposed to cases where some clients had no voice, how there was no hope and how the criminal justice system was a continuous cycle for them. This bothered me. Therefore, I believed that if I was passionate to help these individuals then I could possibly assist them in improving their lives.

**Practical.** Although not as prevalent as the themes of helping and education, many respondents were drawn to the field because of practical needs like benefits and needing a job. The sample majority worked in state agencies that have historically been viewed as stable positions with good benefits. Some identified needing a job, building a resume and taking a position in the field as the next logical step in career growth. Others (7) identified pay and benefits as significant motivators. For example, one person was drawn to state service from the private sector. He/she said:
I was working in the youth services field for private agencies where the pay/benefits structure is notoriously weak; [a family member] suggested I explore opportunities in [child services or community supervision] as a means for obtaining better compensation.

Clearly, the respondents provided thoughtful, detailed insights into what led them to the field of forensic social work. In addition to providing their motivations, the comments also provided some insight into the relationship between social work and the other professions in the criminal justice field.

Additional Themes

Content analysis of the open-ended questions revealed other inconsistencies and commonalities within the sample. Key terms revealed a possible divide among the sample along social work and custodial/law enforcement philosophies. In addition, many shared insights about their first populations, previous professions and the frequency of probation as a component of this group’s path to forensic social work.

Philosophies. In content analysis, word choice is an important consideration. Respondents’ word choice ranged widely among those who answered the question. There were many instances of respondents using more punitive terms such as crime, criminal, psychopath, criminogenic, and criminal behavior. Some used law enforcement related terms such as recidivism, rehabilitate, protect, and safety. In contrast, other responses used more social work-centered terminology such as help, helping, change, change agent, social justice, poverty, marginalized, disadvantage, rights, advocate, advocacy, and assist.

Prior Professions. One hundred forty seven (44%) respondents to the question shared what they were doing before getting into the field of forensic social work. In addition to being
students, some were volunteers, had other social work careers, or came to the work from very different paths. One former volunteer enthusiastically declared

I have always been drawn to the helping professions and have volunteered and worked my entire life in these types of roles. Once I entered the Correctional setting, I never looked back...I knew that this was the type of work that I wanted to be doing and the population that I wanted to work with. For me it just felt right. It's challenging, but extremely rewarding.

The content analysis indicated that many of those working in these processes were not social workers by education or title and they may have come from other professions. These included nursing, business, religion, public safety/law enforcement, military, marketing, education and other social work. A subset of the sample were social workers in other specialties before they came to forensic social work. These social work specialties were health care, social services, and child welfare. Some respondents were attorneys involved in social work duties. One person posited “[a]s part of my responsibilities as a criminal defense attorney it is often necessary to include some forms of social work to insure clients do not go to jail and / or return to jail after a period of incarceration.”

Fifty-four (16%) of the question respondents mentioned probation in their career path. Respondents frequently noted, “I am not a social worker,” but went on to explain how their work overlaps with social work or that they identified themselves as doing social work. A closer look at the terms this probation subgroup used revealed potential dichotomies within the group. For example, some respondents used the terms “punitive” and “law-enforcement“ to describe the
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30 Self-identification early in the survey was their likely path for study inclusion. The second screening question intended to capture this hidden group by including “[c]urrently I work in a position that I consider social work related.”
previous culture of probation work and the terms “social work” and “human” to describe the current culture. One individual’s comment illustrated the contrast:

    I am employed as a Probation Officer because I developed an interest in working with the criminal population. I have a Bachelors (sic) Degree in Criminal Justice. My job responsibilities as a Probation Officer include aspects of social work, such as making referrals to treatment programs and monitoring compliance with treatment.

**Social Work Activities within Probation.** Many of those who identified themselves within probation also identify as social workers and/or are engaged in traditionally social work activities. Some examples of social work activities shared by those respondents engaged in probation work were “case management,” “monitoring treatment,” “making referrals,” “holistic,” “offering support and guidance,” helping to “improve quality of life,” and “improving [client’s] potential.” One individual noted, “I am currently working as an Adult Probation Officer which encompasses many roles within the social work field. I enjoy being able to offer support, guidance, and help people reach their full potential and overall better quality of life.”

    Overall, the respondents provided important insights about what motivated them to work in the field of forensic social work. The responses revealed the influence of probation and other careers on the path to forensic social work practice and are discussed in more detail in chapter five.

**Summary**

    This chapter provided a description of the demographic, employment and educational characteristics of forensic social workers in Connecticut and what led them to the criminal justice field. For context, the NASW study of licensed social workers provided comparisons along many of the variables (NASW Center for Health Workforce Studies School of Public Health,
2006). In addition to the quantitative data collected through the survey, qualitative responses provided respondents with opportunities for further elucidation. The qualitative responses were supportive of the quantitative data and, in most cases, provided a richer understanding of the sample.

These demographics provide a foundational understanding of the group that completed the survey. The next chapter builds upon that foundation through a deeper analysis of the hypothesized relationships among various subgroups of respondents and the variables of stress, professional quality of life, professional opinions, racial bias, and discrete emotions.
Chapter Four: Hypothesis Testing

The previous chapter responded to research question one by describing the sample of 384 respondents either who identified as social workers conducting social work activities in criminal and/or juvenile justice processes or who possessed social work degrees, titles and/or job descriptions within criminal and or juvenile justice (CJ/JJ) processes in Connecticut. This chapter responds to the remaining research questions by providing an overview of, in this order, the 1) dependent variable correlations, 2) description of subgroup pairings used for analyses, 3) findings related to hypotheses, and 4) summary.

Dependent Variable Correlations

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients (r) were used to explore the relationships among the existing scales. The scales were the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS); the Professional Quality of Life Scale’s (ProQOL) three subscales burnout (BO), secondary traumatic stress (STS), and Compassion Satisfaction (CS); and the Discrete Emotions Emotional Labor Scale’s (DEELS) two subscales DEELS Fake and DEELS Genuine. These scales were used to measure the dependent variables job satisfaction, level of fit, and job role stress. Table 4.1 illustrates the correlations.

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations among Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSS (n=383)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO (n=379)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS (n=379)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS (n=379)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEELS Fake (n=364)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEELS Genuine (n=366)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
As Table 4.1 illustrates, there were statistically significant correlations between all of the dependent variables. The strongest were the negative relationship between burnout and compassion satisfaction ($r = .618, p = .000$), the positive relationship between job satisfaction and compassion satisfaction ($r = .557, p = .000$) and the negative relationship between job satisfaction and burnout ($r = -.549, p = .000$).

**Description of Subgroup Pairings Used for Analyses**

In order to test the hypotheses of research questions two and three, the sample was divided into distinct subgroups. This was accomplished by transforming several new variables into discrete (dichotomous) and categorical variables. The following sample subgroup variables were created for analyses:

(a) **VICTIM/OFFENDER**: Respondent works with offender only or works primarily with offender but also victim (two values).

(b) **MICRO/OVERLAP/MACRO**: The respondent works only in micro level practice, works in an overlap of micro and macro level practice, or worker works only in macro level practice (three values).

(c) **AUSPICE ALL**: The respondent works for a public auspice, or a nonprofit auspice, or a proprietary auspice (three values).

(d) **PUBLIC AUSPICE/ALL OTHER**: The respondent works in a public auspice or in other types of auspices (two values).

(e) **POLITICAL INTEREST**: The respondent identified with lower levels of political interest or with higher political interest (two values).
(f) CJ/JP POLITICAL INTEREST: The respondent identified lower levels of
criminal and/or juvenile justice political interest or identified higher levels of
criminal and/or juvenile justice political interest (two values).

Findings Related to Hypotheses

Research Question 2: How do groups of forensic social workers differ in what they report about
their social justice values?

Findings Related to Hypothesis 1

H1: There will be a significant difference between the Professional Opinion Scale (POS) scores
of the victim/offender subgroups.31

To test Hypothesis 1, an independent samples t-test was used to determine if the POS mean
scores differed significantly for those who work with only offenders and those work with both
offenders and victims. The results were not statistically significant ($t_{[280]}=-.84, p=.400$),
therefore it failed to reject the hypothesis.

There were no significant differences in the strength of social work values score between the
respondents who worked with both offenders and victims ($M=2.25, SD=.56$) and those who
worked with only offenders ($M=2.20, SD=.61$).

Findings Related to Hypothesis 2

H2: Those working only in the macro level of practice will have higher POS scores than those
working only in micro practice or those working in an overlap of both micro/macro.

A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine if those working solely in
macro practice had, on average, stronger social work values than those working only in micro
practice or those working in an overlap of micro/macro practice. The mean POS scores for those

31 The sample included respondents who worked with “only offenders” and those who worked with “both victims
and offenders”: VICTIM/OFFENDER.
who worked in micro practice ($M=2.2654, SD=.57$), worked overlap of micro and macro ($M=2.1997, SD=.61$), and worked in only micro practice ($M=2.1219, SD=.64$), were not statistically significant. The three groups’ professional social work values did not significantly differ from one another [$F(2, 345) = .801, p = .450$], therefore the hypothesis was not supported.

**Findings Related to Hypothesis 3**

H3: Those working in a public auspice will report lower POS scores than those in non-profit or proprietary auspices.

Hypothesis 3 was tested using a one-way ANOVA to determine if those working in public organizations had, on average, weaker social work values ($M=2.23, SD=.58$) than those working in non-profit ($M=2.16, SD=.58$) or proprietary auspices ($M=2.44, SD=n.s.$).

There were no statistically significant differences in the mean POS scores among those working in the public, non-private, proprietary or “other” auspices [$F(2, 373)=.828, p=.438$] therefore the hypothesis was not supported.

**Findings Related to Hypothesis 4**

H4: Those with high levels of political interest will have higher POS scores than those on the lower end of the spectrum.

To test Hypothesis 4, a one-way ANOVA was used to examine if respondents with higher levels of political interest had, on average, stronger social work values. Political interest in Connecticut was measured using the 5-point Likert-type question: “how would you describe your political interest in Connecticut?” There were no statistically significant differences in the mean POS scores among those with varying levels of political interest in Connecticut [$F(4, 346)=1.273, p=.28$] therefore the hypothesis was not supported. There was no statistically significant
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32 Variable: AUSPICE ALL
evidence that respondents with more interest in Connecticut politics have stronger social work values.

**Findings Related to Hypothesis 5**

H5: Those with high levels of criminal justice political interest will have higher POS scores than those on the lower end of the spectrum.

To test Hypothesis 5, a one-way ANOVA was used to examine if respondents with higher levels of political interest in criminal and/or juvenile justice (CJ/JJ) issues in Connecticut had, on average, stronger social work values. Political interest in CJ/JJ issues in Connecticut was measured using the 5-point Likert-type question: “how would you describe your political level in criminal and/or juvenile justice issues in Connecticut?” There were no statistically significant differences in the mean POS scores among those with varying levels of political interest in CJ/JJ issues in Connecticut \[F(4, 352)=1.301, p=.269.\] therefore the hypothesis was not supported. There was no statistically significant evidence that respondents with more CJ/JJ interest in Connecticut politics have stronger social work values.

**Findings Related to Hypotheses for Research Question Three**

**Research Question 3**: How do the various traditionally deleterious (isolation, stress over safety at work, stress over lack of resources, overlapping duties, value inconsistencies, mission inconsistencies, and working in a public auspice), and protective factors (external support, professional memberships, continuing education inside agency and outside agency, believing work is vital, having a mentor, and having clinical supervision) impact forensic social workers’ level of fit, overall job satisfaction and job role stress?

**H6**: The more negative factors reported, the lower the scores on the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) and the Professional Quality of Life Survey (ProQOL).
A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient ($r$) was used to test hypothesis 6 and assess the relationship between the number of negative factors and scores on the JSS. Using the JSS total score and the number of negative factors confirmed by each respondent, the results ($r=-.309$, $p=.000$) indicated a negative, although weak, correlation between the two variables. The hypothesis was supported.

**ProQOL BO, STS, and CS.** A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient ($r$) was used to assess the relationship between the number of negative factors and scores on the ProQOL. The number of negative factors revealed a positive, although weak to moderate, correlation with higher burnout scores ($r=.461$, $p<.01$). The number of negative factors was also positively correlated with higher secondary traumatic stress scores ($r=.397$, $p<.01$). As expected, more negative factors reported was inversely correlated with compassion satisfaction ($r=-.217$, $p<.01$), however the correlation was weak. The findings all supported hypothesis 6.

Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Negative Factors</th>
<th>Secondary Traumatic Stress</th>
<th>Compassion Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Negative Factors (n=384)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO (n=380)</td>
<td>.461**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS (n=380)</td>
<td>.397**</td>
<td>.574**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS (n=380)</td>
<td>-.217**</td>
<td>-.618**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Note: BO=Burnout, STS=Secondary Traumatic Stress, CS=Compassion Satisfaction

**Additional Tests to Assess How Negative Factors Predict Job Satisfaction (JSS) and level of fit (ProQOL).** Multiple regression analysis was used to test if and how value inconsistencies, mission inconsistencies, safety concerns, resources, overlapping duties with other professions, working in a public auspice, and isolation within place of work significantly predicted
participants' ratings of level of fit (PROQOL Burnout, Compassion Satisfaction and Secondary Traumatic Stress). Three multiple regression analyses were used. See Table 4.6 for more information on interpreting the measurement of the “negative” factors.

**JSS.** Two factors predicted 15.1% of the variance in job satisfaction \( R^2 = .151 = F(2,347) = 32.065, p < .01 \). This finding shows that as frequency of value inconsistencies at work increases, job satisfaction decreases (\( \beta = -.245, p < .01 \)). As stress over resources at work increases (lower scores indicate higher stress), job satisfaction decreases (\( \beta = .248, p < .01 \)).

Table 4.3

*Interpreting “Negative” Independent Variables in Regression Analyses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Measurement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress over Resources at Work</td>
<td>Lower Values = most stress</td>
<td>0=Results in Very Much Stress - 3= Results in No Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress over Safety at Work</td>
<td>Lower Values = most stress</td>
<td>0=Results in Very Much Stress - 3= Results in No Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress over Isolation at Work</td>
<td>Lower Values = most stress</td>
<td>0=Results in Very Much Stress - 3= Results in No Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Value Inconsistencies at Work</td>
<td>Higher values = happens most often</td>
<td>1=Not at all – 5=Very Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience Overlap of Duties at Work</td>
<td>Higher values = happens most often</td>
<td>1=Not at all – 5=Very Often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROQOL BO.** The results of the first stepwise regression (burnout) indicated that four of the negative factors predicted 24.8% of the variance \( R^2 = .248, F(4,343) = 29.627, p p < .001 \). In order of predictive value, stress over resources significantly predicted burnout (\( \beta = -.301, p p < .001 \)), as did stress about safety (\( \beta = -.171, p = .001 \)), value inconsistencies (\( \beta = .149, p = .003 \)), and feeling isolated in place of work (\( \beta = .115, p = .022 \)). Because of scoring directions, these results indicate that all four negative factors predicted an increase in burnout level (see Table 4.4) with the strongest predictor being stress over resources.
PROQOL STS. The results of the second stepwise regression (secondary traumatic stress) indicated that four negative predictors explained 17.1% of the variance ($R^2=.171$, $F(4,343)=18.863$, $p<.001$). In order of predictive value, stress over safety significantly predicted secondary traumatic stress ($\beta=-.219$, $p<.001$), followed by value inconsistencies ($\beta=163$, $p=.002$), and stress over resources ($\beta=-.137$, $p=.012$). As each of these negative factors increased, they resulted in an increase in secondary traumatic stress and safety was the strongest predictor.

PROQOL CS. The results of the third stepwise regression (compassion satisfaction) identified two statistically significant negative predictors of compassion satisfaction, although they only predicted 4.7% of the variance in compassion satisfaction [$R^2=.047=F(2,345)=9.535$, $p<.001$]. This is expected as negative factors are not as likely to predict this positive dimension of the ProQOL. The predictors were stress over resources ($\beta=-.154$, $p=.005$) and stress over safety ($\beta=-.128$, $p=.021$). The higher these stress items were scored, the lower the level of compassion satisfaction.

Overall, the more negative factors reported, the less job satisfaction, more burnout and more secondary traumatic stress. Stress over resources at work, value inconsistencies, and safety at work were the most predictive of lower job satisfaction and level of fit (ProQOL).

H7: The more negative factors reported, the higher the scores on the Discrete Emotions Emotional Labor Scale (DEELS).

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient ($r$) was used to test hypothesis 6 and assess the relationship between the number of negative factors and scores on the DEELS. The DEELS Fake and the DEELS Genuine subscales measured frequency of faking emotions at work.

---

33 Stress items (safety, resources, and isolation) were scored in the reverse. Lower scores indicated increased stress. See Table 4.3 for details.
and suppressing emotions at work, respectively. Higher scores indicated more job role stress because respondents were compelled to fake or suppress emotions more frequently at work. The test determined that more negative factors resulted in higher scores on the DEELS Fake and DEELS Genuine subscales. The number of negative factors was positively correlated with higher DEELS Fake scores ($r=.118, p=.024$). The number of negative factors was more positively correlated with higher DEELS Genuine (suppressing emotions at work) scores ($r=.397, p<.01$). As expected, more negative factors reported was positively correlated with both of the measures of job roles stress (DEELS) ($r=.357, p<.01$). Although all correlations were in the weak to moderate range, the findings all supported hypothesis 6.

Table 4.4

*Pearson Correlations for Negative Factors and DEELS Subscales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Negative Factors</th>
<th>Fake</th>
<th>Genuine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Negative Factors (n=384)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fake (n=365)</td>
<td>.118*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine (n=367)</td>
<td>.357**</td>
<td>.322**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Additional Tests to Assess How Negative Factors Predict Job Role Stress (DEELS).**

Multiple regression analysis was used to test if and how value inconsistencies, mission inconsistencies, safety concerns, resources, overlapping duties with other professions, working in a public auspice, and isolation within place of work significantly predicted participants’ job role stress (DEELS Fake and DEELS Genuine).
**DEELS Fake**\(^{34}\). The results of the stepwise regression identified one statistically significant “negative” factor that predicted frequency of faking emotions at work (DEELS Fake). Despite statistical significance, the regression model was weak. The predictor, stress over feeling isolated at work, explained only 2.8% of the variance in how frequently respondents faked emotions at work \([R^2=.28=F(1,344)=10.753, p<.001]\). As stress at feeling isolated decreased, the frequency of faking emotions at work decreased \((\beta=1.177, p=.001)\) (see Table 4.4 for measurement reference).

**DEELS Genuine**\(^{35}\). The results of the stepwise regression indicated that two factors, stress over resources and stress over feeling isolated, predicted 13.7% of the variance \([R^2=.137, F(2,338)=27.952, p<.001]\). As stress over resources at work decreased, respondents suppressed emotions at work less frequently \((\beta=-.270, p<.001)\). As stress over feeling isolated at work decreased (a higher score), respondents suppressed emotions at work less frequently \((\beta=-.195, p<.001)\).

Overall, an increase in the number of negative factors identified resulted in an increase in job role stress, i.e. faking or suppressing emotions at work. The best predictors of faking and suppressing emotions at work were feeling isolated at work because there are few or no other social workers and frequency of feeling stress over resources.

**H8:** The more protective factors reported, the higher the scores on the JSS and ProQOL.

---

\(^{34}\) For the DEELS Fake subscale, higher scores reflect increasing frequencies of faking emotions when you do not feel them. The measurement: 1=never express this when I DO NOT FEEL THIS WAY, 2=Express this a few times per month when I DO NOT FEEL THIS WAY, 3=Express this a few times per week when I DO NOT FEEL THIS WAY, 4=Express this a few times per day when I DO NOT FEEL THIS WAY, and 5=Express this many times per day when I DO NOT FEEL THIS WAY.

\(^{35}\) For the DEELS Genuine subscale, higher scores reflect increasing frequency of suppressing emotions at work. The measurement: 0=I never feel this, 1=I never keep this to myself, 2=I keep this to myself a few times per month, 3=I keep this to myself a few times per week, 4=I keep this to myself a few times per day, and 5=I keep this to myself many times per day.
JSS. A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient ($r$) was used to test hypothesis 6 and assess the relationship between the number of protective factors and scores on the JSS. The test determined if more protective factors resulted in higher scores on the JSS by examining the JSS total score and the number of protective factors confirmed by each respondent. The results [$r(382)=.045, p=.382$], although pointing slightly in the expected direction, were not statistically significant. There was no significant correlation between number of protective factors and job satisfaction in these data.

ProQOL. Pearson correlation ($r$) was used to determine if more protective factors resulted in higher scores on the BO and STS and lower scores on the CS. None of the correlations between number of negative factors and the three subscales were statistically significant: BO [$r (377)=-.039, p=.451$], STS [$r (377) =.060, p=.244$], and CS [$r (377)=.050, p=.333$). See Table 4.5 for the correlation matrix. The findings did not support hypothesis 6.

Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Protective Factors</th>
<th>BO</th>
<th>STS</th>
<th>CS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Protective Factors (n=382)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO (n=378)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS (n=378)</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.574**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS (n=378)</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>-.618**</td>
<td>-.180**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Note: BO=Burnout, STS=Secondary Traumatic Stress, CS=Compassion Satisfaction

Additional Tests to Assess How Protective Factors Predict Job Satisfaction (JSS) and Level of Fit (ProQOL). Multiple regression analysis was used to test if and how seven protective factors (external support/being in a relationship, having a mentor, having clinical supervision, having professional memberships, believing work is vital, attending social work training inside
of agency, and attending social work training outside of agency) significantly predicted
participants' ratings of job satisfaction (JSS) and level of fit (PROQOL Burnout, Compassion
Satisfaction and Secondary Traumatic Stress). Four multiple regression analyses were used. All
independent variables were either already or collapsed into dichotomous variables.

**JSS.** First, a multiple regression analysis was performed with dependent variable JSS and
the seven “protective” independent variables. The regression model predicted 5.3% of the
variance in job satisfaction \[R^2=.053=F(1,147)=9.270, p=.003\]. Receiving social work training
outside of work slightly increased job satisfaction (\(\beta=.244, p=.003\)).

**BO and STS.** Next, multiple regression analysis was used to test if and how the seven
protective factors predicted the burnout. The model predicted 2.3% of the variance in burnout
\[R^2=.023=F(1,145)=4.482, p=.036\]. The one statistically significant predictor, outside training
(\(\beta=-.173, p=.036\)), indicated that increase in outside training predicted a slight decrease in
burnout. No statistically significant predictors were identified by the regression model for
secondary traumatic stress.

**CS.** The fourth multiple regression analysis examined if and how the seven protective
factors predicted compassion satisfaction. The model predicted 2.6% of the variance in
compassion satisfaction \[R^2=.026=F(1,145)=4.848, p=.029\]. An increase in training outside of
work resulted in an increase in compassion satisfaction for respondents (\(\beta=.180, p=.029\)).

Overall, there was no evidence that those with more identified protective factors had
higher levels of job satisfaction or lower burnout and secondary traumatic stress. The
hypotheses were not supported. In addition, despite relatively weak regression models there was
one protective factor, receiving social work training outside of the agency, that slightly predicted
job satisfaction, burnout and compassion satisfaction.
H9: The more “protective” factors reported, the lower the scores on the DEELS.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (r) to determine if more protective factors resulted in lower scores on the DEELS Fake and DEELS Genuine subscales. Neither the DEELS Fake subscale \( r(364)=-.032, p=.411 \) nor the DEELS Genuine \( r(366)=-.011, p=.836 \) resulted in statistically significant correlations with the number of protective factors. Hypothesis 6 was not supported.

Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Protective Factors</th>
<th>Fake</th>
<th>Genuine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Protective Factors (n=382)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fake (n=365)</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine (n=367)</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.322**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

Additional Tests to Assess How Protective Factors Predict Job Role Stress (DEELS).

Multiple regression analysis was used to test if and how protective factors significantly predicted participants' job role stress (DEELS Fake and DEELS Genuine). This did not result in any statistically significant regression models.

Hypothesis testing for Research Question 3 revealed that negative factors have a detrimental impact on how respondents fit and perform in their work environment. The more negative factors present, the lower the level of job satisfaction and the higher the levels of burnout and secondary traumatic stress. This is indicative of poor level of fit. Increased negative factors also correlated with increased job role stress (i.e. increased faking and suppressing emotions at work). The only protective factors predictive of job satisfaction,
burnout and compassion satisfaction was receiving outside social work training and up to four negative factors were significant predictors of job satisfaction, level of fit, and job role stress. Those negative factors were stress over resources, stress over safety, value inconsistencies at work, and stress over being isolated at work.

While protective factors were hypothesized to have significant, positive influence on job satisfaction, level of fit, and job role stress, the results were weak. There was no significant correlation between the number of protective factors and job satisfaction, level of fit, or job role stress, however receiving social work training outside one’s agency did provide a weak prediction for all but job role stress (DEELS) and the STS dimension of level of fit (ProQOL).

**Summary**

This chapter provided results from an online survey of forensic social workers in Connecticut. The first part of the chapter investigated a) how various sample subgroups differed in their professional values, and b) how a variety of factors (both deleterious and supportive) affected and predicted job satisfaction, level of fit, and job role stress. The findings in this chapter supported six of the proposed nine hypotheses. The results further illuminated chapter three’s rich sample description of this previously unexplored group of forensic social workers in Connecticut. The final chapter provides an in-depth discussion of the findings, implications, study limitations and future research.
Chapter Five: Discussion and Implications

This chapter discusses the main findings from the analysis of the three research questions. 1) what are the demographic, employment and educational characteristics of forensic social workers in Connecticut and what led them to the criminal justice field, 2) how do groups of forensic social workers differ in what they report about their social justice values, and 3) how do the various traditionally deleterious and protective factors impact forensic social workers’ level of fit, overall job satisfaction and job role stress? This study is the first of its kind. It contributes to the understanding of forensic social workers through group description and analysis of the factors that influence their level of fit, job satisfaction, job role stress and commitment to social work values. The chapter presents recommendations for attraction and retention as well as increasing level of fit and reducing job role stress. While there were inherent study limitations reviewed here, suggestions for future research would address those limitations.

This chapter includes, in this order, 1) discussion of forensic social workers, professional affiliation, level of fit, job role stress, and forensic social work identity, 2) policy and practice implications, 3) social work and forensic social work implications, 4) study limitations, and 5) future research.

Discussion

Forensic Social Workers

Forensic social workers in this study consisted of 384 individuals from thirteen state and nonprofit agencies in Connecticut. Survey respondents worked in criminal and/or juvenile

---

36 Deleterious/negative factors: stress over isolation from other social workers at work, stress over safety, stress over lack of resources, overlapping duties, competing/inconsistency of values, inconsistency of mission, and organizational auspice – public external support. Protective factors: external support (relationship), social work training provided inside the agency, social work training provided outside of the agency, professional affiliation, having a mentor, having clinical supervision, believing that area of practice is vital.

37 The term forensic social worker is used from here forward for clarity; however, it refers to the work encompassed by the respondents in this study. It does not reflect the self-identification of every respondent.
justice processes (CJ/JJ) and either a) identified as social workers, or b) possessed a social work degree, job title or job description that encompassed social work within those CJ/JJ processes. More than half completed the survey because they consider the work they do is social work, not because of a social work degree, title or description. Despite this, there were commonalities between those who had social work degrees and those who did not. The majority of the forensic social workers also worked in custodial or client supervision positions rather than traditionally therapeutic roles. Most worked in a public auspice and identified clinical and case management as their most common activities. The group was a generally well-educated, long-tenured, stable population of mostly female Caucasians who were not of Hispanic/Latin/Spanish descent.

**Custodial Settings.** Nearly 57% (217) of the final sample was included only because they considered their work “social work related”. This confirmed that the total population sampling strategy successfully captured individuals within CJ/JJ processes who were doing the work, rather than only because of the degree. The analyses and commentary throughout the study indicated that this subgroup was involved in custodial or supervisory work with defendants, inmates, or people under community supervision. In fact, 65% of the forensic social workers worked in custody and/or supervision of justice-involved individuals. Additionally, crosstabs confirmed that 42.1% of those who worked in custody positions were captured by the survey screening question *I work in a position that I consider social work related*. Therefore, 42.1% of those working in custody settings did not fit the survey criteria for other reasons (social work student, has a BSW, has an MSW, has a social work doctorate, or has “social work” in their job description).

---

38 Custody/Supervision categories included Juvenile Detention, Adult Corrections, Juvenile Probation, Adult Probation, and Parole.
Identifying this subgroup was important to the study because they represent individuals working in forensic social work capacities who had neither a social work education nor were they obligated to uphold the values, mission, and ethics of the social work or forensic social work profession. This is germane to the later discussion of implicit racial bias, beliefs and ethics, and the importance of social work education.

**Gender.** The juxtaposition between the female dominated field of social work and the male dominated field of criminal justice provided an interesting context to the study of gender in forensic social work. In the current study, women represented 67.5% of the forensic social workers, however a higher percentage of male respondents were included in this study than in other studies of social workers. This may be a function of the higher frequency of custody and supervisory agencies that agreed to participate in the study or may be an indication that male social workers were drawn to forensic social work.

Despite the high number of males, nearly 43% (156) of those working in custody positions (as defined in Footnote 2) were female, however it is unknown if they were in leadership positions or had leadership responsibilities. The criminal justice field encompasses many custody-driven organizations and agencies such as prisons, jails, juvenile detention, community supervision (parole and probation), and courthouses. Correctional facilities, in particular, may mirror paramilitary organizations and generally provide promotional opportunities and leadership positions to those working in custody rather than treatment. In a study of correctional officers’ perceptions of treatment on the job, the authors noted “the prison environment is an exceedingly masculinized organization wherein the traits of the dominant group (i.e., physical strength and a willingness to use force) are emphasized and valued and
where the essential skills for the job are assumed to be masculine in nature” (Griffin, Armstrong, & Hepburn, 2005, p. 191).

Within the power and control dimension of the ecological perspective, female social workers may be lower in hierarchical rank within the organization, leading to limited authority and fewer opportunities for creativity and initiative (Gitterman & Miller, 1989). The three items that resulted in the lowest levels of job satisfaction on the Job Satisfaction Scale (Koeske, Kirk, Koeske, & Rauktis, 1994) were all related to initiative, leadership and authority, and recognition. Respondents felt the least amount of job satisfaction with the *amount of support from agency administration*, followed by *amount of support from agency administration*, and *recognition given your work by your supervisor, opportunities for promotion*.

Although legal prohibitions in employment law have greatly increased gender diversity in correctional and other settings, “more commonly, gender is invoked by facially gender-neutral policies that nevertheless reinforce inequality, as well as by informal practices that draw on and re-inscribe notions about gender” (Britton, 2003, p. 11). Correctional officers, whose positions are often referred to with military terminology such as lieutenant, may be more likely to achieve management status in the highest positions of deputy warden, warden, and commissioner. Men have historically filled these positions, whereas the treatment positions within these and other CJ/JJ facilities reflect more gender diversity. The United States Department of Justice’s Office of Justice Programs (USDOJ/OJP) released an equal opportunity report that noted white females were underutilized (-3%) in the officials/administrators category and “significantly underutilized

---

39 In Connecticut Department of Correction (DOC), the Commissioner is male and the two Deputy Commissioners are female. Twenty one percent of the facility Wardens are female and 45% of the facility Deputy Wardens are female. Although, as mentioned above, the Administrative Division is led by a female Deputy Commissioner, only 10% of the Directors within that division are female. Within the parole division of DOC, both the Director and Deputy Director are male and 31% of parole managers are female (“Organization”, 2018)

40 The Director of Health Services and the Deputy Warden of Addiction Services are both female (“Organization”, 2018).
(-18%)” in the professionals category (2017, p. 8). Hispanic descent and Asian females were also underutilized (-1% to -2%) in those categories (USDOJ/OJP, 2017, p. 8).

Corrections and other custody positions are only a portion of the forensic social work jobs available in forensic social work, however understanding how gender impacts job satisfaction and leadership within these settings can be valuable when conducting future research on all settings and positions.

**Racial and Ethnic Disparity.** People of color are over-represented in the criminal and juvenile justice systems (Nellis, 2016). It is important for the accused, incarcerated, and those under community supervision to see themselves reflected demographically in those who work with them. Males, Black/African Americans and those of Hispanic/Latin/Spanish descent are among the least represented groups in the current study.

The group was 78.1% Caucasian; however, with 15.1% of Hispanic/Latin/Spanish (HLS) descent this sample had three times more people of HLS heritage than the NASW study (NASW Center for Workforce Studies School of Public Health, 2006). This is encouraging. It is also an important consideration for recruitment and retention of forensic social workers. The presence of racial and ethnic disparity in the CJ/JJ systems calls for the involvement of social workers and other helping professions who better reflect the race and ethnicities of those in the system.

**Implicit Racial Bias.** Not only is there a need for a more diverse forensic social work workforce, the data highlighted the importance of addressing implicit racial bias within the profession. The National Association of Social Work (NASW) code of ethics, the Educational Policy and Education Standards (EPAS) of the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE), the international federation of social workers (IFSW), and the National Association of Social Workers (NOFSW) all have policies that reflect social work’s core values. Regardless of race or
any other personal characteristic, social workers must uphold the dignity and worth of all persons and support the right to self-determination. NOFSW’s Anti-Racism Statement assures that:

[t]he National Organization of Forensic Social Work joins in solidarity with other professional practice organizations in standing together with widespread communities working to address and dismantle racism...and we grieve the recent events in Ferguson, Cleveland, New York, Phoenix, Saratoga Springs, Sanford, and elsewhere. Because of our unique work with legal systems, we wrestle with their (and thus, our) perpetuation of structural oppression, dis-empowerment, and violence. We also recognize that legal systems can help protect the vulnerable, care for the maltreated, and advocate for the voiceless. So, it is in this vein that we stand with those working towards promoting just, anti-racist, and empowering change. (“About NOFSW”, 2018)

With this fundamental commitment to racial equality in mind, the current study examined the presence of implicit racial bias in this group of forensic social workers. This included both awareness and action related to overt racism, institutional racism and the worker’s own internalized racism and implicit bias (NASW, 2007). The six negatively worded racial bias questions had sample means within the neutral to disagree range on the racially biased statements; however, some of the racially charged statements garnered agreement for a substantial percentage of the respondents. Agreement regarding tendency toward violence, having less value for human life, not taking full advantage of programs given to them, and resorting to crime indicated evidence of more serious implicit racial bias within the sample.

The items were taken from the State of Connecticut Judicial Task Force on Minority Fairness (1996). The results of the attitudinal portion of that study indicated consistency in court personnel perceptions that “police behavior could contribute to differential treatment of
minorities” and “attitudes toward behavior by minorities that could influence treatment of them in court (State of Connecticut, 1996, p. lxiv). Specifically, the results indicated that “judges, attorneys, and employees might be more apt to assume that minorities are criminally inclined” (State of Connecticut, 1996, p. lxv).

Implicit bias is present in everyone, including social workers. Since values and beliefs are sometimes implicit and escape self-examination, students may have difficulty identifying them unless they are challenged to do so (Wahler, 2012, p. 1061). The social work profession and social work education in particular, are well equipped to assist social workers and social work students in reflecting and confronting their own biases. In fact, the Council on Social Work Education’s (CSWE) 2015 Educational Policies and Accreditation Standards (EPAS) identified demonstrating ethical and professional behavior as the first of the nine competencies. The competency directs social workers to “use reflection and self-regulation to manage personal values and maintain professionalism in practice situations” (CSWE, 2015, p. 7). This is particularly helpful to forensic social workers needing to uncover and reflect on personal implicit racial bias.

With that said, only 27% of the current study sample has had some level of social work education and 56.8% were included in the study despite not being a social work student, having a social work degree or having “social work” in their job description. Without that foundation, it is unknown what percentage of the sample has engaged in this type of reflection and confrontation. For social workers, personal reflection is also an ongoing process. The CSWE EPAS Policy 2.1.1 requires social workers to “practice personal reflection and self-correction to assure continual professional development” (CSWE, 2010, p. 3), but that may not be the case for
other professions who are engaged in social work processes. For a practice area that works with vulnerable and marginalized people, addressing bias is critical.

**Practice.** While the sample was primarily clinically oriented, their choices reflected a level of practice complexity and sophistication. Their top three activities, in order, were: 1) direct clinical practice, 2) administration, and 3) policy development. Nearly 15% of the sample said they work in multiple (4-6) settings and 17% indicated working in both macro and micro level work. These are reflective of the complexity and range of the work that many positions require leading workers to span multiple setting types and engage in various service types.

These findings are supportive of the emerging forensic social work theories like Maschi and Killian’s “two-pronged approach to social welfare” (2011, p. 8) that calls for forensic social workers to not only focus on working with justice-involved individuals, but also advocating for system reform. Having educational practices, models and the support of CSWE are important steps in building a forensic social work educational infrastructure to prepare those working in and possibly struggling through this complex work.

**Compensation and its Correlates.** In comparison to the NASW (NASW Center for Workforce Studies School of Public Health, 2006) study, which reported the mean income of $50K (p. 3), the current study participants reported considerably higher earnings, although not directly comparable due to the twelve year gap between studies. In fact, 86% of the participants in the current study reported earning between $50K and $100K in 2014. Education may be correlated to higher salaries. The overwhelming majority of participants (89.4%) in the current study reported having completed post-secondary education with 3.6% attaining doctoral level degrees. Higher salaries are also correlated to length of service and this sample’s mean length of

---

41 Refer to chapter three for a more detailed discussion of the factors that may have influenced income in the current study.
time with current employer was 11.4 years. The sample also had mean of 13.8 years being a social worker.

While compensation is a protective factor in some studies, it can also exacerbate stress and unhappiness because leaving a stable well-paying job is more difficult (Hopkins, Cohen-Callow, Kim, and Hwang, 2010). This is particularly true for those who have been working in state agencies for long tenures and are earning higher salaries with benefits. In the current study, the study sample exhibited poor level of fit (increased levels of burnout and secondary traumatic stress), therefore high compensation and benefits may result in reduced work quality. The desirable employment factors raised throughout the qualitative and quantitative data included benefits, stability, and compensation. Some research indicates that individuals who would otherwise leave their jobs due to burnout or other negative factors, but stay for reasons such as a lack of other employment opportunities or lesser pay in comparable positions exhibit diminished work quality (Hopkins, Cohen-Callow, Kim, and Hwang, 2010). This is important when assessing work quality and level of fit in well-compensated workers in high stress environments such as state jobs.

The majority (85.1%) of the sample worked in state agencies and, according to the themes discussed in chapter four, a proportion of those had ties to probation leading up to or in their current positions. Not surprisingly, this group was largely comprised of individuals working in custody or community supervision based settings such as probation (39.7%) and corrections (24.8%). There has been a shift in the field of probation over the past two decades from a more punitive law-enforcement culture to a more holistic, client-centered one. Even with this shift, education and training should be provided in research-informed programs that have evidence-based practices, a solid code of ethics, and a professional leadership organization that
can provide ongoing education. Understanding of human oppression, social justice, human rights, and the other core concepts examined during social work education, is vital to providing the most marginalized members of society with competent social workers.

**Education.** Nearly 90% of the forensic social workers in the current study had either a bachelor’s or graduate degree. Just over 27% had a BSW or MSW, leaving the remainder of post-secondary degrees in fields other than social work. This was also reflected in the commentary and open-text answers. Forensic social workers need to have specific skills and a strong ethical framework to work in the field. Ideally, this would be achieved through the full curriculum of core competencies provided by accredited social work programs, but also content specific to forensic practice. One respondent said it best when he/she posited

> [o]ur unique focus on the individual in the context of larger systems, specialized training and skills, combined with a nonjudgmental ethical base makes Social Workers highly qualified and valuable players in the criminal justice system.

There are a number of skill areas that should be mastered prior to working with forensic social work populations. The University of Utah’s MSW program outlined the core competencies expected of students who complete the forensic social work concentration42.

---

42 They should 1) describe the criminal justice system, its purpose, and the population it serves, 2) explore the ethical dilemmas inherent in forensic social work. For example, our ethical obligation to advocate for a clients’ self-determination contrasted with the needs of the community for safety, order and justice, 3) develop competencies in evidence-based practice models and critically evaluate the effectiveness of existing programs for offenders, victims of crime, and families, 4) describe the development of the criminal personality and its relationship to the justice system, 5) understand how biological and environmental risk and protective factors lead to antisocial trajectories (micro, mezzo and macro) and to develop intervention strategies to improve outcomes, 6) apply the principles of evidence based practice and restorative justice in treatment, program development and evaluation, 7) identify factors that account for the over-representation of people of color, the perception of racial bias and social class distinctions within the criminal justice system, 8) define and describe the impact of common policy practices such as racial profiling and bootstrapping in the sentencing, treatment and administration of the criminal justice system, 9) apply evidence-based assessment, planning, interventions and evaluation strategies with individuals, groups and communities, 10) apply practical research skills for evaluation of individual client interventions and program accountability, 11) utilize risk assessment instruments with criminal offenders and trauma assessment with victims of crime including the appropriate use of and limitations of psychometric and risk assessment tools, 12) demonstrate respect for the dignity and worth of clients and victims of crime, 13) apply the NASW Code of Ethics to practice in
Competencies address forensic-specific skills such as balancing ethical obligations to the client and society, evaluating effectiveness of Risk Needs Responsivity (RNR) measures, and providing competent testimony in Court (“Forensic Social Work”, 2018).

There is a need for forensic social work education but there is currently little in place. Fifty-three percent of the sample desired a career in forensic social work during their education, yet 66% of those who actually had a social work education were offered little to no forensic social work coursework/field placements. This disregards the needs of both those in social work programs and those who desired forensic social work but were in criminal justice or other educational programs.

Currently, there are a handful of social work programs that offer a range of forensic social work content. Dual degree programs with social work and law handle this in a cursory manner. Others, such as Long Island University and the University of Maryland School of Social Work have advanced certificates in forensic social work (see Appendix I). Some, such as the University of Utah’s School of Social Work, offer concentrations in forensic social work (see Appendix I for sample curricula for both types of programs). Right now, these programs are the exception rather than the rule in social work education. There are other ways to infuse forensic social work content.

Short of major curriculum revision, or the addition of a forensic specialization, there are other ways to accomplish this within the structure of existing courses and curricula. This may include, for example, having students engage in forensic social work research and empowerment practice, or having them formulate and advocate for policies to reduce co-

the criminal justice system, and 14) develop competencies and skills in working within the courts and judicial system including testifying in court and collaboration with other professionals (“Forensic Social Work”, 2018).
morbid health, behavioral health, and criminal justice disparities. (Robbins, Vaughan-Eden, & Maschi, 2014, pp. 173-4)

Without forensic social work courses or content and without strong field instruction and placements, social workers in criminal and juvenile justice settings learn on the job. The current study indicates that the sample is providing complex, often clinical, services to clients. Those workers are likely to be in a host setting with other professions that cause stress to the worker because they overlap or having differing value bases and missions. Learning on the job is likely to occur from interacting with other professions that may or may not share the same professional belief.

Adding to this, the majority (76%) of the sample viewed forensic social work as a distinct area of practice. This raises the question of why other distinct areas of practice such as child welfare, mental health, substance abuse and gerontology have a stronger presence in the social work curriculum than forensic social work. The group in the current study appears ripe for forensic social work ties and education as they identified more as forensic social workers by the end of the survey after only minimal exposure to forensic social work terms and concepts.

Within this well-educated group, 313 responded to the forensic social work education questions. The content analyses discussed at the end of chapter four showed that having an interest in social work and/or criminal justice sometimes led to educational programs other than social work. In fact, again, only 27% of the sample had a social work degree (BSW, MSW, DSW/PhD). This is problematic for the future of forensic social work. Further research may identify how often this occurs and if increased awareness of forensic social work, more forensic social work programming, and field support might reroute those students into social work instead of criminology, sociology, psychology, and criminal justice.
Professional Values

The current study examined attraction and retention among the five subgroup pairings identified in chapter three\(^{43}\). Based on common values that are foundational to social work practice, this study sought to investigate whether the strength of those values transcended various group differences.

To test this, the researcher hypothesized that the social work values orientation of those working with victims and those working with those charged with offenses would be statistically significantly different but that other pairings would differ. Ultimately, there were no statistically significant mean differences on the Professional Opinion Scale (POS) among any of the subgroups. The sample generally shared similar professional values. Regardless of where you work (auspice), with whom you work (offenders only or offenders and victims), the type of work you do (micro, overlap, or macro), or your political interest levels, your social work value base does not significantly differ.

Level of Fit

This study was informed by the ecological perspective (Gitterman and Germain, 1978). One ecological concept, level of fit, was the primary consideration for examining how the forensic social worker is influenced by and influences his/her environment. The first indication of what causes stress in the work environment were twelve stress items listed in Table 3.8. Those that resulted in the most stress (highest means) were, in order of most stressful, working in a team with people from other professions, getting performance feedback from supervisors, and

---

\(^{43}\) Work with offender only/work with primarily offenders, but also victims; work in only macro/overlap of macro and micro/work in only micro; public auspice/non-profit/proprietary; higher levels/lower levels of political interest in Connecticut; and higher levels/lower levels of political CJ/JJ interest in Connecticut.
my ability to make positive change in my work environment. The first and last items are indicative of environmental impact and interaction with the worker.

Additional analyses identified seven negative and seven protective factors within the literature to assess how level of fit was impacted. Level of fit was operationalized through the ProQOL as the balance among compassion satisfaction (CS), burnout (BO) and secondary traumatic stress (STS) in a work setting. The more negative factors identified for a respondent, the higher the burnout and secondary traumatic stress and the lower the compassion satisfaction. However, there was not a significant relationship between the number of protective factors and burnout, secondary traumatic stress, or compassion satisfaction.

With poor fit, forensic social workers’ potential for growth and sense of mastery are challenged (Gitterman & Heller, 2011). Consequently, the worker may be at risk of increased discomfort and decreased productivity and sustainability. The data showed that the sample had standardized mean scores of 51 for burnout (58th percentile), 60 for secondary traumatic stress (84th percentile) and 52 for the positive subscale compassion satisfaction (54th percentile). This indicates high secondary traumatic stress, moderate burnout, and moderate compassion satisfaction according to the ProQOL scoring grid (Stamm, 2010).

Those with this profile combination (Stamm, 2010, p. 23) are generally highly effective because they can derive pleasure, satisfaction, and pride in their work. Although they are happy with their vocation, they work in riskier environments and experience fear and stress related to others’ traumatic stories and experiences. The worst-case scenario, according to Stamm (2010) is for those experiencing this combination of indicators to remain silent or isolated about their experiences, however, “knowing that others have been traumatized by the same type of situations in which the person finds him or herself has the potential to change the person’s interpretation of
the event” (p. 23). For non-clinical level STS and BO, Stamm suggests supportive interactions with co-workers and administrators that reinforce feelings of altruism and the belief that he/she is making a difference (2010, p. 23). Unfortunately, the current study also found evidence of dissatisfaction with the administration, lack of clinical supervision and mentoring opportunities, and feeling unappreciated by supervisors.

For forensic social workers in this study, burnout and secondary traumatic stress were best predicted by the three factors 1) by stress over safety, 2) stress over resources, 3) and value inconsistencies between the worker and agency. Stress over safety was the only significant contributor to models for both BO and STS. The finding was not surprising, considering that the largest percentage of the sample worked in custody or supervisory settings and prior research identified safety as a risk factor for similar populations in forensic settings (Weiskopf, 2005). Additional commentary from the open-ended fields included responses about hazardous duty and lack of benefits corresponding with involved risk. This refers to the split in forensic settings where some working in the public auspice are afforded early hazardous duty retirement while others are not afforded this benefit. In addition, home visits and other clinical and case management duties may contribute to safety concerns among forensic social workers. Overall, burnout and secondary traumatic stress among forensic social workers may result in poor services for clients, the agency and the worker.

The factor stress over value inconsistencies between the worker and the organization, can arise from social workers working in host agencies that operate from a different value base than that of the social worker. One example is working as a social worker in an agency whose values are not consistent with upholding the dignity and worth of every human being (e.g. corrections).
Notably, no factors were significant contributors to the compassion satisfaction subscale. Unfortunately, the data were able to identify some of the factors that negatively influenced level of fit but not any that could significantly predict improved level of fit. This may be related to the research design, the constellation of agencies who agreed to participate, or it could indicate that more targeted research is needed into which factors best predict compassion satisfaction. In the meantime, organizations can start by reducing concerns about safety, resources and value inconsistencies. Ensuring that these issues do not arise in the future would also benefit agency, worker, and client outcomes.

**Job Role Stress**

Job role stress was measured using the two subscales of the Discrete Emotion Emotional Labor Scale (DEELS). Emotional labor, in this case, means faking emotions to lessen anxiety within your work setting and/or “hiding negative emotions [as] an effortful form of self-regulation, [for which] the physiological costs may be high” (Seger-Guttmann & Medler-liraz, 2016, p. 353). The cognitive energy and resources needed to manage hiding emotions and/or faking them to conform to one’s work environment detract from being able to use that energy on other duties (Seger-Guttmann & Medler-liraz, 2016, p. 352).

Forensic social workers in this study generally felt less job role stress with fewer negative factors. For example, a small portion of faking emotions at work was explained by feeling isolated at work from other social workers. Also, over a quarter of the variance in forensic social workers suppressing emotions at work was predicted by increases in stress over work resources and increase in stress over being isolated from other social workers while at work.

Overall, forensic social workers’ job role stress was impacted by the lack of resources to do their work and feeling that they were isolated with no other social workers in their physical
location. These negative factors are closely related to the nature of this sample’s work. For example, the majority of the agencies in this study are non-social work dominant. This means that most of the respondents work in host settings and are likely to be isolated from other social workers. One example is the public defender’s (PD) offices where one social worker is typically assigned to each courthouse PD office. Also salient to these findings are the budgetary constraints felt by many agencies. The 85% who work in public auspices (i.e. state agencies) are regularly limited by budgetary restraints. The 12.5% who worked in non-profits may also feel the corollary impact of budget restraints in state agencies because they are most often contractors of those state agencies.

**Job Satisfaction**

Job satisfaction is critical for those in helping professions. As Butler (1990) posits, job satisfaction is an important area of study for social work because of the humanitarian values of the profession, the concern about client outcomes, the economic impact of absenteeism and turnover, and the necessity of attracting competent individuals to the field (p. 112). In the current study, both the quantitative and qualitative results show that job satisfaction is an important component in understanding how to improve forensic social workers’ experiences. The data also provided insight into the factors that predict an individual’s satisfaction. When stress over value inconsistencies between worker and workplace decreased and opportunity for employer-funded social work training outside of the agency increased, respondent job satisfaction increased.

Job satisfaction was measured using the Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) (Koeske, Kirk, Koeske, & Rauktis, 1994) and hypothesis testing to determine best predictors of job satisfaction was accomplished using the seven negative and seven protective factors mentioned above.
Although it was weak, the analysis identified a relationship between the number of negative factors reported and lower job satisfaction. There was no significant correlation between the number of positive factors and job satisfaction. As with other measures in this study, negative factors were much more informative than protective factors. The more negative factors experienced by the forensic social worker, the less job satisfaction he/she experiences. This often becomes a performance issue that may or may not lead to turnover. More importantly, subpar performance negatively impacts the clients who may already be in vulnerable situations.

Qualitative responses about “other” factors involved with job satisfaction showed dissatisfaction with opportunities for advancement within their agencies and various aspects of the power and control wielded by their administration. The example of “administration often mak[ing] decisions about my job duties that are unrealistic and inappropriate”, echoes the factor value inconsistencies with agency. This and the other results of the survey provide insight into changes administrators can make in order to improve job satisfaction. Increasing training opportunities outside the agency on social work topics would likely connect forensic social workers in host settings with social workers from other agencies. This could also mediate the negative impacts of value inconsistencies.

**Forensic Social Work Identity**

**Professional Ties and Supports.** Having support and interaction with others in your profession can be rewarding and can affect how you see yourself. One of the major factors in this study is the importance of having supportive resources both internally at work and externally with the profession. This highly educated group that desired work in the CJ/JJ field and reported interest in being politically active, particularly in their field, did not generally report having had supportive experiences internally or externally. Those within the sample group who responded
to the organizational membership questions reported few ties to professional organizations. For social work focused organizations, 79% reported having no memberships. For CJ/JJ focused organizations, 71.4% reported having no memberships. Of those who did have memberships, most were CJ/JJ based. Considering that only 27% (103) of the sample had a social work degree, 58 members of NASW was substantial.

While this intuitively indicates that increasing membership affiliation could increase job satisfaction and level of fit, having a membership was not a significant predictor of those measures. Despite that, having professional memberships has many advantages. It provides access to research and resources related to one’s field of practice through websites, journals, and conferences. Memberships provide opportunities to interact professionally and personally with others in one’s field. Members are also invited to present their own research and network with other researchers and learn about others’ innovative practice while at annual conferences and meetings.

Having internal supports was also hypothesized as a protective factor in job satisfaction and level of fit. Two examples of internal support in the current study were mentoring and clinical supervision. At 59%, the majority of the group reported never having had a mentor while working in the CJ/JJ field. Of the 41% who did have a mentor, 94.1% of them strongly agreed that it was a positive experience in his/her social work CJ/JJ career. Providing mentors for forensic social workers, regardless of length of tenure, could result in a positive experience. Mentors would provide a source of support for those experiencing the above mentioned value inconsistencies, stress over resources, and safety concerns.

Clinical supervision is another important tool for managing the complexities of forensic social work practice. As indicated earlier, 77.4% of this group reported working solely in micro
practice and direct clinical practice was the number one practice activity. The respondents were also often working in host settings and working in multiple settings. While these data suggest this group could benefit from clinical supervision, 57.5% reported never having had clinical supervision and 73.4% had never provided it. Clinical supervision could meaningfully influence the effects of burnout, secondary traumatic stress, and the safety and value inconsistency stressors that cropped up across the data.

Clearly, there is room for improvement in both internal and external support systems for social workers and those working in social work duties within the core CJ and JJ processes. This may be particularly true for those who more strongly identify as forensic social workers.

**Forensic Social Work Identity (FSW-ID).** Most of the sample group responded to both the pre- and post- FSW-ID questions that bookended the survey. Statistically significant increases in FSW-ID by the end of the survey may indicate that exposure to FSW terminology and concepts increases forensic identification. Within the group, 24% identified as more FSW in pre-FSW-ID and that increased to 38.3% by the end of the survey. In addition, about 43% identified as equidistant between FSW and SW in both pre and post. This last demographic area of forensic social work identity and the results indicate that this group is ripe for absorbing more supportive networking practices in their places of work and within the profession. Additionally, 75.9% said they believed that forensic social work is a distinct area of practice. All of these findings support the need for more interaction among forensic social workers regardless of their agency or population. Forensic social work identity may transcend the differences in the respondents’ work. The next section, implications, explores how this study may influence forensic social workers, the social work profession, forensic social work, clients, and employers.
Implications

Policy and Practice

Involvement. Maschi and Killian’s (2011) two-pronged approach to forensic social work practice forensic calls on social workers to intervene on macro legal issues, processes and systems. Consistent with the call, this study shines a light on the importance of this specialization and provides an opportunity for forensic social work leaders to emerge and/or be recognized for their contributions to changing the criminal and juvenile justice policies of the last century that led to, among others, mass incarceration and racial and ethnic disparity. As evidenced by these punitive and ultimately failed policy attempts, organizational changes more aligned with social work values may be in order. In their study of workplace incongruence, Graham, Shier and Nicholas (2016) explain

[t]ransformational change within organizations—where the expectations of the organization become more aligned with those of the workers—does not typically occur from the top down (p. 1110).

Forensic social work leaders on all levels of practice are necessary agitators to the system and to the continued shift in favor of forensic social work practices and values.

Increased forensic social work presence and improved training, education, and support for forensic social workers improves practice and may lead to more positions for practitioners. The shift away from mass incarceration and practices such as cash bond results in more diversion and no-entry policies in all states, but particularly in Connecticut under the Second Chance Society. These policies require well-trained and educated staff. Social workers would be well-suited to those positions as well as the research, grant, political, and policy analyst positions that support those policy changes.
Forensic social workers and those working in these positions are unlikely to be invited to the table to provide policy input. Insistence and perseverance are necessary. Social workers in criminal and juvenile justice agencies should lobby to be part of committees that influence agency policy. This may include participation in periodic reviews of agency administrative manuals or on standing committees. Social workers could exert great influence in positions of leadership within criminal and juvenile justice agencies. These include not only executive director, but also human resources officer, research director, and legislative liaison.

Involvement in local and national interagency work is also an important avenue for forensic social workers hoping to enact policy changes. Locally, social workers can ask to attend public meetings of criminal and juvenile justice agencies such as the Connecticut Justice Policy Advisory Commission (CJPAC) or the Juvenile Justice Policy and Oversight Committee (JJPOC). If attendance is not permitted, the meetings are simulcast and committee minutes are published online. It is good practice for forensic social workers to regularly review the minutes and presentations generated by groups like CJPAC and JJPOC in order to better understand the policy implications for their clients and their agencies.

Social workers in criminal and juvenile justice agencies should be well versed in the types of grants available and the entities that request proposals. Even if he/she is not in a position that oversees grant applications within the agency, they can bring grant opportunities that highlight social work or social work values to administrators. In addition, there are national initiatives for criminal justice reform that are funded by private foundations that call for interagency collaboration. Social workers should lobby to be a part of their agency’s delegation.

Support. Organizational-level support and policy changes are also necessary for improving job satisfaction, level of fit and job role stress for those working as social workers in
criminal and/or juvenile justice organizations. In this study, negative factors were stronger predictors than protective factors of poor level of fit and job role stress. Administrators should resolve these concerns with current employees and work to prevent them from occurring further. Because poor fit for the worker due to stress and burnout negatively influences level of service and fulfillment of administrative goals and objectives, it behooves administrators to ensure access to protective factors. These include funding and availability for training and ongoing education; particularly social work training offered outside of the agency, as that was a significant predictor of reduced burnout and secondary traumatic stress.

Although they were not significant predictors of level of fit and job role stress, protective factors should still be supported by organizational policies and practices to assist the worker in garnering internal and external support. Those working directly, or even indirectly, with clients’ traumatic histories, unsettling photos or reports or other image-invoking materials may not be able to avoid these materials because they are part of their job, but they may benefit from varying their daily tasks. Some examples are victim advocates, mitigation specialists, and crisis interventionists. Secondary traumatic stress, one dimension of level of fit, is a more serious phenomenon and may require referrals for assessment and treatment. If an employee assistance program already exists and has been evaluated for effectiveness, staff should be encouraged to participate. Secondary support includes mentorships and clinical and peer supervision opportunities. Found to be important, yet underutilized, by the study sample, these practices enhance worker well-being and productivity. This may be even more important for women in these positions.

Although the recommendations were specific to female correctional officers, a recent article discussing the need to capitalize on the growing number of women working in corrections
highlighted the importance of mentorship and leadership opportunities for all women in forensic social work.

While women have entered the correctional workforce, their promotion into supervisory and other leadership roles has been slower. Good mentorship is key to developing leaders, and with few female role models, women correctional professionals have suffered a dearth of mentorship. As women gradually enter the leadership ranks in greater numbers, a “critical mass” of potential mentors will develop. However, given their relative scarcity it is vital that female leaders act as mentors at every opportunity. (Winters, 2014, ¶9)

**Recognition.** This study highlighted the importance of having an administration that recognizes its employees. Many respondents worked in value-inconsistent settings that can provoke safety concerns and stress over duties, yet they expressed dedication to their work and clients. Forensic social workers would benefit from more supervisor recognition. Discontent with administrative efforts to recognize worker dedication and talent came through loud and clear in the open-ended responses. A few targeted policy and practice changes could reduce that dissatisfaction.

First, provide leadership opportunities for not only forensic social workers in general, but also people of color and women working in custodial and host settings, in particular. This may improve administrator/employee relations and help recognize talented leaders. Opportunities include hiring changes such as increasing advancement opportunities, revising hiring practices, or increasing targeted recruitment based on the current study. Less formal suggestions include assembling leadership and steering committees led and staffed by forensic social workers or encouraging staff to propose their own committees and task forces that reflect the concerns of
this study population. Simply increasing the worker’s flexibility in decision making and autonomy within their work role can improve client care and decrease stress and dissatisfaction (Travis, 2006).

Second, administrators and supervisors should recognize the accomplishments of social work staff when it is warranted. Using empowering management practices such as staff recognition, developing staff potential, and creating (or encouraging natural formation of) connections increases intrinsic and extrinsic worker satisfaction (Travis, 2006).

**For the Social Work Profession and Education**

At first glance, this study may seem to criticize both social work education and the social work profession’s lack of attention to forensic social work. Instead, this study provides opportunities to strengthen the profession through additional specialization and by making an argument for increased forensic content in social work education.

The literature suggests that reclaiming areas of specialization may not only reinforce that specialty (forensic social work), but can also bolster the profession itself and provide a path to leadership positions for social workers. Randall and Kindiak described a social work framework called *post-professionalization* that included the suggestion of “restratification” (Randall & Kindiak, 2008, p. 346) and expanding scopes of practice. Restratification refers to the process of the more successful elite members of a profession moving into leadership positions as a “means of maintaining professional power over decision-making” (Randall and Kindiak, 2008, p. 346). Forensic social workers in decision-making positions is consistent with the current paradigm shift in criminal and juvenile justice. Randall and Kindiak posited that professions that have achieved this state of *post-professionalization* have “not only resisted professional decline, but
have demonstrated the ability to flourish” (2008, p. 346). The current study brings specialization and restratification one-step closer for both social work and forensic social work.

Using this study to develop forensic social work education and training would enhance the social work field and close the research-practice-education loop. Social work is an applied science, but if practice, education and research do not inform each other, there is a gap. According to the current study, individuals are practicing social work in a variety of settings including probation offices, courthouses, correctional facilities, law offices, and juvenile detention. Using their voices and practice experiences informed this study, but more case studies and examples from the field would enhance forensic social work education and training. More scholarly research would attract more scholars. Better field placement opportunities and parallel content in classrooms would attract more social work-oriented students who also have interest in criminal justice rather than losing those students to other professions.

**For Forensic Social Work**

This study contributes to the field of forensic social work in several ways. First, it provides an inaugural look at this population, their motivations, beliefs, stressors, and the protective and deleterious factors that affect their work. This study is a foundation for additional research.

Second, in a field that has struggled for support and recognition at various times over the last century and a half, forensic social work is in the midst of a resurgence. There are more opportunities than ever before for forensic social workers because of policy shifts towards rehabilitation and diversion. This study brings attention to the specialization.

Third, this study identified not only the gaps in forensic social work education, but also the strong desire and need for forensic social work content and training. Forensic social work
course materials are being used in a limited number of social work programs around the country; however, it is unlikely that they are based on practice information gathered directly from forensic social workers. The insights gained from the forensic social workers in this study can be used to develop a curriculum and other course content that encompass the strengths, challenges and other factors identified here. In addition to formal social work education, this study can also provide rich training module material for a variety of organizations to use for new employees and ongoing education. Some examples include workshops on ethical and value-based issues faced by forensic social workers; recognizing and addressing implicit bias in assessment; dual-pronged approaches to direct practice with clients while advocating on a systemic level; and identifying protective factors for yourself and your employees.

Lastly, this study may provide the impetus for bringing together disparate pockets of forensic social workers based on commonalities rather than differences. Understanding other facets of forensic social work can improve understanding of all forensic social workers about the full universe of the practice. Coordinating forensic social work communities of practice would be a difficult process nationally if it were developed through grassroots organization. National social work organizations already have the infrastructure in place to achieve this goal. The National Association of Social Workers (NASW), for example, could take the lead by creating a forensic social work track that brings together forensic social workers. As Wilson posited, NASW also has the infrastructure for spearheading specialization and licensing (2010). These connections may lead to increased organizational memberships, opportunities for peer and clinical supervision, and mentoring relationships. In other words, these advances would provide a tether for the forensic social worker who may have felt he/she was set adrift.
For Employers

The study results have important retention and goal realization implications for employers of forensic social workers. For example, the detrimental effects of value incongruities between worker and organization significantly predicted problems with level of fit (ProQOL). This is important for employers to know, not only to improve the environment for the worker, but because realigning those incongruities or even just acknowledging them can improve worker and organizational goal attainment. Aligning the values of workers with their organizations can reinforce the realization of the goals of that organization (Ren, 2010). Ren’s (2010) research supported a strong link between organizational outcomes such as performance and goals, with higher level of congruence (i.e. level of fit).

Second, this study gives recruitment recommendations to criminal and juvenile justice agencies who employ social workers or those who may identify as doing social work. For agencies trying to recruit qualified social workers to forensic positions, it is important to know what factors led others to the work. Knowing where to look for job fairs and interns increases access to qualified candidates.

Third, keeping qualified social workers satisfied and stable in their positions is important for all involved. This study gives insight into the factors that best predict symptoms of instability, such as burnout, job stress, and secondary trauma. The research and scales used in this study provide a foundation for initial and ongoing assessment of employee risks and needs. Employers will have a better understanding, and can be mindful, of the stressors that the sample reported in higher levels (interaction with their clients, working on the types of cases that they work on, their caseload, their assigned duties, paperwork and other reporting duties, and the mission of their current place of work). Not only can training departments and human resources
tailor training and interventions to address these stressors, administrations who may be out of touch with employees can foster better relationships with them.

For Forensic Social Workers

The aim of this study was to improve the experiences of forensic social workers by better understanding who they are and what they need because they are providing services to vulnerable and marginalized populations. This study has several implications for forensic social workers, those who self-identified as forensic social workers, and others doing the work. They were given a voice and they used it. The design purposely provided many “other” open text fields to encourage sharing and respondents did provide extensive additional commentary. For a group that is susceptible to burnout, stress, secondary trauma and increasingly complex duties, the opportunity to speak up may empower.

Second, the study itself provided an opportunity to reflect on their own practice and identity. Even the appearance of being a valued information resource can increase sense of worth. The experience of taking the survey itself was a guided study in finding one’s place among a hidden community and learning more about the terminology, values and mission of forensic social work.

Third, this study was intended as an initial step in further research on forensic social workers by learning from the ground up. There are always limitations and unexplored research questions in studies like this one; however, the time and effort the respondents put into answering the questions provided a solid springboard for future research.

Study Limitations

Despite all efforts to construct a strong methodological design, the study had limitations. The first was potential sampling bias. The exploratory nature of this study of forensic social
workers had inherent limitations because it explored a previously un-researched population. The non-probability sampling technique “total population sampling” was used to capture all members of the target population of forensic social workers based on the lists of those who fit the criteria. The limitations of non-probability sampling techniques, and total population sampling in particular, are related to bias and an inability to generalize to the wider population. The aim was to create lists of all possible members of the study population were based on Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests, agency reports, websites and other concrete information; however, bias can exist in identifying all possible entities involved in forensic social work. As a result, the lists may have been incomplete and some of the findings may have other plausible explanations.

Second was access to potential respondents. Actual access was also a limitation in the current study. Access to the members of the population was limited by gatekeepers. Gatekeepers were the human resources employees and directors of the agencies who either did not respond at all to the study or declined to let staff participate. This limited full access to all members of the population. In addition, the two large agencies that declined to participate after a long period of time contained two particular subsets of forensic social work that were not otherwise represented in the final sample. It is also possible that these two agencies are particularly susceptible to higher rates of burnout and secondary traumatic stress due to the nature of their work and the specific populations with whom they work.

The third was response rate. It was unknown how many emails were distributed by the gatekeepers in all agencies. Despite repeated attempts to ascertain how many emails went out, there were agencies that did not provide that information. This limited my ability to determine
how many of the distributed survey links resulted in respondents and how the sample may be biased.

Fourth, the final sample limited the utility of the results to a specific population. This was a non-probability sample and a study with a largely exploratory purpose. These approaches were necessary, as this was a hard-to-reach, largely hidden population for whom no list existed. With that said, a goal of the research was to cast a wide net to uncover not only those who were easily identified within the forensic social work definition used here, but also those who felt they were doing social work activities in this realm. Another aspect of generalizability was the forensic social work identity mean differences between the completers and non-completers. Because the former had a statistically significantly higher mean identity than the latter, the results may be limited to those with higher forensic social work identity.

Finally, the survey itself had some limitations. The survey was very long and included many questions. While the overwhelming majority of questions were quantitative and took little time to complete individually, completing the entire survey required a level of commitment. Clearly almost 400 respondents rose to the occasion and became part of the sample; however, there is an unknown element of fatigue that may have contributed to some of the responses throughout the survey. In addition, the response sets often allowed the respondent to choose multiple answers. While this choose all that apply option did increase the ability to capture the complexity of this otherwise unknown population’s work, it may have limited certain analyses that required mutually exclusive categories.

Additionally, while there were other or additional comment options for 30 of the questions, the survey did not specifically asked for detailed information about respondents who did not have social work education. The large proportion of the sample who had other types of
education and training added to the sample, but it raised questions about what education and training those individuals experienced. Question logic or additional choices in the education and training section could have elicited more information about this subsample.

Despite these limitations, this study is an important step in the profession’s efforts to understand more about this vital group of social workers. With an understanding of the limitations of this survey, recommendations for further research will provide opportunities to strengthen the knowledge base.

**Future Research**

**Scope.** This study will contribute to the social work and forensic social work literature and should act as a springboard for future scholarly research. The study was geographically limited to those working in Connecticut; however, there are forensic social workers in positions around the country and the world. Increasing the scope of the sampling frame would provide a more comprehensive view of who is doing this work outside of Connecticut.

**Depth.** The information gathered from the current study provided a preliminary, primarily quantitative, view of who is doing this work and many of the factors that influence their work. Qualitative studies based on the information reported here would provide a deeper understanding of the experiences of being a forensic social worker. A variety of designs could accomplish this. One example includes in-depth interviews, and/or roundtables with key informants. Some key informants about social work in criminal and juvenile justice processes are:

- Forensic social workers themselves
- Consumers: inmates, defendants, those on probation/parole, victims, community members, voters, families
Decision-makers: judges, wardens, probation and parole officers, correctional officers, law enforcement, legislators

Other in CJ/JJ Work: defense attorneys, prosecutors, community service providers, investigators

Supports: forensic social worker partners/spouses, mentors, supervisors, Employee Assistance Providers (EAP), union leaders, human resources, social work educators, social work field instructors

In addition to purely quantitative or qualitative studies, mixed methods studies of forensic social workers and their practices would also be informative and ultimately the best approach.

**Duration.** The current design captured data at one point in time and was susceptible to the many threats to validity involving historical, political, socio-economic, and other changes. A longitudinal or cohort study that follows forensic social workers over time would provide insight into the impact of ebb and flow of the profession on their trajectory. This would also provide better insight into how various factors impact level of fit, job role stress, and other factors.

There are additional research areas that target specific portions of the study population. There are a variety of training and education backgrounds reflected in the current study sample. While most of the analyses examining if the various backgrounds impacted level of fit, job satisfaction, and job role stress did not detect statistically significant differences, further research is necessary to understand more about those doing forensic work a) without any advanced degree, b) with an advanced degree in disciplines other than social work (criminal justice, sociology, psychology, other), c) with a social work degree, and finally d) with specific forensic social work education and/or training. Additional research with a larger, more geographically
diverse sample could examine whether forensic social work education and training does indeed result in better skills and service to clients in criminal and/or juvenile justice processes.

Probation was a commonly reoccurring context within the sample. It was often identified as the path that led respondents to forensic work via internships, recommendations from family or colleagues, or finding the position while working elsewhere. While the overlap of probation and social work has ebbed and flowed since the beginning of the social work profession, they seem to be more aligned than ever before. It is important to know what that means for clients, social workers, the profession and social work education. The current study provided some insights that could act as the basis for further research.

**Conclusion**

Forensic social workers are often the front line for achieving social justice for clients in the criminal and juvenile justice systems. They directly influence the lives of those who have been victimized and their families; those who have been accused and possibly convicted of crimes and their families; and the communities where all stakeholders in the adjudication process live. At the same time as forensic social workers are influencing these groups and individuals, they are impacted by their work environments and the interactions within those environments. Within this reciprocal relationship, exposure to a variety of stressors and deleterious (negative) factors not only influences the worker but also influences the clients and other stakeholders in the process.

Forensic social workers experience a variety of job stressors such as lack of recognition, lack of available resources, and lack of support. They work in host settings with other professionals resulting in difficulties arising from overlapping duties. They sometimes feel unsafe in their environments. They may fake emotions at work to ease social tensions when their
missions and values are at odds with their organization. This study gave a voice to this under-researched group. It also provided a deeper understanding of who is working in these processes and what intrinsic and extrinsic factors influence their fit within their work environment.

The study will be offered for dissemination to all organizations who were initially contacted for inclusion in the study. This is critical because it provides direct feedback to those agencies that are most likely to be impacted by the results and the recommendations. In addition, this researcher will provide training materials and presentations to those agencies that request more in depth information, however all data will be presented in the aggregate with no one agency singled out. This ensures continued protection of the human subjects who agreed to participate in this study.

The study will also be submitted for presentation at national forensic and other social work conferences. Poster presentations will also be submitted for those that do not accept the full presentation proposal. Every attempt at raising awareness of the forensic social work specialization will increase the likelihood of increased educational and funding opportunities for this group.

By nature, this work can be both rewarding and stressful; this study endeavored to investigate what factors can alleviate stress and improve feelings of satisfaction. The researcher will continue to work to improve forensic social work’s research base and the work experiences of forensic social workers so that they can provide the best services to the marginalized and vulnerable people who are entangled in our criminal and juvenile justice systems. This researcher’s hope is for this study to provide a lifeline not only to those who have felt bereft by their jobs, their support systems, and/or their profession but to increase the supportive safety net for all forensic social workers.
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Per 45 CFR 46.117(c)(2), the IRB waived the requirement for the investigator to obtain a signed consent form for the subjects because it found that the research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to subjects and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context.

*Please note that no research may take place at any institution or organization without their prior approval.

All investigators at the University of Connecticut are responsible for complying with the attached IRB "Responsibilities of Research Investigators”.

Any proposed changes that may affect the exempt status of the research study must be submitted to the IRB for review and approval prior to their implementation.
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The amendment includes the following change:
1. The survey has been modified, reducing the length by 17 questions and 16 items within two scales/matrices.

The amendment also does not change the IRB’s previous determination to waive signed consent. Specifically, per 45 CFR 46.117(c)(2), the IRE waived the requirement for the investigator to obtain a signed consent form for the subjects because it found that the research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to subjects and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required outside of the research context.

Protocol Approval Date: April 29, 2015
Amendment Approval Date: June 29, 2015
Approval is Valid Until: No Expiration Date
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Attach two (2) copies of the revised documents (e.g., Consent forms, questionnaire, etc.) inclusive of all amendment(s) proposed. In one copy, the amendments should be identified by using the track-changes feature of Microsoft Word to facilitate the IRB review; the other copy should be a “clean” copy incorporating the revisions. If you are changing the key personnel on the study, submit the Appendix A form only (inclusive of all active study personnel).

Amendment Review Form (IRB-3)
Institutional Review Board, Research Compliance Services
Whetten Graduate Center, Rm #214, 438 Whitney Road Ext., Unit 1246 Storrs, CT 06269-1246 860-486-8802

Any amendment to an approved protocol must be reviewed and approved by the IRB before the amendment is implemented. Such amendments could include changes to the study design, procedures, enrollment, methods of recruitment, personnel, funding source or the consent form/information sheet. This includes changes that appear to reduce risks to subjects. There are NO EXCEPTIONS to this rule.

Protocol #: x15-080

Principal Investigator: Albert, Jennie

Study Title:
Set Adrift: A Study of Characteristics, Sustainability and the Lifelines Tethering Connecticut Forensic Social Workers in the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Fields to the Social Work Profession

*1. Describe each proposed amendment(s) and explain why it is being made.

I proposed to reduce the length of the electronic survey by seventeen questions and 16 items within two scales/matrices. The proposed amendment is based on the need to reduce the time involved in respondents taking the survey. The survey has not been distributed, however the early feedback from the various agencies involved in the process has been that the survey may be cumbersome to their staff.

*2. For each amendment listed above, explain whether the proposed amendment increases or decreases the level risk to participants (thereby changing the risk/benefit ratio) and, if so, describe. If the level of risk remains the same, describe this as well.

The level of risk remains the same. The only change is fewer items for the respondents to answer.

*Has the funding source or the status of funding changed since initial or last re-approval review? ☐ Yes ☑ No

*Does the study have a Certificate of Confidentiality? ☐ Yes ☑ No

*Is this a change to personnel? ☐ Yes ☑ No

UCONN IRB
Approved On: 04/29/15
Approved Unit: JLV/TL
Approved by: JLV/TL
Appendix B
Cognitive Interviewing Prompts

Cognitive Interviewing

This process is called cognitive interviewing and can be thought of as a “think aloud”. I anticipate it will take at least one hour.

While your survey answers are important, this process is more about how and why you arrived at your answers. I am testing the questionnaire. In this process, I will ask you to consider each question in terms of how you interpret what the question is asking, your thought process and how it felt to answer the question. I would like to know what problems you encountered – therefore any detailed help you can provide will be of interest; even if it seems trivial or irrelevant. I hope you will be able to “think out loud” as much as possible throughout this process.

Questions

There are eight basic questions I may ask about any given question. These are:

What does that term mean to you? (comprehension/interpretation)
Can you repeat the question I just asked in your own words? (paraphrasing)
How are you sure that _? (confidence judgment)
How do you remember that __? (recall probe)
Why do you think that ____is ______? (specific probe)
How did you arrive at that answer? (general probe)
Was that easy or hard to answer? (general probe)
I noticed that you hesitated; tell me what you were thinking. (general probe)

Candor

While I did write these questions and response sets, this is a preliminary survey. Please do not hesitate to share any and all feelings about the design or any other aspect of your experience taking this survey. All feedback is helpful to me.
Appendix C Survey Instrument

Survey of Connecticut Social Workers Working in Criminal and Juvenile Justice Processes

A research study by: Jennie Albert, LCSW

University of Connecticut School of Social Work

August 2015

Statement of Confidentiality:

All identifying information of the participants in this study will be kept strictly confidential.

Purpose:

The purpose of this study is to learn about the roles, challenges and rewards of Connecticut Social Workers working in some capacity within or related to the field of criminal and/or juvenile justice. You have been asked to complete this survey because you are a social Worker who may be working in or related to the field of criminal and/or juvenile justice in the State of Connecticut on behalf of the community, the accused, the offender and/or the families of offenders or victims.

Even if you feel this survey many not be right for you - please answer the first Two questions. It will screen you and let you know right away if this survey is right for you. If you are sent to additional questions, please answer all questions to the best of your ability. Thank you.

Survey of Connecticut Social Workers Working in Criminal and Juvenile Justice Processes

Is this Survey right for you?

Please answer the first two questions to determine if this survey is right for you. If you are rerouted to the end of the survey - thank you for taking the time to answer the first two questions.

1. Please complete the following sentence ‘Currently, I ___(Please check all that apply)’.
   - am a student in a social work program have a BSW
   - have an MSW
   - have an advanced doctoral degree in social work
   - work in a position that has “social work” or “social service” in the title or job description work in a position that I consider social work related
   - NONE OF THE ABOVE
2. Please complete the following sentence: ‘Currently, my work includes _______ (Please check all that apply).

☐ working in a primarily criminal and/or juvenile justice agency

☐ working directly with adults and/or juveniles suspected, accused, Convicted, incarcerated or under supervision for breaking the law

☐ working in a non-criminal justice agency, but in a unit or program or job description that relates to criminal and/or juvenile justice (ex., treatment, policies, laws, funding, administration etc.)

☐ NONE OF THE ABOVE

---

Survey of Connecticut Social Workers Working in Criminal and Juvenile Justice Processes

At this moment, how do you see yourself professionally?

---

3. Right now, where do you identify yourself on a continuum between the term "social worker" and "forensic social worker" (defining that term for yourself)?

Social Worker

Forensic Social Worker

---

Connecticut Social Workers Working in Criminal and Juvenile Justice Processes

You as a Social Worker

4. How long have you been working in the field of social work?

Years

Months

5. How long have you been working as a social worker in the field of criminal and/or juvenile justice?

Years

Months
6. What led you to work in the criminal justice field as a social worker? Please write your answer in the space provided below.

7. Have you ever been a member of any social work organizations? Please mark all that apply.

☐ National Association of Social Workers (NASW)
☐ National Organization of Forensic Social Work (NOFSW)
☐ Psychoanalysis in Clinical Social Work (AAPCSW) American Association of Spinal Cord Injury Professionals
☐ Psychologists and Social Workers American Case Management Association
☐ American Network of Home Health Care Social Workers American Public Health Association
☐ Social Work Section Association for Community Organization and Social Administration
☐ Association for Gerontology Education in Social Work
☐ Association of Baccalaureate Social Work Program Directors, Inc.
☐ Association of VA social Workers Clinical Social Work Association Council on Social Work Education
☐ Influencing State Policy group Richmond, VA) International Association for Social Work
☐ With Groups International Federation of Social Work (IFSW)
☐ Latino Social Workers Organization
☐ National Association of Black Social Workers
☐ National Association of Puerto Rican / Hispanic Social Workers
☐ National Network for Social Work Managers
☐ Social Workers Helping Social Workers
☐ National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers (NACDL)/National Association of Sentencing Advocates (NASA) combined
☐ I have never been a member of any social work organization

Other social work organizations not listed

8. Have you ever been a member of a professional criminal justice organization? Please mark all that apply.

☐ American Correctional Association (ACA)
☐ American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) American Society of Criminology (ASC)
☐ Justice Research and Statistics Association (JRSA) National Criminal Justice Association (NCJA) National Institute of Corrections (NIC)
☐ Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS)
☐ American Criminal Justice Association - Lambda Alpha Epsilon
☐ National Association of Blacks in Criminal Justice International Community
☐ Corrections Association (ICCA) American Jail Association (AJA)
☐ Correctional Education Association (CEA) Institute for Criminal Justice Ethics
☐ I have never been a member of any criminal justice organization

Other criminal justice organizations not listed:

---

Survey of Connecticut Social Workers Working in Criminal and Juvenile Justice Processes

Your Current (or most recent) Position

For the questions on this page, please think about your current position or most recent position.

9. About how long have you been at your current place of employment?

Years

[ ]

[ ]

Months

10. For which type of organization do you currently work?

☐ Public: local, state or federal government agency within the executive, legislative or judicial branches
□ Non-Profit: a 501(c)(3) agency led by a voluntary board
□ Proprietary: delivers services for a profit, may be governed by a board of directors
□ Other (please specify)

Survey of Connecticut Social Workers Working in Criminal and Juvenile Justice Processes

Your Job Satisfaction

It is important to know how satisfied social workers are at work. Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability.

11. Please mark the one response below that best reflects your employment in the past three years.

□ I changed employers once or twice in the past three years
□ I changed employers more than twice in the past three years
□ I have worked for the same employer for more than three years
□ Other (unemployed, student only, etc.) PLEASE SPECIFY
12. For each of the aspects of your work life listed below, please rate the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction each provides for you. Choose a number between 1 (very dissatisfied) and 11 (very satisfied) for each aspect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working with your clients</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of authority you have been given to do your job</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal relations with fellow workers</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your salary and benefits</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for promotion</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The challenges your job provides you</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of supervision you receive</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chances for acquiring new skills</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of client contact</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for really helping people</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of funding for programs</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of guidelines for doing your job</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for involvement in decision-making</td>
<td>□</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The recognition given your work by your supervisor

Your feeling of success as a professional

Field of specialization you are in

Amount of support from agency administration

Opportunity for advanced training

For each of the 18 items listed below, I would like to know about your current place of employment (or most recent place of employment).

Survey of Connecticut Social Workers Working in Criminal and Juvenile Justice Processes

Settings and Populations

13. In which types of settings do you currently work? Please mark all the boxes for each setting in which you currently work.

Yes, I CURRENTLY work in this setting

Investigation/Arrest Stage

Court Pretrial Stage

Court Sentencing Stage

Pretrial Diversion Programming

Correctional Facility (Adults) - Employee of Department of Correction

Correctional Facility (Adults) - Employee of a Managed Care Provider
14. What types of professional activities in the area of Forensic Social Work and/or Criminal/Juvenile Justice do you currently do? Please mark all the boxes for each activity you do in your current position.

Yes, I do these activities in my CURRENT POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration in the area of Forensic Social Work OR Criminal/Juvenile Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative activities in the area of Forensic Social Work OR Criminal/Juvenile Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research in the area of Forensic Social Work OR Criminal/Juvenile Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants in the area of Forensic Social Work OR Criminal/Juvenile Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Development in the area of Forensic Social Work OR Criminal/Juvenile Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct clinical practice (individual, group or family therapy) in the area of Forensic Social Work OR Criminal/Juvenile Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Management (includes client supervision, assessment and planning etc.) in the area of Forensic Social Work OR Criminal/Juvenile Justice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional activities (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. With which populations do you currently work? Please mark all the boxes for each population that apply to your current work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Yes, I CURRENTLY work with this population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males, Females, Adults, Juveniles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenders or those charged with offenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims of crime, Families of Offenders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families of Victims of Crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities or Community Groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituents (voters, taxpayers, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other populations I may have missed (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Feelings about Your Work

The following section asks you to share your feelings about your work and your workplace. Please answer these to the best of your ability.

16. I DO feel that other professions in my place of work have duties that overlap my social work duties.
Directions: The next section is about your Professional Quality of Life in the work you do related to the criminal and/or juvenile justice system. Please think about the primary population with whom you work or serve as the object of your “help”.

17. When you help people you have direct contact with their lives. As you may have found, your compassion for those you help can affect you in positive and negative ways. Below are statements about your experiences, both positive and negative, as a helper. Consider each of the following questions about you and your current work situation. Please choose the response that honestly reflects how frequently you experienced these things in the past 30 days.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am happy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am preoccupied with more than one person I help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I get satisfaction from being able to help people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel connected to others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I jump or am startled by unexpected sounds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel invigorated after working with those I help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it difficult to separate my personal life from my life as a helper.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not as productive at work because I am losing sleep over traumatic experiences of a person I help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that I might have been affected by the traumatic stress of those I help.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I feel trapped by my job as a helper.

| I feel trapped by my job as a helper. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Because of my helping, I have felt "on edge" about various things.

| Because of my helping, I have felt "on edge" about various things. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

I like my work as a helper.

| I like my work as a helper. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

I feel depressed because of the traumatic experiences of the people I help.

| I feel depressed because of the traumatic experiences of the people I help. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

I feel as though I am experiencing the trauma of someone I have helped.

| I feel as though I am experiencing the trauma of someone I have helped. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

I have beliefs that sustain me.

| I have beliefs that sustain me. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

I am pleased with how I am able to keep up with [helping] techniques and protocols.

| I am pleased with how I am able to keep up with [helping] techniques and protocols. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

I am the person I always wanted to be.

| I am the person I always wanted to be. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

My work makes me feel satisfied.

| My work makes me feel satisfied. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

I feel worn out because of my work as a helper.

| I feel worn out because of my work as a helper. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

I have happy thoughts and feelings about those I help and how I could help them.

| I have happy thoughts and feelings about those I help and how I could help them. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

I feel overwhelmed because my case [work] load seems endless.

| I feel overwhelmed because my case [work] load seems endless. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

I believe I can make a
difference through my work.

I avoid certain activities or situations because they remind me of frightening experiences of the people I help.

I am proud of what I can do to help.

As a result of my helping, I have intrusive, frightening thoughts.

I feel "bogged down" by the system.

I have thoughts that I am a "success" as a helper.

I can't recall important parts of my work with trauma victims.

I am a very caring person.

I am happy that I chose to do this work.

Directions: For the following two questions, I would like to know about the emotions you express to others (including clients, coworkers and supervisors) as well as the emotions you feel but do NOT express while on the job. That is, I am interested in what you express through your body language, facial expressions, tone of voice etc. Consider your experiences at work OVER THE PAST SIX MONTHS. The two questions may seem somewhat similar so please read the instructions carefully.

In this question, I would like to know how often YOU EXPRESS EMOTIONS ON THE JOB WHEN YOU REALLY DO NOT FEEL THESE EMOTIONS. For example, how often do you express feelings of happiness or excitement when you really do not feel that way?
18. How often do you express feelings of ___ on the job when you really do not feel that way? Please circle the number that best reflects your answer for each of the fourteen emotions below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I express this many times a day when</th>
<th>I express this a few times a day when</th>
<th>I express this a few times a week when</th>
<th>I express this a few times a month when</th>
<th>I never express this when I DO NOT feel it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irritation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contentment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disliking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this question, I would like to know about emotions YOU DO NOT EXPRESS ON THE JOB BUT FEEL LIKE EXPRESSING. That is, I am interested in how often you keep certain emotions to yourself because you feel you should not express them on the job. For example, how often do you keep feelings of anger or frustration to yourself when you really feel that way?

19. How often do you keep feelings of _____ to yourself when you really feel that way? Please mark the number that best reflects your answer for lines A-N below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Results in very much stress</th>
<th>Results in some stress</th>
<th>Results in very little stress</th>
<th>Results in no stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irritation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contentment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disliking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Job Stress

Job Stress: For the following sixteen items, I would like to know how you feel about the work-related circumstances about your current place of employment (or, if not working, your last place of employment). Does the circumstance listed create very much stress at work, some stress at work, very little stress at work or no stress at work?

20. Please mark the response for each question that comes closest to reflecting your feelings about the items below.

Results in very much stress | Results in some stress | Results in very little stress | Results in no stress
---|---|---|---
Interaction with coworkers from the social work profession within my place of work  
Interaction with coworkers from other professions within my place of work  
Working in my current work environment (physical location)  
Interaction with my clients (or constituents, patients, consumers etc.)
Running head: SET ADRIFT: A STUDY OF CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working on the types of cases (or topics, subject matter etc.) that I work on</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My case load</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mission of my current place of work</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My assigned duties</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in a team with people from other professions</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My personal safety at work</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ability to make positive changes in my work environment</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to improve my skills and knowledge</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting performance feedback from supervisors</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paperwork and other reporting duties</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources to do my job effectively</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling isolated in my place of work because there are few or no other social workers</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did I miss something? Please identify any other circumstances that may create stress for you.
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Social Work and the Criminal/Juvenile Justice Process
This section is concerned with your thoughts about and suggestions for social work in the criminal and juvenile justice process.

Directions: The next group of questions is asking you about your personal beliefs. Please read each item choose the response that best reflects your belief.

21. How do you feel about each of the following ten statements? Do you: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Disagree or Strongly Disagree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under similar circumstances, African American and Latino men are more likely than Caucasian men to respond violently to frustration (threat, challenge, other).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor racial/ethnic minorities in our major cities have come to place less value on human life than non-minorities in similar circumstances.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If African Americans and Latinos would try harder they would be just as well off as Caucasians financially and educationally.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over the past ten years, minorities have been given enough special programs and other opportunities, but they haven't taken full advantage of them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>African American and Latino males are more likely than Caucasians to be arrested by police under similar circumstances.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generations of slavery and discrimination have created conditions that make it difficult for poor African Americans to work their way out of the lower class, and so they are more likely to turn to crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Americans and Latinos are more likely to be poor because most of them don't have the motivation or will power to improve their conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial/ethnic minorities accept less fully the legitimacy of the courts than similarly situated non-minorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police officers use force against racial/ethnic minorities when such force would not be used against a non-minority.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Police officers treat African Americans and Latinos with less respect or courtesy than they treat Caucasians.
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Your Beliefs

22. How do you feel about each of the following statements? Do you: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree or Strongly Disagree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There should be a guaranteed minimum income for everyone.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The federal government has invested too much money in the poor.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government should not redistribute the wealth.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women should have the right to use abortion services.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government should keep files on individuals with minority political affiliation</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government should not subsidize family planning programs.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family planning should be available to all adolescents.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The government should provide a comprehensive system of insurance protection against loss of income because of disability.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal punishment is an important means of discipline for aggressive, acting-out adolescents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment benefits should be extended, especially in areas hit by economic disaster.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The gap between poverty and affluence should be reduced through measures directed at redistribution of income.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts should be made to increase voting among minorities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family planning services should be available to individuals regardless of income.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older persons should be sustained to the extent possible in their own environments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The child in adoption proceedings should be the primary client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A family should be defined as two or more individuals who consider themselves a family and who assume protective, caring obligations to one another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following questions inquire about your own experience, feelings and beliefs as they relate to the specialization of "Forensic Social Work" (refer to definition below).

FSW Definition

**Definition**

Forensic social work, for the purposes of this survey, refers to the professional activities related to the field of criminal justice and/or juvenile justice in which the social worker’s primary work includes one or more of the following: direct (treatment, case management, group work, or family therapy), policy and planning, administration, research, grants (applications and/or management), community organization, supervision or legislative functions.

23. Do you believe forensic social work is a distinct practice area of social work (i.e. different from other social work activities)?

☐ No

☐ Yes
Additional Comments (please specify)

NOFSW Mission Statement

Mission Statement of the National Organization of Forensic Social Workers (NOFSW):

“The mission of the National Organization of Forensic Social Work is to adhere to ethical standards of practice, to advance the field of multidisciplinary forensic social work through training for our members, to engage in policy and program development and evaluation, to facilitate expertise related to civil and criminal law and alternative dispute resolution, and to provide services that improve the effectiveness of our members and the lives of our clients.”

24. Where does the mission statement of the NOFSW (above) align with how you understand your own work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Aligned</th>
<th>Somewhat Aligned</th>
<th>Not Very Aligned</th>
<th>Not at all Aligned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comment(s):

Survey of Connecticut Social Workers Working in Criminal and Juvenile Justice Processes

Your Educational Background

25. What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

☐ Less than high school degree

☐ High school degree or equivalent (e.g., GED)

☐ Some college but no degree

☐ Associate degree
☐ Bachelor degree
☐ Graduate degree
☐ Doctoral Degree
Other (please specify)

26. What types of forensic social work courses/programs that were offered in your social work program? (My school offered ______). Please answer "yes" or "no" for each of the five rows below.

- **no specific courses but some forensic social work content within other courses**
- **some courses in forensic social work (or its equivalent) as electives**
- **a substantive area/concentration in forensic social work (or its equivalent) (typically 2-3 elective courses)**
- **field placements in forensic settings**
- **a certificate or other specialization in forensic social work (or its equivalent)**

Additional Comments (please specify)

---
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27. Did you desire a social work career in the area of criminal justice at some point during your education?

☐ No
☐ Yes

Additional Comments (please specify)

28. When thinking about the courses you took in obtaining your social work degree(s), which ONE course do you feel is the most useful in your current work within the criminal and/or juvenile justice system? Please provide a response in the box below.
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Social Work Values and Ethics

Core Social Work Values

- Service
- Social justice
- Dignity and worth of the person
- Importance of human relationships
- Integrity
- Competence
29. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement? “In my professional life, I abide by the social work values listed above”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments (please specify)

30. How often do you experience inconsistencies between the social work values listed above and the values emphasized in your current practice setting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments (please specify)
NASW Mission Statement

Social Work Mission Statement
(Taken from the preamble of the NASW Code of Ethics):

The primary mission of the social work profession is to enhance human well-being and help meet the basic human needs of all people, with particular attention to the needs and empowerment of people who are vulnerable, oppressed, and living in poverty. A historic and defining feature of social work is the profession's focus on individual well-being in a social context and the well-being of society. Fundamental to social work is attention to the environmental forces that create, contribute to, and address problems in living.

31. How strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

"I subscribe to the social work Mission Statement (above)."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments (please specify)

32. How often do you experience inconsistencies between the social work Mission Statement (listed above) and the Mission Statement of your current practice setting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments (please specify)
The next section inquires about your thoughts, experiences and suggestions about the types of skills, knowledge, and supervision social workers should have available to them in their professional lives.

33. Please rank your top THREE social work skills that have been the most valuable in your work with your client base.

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>Assessment/Evaluation</td>
<td>Ethics of Managed Care</td>
<td>Casework Techniques</td>
<td>Community Organization Practice</td>
<td>Critical Thinking Process Recording</td>
<td>Evidenced Based Practice</td>
<td>Grant Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political Advocacy</td>
<td>Program Planning/Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychopharmacology (medications)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mentor Definition

**Definition**

*Mentor*: In this case, “mentor” refers to someone formally connected to you by/through a school or organization.

34. Have you ever had a mentor (defined above) from the field of criminal and/or juvenile justice?

☐ No
☐ Yes

Additional Comments (please specify)
35. You indicated that you did have a mentor in the field of criminal and/or juvenile justice; please choose the response below that best reflects your feelings about this statement:

"Having a mentor was a very positive experience for me in terms of my social work career in the criminal and/or juvenile justice field".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments (please specify)

36. Whether or not you had a mentor, how strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

"I believe having a mentor is important for social workers working in (or related to) the field of criminal and/or juvenile justice because it provides an important support".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments (please specify)
Clinical Supervision Definition

**Definition**

Clinical Supervision is defined as receiving supervision from a licensed clinical social worker either towards the requirements of being licensed yourself or solely for the purpose of supervision.

37. Whether or not you have had clinical supervision (defined above), how strongly do you agree or disagree with the following statement?

"I believe having clinical supervision is important for social workers working in (or related to) the field of criminal and/or juvenile justice."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Neither Agree Nor Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments (please specify)


38. With regard to training and clinical supervision (defined above), have you EVER participated in the following activities at your current or most recent position? Please provide a response to each activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided Clinical Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received Clinical Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Training Sponsored WITHIN MY AGENCY on the topic of social work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Training/Conference (OUTSIDE OF WORK) paid by my agency on the topic of social work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Comments (please specify)
Now, at the end of this survey, how do you see yourself professionally?

You identified yourself on the continuum of social work at the beginning of the survey. How do you feel now, after thinking more deeply about your own practice and the field of forensic social work?

* 39. Right now, where do you identify yourself on a continuum between the term "social worker" and “forensic social worker” (still defining that term for yourself)?

Social Worker

Forensic Social Worker

The last section asks you to share information about your life.
40. What is your gender?
   ☐ Male
   ☐ Female
   Other (please specify)

41. In which month and year were you born? Please choose from drop down menus (this information is used for aggregated demographic data only and not for any identification purposes).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month and Year of birth</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

42. Which of the following best describes your current relationship status?

   ☐ Married
   ☐ Widowed
   ☐ Divorced
   ☐ Separated
   ☐ In a domestic partnership or civil union
   ☐ Single, but cohabiting with a significant other
   ☐ Single, never married
   Other (please specify)

43. How would you describe your political interest level in Connecticut? Please choose the most appropriate response below.

   ☐ I am totally uninterested in state or local politics
   ☐ I sometimes vote in Connecticut elections
   ☐ I vote in most Connecticut elections
   ☐ I actively campaign for candidates and social issues in Connecticut
   ☐ I have run for office in Connecticut
   ☐ Additional Comment(s):
44. How would you describe your political interest level in criminal and/or juvenile justice issues in Connecticut? Please choose the most appropriate response below.

☐ I am totally uninterested in any politics related to criminal and/or juvenile justice
☐ I sometimes follow politics related to criminal and/or juvenile justice issues
☐ I closely follow politics related to criminal and/or juvenile justice issues
☐ I actively campaign for candidates and social issues related to criminal and/or juvenile justice issues
☐ I have run for office based on platforms that include criminal justice issues
☐ Additional Comment(s):

45. Do you identify with any of the following religions? (Please select all that apply.)

☐ Protestant Catholicism Christianity Judaism
☐ Islam
☐ Buddhism Hinduism
☐ Native American
☐ Inter/Non-denominational
☐ No religion
☐ Other (please specify)
46. Are you White, Black or African-American, American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian American, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander or some other race?

☐ White

☐ Black or African-American

☐ American Indian or Alaskan Native

☐ Asian American

☐ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

☐ From multiple races

Some other race (please specify)

47. Are you Mexican, Mexican-American, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Cuban-American, or some other Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino group?

☐ I am not Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino

☐ Mexican

☐ Mexican-American

☐ Chicano

☐ Puerto Rican

☐ Cuban

☐ Cuban-American

☐ Some other Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino group

☐ From multiple Spanish, Hispanic, or Latino groups
48. How much money did YOU personally earn in 2014? This includes money from jobs; net income from business, farm, or rent; pensions; dividends; interest; social security payments; and any other money income received by YOU. Please report the total amount of money you earned - do not subtract the amount you paid in taxes or any deductions listed on your tax return.

☐ $0 - $9,999
☐ $10,000 - $19,999
☐ $20,000 - $29,999
☐ $30,000 - $39,999
☐ $40,000 - $49,999
☐ $50,000 - $59,999
☐ $60,000 - $69,999
☐ $70,000 - $79,999
☐ $80,000 - $89,999
☐ $90,000 - $99,999
☐ $100,000 or More

---

Survey of Connecticut Social Workers Working in Criminal and Juvenile Justice Processes

Thank YOU!

Thank you for taking your valuable time to complete this survey about your work and your needs in the criminal and/or juvenile justice fields. If you have questions or comments please feel free to contact me via the address, email and/or phone number provided in your information materials.

Sincerely,
Jennie Albert
Appendix D

Sample Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Letter

Jennie J. Albert, LCSW, Doctoral Candidate

Email: [REDACTED]
Cell: [REDACTED]

[DATE]

[NAME AND TITLE]
[AGENCY]
[ADDRESS 1]
[ADDRESS 2]

To [REDACTED],

Under the Connecticut Freedom of Information Act §1-200 et seq., I am requesting an opportunity to inspect or attain copies of the following public records:

1. The name and description of any positions, units, teams or groups of employees whose function includes providing social work services (grant management, administration, research, case management, clinical counseling, non-clinical counseling, referrals, testimony, assessment/evaluation, discharge planning, re-entry or any other services commonly associated with the social work profession) in relation to the criminal justice process.

2. The job descriptions and titles of any positions within your agency whose function includes providing social work services (grant management, administration, research, case management, clinical counseling, non-clinical counseling, referrals, testimony, assessment/evaluation, discharge planning, re-entry or any other services commonly associated with the social work profession) and identify any positions that call for a social work degree (BSW, MSW, PhD, DSW), social work experience a title that includes the phrase “social worker” in relation to the criminal justice process.

3. The number of employees with social work degrees (BSW, MSW, PhD, DSW), their titles and work location (e.g., facility name/location) who are employed in relation to the criminal justice process. I am not requesting the names of the employees within the scope of this FOI request.

4. The number of employees who are licensed social workers (LCSW, ACSW or other licensing designation), their titles and work location (e.g., facility name/location) in
relation to the criminal justice process. I am not requesting the names of the employees within the scope of this FOI request.

If there are any fees for searching or copying these records please inform me if the cost will exceed $20.00. However, I would like to request a waiver of all fees in that the disclosure of the requested information is in the public interest and will contribute significantly to the public’s understanding of social work in criminal justice processes. This information is not being sought for commercial purposes. The information is directly related to a dissertation at the University of Connecticut School of Social Work.

The Connecticut Freedom of Information Act requires a response within four business days. If your access to the records I am requesting will take longer please contact me with information about when I might expect copies or the ability to inspect the requested records.

If you deny any, or all, of this request, please cite each specific exemption you feel justifies the refusal to release the information and notify me of the appeal procedures available to me under the law.

Thank you for considering my request.

Sincerely,

Jennie Albert
Appendix E
Sample Recruitment Materials sent to Agency Administrators

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
School of Social Work

[Administrator]
[Agency]
[Address 1]
[Address 2]

Jennie Albert, LCSW
1798 Asylum Avenue
West Hartford, Connecticut 06117-2698

RE: UCONN SSW Doctoral Dissertation, UCONN IRB Protocol #X15-080 (exempt study)

Dear [Administrator],

Per my email from [DATE] I am reaching out to you regarding my dissertation research study, *A study of characteristics, sustainability and the lifelines tethering Connecticut forensic social workers in the criminal and juvenile justice fields to the social work profession* that was approved on [DATE] by the University of Connecticut Institutional Review Board (IRB) process for protection of human subjects as an exempt study.

I would like to administer the survey to your staff at [AGENCY] and if you agree, please provide a letter stating that you give permission to me to administer my email survey to your staff. I outlined the protocol and the selection criteria below. I am hoping to start the process by the end of [DATE].

**Overview of Study and Materials**

**Population:**
Overview: Male and female respondents will be accepted into the study and a social work degree is preferred. Those without a social work degree will be not excluded from the study provided they are working in a social work-related position or have a social work background and are working in a criminal and/or juvenile justice process. Because of the degree and position requirement, the respondents will all be over the age of 18. A variety of ethnicities, age ranges and income levels will be included. Inclusion in this study will be based on working within the criminal and/or juvenile justice process (Judicial Branch, Executive Branch or Legislative Branch, private non-profit and for profit contracted agencies) in Connecticut who have a social work degree and/or are working in a social work position. There will be no exclusions based on gender, age or race, but the survey will only be provided in English.

**Specific selection criteria for [PROGRAM] units and programs are defined as:**

those working for the identified forensic programs within [PROGRAM] who have a social work degree AND those in the identified forensic programs who may not have a social work degree, but do have:

i. A social work-related position

Those positions may include any position with the following key words in the title:
- “social work(er)”
- “social service”
- “clinical” or “clinician”
- “ass ssment”
- “re-entry”
- “evaluation”
- “treatment”
- case managers
- caseworkers
- groupworkers

ii. those with a social work background as defined as:
   1. a social work student now or at some point
   2. experience that may lead the person to consider themselves a social worker

The potential respondent population includes not only degreed Social Workers but also those performing both macro (policy, planning, community organization, administration, research) and micro (direct service, case management, individual and group work) level social work in or related to Connecticut Criminal and Juvenile Justice processes. Because not all working in social work positions have degrees and not all those with social work degrees are working in social work “titled” positions, some of the target population may be “hidden”.

**Survey:**

This anonymous survey will take approximately 20 minutes. I have attached a hard PDF copy of the online Survey Monkey™ survey.

**Anonymity of Participants and Privacy of Agencies:**

The survey is electronic, anonymous and completely secure from me having any indication of who completed each survey. In addition, the results will be reported in my dissertation as aggregate data and will not be reported in a way that would identify any individual or agency. Finally, the survey is being distributed to an estimated forty five (45) state and non-profit agencies in Connecticut.

**Correspondence with Your Agency Staff:**

For everyone on staff at your site, the study includes an email to introduce the study, another email to provide the information and study link and then two (2) follow up email reminders. I will provide the email to a designated staff person at [AGENCY] on the evening before the planned distribution date for each of the above listed emails. The designated staff person would forward the email to your site staff list.

Below are the four emails I propose sending to your staff with possible dates that are dependent on [AGENCY] approval date.

**Correspondence 1: Introduction email explaining the study and that an email with the link is forthcoming (see pre-notice email language below).**

*A few days from now, you will receive, via your work email account, a request to fill out a survey for a dissertation research study being conducted by me, Jennie Albert. I am a doctoral student at the*
University of Connecticut School of Social Work. This study was approved by the University of Connecticut on [DATE] and your potential participation was approved by Director [name].

This anonymous survey concerns the experiences and beliefs of social workers and those working in social work-type positions in Connecticut whose work is related to the criminal and juvenile justice process. This research will help give those in this field a voice and an opportunity to share thoughts, feelings and recommendations that have the potential to impact the agencies involved, our social work and criminal justice education and the field itself.

I am writing in advance because I know that your time is valuable and advance notice may assist you in carving out time to take the survey. Even if you do not feel that the work you do falls within the parameters of this survey topic, please take the time to answer the first two questions. The survey will determine if you should answer the remainder of the questions or not.

Thank you for your time and consideration. It is only with the generous help of people like you that this research can be successful.

Thank you,

Jennie Albert
Social Work Doctoral Student

Correspondence 2: Email with study information (risks/rewards/anonymity/contact information etc.) and a link to the survey for all staff to take. The first two questions are screening questions and will identify staff who fall within the desired study population (see information sheet language and survey link email language below).

Study Information®
Principal Investigator: Eleanor Lyon, PhD Student: Jennie Albert, LCSW
Title of Study: A Study of Characteristics, Sustainability and the Lifelines Tethering Connecticut Forensic Social Workers in the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Fields to the Social Work Profession

You are invited to participate in this survey of Forensic social workers and those working in social work-type positions related to criminal and juvenile justice. I am a graduate student at the University of Connecticut, and I am conducting this survey as part of my requirements towards completion of a doctoral degree. I am interested in finding out about social workers working in the criminal justice and juvenile justice fields in Connecticut, their characteristics, their beliefs and their experiences. Your work and your thoughts are important!

Your participation in this study will require completion of the attached questionnaire. This should take approximately 45 minute minutes of your time. Your participation will be anonymous and you will not be contacted again in the future. You will not be paid for being in this study. This survey does not involve any risk to you. However, the benefits of your participation may impact society by helping increase knowledge about social workers who are working directly with criminal and juvenile justice populations and those who are influencing policy and administration.

You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to be. There will be no penalty if you choose not to participate or choose to stop the survey at any time. You do not have to answer any question that you do not want to answer for any reason. We will be happy to answer any questions you have about this study. If you have further questions about this project or if you have a research-related problem, you may contact me, Jennie Albert (the student) at 860-787-____ or my advisor, Dr. Eleanor Lyon at (203) ______. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant you may contact the University of Connecticut Institutional Review Board (IRB) at ______. The IRB is a group of people who review research studies to protect the rights and welfare of research participants.
Please complete the online survey by [DATE]. Thank you.

ACTIVE LINK WILL BE INCLUDED HERE

You may stop and re-enter the survey at any time to complete the survey by using the above link. Even if you do not feel you fit the population the study is seeking, please answer at least the first 1-2 questions and the survey will direct you to complete it or thank you for your time.

*This study was approved by the University of Connecticut on [DATE] and your potential participation was approved Director [Redacted].

Thank you,

Jennie Albert
Social Work Doctoral Student

Correspondence 3: Follow up reminder email thanking those who completed the survey and reminding those who have yet to complete it to please do so (see follow up email language below).

About two weeks ago, you received a cover letter email with a link to a survey entitled “A Survey of Connecticut Social Workers Working in the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Processes”.

If you have already completed the online survey, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please use the link provided in the previous email:

ACTIVE LINK WILL BE INCLUDED HERE AGAIN

You may stop and re-enter the survey at any time to complete the survey by using the above link. Even if you do not feel you fit the population the study is seeking, please answer at least the first 1-2 questions and the survey will direct you to complete it or thank you for your time.

I am especially grateful for your help because it is only by asking people like you to share your experiences that we can better understand more about the challenges and rewards of doing this work as well as the education, training and support necessary.

If you believe you did not receive the previous email cover letter and link to the survey, please feel free to contact me at jennie.albert@uconn.edu.

Thank you,

Jennie Albert
Social Work Doctoral Student

Correspondence 4: Final follow up reminder email thanking those who completed the survey and reminding those who have yet to complete it to please do so (see follow up email #2 language below).

About two weeks ago, you received a cover letter email with a link to a survey entitled “A Survey of Connecticut Social Workers Working in the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Processes”.
If you have already completed the online survey, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please use the link provided in the previous email:

ACTIVE LINK WILL BE INCLUDED HERE AGAIN

You may stop and re-enter the survey at any time to complete the survey by using the above link. Even if you do not feel you fit the population the study is seeking, please answer at least the first 1-2 questions and the survey will direct you to complete it or thank you for your time.

I am especially grateful for your help because it is only by asking people like you to share your experiences that we can better understand more about the challenges and rewards of doing this work as well as the education, training and support necessary.

If you believe you did not receive the previous email cover letter and link to the survey, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Thank you,

Jennie Albert
Social Work Doctoral Student

I hope I have provided you with enough information to consider my request and I hope to have the opportunity to speak to you soon. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jennie Albert
Social Work Doctoral Student
University of Connecticut School of Social Work
Appendix F

Contact Materials Sent to Potential Respondents

First of Four Emails to Potential Respondents

[DATE]

[NAME]
[AGENCY]
[ADDRESS 1]
[ADDRESS 2]

A few days from now you will receive, via your work email account, a request to fill out a survey for a dissertation research study being conducted by me, Jennie Albert. I am a doctoral student at the University of Connecticut School of Social Work. This study was approved by the University of Connecticut and your potential participation was approved by [Director's Name], Director of [Agency Name].

This anonymous survey concerns the experiences and beliefs of social workers and those working in social worker-type positions in Connecticut whose work is related to the criminal and juvenile justice process. This research will help give those in this field a voice and an opportunity to share thoughts, feelings and recommendations that have the potential to impact the agencies involved, our social work and criminal justice education and the field itself.

I am writing in advance because I know that your time is valuable and advance notice may assist you in carving out time to take the 45 minute survey. Even if you do not feel that the work you do falls within the parameters of this survey topic, please take the time to answer the first two questions. The survey will determine if you should answer the remainder of the questions or not.

Thank you for your time and consideration. It is only with the generous help of people like you that this research can be successful.

Sincerely,

Jennie Albert
Social Work Doctoral Student
Second of Four Emails to Potential Respondents

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
School of Social Work

Jennie Albert, LCSW
1798 Asylum Avenue
West Hartford, Connecticut 06117-2698

[DATE]

[NAME]
[AGENCY]
[ADDRESS 1]
[ADDRESS 2]

RE: Criminal and Juvenile Justice Survey for Social Work

A few days ago you received an email from me alerting you to today’s email and survey link. Today I am asking for your help with a study of degreed social workers and those doing social work-type work (from case management to grants and community organization) that is related to criminal and juvenile justice processes in Connecticut. This study aims to learn more about those doing this work, their experiences, their education, feelings and beliefs and suggestions.

Results from the survey may contribute to the understanding of this work here in Connecticut in a way that has never been done. By learning from you and your colleagues in various agencies around the state, this study may positively impact the training, support, education and policies that impact social work in criminal and juvenile justice processes in Connecticut.

This survey will take approximately 45 minutes and begins with two screening questions that will determine if you should complete the survey. Even if you suspect you may not fall in to the groups of staff for whom this survey is intended, please complete the initial screening questions. You may be surprised!

Your answers are completely confidential and will be released only as summaries in which no individual’s answers can be identified. When you complete your online survey, your name will not be linked to your survey responses. Although Director [REDACTED] from [REDACTED] has approved each employee’s participation in this survey during work hours, you may feel more comfortable forwarding the survey email and link to a personal email address to complete the survey outside of work. This survey is voluntary. If you choose not to complete this survey you will not encounter any negative consequences. At any time during the survey, if you feel the need to stop the survey, you can.

I sincerely hope you will choose to complete the survey because your valuable information will provide insight into an important, though never before studied, group of people who greatly impact our criminal and juvenile justice processes every day. Please use the following link:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/surveyofconnecticutforensicsocialworkers

Thank you for your time and consideration. It is only with the generous help of people like you that this research can be successful.

Sincerely,

Jennie Albert
Social Work Doctoral Student
Language Included in Email Contact Number 2 for Researcher’s Agency

It is important that you know, as an employee of the Connecticut Division of Public Defender Services, that this study is being conducted by an employee of your agency who may potentially be able to identify you based on demographic and employment information gathered within this survey. Your identity and your responses will remain anonymous and may only be known to this researcher. Your responses will be aggregated with other responses during analysis so as not to identify you or any other participants. It is your choice whether or not to participate in this study by completing and returning this survey.
Third of Four Emails to Potential Respondents

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
School of Social Work

[DATE]

[NAME]
[AGENCY]
[ADDRESS 1]
[ADDRESS 2]

RE: Follow-Up on Criminal and Juvenile Justice Survey for Social Work

Last week a cover letter and link to a survey entitled “A Survey of Connecticut Social Workers Working in the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Processes”.

If you have already completed the online survey, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please use the link provided in the [DATE] email:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/surveyofconnecticutforensicsocialworkers

I am especially grateful for your help because it is only by asking people like you to share your experiences that we can better understand more about the challenges and rewards of doing this work as well as the education, training and support necessary.

If you believe you did not receive the previous email cover letter and link to the survey, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

Jennie Albert
Social Work Doctoral Student
Fourth of Four Emails to Potential Respondents

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
School of Social Work

[DATE]

[NAME]
[AGENCY]
[ADDRESS 1]
[ADDRESS 2]

RE: Final Follow-Up on Criminal and Juvenile Justice Survey for Social Work

A couple of weeks ago a cover letter and link to a survey entitled “A Survey of Connecticut Social Workers Working in the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Processes”.

If you have already completed the online survey, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please use the link provided in the [DATE] email:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/surveyofconnecticutforensicsocialworkers

I am especially grateful for your help because it is only by asking people like you to share your experiences that we can better understand more about the challenges and rewards of doing this work as well as the education, training and support necessary.

If you believe you did not receive the previous email cover letter and link to the survey, please feel free to contact me at [REDACTED]

Sincerely,

Jennie Albert
Social Work Doctoral Student
Appendix G

National Conference of Charities and Corrections (NCCC) Forensic Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>List of Forensic Topics with Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment in prisons (Woodbury, 1879 and Young, 1883)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative reform (Brinkerhoff, 1880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research (Brinkerhoff, 1880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics (Brinkerhoff, 1880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-entry (Brinkerhoff, 1880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional education (Brinkerhoff, 1880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families of prisoners (Brinkerhoff, 1880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humane treatment (Brinkerhoff, 1880) Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reinvestment (Brinkerhoff, 1880) Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>penalty abolition (Lord, 1880) Suspended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentences (Spalding, 1880) Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corrections (Spalding, 1880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-responsive diversion (Spalding, 1880)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court room advocates (Devoll, 1881)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative to incarceration plans (Devoll, 1881)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sample Characteristics (N=384)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Characteristics</th>
<th>n=</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0-$9,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000-$19,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-$29,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-$39,999</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-$49,999</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-$59,999</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000-$69,999</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000-$79,999</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000-$89,999</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000-$99,000</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 or more</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highest Level of School Completed/Highest Degree Received</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Degree or Equivalent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College but no Degree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Auspice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Profit, 501(c )3 agency</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary, delivers services for profit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of Settings in Which Respondents Currently Work (all that apply)</strong></td>
<td>384*1</td>
<td>0 missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigation/Arrest</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Pretrial</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Sentencing</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretrial Diversion Programming</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Facility (Adults) as Employee of DOC</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Facility (Adults) as Employee of a Managed Care Provider</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detention Facility (Juveniles)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Probation</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Probation</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parole</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halfway House</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Assembly (Legislature)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Branch</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 *Total n does not equal the sum of the categories for those questions in which respondent can choose all that apply.
Types of Activities in Area of Criminal and/or Juvenile Justice (all that apply) & 384* & 0 missing \\
Administration & 61 & 16% \\
Legislative Activities & 15 & 4% \\
Research & 19 & 5% \\
Grants & 13 & 3.4% \\
Policy Development & 35 & 9.1% \\
Direct Clinical Practice (individual, group or family therapy) & 89 & 23% \\
Case Management (client supervision, assessment/planning, etc.) & 309 & 80.5% \\

Populations with Which Respondents Currently Work (all that apply) & 380* & 4 missing \\
Males & 347 & 91.3% \\
Females & 322 & 84.7% \\
Adults & 291 & 76.6% \\
Juveniles & 276 & 72.4% \\
Offenders/those charged with offenses & 203 & 51.3% \\
Victims of crime & 196 & 49.3% \\
Families of offenders/those charged with offenses & 149 & 39.2% \\
Families of victims of crime & 138 & 36.6% \\
Communities or community groups & 119 & 31.3% \\
Constituents (voters, taxpayers, etc.) & 40 & 10.6% \\
Researchers & 34 & 8.9% \\

Believe Forensic Social Work is a Distinct Practice Area of Social Work & 377 & 7 missing \\
Yes & 286 & 75.9% \\
No & 91 & 24.1% \\

Desired a Social Work Career in Area of CJ and/or JJ at Some Point During Education & 381 & 3 missing \\
Yes & 203 & 53.3% \\
No & 178 & 46.7% \\

Had a Mentor from the Field of CJ and/or JJ & 367 & 17 missing \\
Yes & 150 & 40.9% \\
No & 217 & 59.1% \\

Provided Clinical Supervision & 346 & 38 missing \\
Yes & 92 & 26.6% \\
No & 254 & 73.4% \\

Received Clinical Supervision & 351 & 33 missing \\
Yes & 149 & 42.5% \\
No & 202 & 57.5% \\

Attended Training Sponsored within Agency on Topic of Social Work & 355 & 29 missing \\
Yes & 241 & 67.9% \\
No & 114 & 32.1% \\

Attended Training/Conference Outside of Work paid by Agency on Topic of SW & 349 & 35 missing \\
Yes & 191 & 54.7%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political Interest Level in Connecticut</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>19 missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally uninterested in state or local politics</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes vote in Connecticut elections</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote in most Connecticut elections</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively campaign for candidates and social issues in Connecticut</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have run for office in Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Interest Level in CJ and/or JJ Issues in Connecticut</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>20 missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totally uninterested in any politics related to CJ and/or JJ issues</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes follow politics related to CJ and/or JJ issues</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closely follow politics related to CJ and/or JJ issues</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively campaign for candidates and social issues related to CJ and/or JJ</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have run for office based on platforms that include CJ and/or JJ issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Identity (all that apply)</td>
<td>351*</td>
<td>33 missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestantism</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholicism</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christianity</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judaism</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhism</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter/Non-denominational</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Religion</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Relationship Status</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>29 missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a domestic partnership or civil union</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, but cohabitating with a significant other</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single, never married</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>46 missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Caucasian</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Multiple Races</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>53 missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican-American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Count (N)</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuban-American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino Group</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Multiple Spanish/Hispanic/Latino Groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>18 missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>45 missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Time Working in the Field of Social Work</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>200 missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Time working as a Social Worker in Criminal and/or Juvenile Justice Field</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>194 missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of Time at Current Place of Employment</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>156 missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment over Previous Three Years (Stability)</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>12 missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changed employers more than twice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed employers once or twice</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked for same employer &gt; three years</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I

Forensic Social Work Educational Examples

Examples of Forensic Social Work Certificate Programs, Concentrations, and Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Number of Credits</th>
<th>Course Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long Island University ²</td>
<td>New York State Advanced certificate in</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>- Introduction to Criminalistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forensic Social Work Concentration</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Forensic Social Work &amp; the Criminal &amp; Juvenile Justice System Interviewing,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluating, &amp; Offering Treatment as a Forensic Social Worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Forensic Social Work with Drug &amp; Alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Populations in the Criminal &amp; Juvenile Justice Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Forensic Social Work &amp; Domestic Violence – Legal, Cultural, Ethnic, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Religious Issues in the Criminal &amp; Juvenile Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>Certificate in Forensic Social Work</td>
<td>112 hours (45 CEUs)</td>
<td>- Social Work and Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Social Work³</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Clinical Forensic Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Seminar in Ethics and Advanced Forensic Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Skills Lab: Documentation and Testimony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Field/Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nevada Las</td>
<td>Advanced Graduate Forensic Social Work</td>
<td>9-12 Credits (Post</td>
<td>- Introduction to Forensic Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegas (UNLV)</td>
<td>Certificate Program</td>
<td>Master’s Degree)</td>
<td>- Legal and Ethical Issues in Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Seminar in Criminal Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Seminar in Family Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Skills Lab in Forensic Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Field Practicum - Forensic Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Professional Presentation - Forensic Social Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Capstone to Forensic Social Work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### University of Massachusetts Boston (UMASS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>All of the following</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Forensic Services Graduate Certificate | 16 | - Counseling Theory and Practice I  
- Forensic Psychology  
- Field Experience Project |

### University of Utah, School of Social Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>One of the following</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Forensic Social Work Concentration | 6 Core Credit Hours | - Diversity and Social Justice: Reflexive & Ethical Social Work Practice I & II  
- Forensic Practice I: Theory & Direct Practice  
- Forensic Practice II: Evidence-Based Practice Models  
- Advanced Field Practicum I & II |

### Aurora University, Aurora, IL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Single Courses:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Specialization in Forensic Social Work | 9 | - Forensic Social Work  
- Social Work with Vulnerable Children and Families  
- Mediation |

---

**Single Courses:**

**Fordham University** *Forensic Social Work Practice*

“The course prepares social workers to practice at the intersection of social work, public health, and the legal system in order to tackle contemporary social problems, such as health disparities and mass incarceration. Course participants learn and apply a human rights legal framework and social justice and empowerment theories to guide multilevel prevention, assessment, and interventions with historically underserved individuals, families, and communities.

---

5 [https://www.umb.edu/academics/caps/certificates/forensicservices/courses#courses](https://www.umb.edu/academics/caps/certificates/forensicservices/courses#courses)
6 [https://socialwork.utah.edu/academics-resources/msw/msw-program-2nd-year-concentrations/forensic-social-work/](https://socialwork.utah.edu/academics-resources/msw/msw-program-2nd-year-concentrations/forensic-social-work/)
7 [https://aurora.edu/academics/graduate/social-work/requirements.html#WrQ6JuTfP4h](https://aurora.edu/academics/graduate/social-work/requirements.html#WrQ6JuTfP4h)
8 [https://www.fordham.edu/info/20357/master_of_social_work/571/msw_courses](https://www.fordham.edu/info/20357/master_of_social_work/571/msw_courses)
Course participants also are exposed to innovative practice, research, and advocacy solutions that address the psychosocial determinants of health, well-being, and legal/justice involvement. The course also offers unique opportunities action projects and to participate in field visits to innovative local and global organizations that advance human rights and caring justice.”

**University of Buffalo Forensic Social Work Course (3 credits)**

“Forensic social work is defined as social work practice in various criminal justice arenas, at the macro, mezzo and micro levels, with a particular emphasis on working with forms of serious violence. This elective course will introduce concepts, principles and skills of forensic social work practice with individuals, families and groups affected by criminal justice involvement. Criminal justice system components such as police, parole, probation, courts and jails/prisons will be identified and discussed in terms of function, funding and public support. This course offers students an opportunity to define forms of violence, to understand differing etiologies of violence and to develop skills in planning interventions at the micro, mezzo and macro levels. The social work role in assessing and intervening in jails, clinics, hospitals and communities will be highlighted. Major psychopathological pathways to violence will be identified and discussed in the context and role of risk management and safety planning.”

---

9 [https://socialwork.buffalo.edu/education/master-of-social-work-msw/clinical-course-list/host.html/content/shared/socialwork/home/course-descriptions/advanced/elective/sw556.detail.html](https://socialwork.buffalo.edu/education/master-of-social-work-msw/clinical-course-list/host.html/content/shared/socialwork/home/course-descriptions/advanced/elective/sw556.detail.html)