Correctional Officer Job Stress

The Influence of Perceived Occupational Prestige

by

Samuel Gregory Vickovic

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree Doctor of Philosophy

Approved April 2015 by the Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Marie L. Griffin, Chair John R. Hepburn Michael D. White Henry F. Fradella

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2015

## ABSTRACT

More than 450,000 people work in public and private correctional institutions in the United States, collectively supervising over 2.2 million jail and prison inmates. The nature of correctional officers' work exposes them to numerous stressors which can have harmful effects on their health and their job performance. Several studies have examined the significance of environmental factors on work outcomes among prison staff. Less attention has been paid to external stressors such as negative images of correctional officers held by the community and correctional officers' perception of their own occupational prestige. This is an important omission considering the negative stereotypes associated with correctional officers and the tendency for media and entertainment outlets to perpetuate these stereotypes. The aim of this dissertation is to examine how perceived occupational prestige among correctional officers influences job stress. Specifically, the perceived occupational prestige associated with family and friends, the general public, and the media are assessed. To do so, the study employs multivariate analyses of data from a survey of 641 correctional officers employed in one Western prison system to examine the impact of perceived occupational prestige on an attitudinal and health measure of job stress. First, correctional officers believe that friends and family hold the most positive opinions about their profession, while the media has the most negative. Second, perceived occupational prestige among correctional officers does not appear to be a significant stressor, except for perceived occupational prestige associated with the media when predicting health job stress. Finally, when possible mediating variables are assessed for officers that had tenure longer than nine years perceived occupational prestige associated with the media has a significant effect on attitudinal and health job

i

stress. In addition, for officers who identified themselves as non-White perceived occupational prestige associated with family and friends is a significant predictor of attitudinal job stress and perceived occupational prestige associated with the general public is a significant predictor of health job stress. This study concludes with a summary of these findings as well as its key limitations, and offers insight into potential policy implications and avenues of future research.

## DEDICATION

The time and energy that went into this process is dedicated to my amazing mother and the memory of my father. I would have never made it to this level in my academic career if it were not for the love and support of my parents. Words cannot express how much I love and appreciate you.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First, I would like to thank Dr. Marie Griffin, my committee chair, and Dr. John Hepburn for taking so much time to assist me throughout this long process. I am still in awe of how much time and effort you put into helping me and ensuring that I fully benefited from this process. I would also like to thank Dr. Henry Fradella and Dr. Michael White for being a part of my dissertation committee and offering support and guidance.

I would like to thank Weston Morrow, Lisa Dario, Matt Larson, and John Shjarback for always being there to answer my questions, but more importantly to have a good laugh. I would like to recognize all of my good friends who kept me sane and provided an outlet from the academic world. My brother will never know how much he has meant to me throughout my life, and especially my time as a graduate student and I am forever grateful to have him in my life. My amazing girlfriend Kaytie was there for me every step of the way and I cannot thank her enough for her support.

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
Stress Defined	8
Correctional Officers and Stress Measurements	10
Consequences of Stress	13
Emotional Responses to Stress	13
Behavioral Responses to Stress	14
Turnover, Turnover Intent, and Absenteeism	14
Obesity and Substance Abuse	15
Psychological Responses to Stress	16
Physiological and Health Responses to Stress	17
Causes of Stress	17
Individual Characteristics of Officers	17
Organizational Characteristics	20
Job Danger	20
Role Strain	23
Social Support	25
Supervisory Support	26

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAI	PTER	Page
	Organizational Support	27
	External Sources of Stress	28
	Work-Family Conflict	28
	External Support	30
	Summary	31
3	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	33
	Occupational Prestige	33
	Media Portrayals of Correctional Officers	34
	Occupational Prestige of Correctional Officers	35
	Research Questions and Hypotheses	
4	METHOD	44
	Subjects and Procedures	44
	The Sample	45
	Measurement	46
	Independent Variables	47
	Dependent Variables	49
	Control Variables	50
	Role Strain	51
	Percieved Danger	51
	Work-Family Conflict	52
	Quality of Supervision	53
	Organizational Support	53

CHAPTER	Page
Socio-Demographic Varaibles	54
Data Anlaysis	55
5 RESULTS	56
Bivariate Anlaysis	56
Individual-Level Variables	56
Work Environemnt Variables	56
Key Independent Variables	57
Dependent Variables	58
Summary	58
Social Distance Comparison	59
Multivariate Analysis	60
Stepwise Regression of Attitudinal Stress on the Key Independ	ent
Variables, Work environment Variables, and Individual Level	
Varaibles	60
Stepwise Regression of Health Stress on the Key Independent	
Variables, Work Environemnt Variables, and Individual Level	
Variables	63
Summary	65
Stepwise Regression of Attitudinal and Health Stress on POP	
Variables by Level of Quality of Supervision	66
Stepwise Regression of Attitudinal and Health Stress on POP	
Variables by Level of Organizatioanl Support	68

	Regression by Attitudinal and Health Job Stress on POP Variables b	уy
	Individual-Level Variables	69
	Summary	71
6	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	74
	Social Distance of POP	75
	The Influence of Individual-Level Predictors and Work Stress	76
	The Relationship Between POP Domains and Work Stress	77
	Assesment of Conditioning Effects Regarding the Relationship Betwee	en
	POP and Work Stress	80
	The Influence of Quality of Supervision, Organizational Support, Role	<b>,</b>
	Strain, Percieved Danger, and Work-Family Conflict	82
	Limitations	85
	Conclusions	87
	Policy Implications	88
	Future Research	93
REFE	ENCES	97
AITE		- -
A	SUKVEY INSIKUMENII.	55
В	COVER LETTER 13	38

# LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page	
1.	A Comparison of the Sample to the Population, by Prison Complex, on Select	
	Socio-Demographic Characteristics of the Population	
2.	Scale Information	
3.	Descriptive Statistics for All Variables Included in the Model 121	
4.	Correlation Matrix (Perason's r) for Individual-Level Variables Included in	
	Multivariate Analysis	
5.	Correlation Matrix (Perason's r) for Key Independent and Control Variables	
	Included in Multivariate Analysis	
6.	POP and Social Distance	
7.	Regression Analysis Summary Table for Stepwise Regression of Attitudinal Job	
	Stress on POP Varaibles, Work Environment Variables, and Individual-Level	
	Varaibles	
8.	Regression Analysis Summary Table for Stepwise Regression of Health Job	
	Stress on POP Varaibles, Work Environment Variables, and Individual-Level	
	Varaibles	
9.	Regression Analysis Summary Table for Stepwise Regression of Attitudinal Job	
	Stress on POP Varaibles, Work Environment Variables, and Individual-Level	
	Varaibles by Level of Quality of Supervision	
10.	Regression Analysis Summary Table for Stepwise Regression of Health Job	
	Stress on POP Varaibles, Work Environment Variables, and Individual-Level	
	Varaibles by Level of Quality of Supervision	

11.	Regression Analysis Summary Table for Stepwise Regression of Attitudinal Job
	Stress on POP Varaibles, Work Environment Variables, and Individual-Level
	Varaibles by Level of Organizational Support
12.	Regression Analysis Summary Table for Stepwise Regression of Health Job
	Stress on POP Varaibles, Work Environment Variables, and Individual-Level
	Varaibles by Level of Organizational Support
13.	Regression Analysis Summary Table for Regression of Attitudinal and Health
	Job Stress on POP Varaibles, Work Environment Variables, and Individual-
	Level Varaibles by Age
14.	Regression Analysis Summary Table for Regression of Attitudinal and Health
	Job Stress on POP Varaibles, Work Environment Variables, and Individual-
	Level Varaibles by Tenure
15.	Regression Analysis Summary Table for Regression of Attitudinal and Health
	Job Stress on POP Varaibles, Work Environment Variables, and Individual-
	Level Varaibles by Race/Ethnicity
16.	Regression Analysis Summary Table for Regression of Attitudinal and Health
	Job Stress on POP Varaibles, Work Environment Variables, and Individual-
	Level Varaibles by Education
17.	Regression Analysis Summary Table for Regression of Attitudinal and Health
	Job Stress on POP Varaibles, Work Environment Variables, and Individual-

# LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
1.	Sources of Stress	119

#### **CHAPTER 1**

## **INTRODUCTION**

"Correctional officers can always count on four things: being understaffed, unprotected, underpaid, and underappreciated." (Glenn, 2001, p. xii)

With a nearly 400 percent increase in the number of persons incarcerated in the U.S. over the past thirty years, today there are nearly 450,000 persons working as correctional and detention officers in U.S. jails and prisons (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013; Sabol, West, & Cooper, 2009). State spending on corrections is approaching 50 billion dollars annually (The Pew Center of the States, 2008) and three-fourths of that amount is budgeted to cover the costs of the security staff, or correctional officers charged with maintaining order and control in state prisons (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2013; Camp & Lambert, 2006).

Correctional officers are responsible for maintaining a safe and secure environment for both inmates and staff. Officers are the most important resource necessary for accomplishing the goals and objectives of the institution (Archambeault & Archambeault, 1982; Lambert et al., 2009). Correctional officers work in a coercive environment (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Griffin, 2001) and their work has been characterized as demanding, dangerous, and dirty (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000; Tartaro, 2002; Tracy, 2004; Tracy & Scott, 2006). Brodsky (1982) suggested that any organization that is responsible for containing an unwilling population will be an organization under stress. Due to the distinctive and stressful work environment experienced by correctional officers, this unique workplace has received considerable attention from correctional scholars (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Auerbach, Quick, & Pegg, 2003; Garland, Hogan, & Lambert, 2013; Lambert et al., 2009). Stress refers to the outcome experienced when an individual is subject to environmental conditions that place special physical and/or psychological demands on the individual (Sulsky & Smith, 2005). Within the correctional officer literature, researchers focus on job stress which is the response to work-related stressors such as perceived danger and inter-personal relations (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Research suggests that correctional officers have high levels of stress (Auerbach, et al., 2003; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1986), and they are more stressed relative to other occupations (including police officers) (Bourbonnais, Malenfant, Vezina, Jauvin, & Brisson, 2005; Harenstam, Palm, & Theorell, 1988; Johnson et al., 2005; Lasky, Gordon, Strebalus, 1986; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986; Patterson, 1992).

Stress has received a great deal of attention due to the negative outcomes associated with stress (American Psychological Association, 2009; Sulsky & Smith, 2005). Research on correctional officer job stress suggests that increased job stress results in decreased levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and increased job burnout (Balu, Light & Chamlin, 1986; Garner, knight, & Simpson, 2007; Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker-Gail, & Baker, 2010; Hogan, Lambert, & Griffin, 2013; Hogan, Lambert, Jenkins & Hall, 2009; Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007; Lambert, 2004; Lambert & Hogan, 2004; Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd, 1997; Van Voorhis, Cullen, Link, & Wolfe, 1991; Walters, 1992; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1986). Correctional officers who are satisfied, committed to the organization, and are not burned out experience increased job performance, prosocial organizational behavior, increased

human service orientation, and decreased turnover intent (Culliver, Sigler, & McNeely, 1991; Garland, 2002; Hepburn & Knepper, 1993; Kerce, Magnusson, & Rudolph, 1994; Lambert, Hogan, & Griffin, 2008; Lambert, Hogan, Paoline, & Baker, 2005; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Neveu, 2007; Robinson, Porporino, & Simourd, 1992; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000). In addition to possible negative work-related outcomes, stress has been associated with negative medical, psychological, and behavioral conditions such as depression, hypertension, and turnover (Bierie, 2012; Cheek, 1984; Cheek & Miller, 1983; Denhof & Spinaris, 2013; Ferraro, Faghri, Henning, & Chermiack, 2013; Ghaddar, Mateo, & Sanchez, 2008; Harenstam et al., 1988; Morse, Dussetchleger, Warren, & Cherniack, 2011; New Jersey Police Task Force Report, 2009; Samak, 2003; Spinaris, Denhof, and Kellway, 2012; Stack & Tsoudis, 1997; Webster, Porritt, & Brennan, 1983; Weir, Stewart, & Morris, 2012).

Considering the harmful effects of job stress, it is important to understand the causes of job stress. Among correctional officers and correctional staff, role conflict, role ambiguity, perceptions of danger, work-family conflict, organizational support, and quality of supervision are among the strongest predictors of job stress (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Cheek & Miller, 1983; Cullen, Link, Wolfe, & Frank, 1985; Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Griffin, 2006; Grossi, Keil, & Vito, 1996; Hartley, Davila, Marquart, & Mullings, 2013; Jurik & Halemba, 1984; Keinen & Malach-Pines, 2007; Lambert & Hogan, 2009, 2010; Lambert, Hogan, & Griffin, 2007; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000; Shamir & Drory, 1982; Triplett, Mullings, & Scarborough, 1996; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). In addition, several other predictors of stress among correctional officers have been highlighted, including the demands of daily contact with

inmates, low pay and low promotional opportunities, lack of job autonomy, the conflicts between security and treatment orientations, negative perceptions of inmates, officer's perceived level of professionalism, organizational innovation, adequacy of training, questions of distributive and procedural justice, and the physical environment (extreme heat or cold, intrusive noise, little privacy, dilapidation of structures) (Bierie, 2012; Castle & Martin, 2006; Cheek & Miller, 1983; Cullen et al., 1985; Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Finn, 1998; Lambert & Hogan, 2010a; Lambert, Hogan, & Allen, 2006; Lambert & Paoline, 2008; Misis, Cheeseman, Hogan, & Lambert, 2013; Paoline & Lambert, 2011; Robinson et al., 1997; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000; Slate & Vogel, 1997; Stohr, Self, & Lovrich, 1992; Tewksbury & Higgins, 2006).

The absence of social support also may become a stressor. Supervisory support, co-worker support, and organizational support have been highlighted in the correctional officer stress literature (Cullen et al., 1985; Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001; Misis et al., 2013; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000; Van Voorhis, 1991), but there has been much less attention concerning the effect of support from outside the work environment on officer stress levels. This external support typically is explored in terms of support from the family and the community. In addition, research has examined negative public image as a measure of a lack of support that originates when a profession experiences low levels of occupational prestige within the general public and the media. Support from the community and family has been shown to decrease job stress among correctional officers (Cullen et al., 1985; Shamir & Drory, 1982). Studies of correctional officers employed outside of the United States suggest that a perceived negative public image is a significant predictor of job stress, as well as low job satisfaction and job

burnout (Drory & Shamir, 1988; Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007; Moon & Maxwell, 2004; Shamir & Drory, 1982). Occupational prestige refers to the status, power, quality of work, education, and income associated with one's profession (Coxon & Jones, 1978; Treiman, 1977). The public often stereotypes correctional officers as lazy, sexually deviant, brutal, aggressive, and uncaring (Brodsky, 1982; Cheek & Miller, 1982; Cheek & Miller, 1983; Conover, 2001; Freeman, 1998; Johnson, 2002; Kauffman, 1988; Tracy, 2004). Correctional officers are conscious of these stigmas and reference the fact that they are often seen as "the scum of law enforcement" and "glorified babysitters" (Tracy, 2004; Tracy & Scott, 2006). In addition, they work in an environment that is associated with dirty, unfavorable conditions with their primary role of supervising a stigmatized inmate population (Tracy, 2004; Tracy & Scott, 2006). These negative qualities associated with their work are often projected upon the workers themselves (Goffman, 1963). As a result, correctional officers may perceive low occupational prestige which subsequently may act as a stressor.

The problem of low levels of perceived occupational prestige is exacerbated by the fact that the operations and daily life of those working and housed in correctional institutions are hidden from society (Brodsky, 1982; Foucalt, 1977; Garland, 1990; Sussman, 2002; Brower, 2013). This leads to a situation of increased social distance wherein correctional officers are unable to portray a different professional image through interaction and visibility among the public. As a result, most information that the public receives concerning correctional officers is through the media which too often perpetuates the negative stereotypes of correctional officers (Bennett, 2006; Brower, 2013; Cecil & Leitner, 2009; Finn, 1998; Freeman, 1998; Johnson, 2002; Johnson &

Price, 1981; Kantrowitz, 1996; Levan, Polzeret, & Downing, 2011; Levenson, 2001; May, 1976; Meiners, 2007; Morgan, 2009; Smith, 1994; Van Fleet, 1992; Zaner, 1989). Research suggests that the news media and cinematic representations overwhelmingly portray correctional officers negatively (Bennett, 2006; Bennet & Satre, 2000; Freeman, 1998; Kantrowitz, 1996; Vickovic, Griffin, & Fradella, 2013; Zaner, 1989). Although media depictions are negative, those who are close to correctional officers (e.g. family and friends) have a better understanding of the role of a correctional officer and a realization of the inaccurate negative stereotypes perpetuated by the media. Research suggests that opinions are influenced by familiarity with the subject (Anagnostopoulos & Hantzi, 2011; Corrigan, Edwards, Green, Diwan, & Penn, 2001; Holmes, Corrigan, Williams, Canar, & Kubiak, 1999), and that there is significant variation in the influence of individuals and groups on factors such as opinions and behaviors depending on social distance and contact with the individual (Glynn & Park, 1997; Krassa, 1988; Oshagen, 1996; Perkins, 2002; Shibutani, 1955). As such, social distance from correctional officers may influence opinions regarding their profession.

Although there has been extensive research on the causes of work stress among correctional officers, much has focused on how the work environment influences stress; consideration of how the perceived prestige of the job (or lack thereof) may influence stress remains relatively unexplored. The closed nature of prisons and the negative depictions of correctional officers in news and entertainment media may serve to aggravate low perceived prestige among correctional officers. The purpose of this study is to assess the relationship between perceived occupational prestige and correctional officer stress, as well as how perceived beliefs of different audiences (family and friends,

neighbors and townspeople, general public, and media) influence correctional officer stress. The perceived occupational prestige associated with these different audiences is examined in order to assess the relationship between perceived occupational prestige of certain groups (e.g. family and friends or general public) and stress. Furthermore, this study assesses what factors may moderate the relationship between low perceived occupational prestige and job stress.

#### CHAPTER 2

## **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

### **STRESS DEFINED**

Stress is a term that is commonly used to refer to a multitude of experiences in a variety of contexts, ranging from technical biomedical discussions, to conversations regarding daily life events. As a result, the term stress varies across different disciplines and is conceptualized and defined in a variety of ways (Sulsky & Smith, 2005). Matteson and Ivancevich (1987) highlighted the fact that the word stress has so many meanings to different individuals that it has been described as the most imprecise term in the Scientific Dictionary. The formal use of the term stress to reference negative responses to life events dates back to the early 1900s (Abbott, 1990). Early work concerning the study of stress was conducted by endocrinologists and was not used regularly in mainstream literature until the 1950s when it was made popular by Hans Selye's (1956) work (see also Baum, Grunberg, & Singer, 1982; Cannon, 1936).

Stress has been broken down into stimulus definitions which focus on an event or situation (stressor) in the environment that causes a disruptive experience (Cooper & Marshall, 1976; Sulsky & Smith, 2005). Others have focused on response definitions that highlight the reaction the individual has to the stressor. Medical and biological perspectives on stress use this definition due to a primary interest in the reaction of the individual (Selye, 1956; Sulsky & Smith, 2005). The most common definition describes stress as a process that starts with an individual perceiving an event or environment as threatening or traumatic (Baum et al., 1982; Lazarus, 1966). Once an individual perceives a stressor, the elicited stress response comes in many forms including

physiological, psychological, cognitive, behavioral, and emotional (Lazarus, 1966; Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987). A more general definition describes stress as "any circumstance (stressor) that places special physical and/or psychological demands on an organism leading to physiological, psychological, and behavioral outcomes" (Sulsky & Smith, 2005, p. 6). Although there is some agreement on a general definition of stress, scholars emphasize the fact that there needs to be considerable effort to reach a standard definition of stress for the purpose of ongoing research on stress and its effects (Abbott, 1990; Baum et al., 1982; Sulsky and Smith, 2005).

Ivancevich and Matteson (1980) identified a measurement of stress that incorporated two categories: a medical research approach and a behavioral science approach. The medical research approach requires participants to be subjected to laboratory tests and medical examinations performed to measure stress. Within this approach, psycho-physiological measures are taken which typically assess arousal or activation associated with the sympathetic nervous system. An example of a common psycho-physiological measurement is blood pressure (Baum et al., 1982; Sulsky & Smith, 2005). In addition, stress researchers include biochemical measures that assess how stressors influence endocrine function (Selye, 1956).

The behavioral science approach also involves the collection of data from a subject, but often involves self-report measures (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1980). Behavioral approach self-report measures generally assess the affective, somatic, and cognitive aspects of perceived stress (Sulsky & Smith, 2005). These measures may be collected using interviews, but structured questionnaires have been the most widely used data collection technique (Sulsky & Smith, 2005). These measures are used to examine

different types of traumatic events that can lead to stress. Behavioral or performance based measures also are used to assess the effects of stress on an individual. These assessments measure how stressors influence actual behavior in a laboratory environment or field study (Baum et al., 1982; Sulsky & Smith, 2005).

## **CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS AND STRESS MEASUREMENTS**

A large body of research concerning correctional officer stress examines the unique working conditions associated with the job (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Auerbach et al., 2003; Garland et al., 2013; Lambert et al., 2009). This body of literature focuses more specifically on job stress. Job or work stress is the response to work-related stressors, which can range from environmental factors to inter-personal relations and contacts that are associated with one's job (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). The consequences of job stress can be physiological, psychological, cognitive, or emotional (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987). Much like the broader research on stress, the literature concerning correctional officers and job stress suffers from a lack of consensus concerning the definition of stress (Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Huckabee, 1992). The most common measure used is one put forth by Cullen et al. (1985) (Dowden & Tellier, 2004) incorporating the notion that the two major dimensions of job stress are stimuli (stressors) and responses (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987). According to Cullen et al. (1985), job stressors are "the conditions which place excessive or unusual demands on a person and are capable of engendering psychological discomfort (that is stress), physiological pathology, and/or social disability" (p. 507).

The majority of studies exploring job stress among correctional officers used selfreport questionnaires to assess attitudinal measures of workplace stress through scales that use Likert-type responses to statements and questions (see Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Cullen et al., 1985 Griffin, 2006a; Griffin et al., 2010; Grossi et al., 1996; Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986; Lambert et al., 2009; Lambert & Hogan, 2009; 2010a; Lambert, Hogan, Allen, 2006; Lambert, Hogan, Altheimer, & Wareham, 2010; Lambert, Hogan, & Griffin, 2007; Lambert, Hogan, Paoline, & Clarke, 2005; Lambert, Jiang, & Hogan, 2008; Lambert & Paoline, 2005, 2008; Misis et al., 2013; Moon & Maxwell, 2004; Shamir & Drory, 1982; Tewksbury & Higgins, 2006). An example of a typical question included in these scales is, "When I'm at work, I often feel tense or uptight" (Crank, Regoli, Hewitt, & Culbertson, 1995, p. 169).

Some studies included a "life stress" scale that assesses forms of stress generally encountered throughout everyday life. These scales assess symptoms related to stress with questions asking whether or not individuals experience certain symptoms of stress such as a lack of appetite (Cullen et al., 1985; Grossi et al., 1996; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). Cheek and Miller (1983) used a self-report scale concerning stress, but also included questions regarding perceptions of co-worker's stress. Their findings highlighted a common criticism regarding the validity of subjective self-report survey data wherein respondents might misrepresent their stress levels (Sulsky & Smith, 2005). The researchers found that when asked about their own stress levels, officers did not think they were stressed, but assessed their fellow officers as experiencing high levels of stress (see Triplett et al., 1996; Veneziano, 1984). Armstrong and Griffin (2004) used both an attitudinal measure and an objective health measure of stress, which asked about symptoms due to stress, such as headaches.

Another means to measure stress among correctional officers is through medical assessments. One of the first empirical studies assessing stress among correctional officers used a measure of blood pressure to examine stress and found that the average blood pressure of correctional officers was higher than that of inmates (Alvarez & Stanley, 1930; Gross, Larson, Urban, & Zupan, 1994). Other medical measurements have been performed on samples of correctional officers assessing outcomes such as blood pressure, plasma cortisol, gamma glutamyltransferase, ventilation functions, hematology, and obesity (Gross et al., 1994; Harenstam et al., 1988; Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987; Morse et al., 2011; Webster et al., 1983). These assessments involved trained individuals performing tests, while other studies have used health records of correctional officers (New Jersey Police Task Force Report, 2009; Stack & Tsoudis, 1997). In addition to the objective measures of health, researchers have used self-report measures of health including measures of depression, PTSD, sleep patterns, recurring headaches, and gastrointestinal problems (Bierie, 2012; Denhof & Spinaris, 2013; Ghaddar et al., 2008; Goldberg et al., 1996; Gross et al., 1994; Harenstam et al., 1988; Johnson et al., 2005; Morse et al., 2011; Spinaris & Denhof, 2011).

Stress induced behavioral outcomes such as the use of alcohol, tobacco and sedatives have been evaluated using self-report measures from correctional officers (Bierie, 2012; Goldberg et al., 1996; Gross et al., 1994; Morse et al., 2011). One study included perceptions of coworkers' health and behavior (Cheek & Miller, 1983). One of the most thorough measurements of stress was developed by Gross et al. (1994) who included objective workplace outcomes (e.g. sick leave used), objective health outcomes (e.g. blood pressure), subjective workplace outcomes (e.g. emotional exhaustion), and

subjective health outcomes (e.g. headaches). Though various different health and behavioral outcomes have been linked with high levels of stress (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987; Sulsky & Smith, 2005), a majority of these studies do not discuss the behavioral or medical outcomes as an assessment of stress except for select studies (see Cheek & Miller, 1983; Gross et al, 1994). The most recent studies concerning correctional officer job stress have overwhelmingly used an attitudinal measure of workplace stress.

## **CONSEQUENCES OF STRESS**

The topic of job stress has received considerable scholarly attention across a wide array of disciplines and organizations due to the fact that negative outcomes are too often associated with job stress (Sulsky & Smith, 2005). In order to maximize organizational efficacy and efficiency, it is important to understand and manage job stress (Tewksbury & Higgins, 2006). According to a study done by the American Psychological Association (2009), 51% of employees said they were less productive at work due to stress. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that more than 19 million Americans experience stress related disorders (Kalia, 2002). When stressors are constant and result in job stress, this can lead to emotional, psychological, behavioral, and physiological consequences (House, 1981; Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000).

**Emotional responses to stress.** The importance of stress research is emphasized by the fact that several studies have shown that increased job stress decreases levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment, and increases job burnout (Blau et al., 1986; Garner et al., 2007; Griffin et al., 2010; Hogan et al., 2009;2013; Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007; Lambert, 2004; Lambert & Hogan, 2004; Robinson et al., 1997; Van Voorhis et al., 1991; Walters, 1992; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1986). Studies indicate

that higher levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment and lower levels of job burnout result in favorable outcomes and prosocial behaviors among correctional officers such as greater support for rehabilitation, increased human-service orientation, decreased punitive orientation, increased satisfaction with life, and compliance with organizational rules and goals (Culliver et al., 1991; Garland, 2002; Hepburn & Knepper, 1993; Kerce et al., 1994; Lambert et al., 2005; 2008; Maslach & Jackson, 1981; Neveu, 2007; Robinson et al., 1992; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000).

#### Behavioral responses to stress.

Turnover, turnover intent, and absenteeism. In addition to influencing emotional responses, chronic stress can alter the behavior of correctional officers and lead to unfavorable outcomes such as increased turnover. Among federal, state, and local government jobs between 2001 and 2008 the average turnover was 18.1% with a low of 15.7% in 2008 (United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2009). Among corrections personnel, the estimated annual turnover averages around 20%, with rates ranging from 3.8% to as high as 45% (American Correctional Association, 2004; Lambert, 2001a; Lambert & Hogan, 2009; McShane, Williams, Schichor, & McClain; Wright, 1994). The impact of turnover is especially problematic for corrections because these institutions rely heavily on staff to function (Archambeault & Fenwick, 1988; Stohr et al., 1992). Job stress has been shown to be a significant predictor of turnover, turnover intent, and absenteeism (Lambert, 2001b; Lambert, Edwards, Camp, & Saylor, 2005; Minor, Dawson-Edwards, Well, Griffith, & Angel, 2009; Mitchell, Mackenzie, Styve, & Grover, 2000; Slate & Vogel, 1997; Slate, Vogel, & Johnson, 2001). Organizational commitment and job satisfaction also have been shown to influence turnover and absenteeism (Byrd,

Cochran, Silverman, & Blount, 2000; Camp, 1994; Jurik & Winn, 1987; Leip & Stinchcomb, 2013; Lambert, 2001a; 2006; Lambert, Edwards et al., 2005; Lambert & Hogan, 2009; Lambert & Paoline, 2010; Matz, Wells, Minor, & Angel, 2013; Stohr et al., 1992). Some scholars have suggested that job stress may have a direct influence on turnover and turnover intent, but also function indirectly through organizational commitment and job satisfaction (Byrd et al., 2000; Lambert & Hogan, 2009; Lambert, 2006). That is, increased job stress can decrease job satisfaction and organizational commitment, which in turn can result in higher levels of turnover.

**Obesity and substance abuse.** Research has highlighted several negative behavioral responses to high levels of stress including overeating, tobacco use, and alcohol consumption (Conway, Ross, Harold, & Richard, 1981; Dawson, Grant, & Raun, 2005; Grunberg, Moore, Anderson-Connolly, & Greenberg, 1999; Kivimäki et al., 2006; Kouvonen, Kivimäki, Cox, Cox, & Vahtera, 2005; Kouvonen, Kivimäki, Virtanen, Pentti, & Vahtera, J. 2005; Steptoe, Wardle, Pollard, Canaan, & Davies, 1996; Torres & Nowson, 2007; Westman, Eden, & Shirom, 1985). Due to the stressful nature of correctional officers' job, research has examined these behaviors among this group of employees. Cheek and Miller (1983) found that correctional officers in New Jersey often perceived their fellow officers to have problems with alcoholism. Furthermore, they perceived their colleagues to have more alcohol-related problems than police officers (see Cheek, 1984). Other studies found that when compared to other occupations, correctional officers consume more alcohol and use tobacco more often (Morse et al., 2011; Weir et al., 2012). Moreover, correctional officers who perceived higher levels of stress in terms of a harsh working environment were significantly more likely to drink

and smoke (Bierie, 2012). Several studies have found that correctional officers have higher levels of obesity when compared to the general population (Ferraro et al., 2013; Morse et al., 2011; Webster et al., 1983).

*Psychological responses to stress.* Evidence suggests that exposure to stress is a root cause of depression and PTSD (Hammen, 2005; Heim & Nemeroff, 2009; Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987; Melchoir et al., 2007; Pacella, Hruska, & Delahanty, 2013; Paterniti, Niedhammer, Lang, & Consoli, 2002; Stadnyk, 2003). Research has suggested that, when compared to other occupations and the general public, correctional officers are more likely to experience mental health problems (Ghaddar et al., 2008; Goldberg et al., 1996; Johnson et al., 2005; Samak, 2003; Denhof & Spinaris, 2013). For example, Bierie (2012) found that staff members who perceived harsher prison conditions reported significantly higher depression levels. Correctional officers have also been shown to experience higher rates of PTSD when compared to other occupations and the general population (Denhof & Spinaris, 2013; Spinaris et al., 2012; Stadnyk, 2003).

Research suggests that suffering from depression and PTSD increases the risk of suicide (Freeman, Roca, & Moore, 2000; Marshall, Olfson, Hellman, Blanco, Guardino, & Struening, 2001; Miret, Ayuso-Mateos, Sanchez-Moreno, & Vieta, 2013; Oquendo et al., 2005). With the increased occurrence of depression and PTSD among correctional staff, it is logical that these individuals might have increased rates of suicide. Compared to males age 25-64 living in New Jersey (general population), correctional officers were 2.5 times more likely to commit suicide. Compared to the same group, active police officers were only 1.3 times more likely to commit suicide (New Jersey Police Task Force Report, 2009). Stack and Tsoudis (1997) used suicide data from 21 states and

found that the risk of suicide among correctional officers was 39% higher than the rest of the working age population.

*Physiological and health responses to stress.* The primary physiological response to stress is stimulation in the production of hormones such as epinephrine and cortisol. As a consequence to the over or underproduction of these hormones, levels of cholesterol, glucose and triglycerides are altered. These reactions to stress can lead to physical diseases (Ganster & Rosen, 2013). Compared to other occupational groups and the general public, correctional officers have higher levels of cortisol, heart disease, diabetes, asthma, plasma triglyceride, respiratory impairment, sleep problems, ulcers, and hypertension (Cheek & Miller, 1983; Bourbonnais et al., 2005; Harenstam et al., 1988; Johnson et al., 2005; Webster et al., 1983). Moreover, correctional officers who perceive a harsh working environment are more likely to exhibit physical problems, such as headaches, stomach aches, and back pain (Bierie, 2012). These physical and psychological illnesses can ultimately result in a shortened lifespan (Ganster & Rosen, 2013). According to Cheek (1984), the average life span of correctional officers is 16 years less than the national average.

#### **CAUSES OF STRESS**

Individual characteristics of officers. Gender and race have received attention within the correctional officer literature due to the historically white male composition of the correctional officer workforce. Women and minorities often experience a highly racialized and masculinized environment where they have been subject to harassment and discrimination by coworkers and supervisors (Britton, 1997; Griffin, Armstrong, & Hepburn, 2005; Jurik, 1988; Pogrebin & Poole, 1997, 1998; Savicki, Cooley, &

Giesvold, 2003). Several studies have shown that female correctional officers and staff experience more job stress than men (Cullen et al., 1985; Hurst & Hurst, 1997; Lambert et al., 2007; Mitchell et al., 2000; Zupan, 1986; Wright & Saylor, 1991). More recently, Lambert, Altheimer, and Hogan (2010) found that among staff members working at a private correctional facility for juveniles, women experienced more stress than men (see also Lambert et al., 2007; 2005). Similarly, Castle and Martin (2006) found that female detention officers from a northeastern state experienced more occupational stress than men. The findings regarding gender and stress are not consistent, however. Other studies have not found a significant relationship between gender and stress (Carlson, Anson, & Thomas, 2003; Gross et al., 1994; Grossi & Berg, 1991; Lambert et al., 2009; Lambert & Hogan, 2009; Savichi et al., 2003; Triplett et al., 1996). In a study by Griffin et al. (2005), for instance, female correctional officers did not experience more job stress than male correctional officers. In addition, Griffin (2006a) reported finding few differences between male and female officers in their experiences with work-related stressors.

Although there are reasons to suggest that non-white correctional officers will experience more stress, there is limited research to confirm this relationship. Toch and Klofas (1982) found that racial minorities experienced increased levels of stress compared to White correctional officers. Unexpectedly, some studies have found that White officers have higher levels of stress compared to minority officers (Blau et al., 1986; Hartley et al., 2013; Lambert et al., 2007; Mitchel et al., 2000). The majority of studies, however, have found no relationship between race and job stress (Castle & Martin, 2006; Cullen et al., 2004; Lambert et al., 2009; 2010; Lambert & Hogan, 2009; 2010; Lambert & Paoline, 2008; Misis et al., 2013; Triplett et al., 1996; Van Voorhis et al., 1991).

Findings from studies examining the relationship between age and stress among correctional officers also are mixed. Some studies found that compared to older officers, younger correctional officers reported higher levels of job stress (Blau et al., 1986; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1986), while other studies found older officers to experience more stress (Paoline, Lambert, & Hogan, 2006). Other studies did not find a correlation between age and job stress (Armstrong et al., 2004; Castle & Martin, 2006; Lambert et al., 2009; Lambert & Hogan, 2009; 2010; Misis et al., 2013; Triplett et al., 1996). Tenure is another individual-level variable that is often included in models predicting jobs stress and results indicate that there is a positive relationship (Cullen et al., 1985; Armstrong et al., 2004; Lambert et al., 2005; 2008; 2009; 2010; Lambert & Hogan, 2009; Lambert & Paoline, 2008). The positive relationship between tenure and stress suggests that the effects of stress may be cumulative; as experience increases, levels of frustration may increase over time, perhaps as a result of few promotional opportunities (Lambert et al., 2009). Conversely, Grossi et al. (1996) reported that those with longer tenure experienced less stress. Still other scholars have failed to find a relationship between tenure and job stress (Misis et al., 2013; Lambert & Hogan, 2010; Lambert et al., 2007; Paoline & Lambert, 2012).

Hepburn (1989) suggested that higher educational attainment among correctional officers could lead to stress because education may raise expectations for extrinsic and intrinsic rewards that often are not realized by correctional officers. Lindquist and Whitehead (1986) found a positive relationship between education and job stress,

supporting this hypothesis. Other studies have found no correlation between education and job stress (Cullen et al., 1985; Grossi et al., 1996; Lambert et al., 2009; 2010; Lambert & Hogan, 2009; 2010). Due to the different roles fulfilled by supervisors and line officers, supervisory status is often included within studies of job stress. Some studies have found that supervisors experience higher levels of stress (Lambert et al., 2008; Lambert & Paoline, 2008); at the same time, other scholars have reported no association between supervisory status and stress (Lambert et al., 2007; 2010; Lambert & paoline, 2005; Paoline & Lambert, 2012). The research concerning the relationship between individual characteristics of correctional officers and job stress is mixed; however, individual-level characteristics have consistently been shown to have a weaker relationship with job stress compared to organizational factors (Dowden & Tellier, 2004).

**Organizational characteristics.** The research examining individual characteristics of correctional officers and job stress is mixed, but there are consistent findings that social and physical environmental factors (supervisory and organizational support, dangerousness) and the nature of job expectations (role strain and work-family conflict) act as stressors within the prison environment (Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000).

*Job danger.* The physical environment of prisons is often associated with danger. Danger can be associated with disorder among inmates, the threat of violence, and the experience of violence (Dembo & Dertke, 1986). Correctional officers experience a higher number of workplace non-fatal violent incidents per 1,000 employees than any other profession except for police officers (U.S. Department of Justice, 2000). According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010), among all state government employees, correctional officers had the highest number of injuries that resulted in days away from work. According to Konda, Reichard, & Tiesman (2012), assault and violent acts were the leading occupational injury events for correctional officers. Although correctional officers experience an often violent workplace, the perception of danger among correctional officers often has less to do with being victimized and more to do with the constant threat and awareness that there is a possibility of violence (Cullen at al., 1985). Due to the constant possibility of violence, scholars have included danger as a stressor for correctional officers, typically measured as the correctional officer's perception of danger while on the job (Cullen et al., 1985).

The dangerous nature of correctional officer work has been included in studies of correctional officer stress for over 35 years. Jacobs (1978) found that nearly half of the 900 correctional officers assessed reported that danger was a problem, and Cheek and Miller (1983) reported that violence was the most feared and disliked aspect of correctional officer work. Since then, an expansive body of literature suggests that perceived danger is one of the most robust predictors of stress (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Cullen et al., 1985; Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Finn, 1998; Griffin, 2006; Grossi et al., 1996; Hartley et al., 2013; Keinen & Malach-Pines, 2007; Lambert & Hogan, 2010; Lambert & Paoline, 2005, 2008; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000; Shamir & Drory, 1982; Triplett et al., 1996; Triplett, Mulling, & Scarborough, 1999). Among correctional officers employed in a Southern correctional facility, Cullen et al. (1985) found that perceived danger had a positive relationship with stress and was the second strongest predictor of both work and life stress. They emphasized that even though 87% of the officers included in the study had never been victimized, and half of the victimizations

that did occur did not require medical attention, perceived danger is still an important generator of stress. Armstrong and Griffin (2004) assessed whether perceived danger influenced job stress among correctional officers and treatment personnel employed at 10 different adult prisons in a southwestern state. Perceptions of safety influenced both objective and subjective measurements of job stress among correctional officers but not treatment staff. Griffin (2006) used the same sample of correctional officers to assess gender differences in job stress, and found that for both men and women, perceptions of work safety influenced levels of stress. Other studies have used data from staff members at prisons and jails, and have reported that perceived job danger had a positive association with job stress and, in some cases, had the most powerful influence on job stress (see Lambert & Hogan, 2010; Lambert & Paoline, 2005, 2008). Over 75% of correctional officers employed at four maximum security prisons in Israel agreed with the statement that, "there is always some fear that inmates will try to hurt prison officers" (Shamir & Drory, 1982).

Correctional officers work with a population that can become violent at any time, but this population also poses other risks. For example, inmates have elevated rates of infectious diseases such as AIDS and hepatitis (Hartley et al., 2013). As a result of these elevated levels of diseases and constant contact between correctional officers and inmates, the fear of being infected by an inmate can also lead to increased levels of job stress (Hartley et al., 2013; Lambert & Paoline, 2005). Correctional officers employed at prisons across Texas indicated that perceptions of danger had the strongest correlation with job stress and fear of disease was the second strongest (Hartley et al., 2013). Similarly, Lambert and Paoline (2005) found that perceived job danger was the strongest

predictor of job stress with fear of disease as the second most powerful predictor. Regardless of correctional environment (jail or prison), employee role, and security level, research has consistently shown that as perceived job danger increases so does job stress.

*Role strain.* Following an exhaustive review of the literature on correctional officer job stress, Schaufeli and Peeters (2000) concluded that role problems are perhaps the most important job stressors that correctional officers experience. Role strain (also referred to as role problems or role stress) is generally defined as conflict stemming from vague or contradictory directions and duties (Crank et al., 1995; Fried, Shirom, Gilboa, & Cooper, 2008; Hepburn & Knepper, 1993). Within the literature concerning role strain among correctional officers, the concept is separated into two components: role conflict and role ambiguity. Role conflict occurs when directions, behaviors, and duties within a job are inconsistent with one another (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). Role ambiguity occurs when the expected duties of the job are not articulated clearly to the employee (Rizzo et al., 1970). The tension between custody and treatment has long been discussed as a source of role strain in corrections (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Cressey, 1959; Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980; Lambert et al., 2005; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000). Although this can act as a source of role conflict, others suggest that conflict can also arise from poorly outlined goals of the organization, as well as the means of achieving these goals not being transmitted to the staff effectively (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Cullen et al., 1985; Hepburn & Albonetti, 1980). Hepburn and Albonetti (1980) highlighted the conflicting nature of correctional officer work by suggesting that, "Line officers are expected to remain socially distant while establishing close, supportive relationships with inmates; they are to maintain the rules while exercising lenient rule enforcement; they

must preserve their own authority and simultaneously encourage the inmate to make his own decisions" (p. 47).

Most of the studies that assessed role strain among correctional officers use a measure that combines aspects from both role conflict and role ambiguity (Dowden & Tellier, 2004; see also Arsmtrong & Griffin, 2004; Cheek & Miller, 1983; Cullen et al., 1985; Grossi et al., 1996; Lambert & Paoline, 2008; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986; Misis et al., 2013; Tewksbury & Higgins, 2006). Among the studies that have assessed the relationship between a combined measure of role conflict and role ambiguity, there is consistent evidence that role strain is significantly correlated to job stress (Arsmtrong & Griffin, 2004; Cheek & Miller, 1983; Cullen et al., 1985; Grossi et al., 1996; Lambert & Paoline, 2008; Lindquist & Whitehead, 1986; Misis et al., 2013; Tewksbury & Higgins, 2006). For example, among a sample of correctional officers employed in a Southern correctional facility, Cullen et al. (1985) found that role strain was the strongest predictor of work stress and life stress. Tewksbury and Higgins (2006) also found that role conflict was the most robust predictor of work stress within correctional staff working in two Kentucky prisons. According to Armstrong and Griffin (2004), role strain had the strongest correlation with both attitudinal and health measures of stress among correctional officers and treatment staff.

Other studies have looked at more nuanced measures of role conflict and role ambiguity. Lambert et al. (2005, p. 45) developed a scale including such questions as "I regularly receive conflicting requests at work from two or more people" and "I do not always understand what is expected of me at work" to measure role conflict and role ambiguity. Among staff at a private Midwestern maximum security facility, as role
ambiguity increased, stress for males increased (Lambert et al., 2010). Lambert et al. (2005) found a significant positive relationship between role conflict, role ambiguity, and job stress. Among correctional officers employed at four maximum security prisons in Israel, role conflict and role ambiguity were associated with job stress (Shamir & Drory, 1982). Whether role strain is assessed as a combined measure of role conflict and role ambiguity, research suggests that it is an important stressor.

Within the discussion of role strain some researchers also include role overload (see Lambert et al., 2005; 2007; 2010; Moon & Maxwell, 2004; Shamir & Drory, 1982; Triplett et al., 1996, 1999). Role overload occurs when an employee views their job duties as excessive in terms of quality and/or quantity (Matteson & Ivancevich, 1987). A handful of studies have reported that role overload is a substantial predictor of job stress (Lambert et al., 2005; 2007; 2010; Moon & Maxwell, 2004; Shamir & Drory, 1982; Triplett et al., 1996, 1999).

*Social support.* The social support that correctional officers perceive from within the organization can influence job stress. This dimension can be captured through measurements of perceived support by correctional officers or attitudes towards supervisors and peers. If correctional officers perceive low levels of social support, this can exacerbate the negative factors associated with the job. Alternatively, social support can act as a protective factor, helping individuals deal with workplace stress (Brown & O'Brien, 1998; Neveu, 2007; Ross, Altmaier, & Russell, 1989). Social support is typically assessed in terms of support from supervisors, peers, and the organization. Research findings indicate that organizational support and supervisory support have greater effects on the levels of stress among correctional officers than does peer support (Cullen et al., 1985; Cherniss, 1980, Maslach et al., 2001; Misis et al., 2013; Van Voorhis, 1991). The literature concerning facets of workplace support and stress typically focuses on the direct impact between these variables, though a few studies have explored the conditioning effects of gender and race differences on the relationship between workplace support and stress (see Griffin, 2006; Lambert et al., 2010; Van Voorhis et al., 1991).

*Supervisory support.* Supervisors are crucial to the larger organization because such individuals clarify roles and outline organizational practices (Jablin, 1987). They also provide guidance, direction, and feedback for employees (Brough & Williams, 2007). If supervisors care about their employees and provide supportive supervision, this can act as a coping mechanism for stress among their subordinates; however, if supervision is poor, and roles and duties are not clearly defined, this can act as a stressor (Cullen et al., 1985; Jacobs & Olitsky, 2004). A lack of support negatively affects job performance and can create an environment where employees feel that they cannot count on their supervisors for support and guidance in order to achieve their defined goals (Garland, 2004; Walters, 1999).

According to Jurik and Halemba (1984), over 50% of correctional officers in their sample listed supervisors as the group of individuals who cause them the most problems at work. Among line officers employed in a southern correctional facility, supervisory support was identified as the strongest predictor of stress. As perception of supervisory support increased, job stress decreased (Van Voorhis et al., 1991). Lambert and Hogan (2009) examined supervisory support by asking correctional staff to respond to statements such as "supervisors are supportive of employees," and found that supervisory

26

support was inversely related to stress. Among a sample of correctional officers employed in a southern correctional facility, Cullen et al. (1985) reported a significant inverse relationship between supervisory support and job stress. Similarly, Lambert et al. (2010b) found that supervisory support was significantly correlated with job stress. Supervisor consideration had the second strongest relationship with job stress among correctional staff employed at a private correctional facility (Lambert et al., 2009). Liou (1995) found that trust in supervisors is significantly correlated with job stress. Griffin (2006) examined the gendered nature of stress among correctional officers and found that the quality of supervision was significantly related to stress for men but not for women. Clearly, quality of supervision plays an important role in the correctional work environment.

*Organizational support.* Organizational support refers to the extent to which an employee perceives that he or she is supported by the organization (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Griffin, 2002; 2006). When individuals feel that they are supported by the organization, they believe that they are respected and valued (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison, & Sowa, 1986). Griffin (2006) measured organizational support with statements such as "the department takes pride in my accomplishments at work," and found that among correctional officers, organizational support was a significant predictor of stress for both men and women (p. 13). Armstrong and Griffin (2004) used the same sample of correctional officers but controlled for different variables, and also found a significant inverse relationship between organizational support and both attitudinal and health measures of job stress. Among all staff employed at a private juvenile facility, organizational support was significantly correlated with job stress (Auerbach et al.,

2003). Within a sample of juvenile correctional employees, support from the organization had a stronger relationship with stress than did physical danger (Auerbach et al., 2003). Paoline and Lambert (2011) used data from a survey of jail staff employed in Florida to assess the relationship between organizational support and job stress finding that organizational support was inversely related to stress. Similar to organizational support, trust in the organization has also been found to influence stress (Lambert et al., 2008). Survey data from correctional officers employed in Israel suggested that higher levels of perceived organizational support were associated with lower levels of stress (Shamir & Drory, 1982).

**External sources of stress.** External stressors refer to any number of specific events that act as stressors such as divorce or loss of a job; in general, however, most correctional research focuses on the continuing stressors such as lack of social support and work-family conflict.

*Work-family conflict.* The unique job that correctional officers perform can potentially have a negative impact on their home life. Although research regarding correctional officers focuses on many aspects of job duties and the work-environment, a growing body of literature examines how workplace responsibilities and duties often conflict with correctional officers' home life resulting in problems in the workplace (Griffin, 2006; Lambert, Altheimer, & Hogan, 2010; Lambert et al., 2005; 2007; Lambert, Hogan, Barton, 2002; 2004; Lambert, Hogan, & Altheimer, 2010; Lambert, Hogan, Camp, & Ventura, 2006; Lambert & Hogan, 2010b; Lambert, Kelley, & Hogan, 2012; Triplett et al., 1999). Known as work-family conflict (WFC), this dynamic arises when aspects of work and family are incompatible with one another in some manner and resulting problems spillover into the two domains—work life and home life (Greenhaus & Buetell, 1985; Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964; Lambert et al., 2006).

In general, WFC is broken down into two major forms consisting of work on family conflict, and family on work conflict (Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996). Work on family conflict exists when negative aspects of the job permeate the family/social life. There are three categories of work family conflict: time-based conflict, strain-based conflict, and behavior-based conflict. Time-based work-family conflict arises when the scheduling of work shifts or the amount of time spent at work interferes with home life. Behavioral-based conflict is caused by the attitudes and behaviors necessary for the job (e.g., an overly authoritative attitude) permeating the home life and family dynamics. When the demands and stress from the job negatively influence home life, this is considered strain-based conflict (Greenhaus & Buetell, 1985; Netemeyer et al., 1996). Family on work conflict, on the other hand, occurs when harmful features of one's home-life negatively influence the employee at work (Netemeyer et al., 1996).

Within the extant literature on WFC among correctional officers, evidence suggests that this conflict can act as a stressor (Griffin, 2006; Triplett et al., 1999; Lambert et al., 2004; 2006; 2007; 2010). Griffin (2006) used a measure of WFC that included aspects of the three types of conflict and found that among correctional officers, WFC was the most powerful predictor of stress for both men and women. Among all staff at a maximum security private correctional facility, Lambert et al. (2007) found that WFC was a significant cause of stress, second only to role overload. According to Lambert et al. (2004), correctional officers experience more WFC when compared to other non-security correctional staff. In addition, among correctional officers, strain-

29

based conflict was the most prevalent type of WFC followed by time-based conflict, and WFC impacted correctional officers more than family on work conflict. In one of the most thorough assessments of the different types of WFC, Lambert et al. (2006) included measures of all three types of WFC, as well as a measure of family on work conflict and found that strain-based WFC was the only significant predictor of stress. Conover (2001) offered some qualitative insight into WFC by highlighting how the authoritative nature of his job as a correctional officer negatively influenced both his parenting style and his spousal relationship.

Within this body of research, scholars have assessed the gendered nature of this conflict due to the different roles typically played by men and women within the home (see Samak, 2003; Triplett et al., 1999). Lambert et al. (2010) reported that among correctional staff, a combined measure of time and strain WFC was significantly correlated with stress for women but not for men. Similarly, Triplett et al. (1999) surveyed a sample of correctional officers from a medium security correctional facility and found that WFC was only a significant stressor for women. However, other studies have found no difference in the association between WFC and stress by gender (Griffin, 2006; Lambert et al., 2004).

*External support.* Some scholars have examined the influence of support from family and the community on stress among correctional officers (Grossi et al., 1996; Cullen et al., 1985; Shamir & Drory, 1982). Similar to the studies assessing support from within the institution, this research uses measurements of perceived support by correctional officers concerning family, friends, and the community. Strong perceived support from family and community members can help alleviate the effects of stressors

within the prison environment (Cullen et al., 1985; Shamir & Drory, 1982). According to Shamir and Drory (1982), perceived societal support was the strongest predictor of correctional officer stress within a multivariate analysis controlling for variables such as role conflict, role ambiguity, and perception of danger. Surprisingly, strong perceived community support was found to have a positive association with work stress. The authors did not provide an explanation for why this relationship might exist (Grossi et al., 1996). Cullen et al. (1985) found that strong perceived family support had an inverse relationship with work stress much like supervisory support when controlling for variables such as role problems and dangerousness. This small body of literature suggests that it is necessary to continue to examine how perceptions of support from those outside the work environment may influence stress.

#### SUMMARY

Correctional officer stress has received much attention from scholars over the past several years. Job danger, role conflict, WFC, organizational support, and quality of supervision have been shown consistently to be among the most robust predictors of job stress among correctional officers. In addition to these stressors, several other predictors have been highlighted including challenging social contact with inmates, promotional opportunity, low pay, lack of job autonomy, treatment orientation, perception of inmates, perceived level of professionalism, perceived organizational innovation, adequacy of training, distributive and procedural justice, and the physical environment (Bierie, 2012; Castle & Martin, 2006; Cheek & Miller, 1983; Cullen et al., 1985; Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Finn, 1998; Lambert et al., 2007; 2009; Lambert & Hogan, 2010a; Lambert, Hogan, & Allen, 2006; Lambert & Paoline, 2008; Misis et al., 2013; Paoline & Lambert, 2011; Robinson et al., 1997; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000; Slate & Vogel, 1997; Stohr et al., 1992; Tewksbury & Higgins, 2006). These various stressors are related to several negative outcomes such as job burnout, increased turnover intent, and health problems (Griffin et al., 2010; Harenstam et al., 1988; Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007; Mitchell et al., 2000; Morse et al., 2011; Slate & Vogel, 1997). The relationship between the various stressors and the harmful outcomes is represented in Figure 1. Due to the harmful effects of job stress and the reliance upon correctional staff for the success of correctional institutions, it is imperative to understand the causes of job stress.

This summary of the literature regarding correctional officer stress highlights the importance of environmental factors, as well as the spillover of work in to personal life. In addition, this review makes clear that the overwhelming majority of these studies used an attitudinal measure of job stress, highlighting the need to include more objective measures of stress.

**\*\*Insert Figure 1 About Here\*\*** 

#### **CHAPTER 3**

# STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Correctional research suggests that chronic stressors lead to increased burnout, absenteeism and turnover intent, decreased job satisfaction and commitment to the organization, and an increased likelihood of mental and physical health problems. Due to the various negative outcomes associated with stress, it is necessary to further explore relevant stressors present within correctional work. As evidenced in the literature review, prior research has focused almost entirely on stressors originating within the institution, with the exception of a few studies that have examined the influence of WFC and support stemming from the family and the community. One concept that has received little attention is the role of perceived occupational prestige among correctional officers and its relationship to job stress. Scholars conceptualize occupational prestige as an individual's standing or stature that is derived from status, power, quality of work, education, and income associated with one's profession (Coxon & Jones, 1978; Treiman, 1977). Studies have examined occupational prestige using scores that capture societal perceptions of occupations in order to rank different professions (Coxon & Jones, 1978; Dunkerley, 1975; MacKinnon & Langford, 1994).

# **OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE**

The work of correctional officers is assumed to have low occupational prestige, but little empirical research exists on this topic (Sundt, 2009). The general public has little contact with prisons and their daily operations. The only way someone would gain a more accurate depiction of a prison and its employees is if they had worked or been detained in one of these institutions. Garland (1990) notes that "modern institutions of punishment are much less accessible to the public, much more secretive and socially invisible than the punishments of former times" (p. 186). As a result, the attitudes and beliefs held by the public concerning those who work and are housed in these institutions are largely shaped by media depictions that often distort the work of correctional officers (Bennett, 2006; Brower, 2013; Cecil & Leitner, 2009; Freeman, 1998; Levan et al., 2011; Levenson, 2001; Meiners, 2007). The mass media is a pervasive source of information for the public accounting for 80% of the information individuals receive concerning news and public affairs (The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, 2008; Yang & Stone, 2003). These media depictions can influence the public's view regarding which issues are important, as well as how to think and feel about these issues (Addington, 2003; McCombs & Shaw, 1993; Surette, 2015).

#### **MEDIA PORTRAYALS OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS**

Media depictions of correctional officers perpetuate the stereotype that these individuals are violent, abusive, racist, uncaring, and incompetent (Finn, 1998; Freeman, 1998; Johnson, 2002; Johnson & Price, 1981; Kantrowitz, 1996; May, 1976; Morgan, 2009; Smith, 1994; Van Fleet, 1992; Zaner, 1989). Often, media depictions sensationalize inmate violence against correctional officers (Cecil & Leitner, 2009). Researchers have analyzed cinematic representations of correctional officers in movies that date as far back as 1932 and include films such as *Cool Hand Luke* (Rosenburg, 1967), *The Longest Yard* (Aldrich, 1974), *The Shawshank Redemption* (Darabont, 1994), and *The Green Mile* (Darabont, 1999). These studies suggest that the Hollywood depiction of correctional officers tends to characterize them as unnecessarily abusive and violent towards undeserving and often times likable inmates (Bennett, 2006; Bennet & Satre, 2000; Freeman, 1998; Kantrowitz, 1996; Zaner, 1989).

Correctional officer portrayals within the news media are also problematic, especially since correctional officers are only deemed "newsworthy" when negative events occur such as riots, corruption, failure to protect the public, and brutality (Levenson, 2001, Surette, 2007). Conversely, when correctional officers save an inmate, stop an escape, or provide volunteer service to the community, limited media attention captures these more positive depictions (Smith, 1994). Among a sample of over 1,500 newspaper articles concerning correctional officers and inmates, Freeman (1998) found that an overwhelmingly majority of these articles depicted correctional officers negatively. Vickovic et al. (2013) examined articles from several newspapers across the United States and found that nearly 80% of the articles depicted correctional officers as negative, focusing on factors such as excessive use of force, sexual misconduct, and failure to perform job duties. Arguably, the significance of such unfavorable media depictions of correctional officers is determined by the extent to which the public's perception of correctional officers is influenced by the media, and, more important for the study at hand, the impact of such depictions on correctional officers' own perception of their public image, and resulting negative outcomes such as added levels of job stress.

## **OCCUPATIONAL PRESTIGE OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS**

Studies that have assessed the occupational prestige of correctional officers report fairly low occupational prestige when compared to other professions (Nakao & Treas, 1994; Sundt, 2009). According to the National Opinion Research Center (1993), correctional officers received an occupational score of 40, which ranked them below morticians (49) and personal injury lawyers (75), and slightly above exotic entertainers (36)). In fact, a survey of over 2000 people from 50 locations across the United States reported that being a correctional officer is one of the 20 "sleaziest" ways to make a living (Patterson & Kim, 1991). Indeed, the public often views correctional officers as uneducated, lazy, sexually deviant, brutal, aggressive, and uncaring (Brodsky, 1982; Cheek & Miller, 1982; Cheek & Miller, 1983; Conover, 2001; Freeman, 1998; Johnson, 2002; Kauffman, 1988; Tracy, 2004). Toch (1978) suggested that some believe that in order to be a correctional officer, it requires "the IQ of an imbecile, a high threshold for boredom and a basement position in Maslow's hierarchy" (p. 20). Although these studies provide some insight into how the general public views correctional officers, it does not assess how correctional officers perceive their own profession.

Studies have found that citizens view correctional officers as engaged in "dirty work." The term "dirty work" is used to refer to jobs that are viewed as undesirable by the public. Dirty work refers to work that is viewed as physically, socially, and morally tainted (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Tracy, 2004; Tracy & Scott, 2006). Correctional officer work is physically tainted because officers work in a harsh environment where they encounter dirt, death, and bodily fluids (Tracy & Scott, 2006). Correctional officers work with a stigmatized inmate population that socially taints their job, and they perform a job that is morally questionable due to the stereotypes held by the community, such as that correctional officers brutalize inmates (Tracy & Scott, 2006). Individuals that do dirty work have the potential of being stigmatized by the conditions of their occupation because the negative qualities of their work are projected upon them (Brodsky, 1982; Goffman, 1963).

36

Some evidence suggests that correctional officers are aware of the stigmas associated with their job. During their qualitative study of correctional officers, Tracy and Scott (2006) overheard correctional officers saying that they were "sick of people thinking we're all bad, killing people left and right" and that "They think that we're part of the punishment, that we're uneducated, big, mean people barking orders...I've even had people ask me if we beat people" (p. 17). Correctional officers even complained that their friends and family did not understand why they would want to do the type of work they do and that outsiders viewed them as lax, lazy, brutal, sexually deviant, and stupid (Tracy, 2004). Correctional officers also discussed the status of their job in comparison to other law enforcement jobs. One correctional officer stated that "We're the scum of law enforcement. We're the bottom of the barrel" (Tracy & Scott, 2006, p. 7). Correctional officers believed that police officers viewed them as nothing more than glorified babysitters, and correctional officers even described themselves as babysitters and glorified maids (Tracy, 2004; Tracy & Scott, 2006). Tracy and Scott (2006) highlighted the fact that due to the lack of perceived occupational prestige and public visibility, correctional officers are unable to manage the taint from their work. Other professions that engage in dirty work, such as firefighters, are able to manage their taint due to the occupational prestige associated with their profession and the ability to emphasize the "heroic" image of their job.

A small body of research performed outside of the United States explored the influence of a correctional officers' perceived negative public image on stress, as well as job burnout and job satisfaction. Keinan and Malach-Pines (2007) used data from 496 Israeli prison service employees and found that the perceived negative public image of

correctional officers was a significant stressor for security personnel. In fact, when controlling for other stressors, low social status rated equally as stressful as the possibility of being hurt by an inmate. Furthermore, when asked about ways of reducing their workrelated stress, improving the public image of correctional officers emerged as a distinct theme. Moon and Maxwell (2004) used survey responses from correctional officers in South Korea to examine the relationship between a perceived negative public image and stress, and found that a perceived negative public image was the strongest predictor of stress. In a similar study, Shamir and Drory (1982) reported that perceived lack of societal support was one the most robust predictors of burnout among Israeli correctional officers. According to Drory and Shamir (1988), perceived community support was the variable most highly correlated with job satisfaction and burnout reduction. Although these two studies did not assess a perceived negative public image directly, Shamir and Drory (1982) suggested that perceived low status within the community may reflect perceived low support from the community and thus could act as a stressor.

It appears that unfavorable media and the dirty nature of the job combined with the closed nature of prisons, creates a situation in which the public attributes a low level of occupational prestige to the correctional officer profession. Limited research suggests that correctional officers are aware of the low prestige with which their work is viewed by outsiders, but what remains unexplored is whether this perception by officers of how outsiders view their work significantly influences stress levels among correctional officers.

38

# **RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES**

Research suggests that opinions are influenced by familiarity with the subject (Anagnostopoulos & Hantzi, 2011; Corrigan et al., 2001; Holmes et al., 1999). Studies have shown that the influence of individuals and groups on factors such as opinions and behaviors differs depending on social distance and contact with the individual (Glynn & Park, 1997; Krassa, 1988; Oshagen, 1996; Perkins, 2002; Shibutani, 1955). Efforts to measure the effect of a perceived negative public image on correctional officer job stress have focused on the "general public" (Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007; Moon & Maxwell, 2004), the "community" (Grossi et al., 1996), or "community and family" (Cullen et al., 1985), but little effort has been made to examine the individual effects of each group on job stress when the effects of the other are controlled. Correctional officers' perceptions of what these outside groups believe concerning their occupation may differ depending on the social distance of the group. Officers may perceive that individuals who have more contact with correctional officers (e.g. friends and family) have more knowledge and understanding of their job. As a result, correctional officers may believe that those individuals who have less social distance will have more favorable beliefs about their profession. The perceived opinions of those who are closest to the officer may also have a greater influence on the officer when compared to audiences who are more distant. In addition, the relationship between the levels of perceived occupational prestige (POP) and stress may be moderated by other organizational factors, such as perceived levels of organizational and supervisory support.

With this in mind, the purpose of this study is to assess (1) whether the POP accorded to the officer's job by external groups is a significant source of stress, (2)

whether the level of POP differs significantly among these external groups in the eyes of the correctional officers, (3) whether the effects of the POP on stress differs by the social distance between the individual officer and the external group, and (4) whether the relationship is moderated by other variables. Although the sources of stress measured are external to the correctional institution (much like WFC), the source of this stress is associated with ones' job and as a result is hypothesized to influence job stress. In addition, this study seeks to refine the measurement of POP to include perceived beliefs of family and friends (POP significant other), neighbors, local townspeople, and general public (POP generalized other), and the media. This study uses an attitudinal measure of work stress, which is the most common within the correctional officer research, but also includes a health measure of stress to achieve a more accurate measure of work stress (see Armstrong & Griffin, 2004). The different predictors included in the study will be used to assess their influence on both an attitudinal and health measure of work stress.

Due to the closed nature of prisons and the lack of visibility of correctional officers' daily activities, officers may believe that individuals who do not associate with those working in their profession have distorted views of their work. With this in mind, the first hypothesis involves social distance and POP:

Hypothesis 1: The greater the social distance, the lower the POP. Correctional officers will perceive that family and friends (significant others) have the highest level of occupational prestige, compared to neighbors and local townspeople (generalized others).

40

The current literature concerning correctional officer stress has focused on stressors that stem from within the correctional institution and have found several of these variables to be consistent predictors of job stress. Considering this, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 2: The observed effects of POP on attitudinal and health work stress will continue to be significant when the combined effects of environmental workplace stressors are controlled.

In addition to social distance influencing what correctional officers perceive different audiences believe, social distance will moderate the effects of POP on stress. This leads to the next set of hypotheses:

Hypothesis 3a: The greater the social distance, the lower the effect of POP on attitudinal and health work stress.

Hypothesis 3b: The POP of significant others will have the strongest correlation with attitudinal and health work stress, compared to POP of generalized others.

Media depictions of correctional officers highlight the negative aspects of their job and offer a distorted picture of correctional officers and their occupation. Furthermore, research suggests that news and entertainment media account for 80% of information individuals receive concerning news and public affairs (The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press, 2008; Yang & Stone, 2003). Due to the lack of visibility of prisons and correctional officers' work, mass media is often the only source of information concerning correctional officers and their occupation. The media influences public attitudes and the depictions offered by the media of correctional officers are mostly negative. The only way to combat this is through positive social interaction with correctional officers, which is often limited to family and friends of correctional officers. This leads to a situation where these negative media depictions reach a wide audience and may influence individual's opinions regarding correctional officer work. As a result, it is hypothesized that:

Hypothesis 4a. Correctional officers will perceive that the media depicts the lowest level of occupational prestige, compared to POP of significant other and generalized others.

Hypothesis 4b. The POP associated with the media will have the strongest influence on attitudinal and health work stress when compared to POP significant other and generalized others.

Correctional officer work is demanding and the role of social support has been highlighted as a protective factor (Cullen et al., 1985; Lambert, Altheimer, & Hogan, 2010). A lack of social support can be seen as a form of resource depletion wherein the cumulative effect of various stressors and low support from the different internal sources (supervisors and the organization) can result in high levels of work stress (Neveu, 2007). This may lead to a situation where the importance of support from a specific source may be emphasized due to the lack of support from other sources.

Hypothesis 5: The measures of POP will have the strongest effect on attitudinal and health work stress when perceived levels of supervisory and organizational support are low.

Literature concerning individual-level variables such as age, race/ethnicity, and sex report mixed findings regarding their relationship with job stress (Dowden & Tellier, 2004). Some research suggests that these variables have a direct relationship with job stress while others find no relationship (Lambert et al., 2007; 2009; Mitchell et al., 2000; Toch & Klofas, 1982). Although the findings are not consistent concerning the relationship between individual-level variables and job stress, these individual-level variables may have a conditioning effect on the relationship between POP and job stress, which leads to the final hypothesis.

Hypothesis 6: The relationship between POP and attitudinal and health work stress will be conditioned by individual-level characteristics (age, race/ethnicity, sex, tenure, and education).

# CHAPTER 4

## **METHOD**

## **SUBJECTS AND PROCEDURES**

Once the proposed methodology was approved by Arizona State University's Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (IRB Study 00000498), paper surveys were administered to all 1,234 security officers employed at two Arizona Department of Corrections (ADC) prison complexes. Each of the prison complexes is comprised of several semi-autonomous prison facilities, or prison units, that vary in size and security level. The Winslow prison complex consists of three units: minimum security Coronado (606 inmates), close/medium Kiabab (723 inmates), and minimum security Apache (343 inmates). The Florence prison complex consists of five units: maximum security Central (939 inmates), medium security East (679 inmates), minimum security North (1,006 inmates), medium security South (962 inmates), and minimum security Globe (255 inmates). In addition, each complex maintains a contingent of correctional officers assigned to the complex but not to any specific prison unit within the complex. These officers staff the perimeter gates and walls, and the visitors' entry to the complex, transport inmates to court appointments and external medical facilities, and cover staff shortages in the prison units that may arise due to both planned (e.g., vacation) and unplanned (sick and personal days) absences. The number of correctional officers employed within these units ranges from 62 in the smallest unit to 267 in the largest unit.

Two weeks prior to the survey distribution, the wardens, deputy wardens and training officers at each complex received notice from Central Office administration about the impending survey and its importance to ADC. One week before the survey, the Director of ADC sent a memorandum to all wardens, deputy wardens, and shift supervisors to request their support in the administration of the survey. The Director's memorandum mentioned that the survey was being conducted by an external research group, was completely voluntary and anonymous, and could not be completed while on the clock. The administration of the survey was announced at each roll call over a threeday span and collection receptacles were placed at the officers' exit/entrance to the prison facility. Each survey was accompanied by a cover letter from the research team that made it clear that the survey was being conducted by researchers from Arizona State University, that participation was voluntary, and that their answers were completely anonymous (see appendix). In addition, the cover letter included directions for those interested in entering a drawing to win a \$50 dollar gift card (one per prison complex). Those who did not want to return the survey to the specially marked box within the prison unit were asked to use the self-addressed, postage paid return on the back of the survey to return it to the university.

## THE SAMPLE

A total of 1,234 correctional officers were surveyed at the two prison complexes and 664 surveys were returned, resulting in a 53.8 percent response rate. At the larger complex (Florence), 470 of the 850 officers (55.3 percent) returned a completed survey. At the smaller complex (Winslow), 194 of the 384 officers (50.5 percent) returned a completed survey (see Table 1). A technical error occurred during printing and a portion of the survey did not print resulting in some missing data. These errors randomly occurred on 23 surveys. These surveys were removed from the sample resulting in a final sample of 641. These surveys were scanned into an electronic format, reducing the likelihood of human error in the process of data entry. Similar response pattern imputation, which has been shown to be effective (Gmel, 2001), was used to address missing data.

The information regarding the representativeness of the individual samples from the two prison complexes, as well as the combined information concerning the two complexes is provided in Table 1. Compared to the population, the sample is slightly older with longer tenure, more males, and more individuals who identified their race/ethnicity as either "other" or Caucasian/White. The only significant difference is within the racial breakdowns between the sample and the population ( $\chi^2 = 39.19$ ; p < 0.01; Phi = .145) and the Phi statistic indicates that the strength of the association is weak suggesting that the difference is not large. The sample contained significantly more individuals that identified themselves as "other" when compared to those identified as "other" in the population. It should be noted that research suggests that race is not a significant predictor of stress among correctional officers (Castle & Martin, 2006; Cullen et al., 2004; Lambert et al., 2009; 2010; Lambert & Hogan, 2009; 2010; Lambert & Paoline, 2008; Misis et al., 2013; Triplett et al., 1996; Van Voorhis et al., 1991).

#### \*\*Insert Table 1 About Here\*\*

#### MEASUREMENT

All variables included in the analyses, except for the health measure of stress and the individual-level variables, were measured by Likert-type scales where each respondent indicates their degree of agreement or disagreement on a five-point scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (value = 1) to Strongly Agree (value = 5). The sum of the items that create the Likert scale were divided by the number of items in that scale to

create scale scores that range from a low of 1 to a high of 5, with the higher value representing increased levels of that which is being measured. Reverse scoring of some items was required.

For the health measure of stress, correctional officers were asked to indicate whether they experienced specific health conditions (never, seldom, sometimes, often, or frequently) and the scale was divided by the number of items in that scale to create scale scores that range from a low of 1 to a high of 5, with the higher value indicating increased experiences with these health conditions. All of the scales have been deemed valid and reliable in prior studies (e.g. internal consistency demonstrated through sufficient Cronbach's alphas) and within the current study the Cronbach's alphas are sufficient. Information concerning the scales is reported in Table 2.

# \*\*Insert Table 2 About Here\*\*

### **INDEPENDENT VARIABLES**

Most research that assesses occupational prestige asks respondents to rank professions on a few dimensions, such as education and income (Coxon & Jones, 1978; Goyder & Frank, 2007; Nakao & Treas, 1994). For the most part, these prestige scores emerge from assessments by individuals employed in occupations other than the occupation being ranked. While valuable, these second party observations provide no insight into how individuals within different professions would rank their own occupation, or what they believe the public perception of their occupation to be.

This study relied on a subjective measure that incorporated three aspects of prestige: respect, image, and importance of the profession that were informed by previous scales (see Drory & Shamir, 1988; Haug & Widdison, 1975; Moon & Maxwell, 2004;

Shamir & Drory, 1988). These studies measured how the "community" or "public" perceive correctional officers in terms of respect, appreciation, and recognition of the importance for the work they do. The current scale expands upon this by measuring officer's perceptions of respect, image, and importance of their job among family and friends (POP significant other), and neighbors, local townspeople, and the general public (POP generalized other). In addition, it measures how they perceive entertainment and news media depictions of their occupation (POP media). It is necessary to differentiate between these groups because research suggests that opinions are influenced by familiarity with the subject (Anagnostopoulos & Hantzi, 2011; Corrigan et al., 2001; Holmes et al., 1999) and the influence of these opinions depends on social distance and contact with the individual (Glynn & Park, 1997; Krassa, 1988; Oshagen, 1996; Perkins, 2002; Shibutani, 1955). Three unique scales measured perceived occupational prestige among these different groups. A 3-item scale was used to measure POP significant other ( $\alpha = .75$ ).

1. My friends and family have a positive image of the work I do.

2. My friends and family recognize the importance of the work I do.

3. My friends and family show little respect for correctional officers (reverse coded).

POP generalized other was operationalized by a 6-item scale ( $\alpha = .85$ ).

Neighbors and local townspeople recognize the importance of the work I do.
Neighbors and local townspeople show little respect for correctional officers (reverse coded).

3. Neighbors and local townspeople have a positive image of the work I do.

4. The general public shows little respect for correctional officers (reverse coded).

5. The general public recognizes the importance of the work I do.

6. The general public has a positive image of the work I do.

A scale ( $\alpha = .71$ ) was created to measure POP media on the basis of responses to these four statements.

1. When there is a news story about correctional officers they are usually portrayed negatively (reverse coded).

2. The news media highlights the importance of the work correctional officers do.

3. When I see correctional officers on TV or in movies they are usually portrayed negatively (reverse coded).

4. TV shows and movies that feature correctional officers highlight the importance of the work they do.

# **DEPENDENT VARIABLES**

Stress was measured by both an attitudinal and health self-report scale. The fouritem attitudinal self-report measure of stress used by Cullen et al. (1985) and Crank et al. (1995) was used to assess job stress among the officers. This attitudinal stress scale has been found to be reliable elsewhere (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Griffin, 2006; Gross et al., 1996; Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007) and has an acceptable reliability level for this analysis ( $\alpha = .73$ ).

1. When I'm at work, I often feel tense or uptight.

2. I usually feel that I am under a lot of pressure when I am at work.

3. A lot of times, my job makes me very frustrated or angry.

4. My work environment allows me to be attentive, yet relaxed and at ease (reverse coded).

In addition, a more objective health measure of stress (see Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Spector & Jex, 1998; Spector, Chen, & O'Connell, 2000) assessed four potential health consequences of stress. For each, the officers were asked to indicate whether they experienced specific health conditions never, seldom, sometimes, often, or frequently in the past four months and a holiday was used as a reference point ( $\alpha = .82$ ).

 Due to work conditions here, how often have you experienced headaches?
Due to work conditions here, how often have you experienced tiredness/fatigue?

3. Due to work conditions here, how often have you experienced irritability/irritation?

4. Due to work conditions here, how often have you experienced stomach trouble?

## **CONTROL VARIABLES**

In this study, individual level perceptions concerning factors associated with the work environment were measured. The scales included in this study were chosen based on prior research, which consistently identifies role strain, perceptions of danger, work-family conflict, organizational support, and quality of supervision as the strongest predictors of correctional officer job stress (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Auerbach et al., 2003; Cheek & Miller, 1983; Cullen et al., 1985; Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Finn, 1998; Griffin, 2006; Grossi et al., 1996; Hartley et al., 2013; Jurik & Halemba, 1984; Keinen & Malach-Pines, 2007; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000). The scales included in this study

measure role strain, perceived danger, work-family conflict, quality of supervision, and organizational support.

**Role strain.** The concept of role strain can be broken down into two components: role conflict and role ambiguity. Most research assessing role strain uses a combined measure that includes aspects from both role conflict and role ambiguity. The scale used in this study combines measures of both role ambiguity and role conflict. The items for this scale are similar to ones used by Armstrong and Griffin (2004); Hepburn, (1985); Hepburn and Knepper (1993); Poole and Regoli, (1980); and Rizzo et al. (1970). Correctional officers perception of role strain was measured using a 6-item scale ( $\alpha =$ .83).

1. Often times, one rule will tell us to do one thing, but another rule tells us to do something else.

2. When a problem comes up here, nobody can agree on how it should be handled.

3. The rules I am supposed to follow are very clear (reverse coded).

4. I work under conflicting policies and guidelines.

5. I receive conflicting requests from supervisors and management.

6. Overall, the information we get from chain of command is clear and easy to apply (reverse coded).

**Perceived danger.** In order to assess officers' perception of danger within their job, they were asked to respond to these two statements ( $\alpha = .67$ ). The responses ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

1. I work at a dangerous job.

2. In my job, a person stands a good chance of getting hurt.

This two-item scale is similar to the one constructed by Cullen, Link, Cullen, and Wolfe (1989).

Work-family conflict. The current study also includes a measure of the influence of work on home life. The items used to assess work-family conflict include measurements of both time-based conflict and strain-based conflict. Time-based conflict assesses the pressure that arises when scheduling and time spent at work interferes with home life. Strain-based conflict refers to when the negative aspects of the job influence home life. For this analysis, the work-family conflict scale is a composite of time-based conflict and strain-based conflict, similar to measures developed by Bacharach, Bamberger, and Conley, (1991); Bohen and Viveros-Long, (1981); Carlson, Kacmer, and Williams, (2000); Frone, Russell, and Cooper, (1992); Lambert et al. (2007); and Triplett et al. (1999). Work-family conflict was operationalized by a 6-item scale ( $\alpha = .73$ ).

1. My job keeps me away from my family too much.

2. Work makes me too tired or irritable to enjoy my family and/or social life.

3. My work schedule is so uncertain that it interferes with my family and/or social life.

4. I find that my job has negatively affected my home life.

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

6. I don't take my job home with me (reverse coded).

**Quality of supervision.** Correctional officers' perceptions of the quality of supervision was measured by an 8-item scale ( $\alpha = .88$ ) similar to one created by Eisenberger et al. (1986) and used by Armstrong and Griffin (2004) and Griffin (2001, 2002, 2006).

1. I can tell my supervisor when things are wrong.

2. On my job, I know what my supervisor expects of me.

3. I often receive feedback on my performance from my supervisor.

4. I am satisfied with the way I am treated by my supervisor.

5. My supervisor gives very clear directions that are easy to follow.

6. My supervisor listens to suggestions from me and other officers.

7. My supervisor does not treat me with respect (reverse coded).

8. My supervisor coaches and mentors me so I can succeed on the job.

**Organizational support.** This study relies on a four-item scale ( $\alpha = .84$ ) used by Eisenberger et al. (1986) and (Griffin, 2001, 2002, 2006). This scale measured the perceived support from the Arizona Department of Corrections rather than a specific prison complex or unit due to the frequency of officers being transferred between prison complexes and units. The items which comprise this scale are:

1. ADC takes pride in my accomplishments at work.

2. Even if I did the best job possible, the department probably would not notice (reverse coded).

3. The department values my input.

4. The department shows very little concern for me personally (reverse coded).

**Socio-demographic variables.** A number of control variables were used in this analysis. Previous research has explored the effects of age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, and length of tenure on stress and the findings are mixed (Dowden & Tellier, 2004). Often these variables are not significant. When a significant relationship is found between individual level variables and job stress, the strength of these relationships are generally much weaker than those found between organizational factors and job stress (Dowden & Tellier, 2004). Although the findings are mixed, it is important to control for these variables in order to determine their effect when assessing the relatively unstudied variable of POP.

Descriptive statistics for all variables are included in Table 3. Age of correctional officer was measured as a continuous variable. The mean age was 40.7. Gender was measured as a dummy variable with zero representing female and one representing male (78.4% male and 21.6% female). Race was measured as a dummy variable with White (1) and non-White (0) and 63.4% were White, while 36.6% were non-White. An officer's level of education was measured as a dichotomous variable with "0" representing a high school degree and "1" representing more than a high school degree. For a majority of the correctional officers (70%) a high school degree was their highest level of education. Tenure was measured as a categorical variable (1 = 0-4 years, 2 = 5-9 years, 3 = 10+ years) and followed the cutoffs outlined by career stage theory which suggests that there are specific stages in ones' career that can influence workplace factors (Greenhaus, 1987; Greenhaus, Callanan, & Godshalk, 2000; Super, 1980). The majority of correctional officers (57.5%) had been employed for less than 10 years.

# \*\*Insert Table 3 About Here\*\*

# DATA ANALYSIS

Given that the dependent variables are interval level data and the dependent variable, stress, is normally distributed, the current study employs multivariate Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression models to test the research hypotheses. OLS regression models allow for an assessment of the relationship between the key independent variable and the dependent variables while controlling for important factors that are theoretically relevant to our model, such as job danger and role strain (Field, 2013). The sociodemographic variables race, gender, age, tenure, and education are also included in the model to control for their effects. Pearson's correlation coefficients, variation inflation factors, and tolerance statistics are reported in the results section and multicollinearity between the independent variables and the control variables is not an issue.

#### CHAPTER 5

# RESULTS

# **BIVARIATE ANALYSIS**

**Individual-level variables.** Table 4 includes the bivariate coefficients among the individual-level variables and all the other variables included in the model. Consistent with previous research, none of the individual-level variables (age, sex, race/ethnicity, education, and tenure) are related to attitudinal stress. For health stress, only male has a negative and fairly weak relationship (-.01) with health stress. Race/ethnicity is the only individual-level variable significantly related to POP significant other. Correctional officers who are White (.13) perceive higher occupational prestige among their significant others. Conversely, those who are White (-.09) perceive lower occupational prestige among generalized others, while older (.11) correctional officers perceive higher occupational prestige among generalized others. Correctional officers who are White (-.21), and have longer tenure (-.11) perceive lower occupational prestige among the media. All of these relationships between individual level variables and POP are relatively weak. Correctional officers who are older perceive more organizational support (.11) and lower levels of danger (-.20), role strain (-.09), and work-family conflict. More educated officers experience less work-family conflict (-.10). Those who have longer tenure experience lower levels of quality of supervision (-.08), danger (-.17), and work-family conflict (-.08).

# \*\*Insert Table 4 about here\*\*

**Work environment variables.** Table 5 includes the bivariate coefficients for all key independent and work environment variables among all the variables. Consistent

with previous research, all of the work environment variables (quality of supervision, organizational support, dangerousness, role strain, and WFC) have a significant relationship with attitudinal job stress. Quality of supervision and organizational support have an inverse relationship with stress, while dangerousness, role strain, and WFC have a positive relationship. Similarly, all of the work environment variables also have a significant relationship with the health measure of stress. The relationships are in the same direction as with the attitudinal measure of job stress; quality of supervision and organizational support have an inverse relationship and dangerousness, role strain, and WFC have a positive relationship. A significant association exists among the five work environment variables. Organizational support has a strong positive significant relationship with quality of supervision, while dangerousness, role strain, and WFC have a significant negative association with quality of supervision, as well as organizational support.

## **\*\*Insert Table 5 about here\*\***

Key independent variables. POP significant other (-.19), POP generalized other (-.35), and POP media (-.28) each have a significant inverse relationship with attitudinal job stress. As correctional officers perceive higher status among these audiences, stress is reduced. POP generalized other has the strongest relationship with attitudinal job stress. The correlations between the POP variables and the health measure of stress are similar to the relationship with attitudinal job stress. POP generalized other (-.36) also has the strongest inverse relationship with health stress, while POP significant other (-.17) and POP media (-.29) also are significantly and inversely related to health stress.

Among the relationships between the key independent variables, POP generalized other (.28) has a significant positive relationship with POP significant other, while POP media does not have a significant relationship with POP significant other. POP media (.51) does have a significant positive correlation with POP generalized other. Quality of supervision and organizational support are significantly positively associated with all of the key independent variables. When correctional officers feel that they are supported by the organization and they have good supervision, they perceive higher levels of occupational prestige among significant others, generalized others, and the media. Conversely, dangerousness, role strain, and WFC each has a significant inverse relationship with the three independent variables; dangerousness is not significantly related to POP significant others. As correctional officers experience higher levels of these stressors, they perceive lower occupational prestige from the three domains.

**Dependent variables.** As expected, the two measures of stress (attitudinal and health) are significantly related (.61). As health stress increases attitudinal stress increases as well.

## SUMMARY

The lack of significant bivariate relationships between individual level variables and job stress is consistent with prior research. The strongest correlations with the dependent variables exist between the environmental stressors. This is not surprising due to the fact that these variables were included because they have been shown within the correctional officer stress literature to be among the strongest predictors of job stress (Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000). The three independent variables have a moderate relationship with the dependent variables. The bivariate results concerning the independent variables are inconsistent with Hypotheses 3b (POP significant others will have the strongest influence on job stress, compared to POP generalized others) and 4b (POP associated with the media will have the strongest influence on job stress when compared to POP significant other and generalized others). POP generalized others has the most robust association with both the attitudinal and health measure of stress, while POP media has the second strongest relationship. The significant relationship between the key independent variables and work environment variables suggest that these variables may condition the effect of POP on stress. Although these bivariate relationships offer some insight into the association between the variables in the model, they are not conclusive. In order to further understand the relationship between these variables, it is necessary to use a multivariate model, which identifies the independent effect of each variable on the dependent variables while controlling for the influence of the other variables included in the model.

### SOCIAL DISTANCE COMPARISON

In an effort to explore Hypothesis 1 which states that greater social distance will result in lower POP, a one-way ANOVA with repeated measures was performed. The assumption of sphericity was violated so the Greenhouse-Geisser correction was used and the differences in means between these variables are significant (F = 1331.58, p < .01). Table 6 reports means, standard deviations, and the comparison of means between POP significant others, generalized others, and media. Correctional officers will perceive that significant others have the highest level of occupational prestige, compared to generalized others and Hypothesis 4a suggests that correctional officers will perceive that the media depicts the lowest level of occupational prestige. The officers believe that significant others (M = 4.03) view their profession with the highest prestige and the media (M = 2.10) has the lowest prestige, while the prestige associated with generalized others (M=2.80) falls in between. The differences in means between these variables are significant at .01. These findings are consistent with Hypothesis 1 and 4a that state that correctional officers will perceive that significant others have the highest occupational prestige when compared to generalized others and media, and that generalized others will have higher levels of occupational prestige than the media.

# \*\*Insert Table 6 about here\*\*

## **MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS**

Significant variation appears to exist in the dependent and independent variables and statistical tests indicate that the variables are normally distributed. To further explore the relationship between POP and attitudinal and health stress multiple multivariate ordinary least squares (OLS) regression models are used. For the models, multicollinearity is not an issue. The highest variation inflation factor (VIF) is 2.14 and the lowest tolerance statistic is .56. VIF values greater than 6 and tolerance values less than .47 suggest that multicollinearity could be an issue (Maruyama, 1998; Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996).

Stepwise regression of attitudinal stress on the key independent variables, work environment variables, and individual-level variables. Table 7 presents results from seven models assessing the influence of POP variables, work environment variables, and individual-level variables on attitudinal job stress. These models test Hypothesis 2 (The observed effects of POP on stress will continue to be significant when the combined effects of environmental workplace stressors are controlled). In addition,
Table 7 reports information concerning Hypothesis 3a and 3b, which suggests that the greater the social distance, the lower the effect of POP on stress; specifically, POP significant others will have a stronger relationship with stress when compared to POP generalized other. Also, the results of Hypothesis 4b (POP associated with the media will have the strongest influence on job stress when compared to POP of significant other and generalized others) are included in Table 7.

Models 1 through 3 assess the bivariate relationship between each POP variable and attitudinal job stress. Each POP variable is significant and has an inverse relationship. As officers perceive higher levels of POP among significant others ( $\beta$  = -.18, p < .01), generalized other ( $\beta$  = -.36, p < .01), and the media ( $\beta$  = -.27, p < .01) attitudinal job stress decreases. Model 4 identifies the effects of all three POP variables on attitudinal job stress (adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = .15 and F = 37.07). The findings are similar to the bivariate relationship with each POP variable having a significant inverse relationship with attitudinal job stress.

Model 5 examines the effects of the individual-level variables (age, sex, race/ethnicity, education, tenure) and the POP variables on attitudinal job stress (adjusted  $R^2 = .13$  and F = 12.60). When these individual-level variables are included the POP variables have a significant inverse relationship with attitudinal job stress and the impact of the POP variables changes little. None of the individual-level variables are significantly related to attitudinal stress.

Model 6 identifies the effects of POP and the work environment variables on attitudinal job stress (adjusted  $R^2 = .48$  and F = 67.58). When these variables are added to the model, the significant relationships between attitudinal job stress and POP among significant others and general public are no longer significant. However, POP media continues to have a significant inverse relationship ( $\beta$  = -.09, p < .01). Quality of supervision and organizational support are not significantly related to attitudinal stress, while dangerousness ( $\beta$  = .13, p < .01), role strain ( $\beta$  = .25, p < .01), and WFC ( $\beta$  = .35, p < .01) have a significant positive relationship. The difference between the explained variance accounted for by the work environment variables and the individual-level variables (adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = .13 vs. adjusted R<sup>2</sup> = .48) are consistent with prior research that suggests variables like role strain, dangerousness, and work-family conflict are among the strongest predictors of stress, while individual-level variables have experienced mixed findings (Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000).

#### \*\*Insert Table 7 about here\*\*

Model 7 identifies the effects of POP, work environment, and individual level variables on the outcome variable attitudinal job stress (adjusted  $R^2 = .48$  and F = 39.57). Unlike Models 5 and 6, none of the POP variables remain significant when all variables are included. This finding does not support Hypothesis 2 which states that when all variables are included, the POP variables will continue to be significant. Hypothesis 4b (POP associated with the media will have the strongest influence on job stress when compared to POP of significant other and generalized others) is partially supported. Although POP media is not significant in the full model, POP wariable that remained significant when the work environment variables were included. Hypothesis 3b (POP of significant others will have the strongest included. Hypothesis 3b (POP of significant others will have the strongest included. Hypothesis 3b (POP of significant others will have the strongest included. Hypothesis 3b (POP of significant others will have the strongest included. Hypothesis 3b (POP of significant others will have the strongest influence on job stress, compared to POP of significant others will have the strongest influence on job stress, compared to POP of significant others will have the strongest influence on job stress, compared to POP of significant others) is not supported due to the lack of significant findings concerning

these variables. When all variables are included, the only significant predictors of attitudinal job stress are dangerousness ( $\beta = .14$ , p < .01), role strain ( $\beta = .25$ , p < .01), and WFC ( $\beta = .38$ , p < .01). All of these variables have a positive relationship with attitudinal jobs stress and WFC is the most robust predictor (.38).

Stepwise regression of health stress on the independent variables, work environment variables, and individual-level variables. Table 8 presents the findings for the stepwise regression of health job stress on POP variables, work environment variables, and individual-level variables. The first three models assess the bivariate relationship between the POP variables and health job stress; each has a significant inverse relationship. As officers perceive higher levels of occupational prestige among the different groups (significant others, generalized others, and media) health job stress decreases. Model 4 examines the relationship between health job stress and all three POP variables (adjusted  $R^2$ =.15 and F = 37.63). The POP variables continue to have a significant inverse relationship with POP generalized other having the strongest influence on job stress ( $\beta$  = -.26, p < .01).

Model 5 identifies the effects of the individual-level variables and all three POP variables on health job stress (adjusted R<sup>2</sup>=.17 and F = 15.39). After entering the individual-level variables, the three POP variables remain significant predictors of health job stress. Three of the individual level variables significantly influence health job stress. Officers who are older ( $\beta$  = -.13, p < .01) male ( $\beta$  = -.09, p < .01) with shorter tenure report ( $\beta$  = .13, p < .01) decreased levels of health stress. The addition of the individual level variables does little to increase the explained variance.

Model 6 presents the findings regarding the impact of work environment variables (quality of supervision, organizational support, dangerousness, role strain, work-family conflict) on health job stress (adjusted R<sup>2</sup>=.40 and F = 47.65). Similar to the findings concerning attitudinal job stress reported in Table 7, when these variables are added, POP significant other and POP generalized other are no longer significant; POP media ( $\beta$  = -.09, p < .01) continues to be a significant predictor. Unlike the results concerning attitudinal job stress, quality of supervision ( $\beta$  = -.12, p < .01) and organizational support ( $\beta$  = -.18, p < .01) are significant predictors of health job stress. When officers believe that the quality of supervision is high and they are supported by the organization, health job stress decreases. WFC ( $\beta$  = .33, p < .01) continues to have a significant positive relationship with health job stress, whereas dangerousness and role strain are not significant. When compared to the variance explained by the POP variables (R<sup>2</sup>=.15), the addition of these five variables adds significantly to the amount of variance explained in health job stress.

### \*\*Insert Table 8 about here\*\*

Model 7 presents the findings regarding the impact of POP variables, work environment variables, and the individual-level variables on health job stress (adjusted  $R^2$ =.41 and F = 29.69). When all variables are included, the only POP variable that is significant is POP media ( $\beta$  = -.09, p < .05). This finding does not support Hypothesis 2 that the observed effects of POP on health stress will be significant when all other variables are controlled. This is also true for Hypothesis 3b (POP of significant others will have the strongest influence on job stress, compared to POP of generalized others). The fact that POP media is the only POP variable that is related to health stress supports Hypothesis 4b (POP associated with the media will have the strongest influence on job stress when compared to POP of significant other and generalized others). Quality of supervision ( $\beta = -.13$ , p < .01) and organizational support ( $\beta = -.16$ , p < .01) continue to have a significant inverse relationship with health job stress. Similar to the influence of WFC on attitudinal job stress, the strongest predictor of health job stress when controlling for all variables is WFC ( $\beta = .33$ , p < .01). Sex ( $\beta = -.08$ , p < .01) and length of tenure ( $\beta = .14$ , p < .01) remain significant whereas age is no longer related to health job stress.

# SUMMARY

The findings concerning attitudinal and health job stress are similar, in that for both the bivariate relationships the three measures of POP have a significant inverse relationship with the measures of stress. In addition, when the individual-level variables are added to the model the significant relationship persists. Conversely, when the work environment variables are added, the POP variables no longer are predictors of either measure of stress. The one exception is that POP media has a significant impact on health job stress. In the full model for attitudinal stress, the only significant predictors are dangerousness, role strain, and WFC. Within the full model assessing health job stress, POP media, quality of supervision, organizational support, WFC, length of tenure, and sex are all significant predictors. For both measures of job stress, WFC is the most robust predictor of stress.

When examining the progression of the stepwise regressions concerning both attitudinal and health measures of job stress, it is apparent that there may be potential conditioning effects among the environmental and individual-level variables concerning the relationship between POP and attitudinal job stress.

Stepwise regression by attitudinal and health job stress on POP variables by level of quality of supervision. The importance of support within the correctional institution has been highlighted in the correctional officer research (see Cullen et al., 1985; Lambert et al., 2010, Neveu, 2007). The quality of supervision experienced by a correctional officer can act as a protective factor against stress, or may amplify workplace stress (Brough & Williams, 2007; Garland, 2004; Walters, 1999). As a result, when quality of supervision is low, this may exacerbate other stressors like low POP. With this in mind, additional analyses explore the mediating effect of quality of supervision on attitudinal job stress. Table 9 reports the results for the analysis that tests Hypothesis 5, which states that POP will have the strongest effect when perceived quality of supervision is low. Table 9 presents results from four models assessing the influence of POP variables, work environment variables, and individual-levels variables on attitudinal job stress by level of quality of supervision. To identify high and low quality of supervision, the distribution of scale responses for quality of supervision was separated into two groups -- those above the median scale score (high quality of supervision) and those below the median scale score (low quality of supervision).

Among those individuals who perceive low quality of supervision, when only the three POP variables are included in the model, POP generalized other and POP media have a significant inverse relationship with attitudinal job stress. When the individuallevel variables are included, this finding remains; however, when the work environment variables are added, only POP media is significant. When all of the variables are included in the model, none of the POP variables significantly impact the attitudinal measure of job stress. Dangerousness, role strain, and WFC have a positive relationship

with attitudinal job stress for individuals who perceive both low and high quality of supervision. The findings do not support Hypothesis 5 (the measures of POP will have the strongest effect on attitudinal job stress when perceived levels of quality of supervision are low). When the coefficients concerning the significant predictors of attitudinal stress from the two models are compared (e.g. dangerousness low quality of supervision compared to dangerousness high quality of supervision) there is not a significant difference between the coefficients (p < .05). As expected, when perceived quality of supervision is high and all variables are included, none of the POP variables have a significant relationship with attitudinal job stress.

The findings are similar when regressing the variables on the health measure of job stress (see Table 10). When the sample consists of officers who perceive low quality of supervision and only the POP variables are included, POP generalized other and POP media have a significant inverse relationship with the health measure of job stress. When the work environment variables are included, POP media is the only POP variable related to health stress. When all variables are included in the model, none of the POP variables significantly impact health job stress. Organizational support and WFC are significant predictors of health stress for individuals who perceive low quality of supervision and high quality of supervision. These findings contradict Hypothesis 5, which states that the measure of POP will have the strongest effect on health job stress when perceived levels of quality of supervision are low. When the coefficients for organizational support and WFC are compared between the two models neither are significantly different (p < .05). For those officers who perceive high quality of supervision, when all variables are

included in the model, none of the POP variables significantly impact health job stress of officers.

#### \*\*Insert Table 9 about here\*\*

#### \*\*Insert Table 10 about here\*\*

#### Stepwise regression by attitudinal and health job stress on POP variables by

**level of organizational support.** When individuals feel they are supported by the organization, this may serve to combat the various stressors experienced within the correctional work environment (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Griffin, 2006; Paoline & Lambert, 2011). As such, Table 11 provides results concerning the hypothesis that the POP variables will have the strongest effect on attitudinal job stress when perceived levels of organizational support are low. To identify high and low organizational support, the distribution of scale responses for organizational support was separated into two groups -- those above the median scale score (high organizational support) and those below the median scale score (low organizational support).

When organizational support is low and only the POP variables are included (see Model1), POP generalized other is the sole predictor of attitudinal job stress. When all variables (POP, work environment, individual level variables) are included in the analysis, none of the POP variables significantly influence attitudinal job stress (see Model 4). Dangerousness, role strain, and WFC are significant predictors of health stress for both low organizational support and high organizational support. This is counterintuitive to Hypothesis 5 (the measures of POP will have the strongest effect on attitudinal job stress when perceived levels of organizational support are low). When the coefficients for dangerousness are compared for both models (low and high

organizational support) they are significantly different (p < .05), but when role strain and WFC are compared they are not significantly different (p > .05). This suggests that perceived dangerousness is a significantly stronger predictor of attitudinal job stress for those who perceive low organizational support. Unexpectedly, for the officers who believed they were highly supported by the organization, POP media has an inverse relationship with attitudinal job stress.

Table 12 identifies the effects of the POP variables, individual-level variables, and work environment variables on health stress when organizational support is low and high. Similar to the findings concerning attitudinal job stress, when the POP variables are regressed on health job stress, POP generalized other and POP media have an inverse relationship with health job stress. When all the variables are included in Model 4, none of the POP variables have a significant relationship with health job stress, which is inconsistent with Hypothesis 5. WFC is a significant predictor of health stress when organizational support is a high and low, but the coefficients for WFC from the two models are not significantly different (p > .05). When organizational support is high and all variables are included, POP media has a significant inverse relationship with health stress. This is counter to what is expected considering that when individuals believe they have support from the organization, this can help the individual cope with other stressor like low levels of POP.

#### \*\*Insert Table 11 about here\*\*

#### \*\*Insert Table 12 about here\*\*

**Regression by attitudinal and health job stress on POP variables by individual-level variables.** In order to assess the potential conditioning effects of the individual-level variables, several regressions are presented that regress the dependent variables on the POP variables broken down by categories of individual-level variables (age, tenure, race/ethnicity, education, sex). Table 13 presents the results of the regression models that examine the relationship between the measures of stress and the POP variables by age. Age is separated into three categories (21-33, 33-46, 46 and above).<sup>1</sup> For correctional officers who are 21-33 years of age, POP generalized other has a significant inverse relationship with attitudinal job stress. POP media is a significant predictor of both attitudinal and health job stress for 33-46 year olds. POP media is a significant predictor of health stress for officers older than 46. All of the relationships are inverse.

#### \*\*Insert Table 13 about here\*\*

The results of the regression models examining the conditioning effects of tenure are presented in Table 14. Informed by the career stage theory that suggests specific stages in one's career can influence how they experience the workplace, tenure was separated into three groups (0-4 years, 5-9 years, 10 years and above) (Greenhaus, 1987; Greenhaus, Callanan, & Godshalk, 2000; Super, 1980). Among officers who have been with the prison organization the shortest time (0-4 years), increased perceptions of prestige among generalized others decreases attitudinal stress. POP variables have no significant impact on either measure of stress for those employed for 5-9 years. POP

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> This was done in order to increase the number of cases in each category in order to have enough statistical power for the analysis. Statistical power is influenced by sample size and is necessary in order to detect true effects for a given effect size (Britt & Weisburd, 2011). An a priori power analysis was conducted to determine the appropriate sample size required for the analysis (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). According to the power analysis, the necessary sample size is 189 in order to detect a moderate effect size.

media is inversely related to attitudinal and health job stress for individuals employed for 10 years or more.

# **\*\*Insert Table 14 about here\*\***

The influence of race/ethnicity on the association between POP variables and both types of job stress is examined and the results are presented in Table 15. None of the POP variables are related to either measure of stress for White officers. For non-white officers, POP significant others negatively impacts attitudinal stress; in addition, POP general has a negative impact on health stress for officers who are not White.

#### \*\*Insert Table 15 about here\*\*

To examine the mediating effects of education, the sample was separated into two groups – those with only a high school diploma and those with some education beyond high school (see Table 16). No significant relationships emerged between the POP variables and attitudinal and health stress. Analyses also were conducted to examine the mediating effects of sex. Among male officers, POP generalized has a negative impact on health stress (see Table 17).

#### \*\*Insert Table 16 about here\*\*

#### \*\*Insert Table 17 about here\*\*

### SUMMARY

As hypothesized, correctional officer perceive that individuals closest to them (POP significant others) hold the highest prestige with regard to their profession, while they perceive that generalized others associate lower prestige with their profession, and believe that the media has the lowest prestige. The findings concerning the relationship between POP and attitudinal stress do not support the hypotheses that suggest that the POP variables will have a significant relationship with attitudinal stress when all variables are controlled, and that POP media will have the strongest influence on stress. None of the POP variables are significant predictors of attitudinal job stress when all of the control variables are included. Similar findings are reported for the relationship with health stress, except POP media continues to have a significant inverse relationship with health stress when all variables are included. This supports the hypothesis that POP media will have the strongest effect on health stress when compared to the other POP variables.

The findings do not support the hypothesis that when officers perceive the quality of supervision as low, the POP variables will have a stronger effect on both measures of stress. In fact, none of the POP variables are significantly associated with the measures of stress. The findings concerning the relationship between POP and stress when assessed by levels of organizational support are similar for quality of supervision. None of the POP variables are significant when organizational support is low. In fact, counter to what was expected, when organizational support is high POP media has a significant inverse relationship. When the sample was separated by individual-level factors for individuals that were employed more than nine years by the department POP media has a significant effect on attitudinal and health job stress. In addition, for individuals who identified themselves as non-White, POP significant other is a significant predictor of attitudinal job stress and POP generalized other is a significant predictor of health job stress. Overall, it appears that POP is not a significant predictor of both measures of stress except for POP media on health stress. The findings support previous research that suggests that workplace factors like dangerousness and role strain are among the most

robust predictors of stress. Work-family conflict emerged as the strongest predictor of both measures of stress, which is not surprising considering previous research that has highlighted the importance of this variable.

#### **CHAPTER 6**

### **DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

The topic of work stress among correctional officers has received extensive attention due to the unique nature of the job. Correctional officers work in a coercive environment and are required to perform a dangerous job with an unwilling population (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Brodsky, 1982; Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000; Tartaro, 2002). This line of research consistently has shown that correctional officers experience high levels of stress (Auerbach et al., 2003; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000; Whitehead & Lindquist, 1986). The importance of understanding work stress among correctional officers is highlighted by the negative outcomes associated with prolonged exposure to work stress (Garner et al., 2007; Griffin, 2008; Griffin et al., 2010; Hogan et al., 2009; Hogan et al., 2013; Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000) and the reliance of correctional institutions upon correctional officers to maintain a safe environment and to achieve the goals of the institution (Archambeault & Archambeault, 1982; Lambert et al., 2009).

The research concerning sources of work stress among correctional officers focuses almost exclusively on stressors associated with the work environment (role strain, dangerousness, occupational support) with the exception of work-family conflict and support stemming from outside the institution. This is problematic because factors beyond the walls of the institution that are associated with correctional officer duties and responsibilities may influence stress among this group of employees. Specifically, how others outside the correctional institution view the role of correctional officers may impact stress. Correctional officers are often portrayed negatively within news and

entertainment media (Bennett, 2006; Bennet & Satre, 2000; Freeman, 1998; Kantrowitz, 1996; Vickovic et al., 2013; Zaner, 1989) and these depictions serve to enforce popular stereotypes of correctional officers as lazy, brutal, and aggressive (Conover, 2001; Freeman, 1998; Johnson, 2002; Kauffman, 1988; Tracy, 2004). Although research suggests that correctional officers are allocated low occupational prestige from the public (Nakao & Treas, 1994; Sundt, 2009), it is necessary to understand the way in which correctional officers believe the public views them and their profession. The public may hold correctional officers in low regard, but if the officers believe that the public views them in a favorable way this will likely not negatively affect the officers. A relatively small body of literature has examined correctional officers outside of the United States finding that a perceived negative public image acts as a significant stressor (Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007; Moon & Maxwell, 2004). As such, this study assesses how perceived occupational prestige influences work stress among a sample of correctional officers while controlling for other relevant sources of stress.

#### SOCIAL DISTANCE OF POP

Findings from these analyses indicate that, as expected, officers believe that significant others view their profession with the highest prestige, while officers perceive that the media views corrections work as having the lowest prestige. These findings follow the logic that opinions are influenced by familiarity with a subject or profession (Anagnostopoulos & Hantzi, 2011; Corrigan et al., 2001; Holmes et al., 1999). Friends and family members of correctional officers receive first-hand information regarding the role of a correctional officer and have contact with officers, which speak to their character. This close contact allows friends and family to possess a clearer understanding

of the realities of the job. Conversely, media depictions are driven by profit margins which are determined by increased viewership, and as a result news sources tend to focus on unique events like violent crime and often offer biased coverage of topics (Beckett & Sasson, 2004; Gruenewald, Chermark, Pizarro, 2011; Potter & Kappeler, 2006; Surette, 2015). This is true for news coverage of correctional officers that focuses on factors like excessive use of force and sexual misconduct among correctional officers (Vickovic et al., 2013). These findings suggest that correctional officers recognize that the media portrays their profession negatively and fails to highlight the importance of their profession. In addition, officers perceived that the general public holds their profession in higher regard than the media but lower than significant others. This also supports the notion that familiarity through social distance can influence opinions. As the source of POP increases in social distance, the perceived occupational prestige of correctional officers decreases.

# THE INFLUENCE OF INDIVIDUAL-LEVEL PREDICTORS AND WORK STRESS

Similar to past research, the influence of individual-level variables on work stress are mixed. There are no individual-level variables that are significantly related to attitudinal work stress. However, both sex and tenure are significantly related to health stress. Specifically, woman experience more health stress than men. This finding is consistent with prior research that has reported that women experience higher levels of work stress (Lambert et al., 2005; 2007; 2010). These findings are often explained by the highly masculinized environment that women experience within these correctional institutions, and the harassment and discrimination historically associated with this work environment (Britton, 1997; Griffin et al., 2005; Jurik, 1988; Pogrebin & Poole, 1997, 1998; Savicki et al., 2003). Tenure is another individual-level variable that has been shown to have an influence on work stress. Supporting prior research, this analysis suggests a positive relationship between tenure and health stress (Armstrong et al., 2004; Cullen et al., 1985; Lambert et al., 2005; 2008; 2009; 2010; Lambert & Hogan, 2009; Lambert & Paoline, 2008). Arguably, this relationship may exist due to the cumulative effects of stress over an officer's career. Frustration may accrue due to lack of improvement of working conditions or limited promotional opportunities (Lambert et al., 2009). Although seemingly straightforward, this finding is more complex than it might appear. Due to the cross sectional nature of the data, it is not possible to assess how stressors and their impact vary across an officer's career. Officers who are better able to cope with work stress may remain with the organization; alternatively, officers may remain with the organization regardless of the stressors experienced due to a belief that they are not able to leave their job. Further research is needed to better understand the role of stressors and an officer's decision to stay with the organization. Although women and those with longer tenure experience more health work stress, the strength of the relationship is relatively weak compared to other variables, which is a consistent finding within this line of research (Dowden & Tellier, 2004).

#### THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POP DOMAINS AND WORK STRESS

POP among the three domains (significant other, generalized, media) has a significant inverse relationship at the bivariate level with both the attitudinal and health measure of stress. When all of the control variables are included, however, the only significant relationship that remains is between POP media and the measure of health

stress. These findings are inconsistent with past studies that have reported a significant relationship between a negative public image and work stress (Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007; Moon & Maxwell, 2004). More importantly, this does not support the hypothesis suggesting that POP has a significant influence on work stress when controlling for relevant factors. With the inclusion of organizational support, quality of supervision, perceived danger, role strain, and WFC, the POP variables no longer significantly impact either measure of stress (except POP media on health stress). Conversely, the addition of individual-level variables (age, gender, race/ethnicity, education, and tenure) did not affect the significant relationships between the POP variables and the measures of stress and altered the adjusted R<sup>2</sup> by less than .03. The explained variance is more than doubled when the control variables are added to the model that includes the POP variables and individual-level variables.

Such findings suggest that the mechanism by which others' attitudes towards one's profession influences an officer's social identity is fairly complex. Some research suggests that a positive self-concept and high self-esteem are inversely related to stress (O'Donnell, Brydon, Wright, & Steptoe, 2008; Rector & Roger, 1997; Schrami, Perski, Grossi, & Simonsson-Sarnecki, 2011; Stinson et al., 2008). The self-concept, or what one thinks about oneself or a group they belong to, is constructed through the way individuals believe society perceives them (Cooley, 1902; Goffman, 1963; Mead, 1934; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). When an individual belongs to a prestigious social group, there exists greater potential to increase self-esteem through identification with the group (Mael & Ashforth, 1992; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Alternatively, when one is associated with a stigmatized group it is difficult for them to construct a positive social identity hindering their ability to increase self-esteem (Ashforth & Kreiner, 1999; Crocker, Major, & Steele, 1998; Goffman, 1963). Although association with a stigmatized group can negatively influence ones' self-concept, individuals within these groups can formulate a positive self-concept through interactions with co-workers that serve to increase pride and prestige associated with their job among those within the profession (Takase, Maude, & Manias, 2006). In addition, individuals can increase self-concept through identification and roles that exist beyond their professional identity (Takase, Maude, & Manias, 2006). POP may not have a significant influence on stress among these correctional officers because they are able to formulate a positive self-concept through positive interactions with co-workers who serve to highlight the favorable aspects associated with their profession. In addition, their professional identity may play a small role in the development of their self-concept.

As noted above, a significant relationship exists between POP media and health stress when all of the controls were included. This is consistent with the hypothesis that suggests that POP media will have the strongest influence on stress. Compared to significant others and generalized others, the media is an important source of information for individuals, with some research suggesting that news and entertainment media account for 80 percent of information individuals receive concerning news and public affairs (The Pew Center for Research, 2008; Yang & Stone, 2003). Combined with the tendency of these media sources to portray correctional officers unfavorably, this can act as a significant stressor for correctional officers. Unlike significant and generalized others where correctional officers may have an opportunity to socialize with these individuals in order to educate them about the realities of their job and speak for their

character, this is not possible with media outlets. In addition, individuals who are close to correctional officers may not value and respect their job but may think highly of them beyond their professional identity. Interaction with these officers in everyday situations may create an identity as a loving parent, significant other, or sibling who is a positive member of the community which may mitigate the negative views of their job. Conversely, the media is a pervasive source of information that unfavorably depicts correctional officers and can influence numerous individuals whose only sources of information concerning correctional officers are these media depictions. Correctional officers have no control over how the media depicts their profession. As a result, officers are likely to experience negative stereotypes associated with their profession by individuals who are not familiar with the corrections profession or an officer's character beyond their job.

# ASSESMENT OF CONDITIONING EFFECTS REGARDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POP AND WORK STRESS

As noted previously, these analyses did not find the expected relationship between POP and work stress. Given the extant research regarding stress and other organizational factors, however, potential conditioning effects were also examined. The sample was divided into two groups, those officers who reported high levels of organizational support and those who reported low levels. The sample was similarly split into those who reported high and low levels of quality of supervision. The notion is that perceptions of lower levels of support from key members within the organization may be seen as resource depletion and serve to exacerbate other stressors among officers, such as POP. This, however, is not the case for this sample of officers who perceived low levels organizational support and quality of supervision. Interestingly enough, the analyses suggest that the only significant relationship is the impact of POP media on both measures of stress for those officers who report higher levels of organizational support. This may be due to the fact that individuals who perceive higher levels of support may have more of their identity invested in this organization that supports them and these negative outside views may be more harmful to these individuals.

Although the findings concerning the direct relationship between individual-level factors and stress are mixed, there is still evidence that these factors can have an impact on stress (Griffin, 2007; Lambert et al., 2007; Mitchell et al., 2000; Paoline et al., 2006; Toch & Klofas, 1982) and may condition the effect of other variables on stress. Potential conditioning effects of individual-level factors like tenure, race/ethnicity, sex, age, and education were also examined. Although few significant themes or patterns emerged, POP media is inversely related to both measures of stress for correctional officers who have over nine years of experience. Officers who have committed themselves to the organization for longer periods of time may have much more invested in their work identity than newer officers. This group of officers may identify with the job more and as a result, negative depictions of their profession may influence them more than those officers who have only been a correctional officer for a limited time.

In addition to tenure, significant differences were found by race. For non-white officers, POP significant others negatively impacts attitudinal stress; in addition, POP generalized other has a negative impact on health stress for officers who self-identified as non-white. To better understand this finding, one should consider the nature of the organization and the dynamics between those who work and those who live in prison.

Given the United State's history of mass incarceration and the impact of this policy on minority communities, race is often a difficult issue in the prison setting. Not only are minorities overrepresented among the incarcerated population (Pew Center on the States, 2008), but minorities are consistently underrepresented among the prison officer population (Britton, 1997; Van Voorhis et al., 1991). Minority officers experience a very different work environment and may very well be viewed by those unaffiliated with the prison as working for an oppressive institution. In addition, POP associated with generalized others is a significant predictor of health job stress for men but not women. Due to the stereotype that correctional officer work is masculine work dominated by men, their identity might be shaped by their role as a correctional officer more so than women and as a result POP may influence them more. It appears that the relationship between POP and attitudinal and health work stress is conditioned by certain individual-level factors like race/ethnicity and tenure.

# THE INFLUENCE OF QUALITY OF SUPERVISION, ORGANIZATIONAL SUPPORT, ROLE STRAIN, PERCIEVED DANGER, AND WFC

The strongest predictors of job stress are those factors associated with the social and physical correctional environment, which supports prior research (Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000). Surprisingly, quality of supervision and organizational support did not have a significant effect on attitudinal job stress. Dangerousness and role strain, however, had a significant positive relationship with attitudinal work stress. The reality of being a correctional officer includes the constant possibility of violence, and as a result perceived dangerousness has been a robust predictor of job stress among correctional officers (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Cullen et al., 1985; Dowden & Tellier, 2004; Griffin, 2006; Lambert & Hogan, 2010; Triplett et al., 1999). Role strain is among one of the most robust predictors of attitudinal job stress within the current study, supporting previous research suggesting that a lack of clarity regarding ones' role is a critical stressor experienced by officers (Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000). In such a difficult working environment it is imperative that officers have clear guidelines concerning the goals of the institution and their role within achieving these goals. Too often, changes in public policy and administrative leadership result in a lack of clarity regarding institutional goals. As messages filter down to the rank and file, it can be difficult for officers to get a sense of their role in the institution leading to increased stress as officers carry out their duties.

Regarding health stress and environmental variables, quality of supervision and organizational support have an inverse relationship with health stress, while role strain and dangerousness have no significant impact on this dependent variable. Research suggests that the quality of one's supervisor and a supportive environment may serve to insulate correctional officers from other stressors (Cullen et al., 1985; Jacobs & Olitsky, 2004). The current findings support this notion that higher levels of quality of supervision lowers health-related stress among officers. Similarly, when employees feel that they are supported by the organization, they believe they are respected and valued and this can lower stress (Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Auerbach et al., 2003; Griffin, 2006).

The measure of work-family conflict that combined elements of strain-based conflict and time-based conflict is the strongest predictor of attitudinal job stress and health job stress. This finding follows the growing body of literature that has examined

relationship between work-family conflict and work stress (Griffin, 2006; Lambert et al., 2004; 2006; 2007; 2010; Triplett et al., 1999). The often unpredictable requirement of working overtime, rotating shifts, and the need to staff correctional institutions regardless of holidays can take a toll on correctional officers and their families. In addition, the demanding nature of correctional work is often brought home and can negatively influence home life. When officers perceive a high level of work-family conflict, such conflict can increase work stress and ultimately influence the various negative factors associated with elevated levels of work stress like decreased job satisfaction, increased job burnout, increased turnover intent, and the many health consequences associated with stress.

Several conflicting findings were noted regarding the stressors included and the two measures of stress. For instance, none of the individual-level variables are significant predictors of attitudinal job stress in the full model, while tenure and sex are significant predictors of health stress in the full model. In addition, perceived danger and role strain are related to attitudinal work stress but quality and supervision and organizational support are not. Conversely, quality of supervision and organizational support are not. Conversely, quality of supervision and perceived danger are not. The majority of studies that have assessed work stress among correctional officers have used self-report questionnaires that assess attitudinal measures of work stress. Although the scales used to measure attitudinal stress have been validated, some evidence suggests that this may not be an accurate measure of work stress. Specifically, researchers have asked correctional officers to report their own stress while also reporting perceptions of co-workers stress (Cheek & Miller, 1983; Triplett et

al., 1996; Veneziano, 1984). They found that compared to the responses concerning coworker's levels of stress, officers tended to underreport their own stress levels. Such studies highlight the common criticism that when answering subjective self-report surveys, respondents might misrepresent their own stress levels. The current research employed a measure of attitudinal work stress and health work stress to more accurately measure stress (see Armstrong & Griffin, 2004). Although this measure of health stress is not an objective measure of stress like measures of blood pressure and ventilation functions, it provides an alternative way to assess work stress among correctional officers. It is important to note that the findings across both measures of stress are not consistent. These findings emphasize the need to further refine the way stress is measured and the utility in including multiple measures in order to validate findings across measurements.

#### LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The survey data used in this study are cross sectional, which does not allow assessment of the influences of stressors on work stress over time. This may be problematic because stress levels may fluctuate over time due to factors like staffing levels, number of inmates, supervisory changes, and new organizational policies. As mentioned previously, missing data was an issue as a result of a printing error. Similar response pattern imputation, which has been shown to be effective (Gmel, 2001), was used to increase the number of cases included in the final models. Imputation was performed on select items that had the most missing values. The item with the most missing values had 6.5 percent missing. Research suggests that data imputation is an efficient way to deal with data with up to 50 percent missing values (Scheffer, 2002).

Before imputation 440 cases were included in the full model for attitudinal job stress and 439 for health stress. After imputation 549 cases were included in the full model for attitudinal job stress and 535 for health stress. Also, the response rate may be viewed as relatively low (53.8%) for social science research involving individual subjects which can potentially bias the findings. It should be kept in mind, however, that such a response rate is consistent with other research concerning correctional officers (see Armstrong & Griffin, 2004; Van Voorhis et al., 1991) and considerably better than other studies (with a response rate as low as 18%) that have examined correctional officers (see Castle & Martin, 2006; Taxman & Gordon, 2009). Achieving high response rates among samples of correctional officers is difficult due to the closed nature of the institution and the fear on the part of potential subjects that individuals in the organization will see their responses. Although the response rate is low, the correctional officers are representative of the population of correctional officers employed at the two correctional institutions on multiple demographic factors. Race/ethnicity is the only significant difference between the sample and the population; the sample consists of more individuals that identified as "other" compared to the population, and the strength of the difference is weak. Given that the sample was drawn from two correctional institutions in Arizona, this may limit the generalizability of the findings to other states. The sample includes correctional officers employed at public state correctional institutions for adult males, therefore, the findings may not represent officers employed in federal, juvenile, female, or private correctional institutions.

The current study included several individual-level variables and key controls because they have been found to be some of the strongest predictors of stress. Due to concerns of survey fatigue and practical constraints, however, only some of the stressors outlined by the correctional officer work stress literature are included in the analysis. It would be beneficial to include other potential stressors like low pay and low promotional opportunities, lack of job autonomy, the conflicts between security and treatment orientations, negative perceptions of inmates, officer's perceived level of professionalism, organizational innovation, adequacy of training, questions of distributive and procedural justice, and the physical environment. Since a survey was used it was not possible to tease apart many of the relationships that may exist. Using a qualitative approach with interviews of officers would offer a more in-depth understanding of the relationships that exist. This study expanded upon the measure of stress typically used in this line of research by including a self-report measure of health stress but it could be improved. Limited research has used objective measures of stress like blood pressure and use of sick leave (see Gross et al., 1994) in order to achieve a more valid and reliable measures of work stress.

### CONCLUSIONS

These limitations notwithstanding, the data offer insight into how perceived occupational prestige among correctional officers influences works stress. In addition, these findings add to the literature concerning existing stressors within correctional institutions and how these variables influence different measures of stress. The significance of this study is seen within several policy implications and avenues for future research concerning the study of work stress among correctional officers and the role of POP.

# **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Although measures of POP (significant other, generalized other, and media) did not have a significant influence on work stress (except for POP media on health stress), these findings are still significant for policy development. Researchers have examined media depictions of correctional officers, as well as how correctional officers view their profession, and it is evident that negative stereotypes are too often associated with correctional officers and their profession (Bennett, 2006; Bennet & Satre, 2000; Freeman, 1998; Kantrowitz, 1996; Tracy, 2004; Tracy & Scott, 2006; Vickovic et al., 2013; Zaner, 1989;;). In addition to empirical research, a general discussion among scholars suggests that media perpetuates unfavorable stereotypes of correctional officers (Bennett, 2006; Brower, 2013; Cecil & Leitner, 2009; Freeman, 1998; Surette, 2015; Van Fleet, 1992; Zaner, 1989). A small set of studies suggest that negative images associated with correctional officers and their role may act as a stressor (Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007; Moon & Maxwell, 2004). Considering the harmful effects of work stress, much of this literature has called for correctional administrators to increase the visibility of correctional staff in the media in order to promote a more positive image of correctional officers (Drory & Shamir, 1988; Freeman, 1998; Smith, 1994). In fact, among a group of correctional officers in Israel, when asked how to reduce work-related stress, improving the public image of correctional officers emerged as a distinct theme (Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007). The conflicting findings regarding the current study compared to the studies that found a negative public image to be a significant stressor among officers in Israel and South Korea (Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007; Moon & Maxwell, 2004) may be due to cultural differences regarding importance of occupational prestige. In these

societies, the way outsiders' views ones' profession may influence individual's selfconcept and self-esteem more due to the emphasis on achieving prestige through their profession. Some scholars have called for public relations and liaison officers to deal proactively with the media (Drory & Shamir, 1988; Freeman, 1998; Smith, 1994).

The findings from this study suggest that this may be unnecessary. Although POP media did influence health stress, this relationship was weak; additionally POP media had no impact on attitudinal job stress. None of the other POP variables influenced either measure of stress. When functioning under budgetary restraints, it is important to allocate resources effectively. Correctional institutions may assign resources towards creating a positive image of these institutions for reasons beyond influencing officers' works stress (e.g. promoting a positive image in order to secure funding or for recruitment purposes). In addition, promoting a positive image among correctional officers may be beneficial for factors like job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Correctional officers perform a demanding job that is viewed as "dirty" work by the public. Officers, however, receive limited recognition and are allocated limited prestige for a job that is essential for maintaining public safety, much like police officers and firefighters, but are considered the "scum of law enforcement." Improving the prestige associated with correctional officer work may increase the wellbeing of these individuals. Within the discussion of work stress, funds would be better served to address other stressors like role strain and work-family conflict, variables that have consistently been shown to act as stressors within the correctional environment.

The organizational variables included in this study (quality of supervision, role strain, organizational support, and dangerousness) all have a significant impact on one of

the measures of stress. The impact of supervisors permeates various different aspects of the institutional environment. Supervisors serve as a link between line officers and toplevel managers, and are responsible for insuring that certain values or beliefs are communicated to officers (Boin, 2001; Schein, 1993). Supervisors can be crucial in the process of making their employees feel that they are supported by both their direct supervisors and the organization as a whole. The problem of role conflict is often related to supervisors giving conflicting orders, or failing to offer clear instructions on how to complete a certain task (Lambert, Kelley, & Hogan, 2013). The quality of supervision may also directly influence levels of stress. Supervisors can act as mentors and provide valuable coping strategies, or they can create a working environment defined by unclear roles and toxic workplace relationships. Due to the important role that supervisors fill, it is crucial that these positions are filled with competent individuals. Correctional organizations often believe that because an employee is good at one role (e.g. line officer), they will excel in a supervisory role. Careful consideration is needed when deciding who will fill these supervisory roles. Once the institution promotes individuals into supervisory positions, adequate and continuing training is imperative to prepare these individuals to be successful correctional leaders.

Role conflict is consistently shown to be a significant predictor of stress. Aside from ensuring quality supervision, correctional institutions need to review policies and procedures in order to determine the causes of this lack of clarity. In addition, institutions need to ensure that the rules and regulations are being enforced uniformly, and inmates and staff experience the same treatment across different shifts (Lambert et al. 2013b). Consistency and adequacy of training among staff, supervisors, and managers can also assist in alleviating role conflict by clearly outlining the goals and procedures of the institutions. It is integral that staff feel that they can comfortably communicate with supervisor and managers without fear of retaliation in order to address issues like role conflict (Lambert & Hogan, 2009). Open communication among staff, supervisors, and managers can also serve to increase perceptions of organizational support. Institutions are constantly struggling with budget issues but administrators and supervisors can use praise, approval, and symbolic rewards in order to increase perceptions of organizational support at no financial cost to the institution (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Garland, 2004). Management should make concerted efforts to create opportunities for staff to offer input and voice concerns. Correctional administrators should focus on distributive and procedural justice. Distributive justice is concerned with ensuring outcomes like promotion and pay are fairly distributed and procedural justice is concerned with the processes by which these decisions are made (Greenburg, 1990; Tyler, 1990). When employees feel that these outcomes and the decision making process is fair they view the institution as legitimate. Conversely, when they are viewed as unfair this can lead to feelings of frustration and anger (Lambert et al., 2007). There is a small body of literature among correctional officers that suggests that distributive and procedural justice has a positive influence on organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and job stress (Lambert, 2003; Lambert et al., 2006; 2007). In addition, top level managers should be visible in the institution and interact with employees while on duty in order to foster feelings of organizational support (Lambert & Hogan, 2009).

The threat of violence is constant within correctional institutions. In order to address feelings of safety among staff it is necessary to discuss the issues of danger

among these individuals to understand what is making them feel at risk. This can result is possible solutions that may take the form of additional training and improvements to the institution, such as more lighting or new equipment (Lambert et al, 2013). Procedural justice is also important when discussing the interactions between correctional officers and inmates. When individuals perceive that they are being treated fairly and with respect they are more likely to respond favorably (Tyler, 1990). Research suggests that when inmates believe that the use of authority within the prison setting is procedurally just levels of inmate misconduct decreases (Beijersbergen, Dirkzwager, Eichelsheim, Van der Laan, & Nieuwbeerta, 2015; Reisig & Mesko, 2009). Creating an environment where inmates feel that they are respected may influence perceptions of hostility between inmates and staff, which may influence perceptions of danger among officers. In addition, building morale and cohesion among officers in order to foster trust in their coworkers in time of need may influence feelings of safety.

Work-family conflict emerged as the most robust predictor of both measure of job stress. Unlike many of the significant stressors that are related directly to the correctional work environment, work-family conflict assesses how the work spills over into officers' home lives. Strain-based and time-based are the elements associated with work-family conflict that have the strongest impact on stress (Lambert et al., 2006). Time-based workfamily conflict arises when the scheduling of work shifts or the amount of time spent at work interferes with home life. When the demands and stress from the job negatively influence home life, this is considered strain-based conflict (Greenhaus & Buetell, 1985; Netemeyer et al., 1996). Each of these elements poses a unique challenge for correctional administrators. Creating a work environment that is supportive and

recognizes the importance of the officers' home life may aid in reducing work-family conflict (Boles, Johnson, & Hair, 1997). The issue of work-family conflict must be acknowledged by administrators, supervisors, and staff in order to create an open discussion concerning ways of decreasing this conflict (Lambert et al., 2013). Counseling should be provided for staff and their families in order to address the effects of the stressful work environment on the interactions between correctional officers and their loved ones (Lambert et al., 2006; 2013). Recruiting efforts should be clear regarding the time commitment of the job. Training should be provided concerning timemanagement skills in order to reduce time-based conflict (Lambert et al., 2002; 2006). During basic training, attention should be given to highlighting the potential demands of the job that may spillover into ones' personal life (Lambert, Minor, Wells, & Hogan, 2015). When possible, employees should be given more input into their schedule and more flexible use of sick and vacation leave (Lambert et al., 2004; 2006). Institutions must strive to make sure that their staffing numbers are adequate in order to reduce the need for forced overtime. Considering the many psychological and physiological problems associated with correctional officer work, it would be beneficial to conduct yearly mental and physical health screenings of correctional officers in order to be proactive.

#### **FUTURE RESEARCH**

Although little support was found for the hypotheses explored in this study, the current findings do provide several avenues for future research. Given the findings from those models that explored the mediating effects of several variables, as well as results from studies conducted in other countries, it would be short sighted to dismiss the significance of perceived occupational prestige in the correctional workplace. Future research regarding this topic should include officers from different types of correctional institutions from across the country. Individuals working in a juvenile facility may believe that perceptions of them and their job are different than an individual employed in a maximum security adult facility. It is important to include employees from institutions in different communities because perceptions of an officer employed in a rural "prison town" may very well differ from that of an officer in an urban institution. Residing in a town where the correctional institution is a large part of the community could have an influence on what correctional officers believe the public thinks due to the familiarity of residents to the institution and the role of correctional officers. In addition, media coverage in small markets may prove different than that found in larger markets in what topics are covered and how they are portrayed (Althaus & Trautman, 2008; Len-Ríos, Hinnant, Park, Cameron, Frisby, & Lee, 2009; Pribble et al., 2006). As such, it would be beneficial to incorporate indicators that would map officer residence and/or prison location.

Making use of multiple research methods would strengthen this body of research. The current study uses survey data, but a qualitative research approach is necessary to better tease apart the potential relationship between POP and workplace attitudes. Conducting interviews with correctional officers would provide insight into their own attitudes regarding 'dirty work,' as well as their beliefs regarding the perceptions of others. This approach would provide a more nuanced understanding of the processes by which image and prestige impact workplace behaviors and outcomes. The focus of the current study was to examine the relationship between POP and stress, but it is important

to assess how POP might influence other organizational attitudes like organizational commitment, job burnout, and job satisfaction. In order to get an accurate assessment of work stress, future research should also include multiple measures of both objective and subjective measures of stress.

Although not the primary focus of this study, secondary findings regarding the impact of organizational variables on stress should be considered in terms of policy implications. A significant body of work has highlighted the association between high levels of work-family conflict and increased work stress (Griffin, 2006; Triplett et al., 1999; Lambert et al., 2004; 2006). This study confirms this relationship. Understanding the antecedents of work-family conflict is necessary in order to understand this phenomenon and to provide avenues for decreasing work-family conflict. A handful of studies have assessed the gendered nature of work-family conflict and the influence of factors like role conflict and dangerousness on levels of work-family conflict (Griffin, 2006; Lambert & Hogan, 2006; Lambert et., 2010; 2015; Triplett et al., 1999). Researchers need to continue to assess how factors like sex, age, tenure, marital status, and number of dependents influence work-family conflict.

The United States incarcerates more people and at a higher rate than any other country in the world (Pew Center on the States, 2008). As such, we rely on correctional officers to supervise an unwilling and hostile inmate population in a work environment marked by threat of violence and often unclear and conflicting roles. As a result, the job of a correctional officer is synonymous with stress. Several stressors are present within correctional officer work that are related to factors associated with the work environment like perceived danger and role strain. Little attention has been paid to potential stressors

that exist beyond the work environment, like the prestige associated with the job. A combination of negative media depictions of correctional officers and the closed nature of the prison has led to negative stereotypes concerning correctional officers and a lack of occupational prestige. The negative image associated with correctional officer work and low levels of perceived prestige experienced by correctional officers may influence officers' attitudes about the organization as well as their levels of work stress. Correctional institutions must take measures to minimize as much as possible work-related stress in order to retain competent employees who can ensure that the goals of the institution are achieved. Understanding factors like perceived occupational prestige that may act as a stressor is an important step in creating policy and programs that will create a positive environment for the employees, as well as the inmates.
## REFERENCES

- Abbott, A. (1990). Positivism and interpretation in sociology: Lessons for sociologists from the history of stress research. *Sociological Forum*, 5(3), 435–458.
- Addington, L. A. (2003). Students' fear after Columbine: Findings from a randomized experiment. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 19, 367–387.
- Aldrich, R. (Director). (1974). *The longest yard* [Motion Picture]. United States of America: Paramount Pictures.
- Althaus, S. L., & Trautman, T. C. (2008). The impact of television market size on voter turnout in American elections. *American Politics Research*, *36*(6), 824–856.
- Alvarez, W.C, & Stanley, L.L. (1930). Blood pressure in six thousand prisoners and four hundred prison guards. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, *46*, 17–39.
- American Correctional Association. (2004). A 21st century workforce for America's correctional profession. Baltimore, MD: American Correctional Association,
- American Psychological Association. (2009). *Stress in America 2009*. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/stress-exec-summary.pdf
- Anagnostopoulos, F., & Hantzi, A. (2011). Familiarity with and social distance from people with mental illness: Testing the mediating effects of prejudiced attitudes. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 21(5), 451–460.
- Archambeault, W. G., & Archambeault, B. J. (1982). Correctional supervisory management: Principles of organization, policy, and law. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Archambeault, W. G., & Fenwick, C. R. (1988). A comparative analysis of culture, safety, and organizational management factors in Japanese and U.S. prisons. *Prison Journal*, 68, 3–23.
- Armstrong, G. S., & Griffin, M. L. (2004). Does the job matter? Comparing correlates of stress among treatment and correctional staff in prisons. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 32, 577–592.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Kreiner, G. (1999). How can you do it? Dirty work and the challenge of constructing a positive identity. *Academy of Management Review*, 24, 413–434.
- Auerbach, S. M., Quick, B. G., & Pegg, P. O. (2003). General job stress and job specific stress in juvenile correctional officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *31*, 25–36.

- Bacharach, S. B., Bamberger, P., & Conley, S. (1991). Work-home conflict among nurses and engineers: Mediating the impact of role stress on burnout and satisfaction at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 12(1), 39–53.
- Baum, A., Grunberg, N. E., & Singer, J. E. (1982). The use of psychological and neuroendocrinological measurements in the study of stress. *Health psychology*, 1(3), 217–236.
- Beckett, K., & Sasson, T. (2004). *The politics of injustice: Crime and punishment in America*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Beijersbergen, K. A., Dirkzwager, A. J., Eichelsheim, V. I., Van der Laan, P. H., & Nieuwbeerta, P. (2015). Procedural justice, anger, and prisoners' misconduct a longitudinal study. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 42(2), 196-218.
- Bennett, J. (2006). The good the bad and the ugly: The media in prison films. *The Howard Journal*, *45*, 97–115.
- Bennett, K. J., & Satre, T. W. (2000). Movie review. The Prison Journal, 80, 228-232.
- Bierie, D. M. (2012). The impact of prison conditions on staff well-being. *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology*, *56*(1), 81–95.
- Blau, J. R., Light, S. C., & Chamlin, M. (1986). Individual and contextual effects on stress and job satisfaction a study of prison staff. *Work and Occupations*, 13(1), 131– 156.
- Bohen, H., & Viveros-Long, A. (1981). *Balancing jobs and family life: Do flexible work schedules help?* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press
- Boin, A. (2001). *Crafting public institutions: Leadership in two prisons*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Reiner Publishers.
- Boles, J. S., Johnston, M. W., & Hair Jr, J. F. (1997). Role stress, work-family conflict and emotional exhaustion: Inter-relationships and effects on some work-related consequences. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 17(1), 17–28.
- Bourbonnais, R., Malenfant, R., Vezina, M., Jauvin, N., & Brisson, I. (2005). Work characteristics and health of correctional officers. *Review of Epidemiiol Sante Publique*, 53, 127–142.
- Britt, C. L., & Weisburd, D. (2011). Statistical power. In A. R. Piquero & D. Weisburd (Eds.), *Handbook of quantitative criminology* (pp. 313–332). New York, NY: Springer.

- Britton, D. M. (1997). Perceptions of the work environment among correctional officers: do race and sex matter? *Criminology*, *35*(1), 85–105.
- Brodsky, C. M. (1982). Work stress in correctional institutions. *Journal of Prison and Jail Health*, *2*, 74–102.
- Brough, P., & Williams, J. (2007). Managing occupational stress in a high-risk industry. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34, 555–567.
- Brower, J. (2013). Review and Input of Correctional Officer Wellness & Safety Literature Review. U.S. *Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs*. Retrieved from http://www.middlesexsheriff.org/CorrectionalOfficerWellnessSafety\_LitReview.pdf
- Brown, C., & O'Brien, K. (1998). Understanding stress and burnout in shelter workers. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 29, 383–385.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics (2010). Nonfatal occupational injuries and illnesses requiring days away from work for state government and local government workers, 2009. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/osh2\_11092010.pdf
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor. (2013). *Occupational outlook handbook, 2012-13 edition*. Correctional Officers. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/ooh/protective service/correctional-officers.htm
- Byrd, T. G., Cochran, J. K., Silverman, I. J., & Blount, W. R. (2000). Behind bars: An assessment of the effects of job satisfaction, job-related stress, and anxiety on jail employees' inclinations to quit. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *23*(2), 69–93.
- Camp, S. D. (1994). Assessing the effects of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on turnover: an event history approach. *The Prison Journal*, *74*, 279–305.
- Camp, S. D., & Lambert, E. G. (2006). The influence of organizational incentives on absenteeism sick-leave use among correctional workers. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 17(2), 144–172.
- Cannon, W. B. (1929) *Bodily changes in pain, hunger, fear, and rage* (2nd ed.). New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Carlson, J. R., Anson, R. H., & Thomas G. (2003). Correctional officer burnout and stress: Does gender matter? *Prison Journal*, *83*, 277–288.
- Carlson, D., Kacmar, K., & Williams, L. (2000). Construction and initial validation of a multidimensional measure of work-family conflict. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 56, 249–276.

- Castle, T. L., & Martin, J. S. (2006). Occupational hazard: Predictors of stress among jail correctional officers. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31(1), 66–80.
- Cecil, D. K., & Leitner, J. L. (2009). Unlocking the gates: An examination of MSNBC investigates lockup. *The Howard Journal, 48*, 184–199.
- Cheek, F. (1984). *Stress management for correctional officers and their families*. College Park, MD: American Correctional Association.
- Cheek, E. E., & Miller, M. (1982). *Prisons of life*. Washington, DC: American Federation of State County and Municipal Employees.
- Cheek, E. E., & Miller, M. (1983). The experience of stress for COs: A double bind theory of correctional stress. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *11*(2), 105–130.
- Cherniss, C. (1980). *Staff burnout: Job stress in the human services*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Conover, T. (2001). Newjack: Guarding Sing Sing. New York, NY: Vintage.
- Conway, T. L., Vickers Jr, R. R., Ward, H. W., & Rahe, R. H. (1981). Occupational stress and variation in cigarette, coffee, and alcohol consumption. *Journal of Health* and Social Behavior, 155–165.
- Cooley, C. H. (1902). Human nature and the social order. New York: Charles Scribner's.
- Cooper, C. L., & Marshall, J. (1976). Occupational sources of stress: A review of the literature relating to coronary heart disease and mental ill health. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 49(1), 11–28.
- Corrigan, P. W., Edwards, A. B., Green, A., Diwan, S. L., & Penn, D. L. (2001). Prejudice, social distance, and familiarity with mental illness. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 27(2), 219–225.
- Coxon, A. P. M., & Jones, C. L. (1978). *The images of occupational prestige*. London: Macmillan.
- Crank, J., Regoli, R., Hewitt, J., & Culbertson, R. (1995). Institutional and organizational antecedents of role stress, work alienation and anomie among police executives. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 22*, 152–171.
- Cressey, D. (1959). Contradictory directives in complex organization: The case of the prisons. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. *4*, 1–19.

- Crocker, J., Major, B., & Steele, C. (1998). Social stigma. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., pp. 504–553). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Cullen, F., Link, B., Cullen, J., & Wolfe, N. (1989). How satisfying is prison work? A comparative occupational approach. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 14*, 89–108.
- Cullen, F. T., Link, B. G., Wolfe, N. T., & Frank, J. (1985). The social dimensions of correctional officer stress. *Justice Quarterly*, 2, 505–533.
- Culliver, C., Sigler, R., & McNeely, B. (1991). Examining prosocial organizational behavior among correctional officers. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, *15*, 277–284.
- Darabont, F. (Director). (1994). *The shawshank redemption* [Motion Picture]. United States of America: Castle Rock Entertainment.
- Darabont, F. (Director). (1999). *The green mile* [Motion Picture]. United States of America: Castle Rock Entertainment.
- Dembo, R., & Dertke, M. (1986). Work environment correlates of staff stress in a youth detention facility. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 13, 328–344.
- Denhof, M. D., & Spinaris, C. G. (2013). Depression, PTSD, and comoribity in United States corrections professionals: Prevalence and impact on health and functioning. *Desert Waters Correctional Outreach*. Retrieved from http://desertwaters.com/?page\_id=746
- Dawson, D. A., Grant, B. F., & Ruan, W. J. (2005). The association between stress and drinking: modifying effects of gender and vulnerability. *Alcohol and Alcoholism*, 40(5), 453–460.
- Dowden, C., & Tellier, C. (2004). Predicting work-related stress in correctional officers: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *32*(1), 31–47.
- Drory, A., & Shamir, B. (1988). Effects of organizational and life variables on job satisfaction and burnout. *Group and Organization Studies*, 13, 441–455.

Dunkerley, D. (1975). Occupations and society. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500–50

- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G\* Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods*, 39(2), 175–191.
- Ferraro, L., Faghri, P. D., Henning, R., & Cherniack, M. (2013). Workplace-based participatory approach to weight loss for correctional employees. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 55(2), 147–155.
- Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Finn, P. (1998). Correctional officer stress: A cause for concern and additional help. *Federal Probation*, 62(2), 1–21.
- Frone, M., Russell, M., & Cooper, M. (1992). Antecedents and outcomes of work-family conflict: Testing a model of the work-family interface. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 65–75.
- Foucault, M. (1977). Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison. New York: Vintage.
- Freeman, R. M. (1998). Public perceptions and corrections: COs as smug hacks. In F. Y. Bailey & D. C. Hale (Eds.), *Popular culture, crime, and justice* (pp. 196–208). Belmont, CA: West/Wadsworth.
- Freeman, T. W., Roca, V., & Moore, W. M. (2000). A comparison of chronic combatrelated posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) patients with and without a history of suicide attempt. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 188, 460–463.
- Fried, Y., Shirom, A., Gilboa, S., & Cooper, C. (2008). The mediating effects of job satisfaction and propensity to leave on role stress—job performance relationships: Combining meta-analysis and structural equation modeling. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 15, 305–328.
- Ganster, D. C., & Rosen, C. C. (2013). Work stress and employee health: A multidisciplinary review. *Journal of Management*, *39*(5), 1085–1122.
- Garland, D. (1990). *Punishment and modern society: A study in social theory*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Garland, B. (2002). Prison treatment staff burnout: Consequences, causes and prevention. *Corrections Today*, *64*(7), 116–121.
- Garland, B. (2004). The impact of administrative support on prison treatment staff burnout: an exploratory study. *The Prison Journal*, 84(4), 452–471.

- Garland, B., Hogan, N. L., & Lambert, E. G. (2013). Antecedents of Role Stress Among Correctional Staff A Replication and Expansion. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 24(5), 527–550.
- Garner, B. R., Knight, K., & Simpson, D. D. (2007). Burnout among corrections-based drug treatment staff impact of individual and organizational factors. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 51(5), 510–522.
- Ghaddar, A., Mateo, I., & Sanchez, P. (2008). Occupational stress and mental health among correctional officers: a cross-sectional study. *Journal of Occupational Health*, *50*(1), 92–98.
- Glenn, L. B. (2001). *Texas prisons: The largest hotel chain in Texas*. Austin, TX: Eakin Press.
- Glynn, C. J., & Park, E. (1997). Reference groups, opinion intensity, and public opinion expression. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 9(3), 213–232.
- Gmel, G. (2001). Imputation of missing values in the case of a multiple item instrument measuring alcohol consumption. *Statistics in Medicine*, *20*, 2369–2381.
- Goffman, E.(1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Goldberg, P., David, S., Landre, M. F., Goldberg, M., Dassa, S., & Fuhrer, R. (1996). Work conditions and mental health among prison staff in France. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 22(1), 45–54.
- Goyder, J., & Frank, K. (2007). A scale of occupational prestige in Canada, based on NOC major groups. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, *32*(1), 63–83.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16, 399–432.
- Greenhaus, J. (1987). Career management. Chicago, IL: Dryden Press.
- Greenhaus, J. H., & Beutell, N. J. (1985). Sources of conflict between work and family roles. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*(1), 76–88.
- Greenhaus, J., Callanan, G., & Godshalk, V. (2010). *Career management* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications
- Griffin, M. L. (2001). Job satisfaction among detention officers: Assessing the relative contribution of organizational climate variables. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *29*(3), 219–232.

- Griffin, M. L. (2002). The influence of professional orientation on detention officers' attitudes toward the use of force. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29(3), 250–277.
- Griffin, M. L. (2006). Gender and stress a comparative assessment of sources of stress among correctional officers. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 22(1), 5–25.
- Griffin, M. L., Armstrong, G. S., & Hepburn, J. R. (2005). Correctional officers' perceptions of equitable treatment in the masculinized prison environment. *Criminal Justice Review*, 30(2), 189–206.
- Griffin, M. L., Hogan, N. L., Lambert, E. G., Tucker-Gail, K. A., & Baker, D. N. (2010). Job involvement, job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment and the burnout of correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37(2), 239–255.
- Gross, G. R., Larson, S. J., Urban, G. D., & Zupan, L. L. (1994). Gender differences in occupational stress among correctional officers. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 18(2), 219–234.
- Grossi, E. L., Keil, T. J., & Vito, G. F. (1996). Surviving "the joint": Mitigating factors of correctional officer stress. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *19*(2), 103–120.
- Grossi, E., & Berg, B. (1991). Stress and job dissatisfaction among correctional officers: An unexpected finding. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, *35*, 73–81.
- Gruenewald, J., Chermak, S. M., & Pizarro, J. M. (2013). Covering victims in the news: What makes minority homicides newsworthy? *Justice Quarterly*, *30*(5), 755–783.
- Grunberg, L., Moore, S., Anderson-Connolly, R., & Greenberg, E. (1999). Work stress and self-reported alcohol use: the moderating role of escapist reasons for drinking. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 4(1), 29–36.
- Hammen, S. (2005). Stress and depression. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *1*, 293–319.
- Härenstam, A., Palm, U. B., & Theorell, T. (1988). Stress, health and the working environment of Swedish prison staff. *Work & Stress*, 2(4), 281–290.
- Hartley, D. J., Davila, M. A., Marquart, J. W., & Mullings, J. L. (2013). Fear is a disease: The impact of fear and exposure to infectious disease on correctional officer job stress and satisfaction. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(2), 323–340.
- Haug, M. R., & Widdison, H. A. (1975). Dimensions of occupational prestige. Work and Occupations, 2(1), 3–27.

- Heim, C., & Nemeroff, C. B. (2009). Neurobiology of posttraumatic stress disorder. CNS Spectr, 14(1), 13–24.
- Hepburn, J. R. (1985). The exercise of power in coercive organizations: A study of prison guards. *Criminology*, 23(1), 146–164.
- Hepburn, J. R. (1989). Prison guards as agents of social control. In L. Goodstein & D. MacKenzie (Eds.), *The American prison: Issues in research and policy* (pp. 191–206). New York: Plenum.
- Hepburn, J. R., & Albonetti, C. (1980). Role conflict in correctional institutions. *Criminology*, 17(4), 445–460.
- Hepburn, J. R., & Knepper, P. (1993). Correctional officers as human service workers: The effect of job satisfaction. *Justice Quarterly*, *10*, 315–335.
- Hogan, N. L., Lambert, E. G., & Griffin, M. L. (2013). Loyalty, love, and investments the impact of job outcomes on the organizational commitment of correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 40(4), 355–375.
- Hogan, N. L., Lambert, E. G., Jenkins, M., & Hall, D. E. (2009). The impact of job characteristics on private prison staff: Why management should care. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(3-4), 151–165.
- Holmes, E. P., Corrigan, P. W., Williams, P., Canar, J., & Kubiak, M. (1999). Changing public attitudes about schizophrenia. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 25(3), 447–456.
- House, J. (1981) Work stress and social support. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Huckabee, R. G. (1992). Stress in corrections: An overview of the issues. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20, 479–486.
- Hurst, T. E., & Hurst, M. M. (1997). Gender differences in mediation of severe occupational stress among correctional officers. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 22, 121–137.
- Ivancevich, J. M., & Matteson, M. T. (1980). Stress and work. Glenville, IL: Scott Foresman
- Jablin, F. M. (1987). Organizational entry, assimilation, and exit. In F. M. Jablin, L. L. Putnam, K. H. Roberts, & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication: An interdisciplinary perspective* (pp. 679-740). Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

- Jacobs, B. J. (1978). What prison guard think: Profile of the Illinois force. *Crime and Delinquency*, *22*, 185–196.
- Jacobs, J. B., & Olitsky, E. (2004). Leadership and correctional reform. *Pace Law Review*, *24*, 477–496.
- Johnson, R. (2002). *Hard time: Understanding and reforming the prison* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Johnson, R., & Price, S. (1981). The complete correctional officer human service and the human environment of prison. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *8*, 343–373.
- Johnson, S., Cooper, C., Cartwright, S., Donald, I., Taylor, P., & Millet, C. (2005). The experience of work-related stress across occupations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20(2), 178–187.
- Jurik, N. C. (1988). Striking a balance: Female correctional officers, gender role stereotypes, and male prisons. *Sociological Inquiry*, 58, 291–305.
- Jurik, N. C., & Halemba, J. H. (1984). Gender, working conditions, and job satisfaction of women in a non- traditional occupation: Female correctional officers in men's prisons. *Sociological Quarterly*, 25, 551–566.
- Jurik, N. C, & Winn, R. (1987). Describing correctional security dropouts and rejects: An individual or organizational profile? *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 24, 5–25.*
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., Snoek, J. D., & Rosenthal, R. A. (1964). Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. New York: Wiley.
- Kalia, M. (2002). Assessing the economic impact of stress: The modern day hidden epidemic. *Metabolism*, *51*(6), 49–53.
- Kantrowitz, N. (1996). Hollywood movies demean COs. Keeper's Voice, 17, 11–12.
- Kauffman, K. (1988). *Prison officers and their world*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Keinan, G., & Malach-Pines, A. (2007). Stress and burnout among prison personnel sources, outcomes, and intervention strategies. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(3), 380–398.
- Kerce, E., Magnusson, P., & Rudolph, A. (1994). The attitudes of Navy corrections staff members: What they think about confinees and their jobs. San Diego, CA: Navy Personnel Research and Development Center.

- Kivimäki, M., Head, J., Ferrie, J. E., Shipley, M. J., Brunner, E., Vahtera, J., & Marmot, M. G. (2006). Work stress, weight gain and weight loss: evidence for bidirectional effects of job strain on body mass index in the Whitehall II study. *International journal of obesity*, 30(6), 982–987.
- Konda, S., Reichard, A. A., & Tiesman, H. M. (2012). Occupational injuries among US correctional officers, 1999-2008. *Journal of Safety Research*, 43(3), 181–186.
- Kouvonen, A., Kivimäki, M., Cox, S. J., Cox, T., & Vahtera, J. (2005). Relationship between work stress and body mass index among 45,810 female and male employees. *Psychosomatic Medicine*, 67(4), 577–583.
- Kouvonen, A., Kivimäki, M., Virtanen, M., Pentti, J., & Vahtera, J. (2005). Work stress, smoking status, and smoking intensity: an observational study of 46,190 employees. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 59(1), 63–69.
- Krassa, M. A. (1988): Social groups, selective perception, and behavioral contagion in public opinion. *Social Networks*, *10*, 109–136.
- Lazarus, R. S. (1966). *Psychological stress and the coping process*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lazarus, R. S. & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal and coping. New York: Springer.
- Lambert, E. G. (2001a). To stay or quit: A review of the literature on correctional staff turnover. American Journal of Criminal Justice, 26, 61–76.
- Lambert, E. G. (2001b). Absent correctional staff: A discussion of the issue and recommendations for future research. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25(2), 279–292.
- Lambert, E. G. (2003). Justice in corrections: An exploratory study of the impact of organizational justice on correctional staff. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *31*, 155–168.
- Lambert, E. G. (2004). The impact of job characteristics on correctional staff members. *The Prison Journal*, *84*(2), 208–227.
- Lambert, E. G. (2006). I want to leave: A test of a model of turnover intent among correctional staff. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*, *2*(1), 57–83.
- Lambert, E.G., Altheimer, I., & Hogan, N. L. (2010a). An exploratory examination of a gendered model of the effects of role stressors. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 20(3), 193–217.

- Lambert, E. G., Altheimer, I., & Hogan, N. L. (2010b). Exploring the relationship between social support and job burnout among correctional staff. *Criminal Justice* and Behavior, 37(11), 1217–1236.
- Lambert, E. G., Edwards, C., Camp, S. D., & Saylor, W. G. (2005). Here today, gone tomorrow, back again the next day: Antecedents of correctional absenteeism Among Federal Correctional Staff. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33(2), 165–175.
- Lambert, E. G., & Hogan, N. (2009). The importance of job satisfaction and organizational commitment in shaping turnover intent a test of a causal model. *Criminal Justice Review*, 34(1), 96–118.
- Lambert, E. G., & Hogan, N. L. (2010a). Wanting change: The relationship of perceptions of organizational innovation with correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 21(2), 160–184.
- Lambert, E. G., & Hogan, N. L., (2010b). Work-family conflict and job burnout among correctional staff. *Psychological Reports*, *106*, 19–26.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Allen, R. I. (2006). Correlates of correctional officer job stress: The impact of organizational structure. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30(2), 227–244
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Altheimer, I., (2010). The association between workfamily conflict and job burnout among correctional staff: a preliminary study. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35, 37–55.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Altheimer, I., & Wareham, J. (2010). The effects of different aspects of supervision among female and male correctional staff: A preliminary study. *Criminal Justice Review*, 35, 492–513.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Barton, S. M. (2004). The nature of work-family conflict among correctional staff: An exploratory examination. *Criminal Justice Review*, 29(1), 145–172.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Camp, S. D., & Ventura, L. A. (2006). The impact of work–family conflict on correctional staff: A preliminary study. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 6(4), 371–387.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Griffin, M. L. (2007). The impact of distributive and procedural justice on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35(6), 644–656.

- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Griffin, M. L. (2008). Being the good soldier: Organizational citizenship behavior and commitment among correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35, 56–68.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Moore, B., Tucker, K., Jenkins, M., Stevenson, M., & Jiang, S. (2009). The impact of the work environment on prison staff: The issue of consideration, structure, job variety, and training. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(3-4), 166–180.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Paoline, E. A., & Baker, D. (2005). The good life: The impact of job satisfaction and occupational stressors on correctional staff life satisfaction: An exploratory study. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 18, 1–26.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., Paoline, E. A., & Clarke, A. (2005). The impact of role stressors on job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment among private prison staff. *Security Journal*, 18(4), 33–50.
- Lambert, E. G., Jiang, S., & Hogan, N. L. (2008). The issue of trust in shaping the job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of correctional staff. *Professional Issues in Criminal Justice*, 3(4), 37–65
- Lambert, E. G., Kelley, T., & Hogan, N. L. (2012). Work-family conflict and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 1–20.
- Lambert, E. G., Kelley, T., & Hogan, N. L. (2013). Hanging on too long: The relationship between different forms of organizational commitment and emotional burnout among correctional staff. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(1), 51–66.
- Lambert, E. G., Minor, K. I., Wells, J. B., & Hogan, N. L. (2015). Leave your job at work the possible antecedents of work–family conflict among correctional staff. *The Prison Journal*, 95(1), 114–134.
- Lambert, E. G., & Paoline, E. A. (2005). The impact of medical issues on the job stress and job satisfaction of jail staff. *Punishment & Society*, 7(3), 259–275.
- Lambert, E. G., & Paoline, E. A. (2008). The influence of individual, job, and organizational characteristics on correctional staff job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. *Criminal Justice Review*, *33*(4), 541–564.
- Lambert, E. G., & Paoline, E. A. (2010). Take this job and shove it: An exploratory study of turnover intent among jail staff. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *38*(2), 139–148.
- Lasky, G. L., Gordon, B. C., & Srebalus, D. J. (1986). Occupational stressors among federal correctional officers working in different security levels. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 13(3), 317–327.

- Leip, L. A., & Stinchcomb, J. B. (2013). Should I stay or should I go? Job satisfaction and turnover intent of jail staff throughout the United States. *Criminal Justice Review*, 38(2), 226–241.
- Len-Ríos, M. E., Hinnant, A., Park, S. A., Cameron, G. T., Frisby, C. M., & Lee, Y. (2009). Health news agenda building: Journalists' perceptions of the role of public relations. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 86(2), 315–331.
- Levan, K., Polzer, K., & Downing, S. (2011). Media and prison sexual assault: How we got to the "don't drop the soap" culture. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociological Theory*, 4(2), 674–682.
- Levenson, J. (2001). Inside information: Prisons and the media. *Criminal Justice Matters*, 43, 14–15.
- Liou, K. (1995). Role stress and job stress among detention care workers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *22*, 425–436.
- Lindquist, C. A., & J. T. Whitehead (1986) Correctional officers as parole officers: An examination of a community supervision sanction. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 13, 197–222.
- MacKinnon, N. J., & Langford, T. (1994). The meaning of occupational prestige scores. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 35(2), 215–245.
- Mael, F. A., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13, 103–123.
- Marshall, R.D., Olfson, M., Hellman, F., Blanco, C., Guardino, M., & Struening, E.L. (2001). Comorbidity, Impairment, and Suicidality in Subthreshold PTSD. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 158, 1467–1473.
- Maruyama, G. (1998). *Basics of structural equation modeling*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal* of Organizational Behavior, 2(2), 99–113.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W. B., & Leiter, M. P. (2001). Job burnout. Annual Reviews of Psychology, 52, 397–422.
- Matteson, M., & Ivancevich, J. (1987) Controlling work stress: Effective human resource and management strategies. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Matz, A. K., Wells, J. B., Minor, K. I., & Angel, E. (2013). Predictors of turnover intention among staff in juvenile correctional facilities the relevance of job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, *11*(2), 115–131.
- May, E. (1976). Prison guards in America: The inside story. *Corrections Magazine*, *2*, 4–5.
- McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1993). The evolution of agenda-setting research: Twenty five years in the marketplace of ideas. *Journal of Communication*, 43, 58–67.
- McShane, M., Williams, F., Schichor, D., & McClain, K. (1991). Early exits: Examining employee turnover. *Corrections Today*, *53*(5), 220–225.
- Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind, self, and society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Meiners, E. R. (2007). Life after OZ: Ignorance, mass media, and making public enemies. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy and Cultural Studies, 29*, 23–63.
- Minor, K. I., Dawson-Edwards, C., Wells, J. B., Griffith, C., & Angel, E. (2009). Understanding staff perceptions of turnover in corrections. *Professional Issues in Criminal Justice*, 4(2), 43–57.
- Misis, M., Kim, B., Cheeseman, K., Hogan, N. L., & Lambert, E. G. (2013). The Impact of Correctional Officer Perceptions of Inmates on Job Stress. *SAGE Open*, *3*(2), 1–13
- Mitchell, O., Mackenzie, D. L., Styve, G. J., & Gover, A. R. (2000). The impact of individual, organizational, and environmental attributes on voluntary turnover among juvenile correctional staff members. *Justice Quarterly*, 17(2), 333–357.
- Mobley, W., Griffeth, R., Hand, H., & Meglino, B. (1979). Review and conceptual analysis of the employee turnover process. *Psychological Bulletin*, *86*, 493–522.
- Moon, B., & Maxwell, S. R. (2004). The sources and consequences of corrections officers' stress: A South Korean example. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *32*, 359–370.
- Morgan, W. J. (2009). Correctional officer stress: A review of the literature. *American Jails*, 23, 33–43.
- Morse, T., Dussetschleger, J., Warren, N., & Cherniack, M. (2011). Talking about health: correction employees' assessments of obstacles to healthy living. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, *53*(9), 1037–1045.

- Melchior, M., Caspi, A., Milne, B.J., Danese, A., Poulton, R., & Moffitt, T.E. (2007). Work stress precipitates depression and anxiety in young, working women and men. *Psychological Medicine*, 37, 1119–1129.
- Miret, M., Ayuso-Mateos, J. L., Sanchez-Moreno, J., & Vieta, E. (2013). Depressive disorders and suicide: epidemiology, risk factors, and burden. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 37(10), 2372–2374.
- Nakao, K., & Treas, J. (1994). Updating occupational prestige and socioeconomic scores: How the new measures measure up. In P. Marsden (Ed.), *Sociological methodology* (pp. 1-72). Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.
- National Opinion Research Center. (2015). *General social surveys, 1972-2014: Cumulative codebook.* Chicago, IL: National Opinion Research Center.
- Netemeyer, R. G., Boles, J. S., & McMurrian, R. (1996). Development and validation of work–family conflict and family–work conflict scales. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(4), 400–410.
- Neveu, J.P. (2007). Jailed resources: Conservation of resources theory as applied to burnout among prison guards. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *28*, 21–42.
- New Jersey Police Task Force Report (2009). Suicide Rates of Law Enforcement Officers versus Males 25-64 years, New Jersey, 2003–2007. Retrieved from http://www.nj.gov/oag/library/ NJPoliceSuicideTaskForceReport-January-30-2009-Final%28r2.3.09%29.pdf
- O'Donnell, K., Brydon, L., Wright, C. E., & Steptoe, A. (2008). Self-esteem levels and cardiovascular and inflammatory responses to acute stress. *Brain, Behavior, and Immunity*, 22(8), 1241–1247.
- Oquendo, M., Brent, D. A., Birmaher, B., Greenhill, L., Kolko, D., Stanley, B., Zelazny, J., Burke, A. K., Firinciogullari, S., Ellis, S. P., & Mann, J. (2005). Posttraumatic stress disorder comorbid with major depression: Factors mediating the association with suicidal behavior. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 162, 560–566.
- Oshagan, H. (1996). Reference group influence on opinion expression. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 8(4), 335–354.
- Pacella, M. L., Hruska, B., & Delahanty, D. L. (2013). The physical health consequences of PTSD and PTSD symptoms: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 27(1), 33–46.
- Paoline, E. A., & Lambert, E. G. (2011). The issue of control in jail: The effects of professionalism, detainee control, and administrative support on job stress, job

satisfaction, and organizational commitment among jail staff. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, *37*(2), 179–199.

- Paterniti, S., Niedhammer, I., Lang, T., Consoli, S. M. (2002). Psychosocial factors at work, personality traits and depressive symptoms. Longitudinal results from the GAZEL Study. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 181,111–117.
- Patterson, B. L. (1992). Job experience and perceived job stress among police, correctional, and probation/parole officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 19(3), 260–285.
- Patterson, J., & Kim, P. (1991). *The day America told the truth*. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.
- Perkins, H. (2002). Social norms and the prevention of alcohol misuse in collegiate contexts. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, *14*, 164–172.
- Pogrebin, M. R., & Poole, E. D. (1997). The sexualized work environment: A look at women jail officers. *Prison Journal*, 77, 41–57.
- Pogrebin, M. R., & Poole, E. D. (1998).Women deputies and jail work. Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice, 14, 117–134.
- Poole, E., & Regoli, R. (1980). Examining the impact of professionalism on cynicism, role conflict, and work alienation among prison guards. *Criminal Justice Review*, 5, 57–64.
- Potter, G. W., & Kappeler, V. E. (2006). *Constructing crime: Perspectives on making news and social problems*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Pribble, J. M., Goldstein, K. M., Fowler, E. F., Greenberg, M. J., Noel, S. K., & Howell, J. D. (2006). Medical news for the public to use? What's on local TV news. *American Journal of Managed Care*, 12(3), 170–176.
- Rector, N. A., & Roger, D. (1997). The stress buffering effects of self-esteem. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 23(5), 799–808.
- Reisig, M. D., & Mesko, G. (2009). Procedural justice, legitimacy, and prisoner misconduct. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 15(1), 41-59.
- Rizzo, J., House, R., & Lirtzman, S. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 15, 150–163.

- Robinson, D., Porporino, F., & Simourd, L. (1992). Staff commitment in the Correctional Service of Canada (NCJ Document Number 148402). Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Canada Correctional Service.
- Robinson, D., Porporino, F., & Simourd, L. (1997). The influence of educational attainment on the attitudes and job performance of correctional officers. *Crime and Delinquency*, 43, 60–77.
- Rosenburg, S. (Director). (1967). *Cool hand Luke* [Motion Picture]. United States of America: Jalem Productions.
- Ross, R., Altmaier, E., & Russell, D. (1989). Job stress, social support, and burnout among counseling center staff. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *36*, 464–470.
- Sabol, W. J., West, H. C., & Cooper, M. (2009). Prison inmates, 2008. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Samak, Q. (2003). Correctional officers of CSC and their working conditions: A questionnaire-based study. *Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Prevention Group, Labour Relations Department, Correctional Service of Canada*
- Savicki, V., Cooley, E., & Gjvesvold, J. (2003). Harassment as a predictor of job burnout in correctional officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *30*, 602–619.
- Schaufeli, W., & Peeters, M. (2000). Job stress and burnout among correctional officers: A literature review. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 7, 19–48.
- Scheffer, J. (2002). Dealing with missing data. *Research Letters in the Information and Mathematical Sciences*, 3, 153–160.
- Schein, E. H. (1993). Defining organizational culture. In E. H. Schein (Ed.), Organizational culture and leadership (pp. 3-13). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schraml, K., Perski, A., Grossi, G., & Simonsson-Sarnecki, M. (2011). Stress symptoms among adolescents: The role of subjective psychosocial conditions, lifestyle, and selfesteem. *Journal of Adolescence*, 34(5), 987–996.
- Selye, H. (1956). The stress of life. New York: McGraw-Hill Shamir, B., & Drory, A. (1982). Occupational tedium among prison officers. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 9(1), 79–99.
- Shibutani, T. (1955). Reference groups as perspectives. *American Journal of Sociology*, 60(6), 562–569.

- Slate, R. N., & Vogel, R. E. (1997). Participative management and correctional personnel: A study of the perceived atmosphere for participation in correctional decision making and its impact on employee stress and thoughts about quitting. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25(5), 397–408.
- Slate, R. N., Vogel, R. E., & Johnson, W. W. (2001). To quit or not to quit: Perceptions of participation in correctional decision making and the impact of organizational stress. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 5, 68–78.
- Smith, M. R. (1994). The public's distorted perception: Can it be changed? *The Keeper's Voice*, *15*, 40–41.
- Spector, P. E., & Jex, S. M. (1998). Development of four self-report measures of job stressors and strain: Interpersonal conflict at work scale, organizational constraints scale, quantitative workload inventory and physical symptoms inventory. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3, 356–367.
- Spector, P. E., Chen, P. Y., & O'Connell, B. J. (2000). A longitudinal study of relations between job stressors and job strains while controlling for prior negative affectivity and strains. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85, 211–218.
- Spinaris, C. G., & Denhof, M. D. (2011). Posttraumatic stress disorder in in United States corrections professionals: prevalence and impact on health and functioning. *Desert Waters Correctional Outreach*. Retrieved from http://desertwaters.com/?page\_id=746
- Spinaris, C. G., Denhof, M. D., & Kellaway, J. A. (2012). Posttraumatic stress disorder in United States corrections professionals: Prevalence and impact on health and functioning. *Florence, CO: Desert Waters Correctional Outreach*. Retrieved from *https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/Publications /abstract.aspx?ID=264389*
- Stack, S. J., & Tsoudis, O. (1997). Suicide risk among correctional officers: A logistic regression analysis. Archives of Suicide Research, 3(3), 183–186.
- Stadnyk, B. (2003). PTSD in corrections employees in Saskatchewan. Retrieved from http://rpnascom.jumpstartdev.com/sites/default/files/PTSDInCorrections.pdf
- Steptoe, A., Wardle, J., Pollard, T. M., Canaan, L., & Davies, G. J. (1996). Stress, social support and health-related behavior: a study of smoking, alcohol consumption and physical exercise. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 41(2), 171–180.
- Stinson, D. A., Logel, C., Zanna, M. P., Holmes, J. G., Cameron, J., Wood, J. V., et al. (2008). The cost of lower self-esteem: testing a self- and social-bonds model of health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94(3), 412–428.

Stohr, M. K., Self, R. L., & Lovrich, N. P. (1992). Staff turnover in new generation jails: An investigation of its causes and prevention. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20(5), 455–478.

Sulsky, L., & Smith, C. S. (2005). Work stress. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Pub Co.

- Sundt, J. L. (2009). Good job or dirty work-public perceptions of correctional employment. *Federal Probation*, 73, 40–45.
- Super, D. (1980). A life-span, life-space approach to career development. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *16*, 282–298.
- Surette, R. (2015). *Media crime and criminal justice: Image, realities, and polices* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Sussman, P. Y. (2002). Media in prisons: Censorship and Stereotypes. In M. Mauer & M. Chesney-Lind (Eds.), Invisible punishment: The collateral consequences of mass imprisonment (pp. 258–278). New York: New Press.
- Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (1996). *Using multivariate statistics* (3rd ed.). New York: HarperCollins.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- Takase, M., Maude, P., & Manias, E. (2006). Impact of the perceived public image of nursing on nurses' work behaviour. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, *53*(3), 333–343.
- Tartaro, C. (2002). The impact of density on jail violence. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *30*, 499–510.
- Taxman, F. S., & Gordon, J. A. (2009). Do fairness and equity matter? An examination of organizational justice among correctional officers in adult prisons. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36(7), 695–711.
- Tewksbury, R., & Higgins, G. E. (2006). Prison staff and work stress: The role of organizational and emotional influences. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30(2), 247–266.
- Toch, H. (1978). Is a "correctional officer," by any other name, a "screw?" *Criminal Justice Review*, *3*(2), 19–35.
- Toch, H., & Klofas, J. (1982). Alienation and desire for job enrichment among correctional officers. *Federal Probation, 46,* 35–44.

- The Pew Research Center for the People and the Press. (2008). *News consumption and believability study*. Retrieved from http://people-press.org/reports/pdf/444.pdf
- The Pew Center on the States (2008). One in 100: Behind bars in America. Retrieved from http://www.pewtrusts.org/our\_work\_report\_detail.aspx?id=35900
- Torres, S. J., & Nowson, C. A. (2007). Relationship between stress, eating behavior, and obesity. *Nutrition*, 23(11), 887–894.
- Tracy, S. J. (2004). The construction of COs: Layers of emotionality behind bars. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *10*, 509–533.
- Tracy, S. J., & Scott, C. W. (2006). Sexuality, masculinity, and taint management among firefighters and correctional officers: getting down and dirty with 'America's heroes' and the 'scum of law enouncement'. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 20, 6– 38.
- Treiman, D. J. (1977). *Occupational prestige in comparative perspective*. New York: Academic Press.
- Triplett, R., Mullings, J. L., & Scarborough, K. E. (1996). Work related stress and coping among correctional officers: Implications from organizational literature. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24, 291–308.
- Triplett, R., Mullings, J. L., & Scarborough, K. E. (1999). Examining the effect of workhome conflict on work-related stress among correctional officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 27(4), 371–385.
- Tyler, T. (1990). Why people obey the law. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2009). Job openings and labor turnover survey news release. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/jolts \_03102009.htm
- U.S. Department of Justice. (2000). Addressing correctional officer stress programs and strategies: Issues and practices. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Van Fleet, F. (1992). COs and their families: Dealing with stress. *The effective correctional officer*, 37–44.
- Van Voorhis, P., Cullen, F. T., Link, B. G., & Wolfe, N. T. (1991). The impact of race and gender on correctional officers' orientation to the integrated environment. *Journal* of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 28(4), 472–500.
- Veneziano, C. (1984). Occupational stress and the line correctional officer. *Southern Journal of Criminal Justice*, *8*, 214–231.

- Vickovic, S. G., Griffin, M. L., & Fradella, H. F. (2013). Depictions of correctional officers in newspaper media: an ethnographic content analysis. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 26(4), 455–477.
- Walters, J. (1999). The impact of work resources on job stress among correctional treatment staff. *Journal of Addictions and Offender Counseling*, 20, 26–34.
- Walters, S. (1992) Gender, job satisfaction, and correctional officers: A comparative analysis, *The Justice Professional*, 7(2), 23–33,
- Webster, I. W., Porritt, D. W., & Brennan, P. J. (1983). Reported health life-style and occupational stress in prison officers. *Community Health Studies*, 7(3), 266–277.
- Weir, H., Stewart, D. M., & Morris, R. G. (2012). Problematic alcohol consumption by police officers and other protective service employees: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40(1), 72–82.
- Westman, M., Eden, D., & Shirom, A. (1985). Job stress, cigarette smoking and cessation: the conditioning effects of peer support. *Social Science & Medicine*, 20(6), 637–644.
- Whitehead, J., & Lindquist, C. (1986). Correctional officer burnout: A path model. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 23, 23–42.
- Workforce Associates, Inc. (2004). A 21st Century Workforce for America's Correctional Profession
- Wright, K. (1994). Effective prison leadership. Binghamton, NY: William Neil.
- Wright, K., & Saylor, W. (1991). Male and female employees' perceptions of prison work: Is there a difference. *Justice Quarterly*, 8, 505–524.
- Yang, J., & Stone, G. (2003). The powerful role of interpersonal communication in agenda setting. *Mass Communication and Society*, 6(1), 57–74.
- Zanner, L. O. (1989). The screen test: Has Hollywood hurt corrections' image? *Corrections Today*, *51*, 64–69.
- Zupan, L. (1986). Gender related differences in correctional officers' perceptions and attitudes. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 14, 349–361.



Figure 1. Sources of stress

Table 1. A comparison of the sample to the population, by prison complex, on select socio-demographic characteristics of the population

	FLOR	ENCE	WINSI	LOW	FLORENCE &	WINSLOW
	Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample
	(N=850)	(N=447)	(N=384)	(N=194)	(N=1,234)	(N=641)
Age (years)	40.03	40.29	40.4	41.5	40.1	40.7
Male	74.60%	75.60%	74.00%	80.90%	74.5%	78.1%
Tenure (years)	8.25	9.08	7.85	9.05	7.9	9.07
Position						
CO 2	80.7%	77.9%	77.3%	74.7%	79.7%	76.9%
CO 3	5.5%	6.5%	6.3%	4.2%	5.8%	5.8%
CO 4	0.9%	1.6%	1.0%	1.6%	1.0%	1.6%
Sergeant	8.7%	9.7%	10.2%	10.5%	9.2%	10.0%
Lieutenant	3.2%	3.2%	3.9%	6.8%	3.4%	4.3%
Captain	0.8%	0.9%	1,0%	1.6%	0.9%	1.1%
Major	0.1%	0.2%	0.3%	0.5%	0.2%	0.3%
Race						
Caucasian/White	61.6%	64.2%	61.2%	61.7%	61.5%	63.4%
Hispanic/Latino	28.1%	22.7%	18.2%	12.8%	25.0%	19.7%
African/ American	6.6%	4.8%	2.3%	1.1%	5.3%	3.7%
Asian/Pacific					1.2%	1.4%
Islander	1.3%	2.0%	1.0%	.0%		
Native American	1.4%	1.8%	15.9%	17.0%	5.9%	6.4%
Other	1.0%	4.5%	1.4%	7.4%	1.1%	5.4%

	# of	Value	Range of	α	М	SD
	items	Range	Inter-Item			
			Correlation			
			Coefficient			
Dependent Variables Scales						
Job Stress	4	1-5	.3255	.73	3.2	.84
Health	5	1-5	.3760	.82	2.7	.92
Independent Variables Scales						
POP Significant Others	3	1-5	.3675	.75	4.0	.83
POP Generalized Others	6	1-5	.3178	.85	2.8	.81
POP Media	4	1-5	.2369	.71	2.0	.92
Control Variables Scales						
Organizational Support	4	1-5	.4862	.84	2.4	.94
Supervisory Support	8	1-5	.34630	.88	3.5	.80
Dangerousness	2	1-5	.52	.67	3.9	.90
Role Strain	6	1-5	.3557	.83	3.1	.83
Work-Family Conflict	6	1-5	.1351	.73	2.8	.77

## Table 2. Scale information

	Corr	ectional Offi	cers	
		(n=664)		
Variables	%	М	SD	
Age (years)		40.7	12.3	
Gender				
0=Female	21.6			
1=Male	78.4			
Race				
1=White	63.4			
0=Non-White	36.6			
Education				
0=H.S. degree	70.0			
1=More than H.S.	30.0			
Tenure				
0-4 years	34.5			
5-9 years	23.0			
10-14 years	18.0			
14+years	24.5			
Rank				
CO 2	76.8			
CO 3	5.6			
CO 4	1.5			
Sergeant	10.4			
Lieutenant	4.3			
Captain	1.1			
Major	0.3			

 Table 3. Descriptive statistics for all variables included in the model

e 4. Correlati	on matrix	: (Pearson'	's r) for in	ıdividual-l€	evel variable	es included	in multive	ariate analy	sis	
s (a)	Stress	Health	POP	POP	POP	Qual	Org	Danger	Role	WFC
			Sig	Gen	Media	Super	Sup		Strain	
	00	01 <sup>a</sup>	01	02	.01	.03	04	.04	00.	.04
	.01	.05	.13 <sup>b</sup>	09 <sup>a</sup>	21 <sup>b</sup>	00	06	90.	.03	01
	06	07	.02	.12 <sup>b</sup>	03	06	.11 <sup>b</sup>	20 <sup>b</sup>	09 <sup>a</sup>	17 <sup>b</sup>
an H.S.	04	05	06	03	.02	03	.01	.01	05	10 <sup>b</sup>
	00 <sup>.</sup>	.07	.01	.03	11 <sup>b</sup>	08 <sup>a</sup>	.02	17 <sup>b</sup>	02	08 <sup>a</sup>
ion is sig ion is sig	nificant a nificant a	t the 0.05 l t the 0.01 l	evel (1-ta evel (1-ta	uiled) uiled)						

Table 5. Correla	tion matrix	(Pearson)	s r) for key	v indepena	dent and co	ntrol variab	les includ	led in multiv	variate av	
Variables ( $\alpha$ )	Stress	Health	POP	POP	POP	Qual	Org	Danger	Role	WFC
			Sig	Gen	Media	Super	Sup		Strain	
1.Stress	1.00									
2.Health	.61 <sup>b</sup>	1.00								
<b>3.POP Sig</b>	18 <sup>b</sup>	16 <sup>b</sup>	1.00							
4.POP Gen	36 <sup>b</sup>	36 <sup>b</sup>	.28 <sup>b</sup>	1.00						
5.POP Media	27 <sup>b</sup>	30 <sup>b</sup>	.02	.48 <sup>b</sup>	1.00					
6.Qual Super	41 <sup>b</sup>	44 <sup>b</sup>	.19 <sup>b</sup>	.31 <sup>b</sup>	.16 <sup>b</sup>	1.00				
7.Org Sup	50 <sup>b</sup>	51 <sup>b</sup>	.18 <sup>b</sup>	.46 <sup>b</sup>	$.36^{\mathrm{b}}$	.55 <sup>b</sup>	1.00			
8.Danger	.40 <sup>b</sup>	$.26^{\mathrm{b}}$	-00	21 <sup>b</sup>	14 <sup>b</sup>	13 <sup>b</sup>	33 <sup>b</sup>	1.00		
9.Role Strain	.58 <sup>b</sup>	.49 <sup>b</sup>	16 <sup>b</sup>	40 <sup>b</sup>	29 <sup>b</sup>	50 <sup>b</sup>	63 <sup>b</sup>	.37 <sup>b</sup>	1.00	
10.WFC	.59 <sup>b</sup>	.53 <sup>b</sup>	17 <sup>b</sup>	30 <sup>b</sup>	14 <sup>b</sup>	37 <sup>b</sup>	42 <sup>b</sup>	.34 <sup>b</sup>	.45 <sup>b</sup>	1.00
<sup>a</sup> Correlation is si	gnificant at	t the 0.05 le	evel (1-tai	led)						
<sup>b</sup> Correlation is si	gnificant a	t the 0.01 l	evel (1-tai	led)						

Role
Danger
Org
Oual
POP
POP
POP
Health
Stress
Variables $(\alpha)$

I

Table 6. POP and social distance

	M(SD)
POP sig other	4.03(.81)*
POP gen other	2.80(.81)*
POP Media	2.10(.75)*
<i>p</i> <.01*	

F = 1331.58

variables								
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	
	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$			$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$	
POP Sig	18(-4.6)**			11(-2.75)**	11(-2.71)**	04(-1.16)	03(-1.02)	
POP Gen		36(-9.56)**		25(-5.78)**	26(-5.66)**	02(50)	03(78)	
POP Media			27(-7.12)**	15(-3.51)**	13(-3.00)**	09(-2.59)**	07(-1.78)	
QualSuper						04(-1.09)	03(73)	
OrgSupport						07(-1.70)	07(-1.51)	
Dangerousness						$.13(3.87)^{**}$	$.14(4.05)^{**}$	
Role Strain						$.25(5.70)^{**}$	.25(4.88)**	
WFC						$.35(10.09)^{**}$	$.38(10.41)^{**}$	
Age					04(87)		.03(.73)	
Male					.01(.14)		00(17)	
White					01(27)		.02(.46)	
More than H.S.					01(28)		.01(.29)	
Tenure					.02(.50)		.05(1.33)	
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.03	.13	.07	.15	.13	.48	.48	
F Ratio	$21.16^{**}$	$91.36^{**}$	50.75**	37.07**	$12.60^{**}$	67.58**	39.57**	
Note: reporting $\beta(t \text{ statisti})$ * $p < .05. \text{ **}p < .01$	c)							

12	
26	
-1	
al	
qи	
vi,	
di	
iп	
$\mathcal{U}$	
aı	
S,	
le	
at	
uri	
20	
nt	
ne	
ии	
10	
vi	
в	
÷	
ĺ0	
7	
2 <i>S</i> ,	
516	
ial	
ar	
2	
Ę	
2	
u l	
0	
SS	
re	
SI	
$q_{c}$	
ľ.	
ıa	
<i>tii</i>	
tue	
tti	
a	
б	
и	
sić	
es	
50	
e.	
ė	
vis	
Na	
ite	
2	
$f_0$	
le'	
qr	
, te	
ŝ	
пс	
m	
ns	
S	
NSI	
aŀ	
uτ	
n ı	
10	
SS	
re	
80	
R	
۲.	
le	
ab	
-	

individual-level va	riables						
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7
	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$			$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$
POP Sig POP Gen	16(-4.0)**	36(-9.60)**		08(-2.11)* 26(-5.74)**	09(-2.17)** 24(-5.33)**	02(58) 05(-1.11)	02 (64) 05(-1.07)
POP Media			30(-7.64)**	17(-3.97)**	16(-3.68)**	09(-2.45)**	09(-2.18)*
QualSuper						12(-2.69)**	13(-2.83)**
OrgSupport						18(-3.68)**	16(-3.38)**
Dangerousness						01(18)	.02(.55)
Role Strain						.10(2.08)*	.09(1.89)
WFC						.33(8.61)**	.33(8.26)**
Age					13(-2.64)**		07(-1.45)
Sex					09(-2.23)**		08(-2.50)*
Race/Ethnicity					01(12)		.01(.34)
Education					04(94)		02(63)
Tenure					.13(2.72)**		$.14(3.06)^{**}$
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.02	.13	60.	.15	.17	.40	.41
F Ratio	$15.63^{**}$	92.23**	58.421**	37.63**	15.39**	47.65**	29.69**
Note: reporting $\beta(a p < .05, **p < .06)$	t statistic) 1						

Table 8. Regression analysis summary table for stepwise regression of health job stress on POP variables, work environment variables, and

Table 9. Regression by level of quality of	analysis summary supervision	v table for stepwist	e regression of att.	itudinal job stress c	on POP variables, w	ork environment va	riables, and indivia	'ual-level variables
		Low Quality (	of Supervision			High Quality o	f Supervision	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
-	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$
POP Sig	02(31)	02(35)	01(12)	01(17)	11(-1.89)	12(-2.10)*	06(-1.24)	05(-1.17)
POP Gen	22(-3.75)**	24(-3.43)**	.01(.15)	02(32)	22(-3.46)**	20(-2.98)**	04(81)	- 04(- 72)
POP Media	17(-2.65)**	17(-2.41)**	13(-2.13)*	10(-1.69)	12(-1.90)	11(-1.70)	08(-1.51)	05(91)
OrgSupport			06(-1.01)	05(85)			05(84)	04(64)
Dangerousness			$.18(3.28)^{**}$	$.21(3.49)^{**}$			$.11(2.19)^{*}$	$.11(2.13)^{*}$
Role Strain			$.20(3.42)^{**}$	$.19(3.16)^{**}$			$.26(4.61)^{**}$	$.27(4.71)^{**}$
WFC			.32(5.88)**	.35(6.00)**			.41(8.33)**	.44(8.63)**
Age		.04(.52)		.08(1.22)		13(-1.66)		01(08)
Male		01(16)		02(29)		.03(.61)		.02(.42)
White		.05(.79)		.06(1.11)		07(-1.15)		01(16)
More than H.S.		.01(.19)		.02(.28)		06(-1.06)		.02(.44)
Tenure		01(14)		.02(.30)		.03(.42)		09(1.41)
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	11.	.10	.48	.35	.10	.13		.46
F Ratio	$12.56^{**}$	4.71**	20.79**	$12.02^{**}$	$13.00^{**}$	$5.16^{**}$	37.32**	$21.17^{**}$
Note: reporting $\beta(t \ s \ *p < .05$ .	tatistic)							

level of quality of sup	vervision	,	0	5				,
		Low Quality	of Supervision			High Quality c	of Supervision	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$							
POP Sig	09(-1.45)	11(-1.86)	07(-1.25)	09(-1.53)	01(23)	01(13)	.02(.43)	.04(.90)
POP Gen	23(-3.40)**	22(-3.22)**	08(-1.16)	10(-1.36)	21(-3.30)**	19(-2.80)**	03(55)	02(28)
POP Media	14(-2.12)*	15(-2.27)*	08(-1.22)*	08(-1.22)	20(-3.11)**	19(-2.89)**	13(-2.23)*	10(-1.83)
OrgSupport			17(-2.61)**	15(-2.21)*			17(-2.63)**	18(-2.83)*
Dangerousness			01(02)	.04(.59)			02(40)	.01(.19)
Role Strain			.08(1.34)	.09(1.28)			$.15(2.46)^{*}$	.13(2.17)*
WFC			.29(4.76)**	.26(4.09)**			.41(7.77)**	.45(8.26)**
Age		13(-1.93)		06(76)		15(-1.92)		05(80)
Male		01(23)		01(.19)		17(-3.01)**		17(-3.69)**
White		03(55)		04(68)		01(22)		.05(.93)
More than H.S.		06(95)		06(-1.06)		05(83)		.04(.72)
Tenure		.17(240)*		.17(2.31)*		.10(1.37)		.15(2.37)*
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.11	.14	.23	.23	.12	.14	.40	.43
F Ratio	12.23 **	$6.10^{**}$	$11.60^{**}$	$7.01^{**}$	$14.13^{**}$	6.59**	27.70**	18.05 **
Note: reporting $\beta(t \text{ st} + p < .05, **p < .01)$	atistic)							

Table 10. Regression analysis summary table for stepwise regression of health job stress on POP variables, work environment variables, and individual-level variables by

128

variables by level of	organizational su	upport						
		Low Organiz	ational Support			High Organiza	tional Support	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
-	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$							
POP Sig	05(91)	04(71)	07(-1.36)	06(-1.07)	15(-2.59)*	15(-2.65)**	.02(.32)	01(14)
POP Gen	21(-3.23)**	22(-3.29)**	03(49)	04(57)	12(-1.93)	13(-2.03)*	03(69)	06(-1.13)
POP Media	08(-1.29)	06(92)	07(-1.16)	03(49)	15(-2.55)*	15(-2.37)*	13(-2.71)**	13(-2.44)*
QualSuper			05(99)	03(61)			06(-1.09)	04(75)
Dangerousness			$.18(3.59)^{**}$	$.20(3.61)^{**}$			.10(2.13)*	.11(2.23)*
Role Strain			$.20(3.44)^{**}$	$.20(3.46)^{**}$			$.32(5.52)^{**}$	$.31(5.26)^{**}$
WFC			.37(6.79)**	.41(7.2)**			.37(7.57)**	.39(7.50)**
Age		.02(.25)		00(03)		06(81)		.08(1.30)
Male		.02(.03)		03(55)		.01(.04)		.01(.22)
White		.03(.44)		.05(1.02)		09(-1.49)		04(86)
More than H.S.		01(07)		.06(1.14)		07(-1.16)		02(50)
Tenure		04(58)		.10(1.42)		.04(.56)		.02(.30)
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.07	.05	.34	.35	.07	.07	.45	.45
F Ratio	8.04**	2.82**	22.08**	13.24 * *	6.85**	3.93**	34.95**	$19.77^{**}$
Note: reporting $\beta(t \text{ s} + p < .05, **p < .01)$	tatistic)							

Table 11. Regression analysis summary table for stepwise regression of attitudinal job stress on POP variables, work environment variables, and individual-level

129

level of organizatio.	nal support							
		Low Organiz	ational Support			High Organiza	tional Support	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
	$\beta(t \text{ statistic})$							
POP Sig	04(63)	04(69)	05(85)	05(86)	11(-1.89)	11(-1.84)	02(04)	01(20)
POP Gen	22(-3.43)**	23(-3.35)**	08(-1.36)	09(-1.40)	07(-1.09)	07(-1.08)	01(18)	02(27)
POP Media	09(-1.49)*	09(-1.44)	08(-1.44)	07(-1.17)	16(-2.65)**	16(-2.50)*	13(-2.23)*	13(-2.18)*
QualSuper			13(-2.21)*	11(-1.95)			17(-2.49)*	21(-3.05)
Dangerousness			.06(1.12)	.11(1.87)			05(82)	02(38)
Role Strain			.11(1.92)	.13(2.13)*			.11(1.63)	.08(1.19)
WFC			.38(6.72)**	.38(6.53)**			.32(5.45)**	.30(4.73)**
Age		07(92)		05(70)		15(-2.00)*		12(-1.50)
Male		06(-1.07)		08(-1.50)		12(-2.09)*		12(-2.21)*
White		.03(.49)		.03(.49)		06(-1.03)		03(48)
More than H.S.		02(41)		.02(.29)		09(-1.46)		04(77)
Tenure		.11(1.46)		.18(2.52)*		.13(1.73)		.13(1.92)
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.07	.07	.29	.31	.04	.08	.23	.26
F Ratio	8.90**	3.72**	$17.39^{**}$	$11.02^{**}$	$5.69^{**}$	4.15**	$13.12^{**}$	8.70**
Note: reporting $\beta(t) = p < .05$ . ** $p < .01$	statistic)							

Table 12. Regression analysis summary table for stepwise regression of health job stress on POP variables, work environment variables, and individual-level variables by

_	Att	itudinal Jobs Stre	ess	H	Health Job Stres	SS
_	21-33	34-46	46>	21-33	34-46	46>
POP Sig	03(55)	03(55)	02(39)	08(-1.23)	.01(.18)	.04(.69)
POP Gen	18(-2.43)*	.13(1.88)	05(87)	11(-1.30)	.02(.28)	11(-1.57)
POP Media	.09(1.26)	18(-2.67)**	09(-1.58)	.02(.20)	15(-2.11)*	14(-2.18)*
QualSuper	.05(.68)	.02(.26)	18(-2.40)*	16(-2.06)*	10(-1.35)	03(33)
OrgSupport	12(-1.38)	04(48)	.05(.64)	16(-1.67)	13(-1.60)	18(-2.10)*
Dangerousness	.08(1.20)	.19(2.95)**	.10(1.81)	.01(.17)	.08(1.17)	07(-1.08)
Role Strain	.28(3.47)**	.26(3.45)**	.20(2.71)**	.09(.10)	.09(1.08)	.18(2.13)*
WFC	.33(5.47)**	.36(5.37)**	.47(7.60)**)	.27(4.00)**	.33(4.81)**	.42(6.02)**
Sex	04(60)	05(81)	.08(1.50)	14(-2.12)*	08(1.17)	03(51)
Race/Ethnicity	.05(.87)	01(02)	.01(.04)	.10(1.52)	.02(.35)	.01(.05)
Education	02(42)	.02(.35)	.03(.57)	08(-1.38)	.02(.35)	.04(.67)
Tenure	.05(.89)	.11(1.79)	.01(.04)	.02(.31)	.22(3.45)**	.05(.86)
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.44	.40	.60	.34	.38	.52
F Ratio	13.40**	11.63**	21.85**	9.01**	10.30**	15.84**

Table 13. Regression analysis summary table for regression of attitudinal and health job stress on POP variables, work environment variables, and individual-level variables by age

Note: reporting  $\beta(t \text{ statistic})$ ; all variables are controlled for

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01

	At	ttitudinal Jobs Stres	SS		Health Job Stress	
	Tenure 0-4	Tenure 5-9	Tenure 9>	Tenure 0-4	Tenure 5-9	Tenure 9>
POP Sig	06(-1.04)	01(14)	06(-1.18)	.18(.86)	08(93)	02(45)
POP Gen	22(-3.21)**	(17(1.91)	.02(.37)	12(-1.47)	.06(.59)	01(15)
POP Media	.05(.80)	05(60)	18(-3.23)**	06(84)	09(-1.00)	14(-2.55)**
QualSuper	.03(.48)	02(19)	13(-2.04)*	18(-2.08)*	14(-1.38)	09(-1.33)
OrgSupport	06(.74)	.03(.32)	06(93)	17(-1.77)	.03(.35)	24(-3.88)**
Dangerousness	.13(2.20)*	.14(1.77)	$.13(2.57)^{*}$	.01(.06)	.07(.78)	01(04)
Role Strain	$.24(3.04)^{**}$	$.40(4.00)^{**}$	$.18(2.81)^{**}$	.05(.55)	.15(1.36)	.12(1.83)
WFC	.38(6.13)**	.35(4.30)**	.42(7.53)**	.22(3.02)**	.41(4.64)**	.38(6.59)**
Age	.09(1.63)	08(-1.02)	.04(.69)	06(90)	02(19)	07(-1.38)
Sex	04(66)	06(80)	.05(1.18)	12(-1.77)	08(19)	07(-1.57)
Race/Ethnicity	.02(.38)	1.32(.19)	06(-1.24)	.03(.40)	.11(1.45)	04(87)
Education	01(21)	.08(1.10)	.01(.24)	06(92)	03(43)	.04(.78)
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.49	.39	.55	.29	.30	.54
F Ratio	15.53**	7.79**	24.77**	7.25**	5.52**	23.20 * *

	ŭ							
	2							
	5							
	2							
	SN							
	ž							
	2							
	ž							
	5							
	S							
	ā							
	10							
	ģ							
	2							
6	7							
	2							
	4							
	ĸ							
	S							
	S							
	Ā							
	S							
	8							
	5							
1	2							
	a							
	ñ							
	7							
	ž							
	a							
	ä							
	Ы							
	ц							
-	11							
	11							
¢	5							
	О,							
	ис							
	2Z							
	S							
	Ĕ.							
	80							
	-							
,	õ							
	5							
	ž							
	al							
	11							
	5							
	202							
	n n							
	E							
	S							
	SIS							
	ž.							
	a							
	лr							
	'n							
	0							
	SS							
	ē,							
	50							
,	S,							
	· ·							
	4							
	0							
-	Ř							
	a							
	Attitudina	l Jobs Stress	Health J	Job Stress				
-------------------------	-------------	----------------------	-------------	----------------------	--	----------------------	--	-----------
	White	Non-White	White	Non-White				
POP Sig	.04(.94)	16(-2.74)** .02(.47)		16(-2.74)** .02(.47)		16(-2.74)** .02(.47)		08(-1.25)
POP Gen	02(35)	05(78)	01(07)	15(-2.00)*				
POP Media	06(-1.48)	11(-1.58)	04(93)	14(-1.90)				
QualSuper	06(-1.24)	.04(.58)	06(-1.16)	23(-2.89)**				
OrgSupport	08(-1.50)	03(43)	18(-3.13)**	09(-1.03)				
Dangerousness	.12(2.62)**	.19(3.02)**	.01(.07)	.08(1.17)				
Role Strain	.29(5.40)**	.17(2.21)*	.16(2.85)**	02(20)				
WFC	.37(8.13)**	.42(6.38)**	.42(8.86)**	.19(2.56)*				
Age	.03(.66)	.02(.35)	06(-1.11)	08(-1.08)				
Sex	02(48)	01(02)	13(-3.35)**	02(31)				
Tenure	.03(.50)	.09(1.26)	.12(2.31)*	.17(2.15)*				
Education	.01(.20)	.01(.12)	.01(.06)	08(-1.19)				
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.50	.45	.47	.35				
F Ratio	30.27**	14.07**	26.51**	9.41**				

 Table 15. Regression analysis summary table for regression of attitudinal and health job stress on POP variables, work environment variables, and individual-level variables by race/ethnicity

Note: reporting  $\beta(t \text{ statistic})$ ; all variables are controlled for

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01

Table 16. Regression analysis summary table for regression of attitudinal and health job stress
on POP variables, work environment variables, and individual-level variables by education

<i>in i oi vanaoros</i> ,	Attitudina	l Jobs Stress	Health	Job Stress	
	High School	More than H.S.	High School	More than H.S.	
POP Sig	01(10)	11(-1.78)	04(93)	.01(.22)	
POP Gen	01(17)	08(-1.18)	04(68)	04(47)	
POP Media	07(-1.55)	06(80)	08(-1.72)	11(-1.41)	
QualSuper	04(90)	.03(.33)	17(-3.22)**	01(03)	
OrgSupport	03(54)	16(-1.96)10(-1.81		16(-1.96)10(-1.81)	31(-3.37)**
Dangerousness	.14(3.23)**	.13(2.09)*	01(12)	.08(1.11)	
Role Strain	.24(4.41)**	.29(3.53)**	.10(1.77)	.07(.72)	
WFC	.40(8.68)**	.37(5.74)**	.38(7.46)**	.29(4.00)**	
Age	01(18)	.13(1.70)	08(-1.50)	02(23)	
Sex	.01(.25)	05(83)	06(-1.57)	.12(-1.89)	
Race/Ethnicity	.02(.49)	01(06)	.01(.07)	.03(.45)	
Tenure	.08(1.57)	01(02)	.13(2.48)*	.15(1.76)	
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.47	.50	.42	.38	
F Ratio	28.87**	14.52**	23.47**	9.14**	

Note: reporting  $\beta(t \text{ statistic})$ ; all variables are controlled for

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01

	Attitudinal	Jobs Stress	Health	Job Stress		
	Women	Men	Women	Men		
POP Sig	02(22)	03(84)	.11(1.32)	05(-1.20)		
POP Gen	.02(.24)	04(95)	.13(1.32)	10(-2.06)*		
POP Media	04(50)	07(-1.59)	18(-1.89)	06(-1.39)		
QualSuper	15(-1.73)	01(.19)	04(35)	15(-2.93)*		
OrgSupport	13(-1.28)	06(-1.19)19(-1.63)		06(-1.19)19(-1.6		16(-3.04)**
Dangerousness	.21(2.72)**	.11(2.69)**	.10(1.07)	.01(.06)		
Role Strain	.15(1.60)	.28(5.39)**	.11(.94)	.08(1.52)		
WFC	.39(4.66)**	.39(9.45)**	.32(3.20)**	.34(7.72)**		
Age	.01(.17)	.03(.70)	13)-1.39)	04(72)		
Race/Ethnicity	.08(1.09)	.01(.13)	.12(1.37)	02(50)		
Education	.03(.44)	.01(.09)	.03(.35)	04(-1.10)		
Tenure	05(64)	.07(1.54)	.12(1.28)	.13(2.52)*		
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.54	.46	.35	.43		
F Ratio	11.85**	32.02**	5.87**	27.90**		

Table 17. Regression analysis summary table for regression of attitudinal and health job stress on POP variables, work environment variables, and individual-level variables by sex

Note: reporting  $\beta(t \text{ statistic})$ ; all variables are controlled for

\*p < .05. \*\*p < .01

## APPENDIX A

### COVER LETTER

March, 2014



TO:ADC Correctional OfficersFROM:Marie Griffin and John Hepburn, Professors

In 1999, we conducted a Quality of Work Life Survey of all ADC employees that studied a number of important work-related issues, such as job satisfaction, safety, and stress. Our purpose then was to get a better understanding of the aspects of the job that create a more favorable working environment. Today we are conducting a similar survey of all ADC correctional officers. This survey is conducted with the approval of Director Ryan, but we do not work for ADC or any other agency. As faculty at ASU, we are an independent, external group of researchers who have been studying the working conditions in prisons for several years.

The goal of this survey is to learn even more about the positive and negative effects of your working conditions. Our objective findings will report only group information, such as the averages and the percentages of responses and the relationships between the different working conditions we are measuring by your responses. These general results and conclusions will be published in a report that will be available to everyone on the web site of the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice. We also will meet with ADC leadership to discuss the implications of our findings for the job satisfaction, health, and well-being of correctional officers.

We expect it will take you about 15 minutes. The first part of the survey asks some individual information, such as your age and sex. The other part is much longer and asks questions about your job. For this part, there are no right or wrong answers just answers which best describe how you feel about things at work. The survey does ask a lot of questions, but we need to ask all these questions so we can get precise measures of your attitudes toward the job, the working conditions, and your health and well-being. So, please answer all questions.

This is not a test. It is just a poll of your opinions and an opportunity for you to have a voice regarding your job. Your responses will not be shown to your supervisor or anyone at ADC, so your answers will not hurt you or help you in your job. We want this to be confidential and anonymous, so please... DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON THE SURVEY.

Your participation in this survey is entirely voluntary, but we hope you will fill out the survey. We don't want just a few people to be answering for all the rest of the officers. If you answer the questions, then your opinions will be a part of our results. If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact Professor John Hepburn at (602) 496-2353 or the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965-6788.

<u>After you have completed the confidential survey form please put it in the</u> <u>designated box or fold, tape, and drop in the U. S. Mail.</u> As an incentive, you can enter a drawing for a \$50 gift card by putting your name and contact information on this letter (not on the survey) and dropping it in the same box that is used to collect the surveys. Thank you for your assistance.

Yes, enter me in the drawing for the \$50 gift card: \_\_\_\_\_

Name and Contact Information

## APPENDIX B

# SURVEY INSTRUMENT



# Work Patterns What do others think about the work you do?

THREE OR MORE TIMES In the four months since Thanksgiving, TWICE ONLY 2013, how often have you: ONCE ONLY NEVER 0 Missed a day of work (for any reason)? 0 Been late for work? 0 0 0 0 Used sick leave? Been injured on the job? 0 0 0 Been reassigned to a different shift? 0 0 Volunteered for overtime or an extra shift? 0 Been asked to report early or held over for additional hours at the end of a shift? 0 0

Strongly Disagree This set of questions asks your opinion about how the work Disagree of correctional officers is perceived by others. Please select Uncertain the response that best fits your opinion - there are no right Agree or wrong answers. Strongly Agree Neighbors and local townspeople: Recognize the importance of the work I do. 000 0 0 00 Show little respect for correctional officers. 0 0 0 Have a positive image of the work I do. The general public: 0 000 0 0 Shows little respect for correctional officers. 0 0 0 Recognizes the importance of the work I do. Has a positive image of the work I do. 0 0 0 My friends and family: 000 0 0 Have a positive image of the work I do. 0 0 0 Recognize the importance of the work I do. Show little respect for correctional officers. 0 0 When there is a news story about correctional officers: Officers usually are portrayed negatively. 0 0 The importance of our job to society usually is highlighted. 0 0 0 When I see correctional officers on TV or in movies: 0 000 0 Officers usually are portrayed negatively. 0 0 The importance of our job to society usually is highlighted.

h this section, please respond by indicating your degree		Strongly Disa Disagree			
There is no right or wrong answer - just your oninion		Unce	rtain		
		gree			
Strong	y Agree				
I like the duties I perform on my jo	b. O	0	0	0	0
The training I received at COTA has been relevant to my jo	<b>b.</b> O	0	0	0	0
I have enough time to get the job don		0	0	0	0
				<u> </u>	
I usually feel that I am under a lot of pressure when I am at wo	k. O	0	0	0	0
ADC takes pride in my accomplishments at wor	k. O	0	0	0	0
I feel a sense of loyalty to AD	. 0	0	0	0	0
Overall, the information we get from chain of command is clear an			0	0	0
easy to apply on the join				<u> </u>	
A lot of people I work with have been physically injured on the jo	o. O	0	0	0	0
When a problem comes up here, nobody can agree on how it should be handle	1. O	0	0	0	0
My work schedule is so uncertain that it interferes with my family and/or social life	e. O	0	0	0	0
I know my work is important to socie	y. O	0	0	0	0
lam satisfied with my io		0	0	0	0
I am proud to be employed by AD	. 0	0	Õ	0	0
I have too much invested with my job to leave it no	v. O	0	0	0	0
When meeting new people, I am proud to tell them that I am a correctional office	r. 0	0	0	0	0
		0		-	-
I am able to determine the pace at which I wo	. 0		0	0	0
I work under conflicting policies and guideline My supervisor does not treat me with respe	t 0	0	0	0	0
Most of the time when I'm at work I don't worry about my personal safet	. 0	0	0	0	0
· · · ·					
I find that my job has negatively affected my home life	e. O	0	0	0	0
l dislike my joi	. 0	0	0	0	0
Even if I did the best job possible, the department probably would not notic		0	0	0	0
There is much to be gained from staying with AD	. 0	0	0	0	0
I can determine the order in which I do the things requested of m	e. O	0	0	0	0
It seems like the inmates know what is going on around here before the correction			0	0	
Officers know about My work environment allows me to be attentive, yet relaxed and at eas		0	0	0	0
I frequently think about quitting my job at ADC	. 0	0	0	0	0
I am making plans now to find another job outside of AD		0	0	0	0
I have been searching for a new job outside of AD		0	0	0	0
It is likely that I will suil be working for ADC a year from no	v.   Ŭ				

This set of questions asks about a variety of possible physical						
ailments and stress that might be related to the work you do. For	Io. For Ofte			Freque Often	equenti en	
each one, please indicate due to your work, how often in the four		S	ometi	mes		
months since Thanksgiving, 2013 have you:	N	Sel ever	dom			
Been bothered by h	eadaches?	0	0	0	0	
Felt tired when you get up in the morning and have to face another day of	on the job?	0	0	0	0	
Helped other officers who have mis	ssed work?	0	0	0	0	
Felt burned out fro	om the job?	0	0	0	0	
Had to interrupt your own work due to delays caused	by others?	0	0	0	0	
Experienced tiredne	ss/fatigue?	0	0	0	0	
Felt that working with others is an emotion	nal strain?	0	0	0	0	
Felt emotionally drained at the end	of the day?	0	0	0	0	
Told your supervisor about a job well done by anoth	ner officer?	0	0	0	0	
Skipped lunch or worked through lunch just to keep up with the	workload?	0	0	0	0	
Felt that you have to put on a good front to hide your true	e feelings?	0	0	0	0	
Fallen behind in your regular duties because you have extra work that is not part	of your job?	0	0	0	0	
Felt d	lepressed?	0	0	0	0	
Defended ADC when other officers	criticize it?	0	0	0	0	
Experienced irritability	//irritation?	0	0	0	0	
Been bothered by little things that usually don't b	other you?	0	0	0	0	
Experienced stoma	ch trouble?	0	0	0	0	
Felt you could not shake off	the blues?	0	0	0	0	į
Felt more stress when working directly with th	e inmates?	0	0	0	0	
Come to work early or stay late just to meet the demands	of the job?	0	0	0	0	
Felt that you just could not get going when you first arrive	ed at work?	0	0	0	0	
Feit less concerned about your o	coworkers?	0	0	0	0	
Had so much to do that you had to leave some thing	problems?	0	0	0	0	
Fer momentum to minutes and their Given advance notice when you knew you would not be able to com	ne to work?	0	0	0	0	
						-

Your opinions about the working conditions on the job.					5
Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement about the working conditions on the job.	Strongly Disa Disagree Uncertain Agree Strongly Agree			gree	
I am not asked to do an excessive amount of work.	0	0	0	0	0
When I'm at work, I often feel tense or uptight.	0	0	0	0	0
The rules I am supposed to follow are very clear.	0	0	0	0	0
My job keeps me away from my family too much.	0	0	0	0	0
Most days I am enthusiastic about my job.	0	0	0	0	0
In my job, a person stands a good chance of getting hurt.	0	0	0	0	0
I receive the information I need to do the work expected.	0	0	0	0	0
The demands of the job often interfere with my personal life.	0	0	0	0	0
My job does not allow me to make a lot of decisions on my own.	0	0	0	0	0
Often times, one rule will tell us to do one thing, but another rule tells us to do something else.	0	0	0	0	0
Work makes me too tired or irritable to enjoy my family and/or social life.	0	0	0	0	0
It would be hard for me to leave my job, even if I wanted to leave it.	0	0	0	0	0
The department values my input.	0	0	0	0	0
I would not recommend this job to a friend.	0	0	0	0	0
The practices and programs at ADC promote a safe and healthy workplace.	0	0	0	0	0
A lot of times, my job makes me very frustrated or angry.	0	0	0	0	0
I don't take my job home with me.	0	0	0	0	0
Even when my work keeps me busy, I still have time to stop and chat with another officer during my job.	0	0	0	0	0
I enjoy most of the work I do.	0	0	0	0	0
The department shows very little concern for me personally.	0	0	0	0	0
If I remain in corrections, I would prefer to remain with ADC.	0	0	0	0	0
My Field Training Officer prepared me to be effective on my job.	0	0	0	0	0
It would be too financially costly for me to quit my job at ADC.	0	0	0	0	0
If I were to start over, I would want to be a correctional officer again.	0	0	0	0	0
I often have to miss important family or social activities/events because of my job.	0	0	0	0	0
l work at a dangerous job.	0	0	0	0	0

Opinions about coworkers and supervisors					6
This set of questions asks about your opinions about your		Strongly Disa			
coworkers and supervisors, and as previously, there are no right or wrong answers. We want only your honest opinion.		Disa			
		gree			
Strongly	Agree	0	0	0	0
I can tell my supervisor when things are wrong.	0	0	0	0	0
If I saw another officer being verbally abusive to an inmate, I would talk to him and	0			0	0
tell nim ne needs to find another way to talk to inmates.			0	0	0
ADC training has prepared me to deal with the kinds of situations that arise of the job.	0	0	0	0	0
I am encouraged by my supervisor to work out my own solutions to tough problems that arise on the job.	0	0	0	0	0
Deciding to work for ADC was a very positive move on my part.	0	0	0	0	0
When another officer tells me that most policies must be bent a little to get the job done, I am quick to tell him I disagree.	0	0	0	0	0
I am allowed to decide how to go about getting my job done.				0	0
I often receive feedback on my performance from my supervisor.		0	0	0	0
My job requires that I be constantly alert and thinking about the job.		0	0	0	0
My supervisor gives very clear directions that are easy to follow.		0	0	0	0
When the need arises on the job, I am willing to ask my co-workers for help.		0	0	0	0
My supervisor listens to suggestions from me and other officers.		0	0	0	0
It seems like most of the information I get about doing my job comes from other officers and not from the chain of command.		0	0	0	0
If another officer ever showed up for work after he had been drinking, I would confront him and get him a ride home.		0	0	0	0
My supervisor coaches and mentors me so I can succeed on the job.	0	0	0	0	0
I am not able to do things in my job that make use of my abilities.	0	0	0	0	0
If another officer was stealing property from the facility, I would do nothing.		0	0	0	0
If you disagree and would do something, what would it be:	would it be:				
talk to the officer	Y	ES D	N	0	
tain to the officer what we should de		0		30	
	9		<u>v</u>		
tell my supervisor.			ų	ע ע	

Thank you very much for your participation. Please use the dropbox provided at your facility to return this instrument. This extra effort on your part will minimize our expenses, and is greatly appreciated.

If you prefer to return by mail, please fold the entire document in half, lengthwise. Then seal with a small piece of transparent tape in the center of the fold. Please do not seal the entire edge, a single small piece will suffice. The postage will be paid by ASU, no stamp is required.

Finally, please provide any other comments or feedback you would like to share in the space provided below.

For any questions or concerns about this survey and Arizona State University's role, please contact John Hepburn, Ph.D. at 602-496-2353. If you have any questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, or if you feel you have been placed at risk, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board, through the ASU Office of Research Integrity and Assurance, at (480) 965-6788.

Fold along dotted line, secure with tape at bottom, do not staple







POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

Arizona State University Tempe AZ 85281-9833 վերուների ինդիրումին, դուներին հե