Stress and Maladaptive Coping Among Police Officers

by

Kathleen Padilla

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Science

Approved April 2016 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Michael White, Chair
Cody Telep
Gary Sweeten

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2016

ABSTRACT

The relationship between stress and policing has long been established in literature. What is less clear, however, is what departments are doing to help officers deal with the stress that comes with the job. Looking at a small Southwestern police agency and using a modified version of Speilberger's (1981) Police Stress Survey, the present study sought to examine stressors inherent to policing, as well as to identify departmental services that may be in place to help officers alleviate those stressors and whether or not police officers would choose to take part in the services that may be offered. The findings suggest that a shift in stress in policing is occurring with operational stressors being reported at higher levels than organizational stressors, contrary to previous research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

Given the current climate surrounding law enforcement, police officers are under more scrutiny than ever, and with that increased scrutiny comes increased levels of stress. The topic of police officer stress should be imperative to researchers because the men and women that serve and protect us as a society do not always get an adequate amount of support themselves. Considering that many police departments have adopted a paramilitary organizational structure (Violanti and Aron, 1995), the military becomes one of the closest occupational comparisons in regards to stress and trauma. Rich Libicer of the East Mesa Group (2015) draws comparisons between law enforcement and the military in their organizational structures, with a stark contrast being that police officers are constantly working in a perceived combative environment.

While soldiers in the military are afforded up to two years of 'dwell' or down time after being deployed (Tan, 2011), police officers are not afforded the same amount of time to cope with what they see on the job. Although military and police experiences with trauma are not entirely comparable, it is useful to consider the time of leave afforded to our soldiers and the lack of leave that tends to be afforded to police officers. In most instances, an officer has the time it takes to get from one scene to the next to process what they have just witnessed and it often does not leave enough time to cognitively make sense of what has happened. Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) is often experienced by police officers as a result of a mass accumulation of traumatic events (Robinson, Sigman, & Wilson, 1997). Events that may seem minor as individual instances (Menard and Arter, 2013) build up over time when there are no appropriate

mechanisms to cope with that stress and trauma, and this can have very dire consequences.

There are typically no departmental mandates that place officers in counseling or mental health assistance programs. At most, an officer is only required to take three days off work when he or she discharges a firearm (Libicer, 2015). Aside from those relatively rare use-of-force instances, police officers are left to advocate for themselves to receive the help they need to effectively do their job. The consequences for failure to process the stress and trauma endured during the daily routines of officers can result in maladaptive coping mechanisms, such as alcohol or substance abuse, or outbursts of anger.

Robert Agnew (1992) proposes that when avenues for appropriately dealing with stress or strain are not available to someone, they will seek other, maladaptive avenues to manage their internal struggles. Whether through socialization processes learned by their Field Training Officers (FTOs), their colleagues once on the job, or simply methods they have personally come to know and appropriate, these methods resolve their strains for the short-term. Studies have shown that police officers tend to have increased rates of alcohol and substance abuse (Burke and Deszca, 1986; U.S. DOJ 2015), and more substantially, suicide (Davis, 2014) when compared to the general population. The risks for suicide persist once the police officer has retired, suggesting that it may not be so easy to "remove the badge" and resume the civilian life. Typically, if an officer survives the first two years after retirement, then they can consider themselves 'in the clear' (Libicer, 2015). Most of these risks involve the constant state of hypervigilance that officers live

in. Their fight-or-flight response is always in the 'on' position, and it is not easily shut off.

While the majority of the risks of extreme, long-term stress and trauma are mostly placed on the police officer, they have just as extreme consequences to the public. When officers are in a constant state of hypervigilance and have accumulated weeks, months, or even years of traumatic events, their citizen encounters are going to be much different. This state of hypervigilance alters how the police deal with citizens and it may lead to increased risk of a violent outcome (Van Maanen, 1978; U.S. DOJ, 2015).

The excessive use of force incidents seen by officers under tremendous amounts of stress, the use of alcohol as an appropriate method to deal with that stress, and the relatively higher rates of suicide among both active and retired police officers warrants investigation into just how stressed police officers are, and how they deal with their stress. Agnew's general strain theory holds that the more negative situations and strains an individual deals with, the more deviant and maladaptive in nature their response to those strains is likely to be.

The current study seeks to add to the literature on stress in policing and look at what, if any, services are offered by the department to help officers manage their stress. Also of importance are reasons officers may or may not choose to take part in these services. These questions will be examined looking at gender, race, rank, and tenure within the department.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Guiding Theory

The current study is guided by Robert Agnew's general strain theory (GST). While originally used to explain delinquency and criminality, the components of GST can provide some guidance to how police officers deal with the stress imposed on them by the very nature of their career. Strain theory is based on Robert Merton's (1938) institutional anomie theory, which sought to explain America's ultimate goal for "pecuniary success and social assent" coupled with the structure that provides very restricted access to attain these goals (Cullen et al., 2006, p. 5). Agnew's general strain theory expanded the scope of Merton's strain theory, which, until 1992 focused solely on the inability to achieve positively valued goals as a source of strain that would increase negative emotions.

Three strains listed by Agnew are: (1) the inability to achieve positively valued goals, (2) the loss of positively valued stimuli, and (3) the presentation of negatively valued or aversive stimuli. The presence of a strain creates negative emotions and a desire for corrective action, and one can cope with those feelings either in an adaptive or a maladaptive manner. Evans, Coman, Stanley, and Burrows (1993) define effective coping as "(a) the efficacy with which individuals deal with their emotional responses to stressors and act to resolve the stressors, and (b) the cost of their effectiveness to the individual" (p. 238). An individual will cope with strains through crime depending on their ability to engage in legal and illegal coping, the costs of crime, and their disposition for crime (Cullen et al., 2006, p. 101).

In regard to policing, the first strain, the inability to achieve positively valued goals can include instances such as not receiving a promotion, not getting an arrest, or something as simple as not receiving praise for following protocol. This lack of support from supervisors tends to be a major source of strain for police officers (Anshel, 2000). The second source of strain, the loss of positively valued stimuli, can be seen in policing in the form of a suspension, a demotion, or a chastising from an individual's superior. The final source of strain, the presentation of negatively valued or aversive stimuli, can appear in policing in the form of an injury obtained in the field, a civil suit, or as seen recently across the country, in a criminal suit as a result of a use of force incident.

Maladaptive Coping

Agnew's general strain theory provides that when a strain is present in an individual's life, they choose to cope in either an adaptive or a maladaptive fashion. Because officers often cannot control the sources of their stress, they use coping mechanisms as a method of controlling what they can (Anshel, 2000). One popular maladaptive or destructive coping mechanism for police is increased alcohol use and abuse (McCarty et al., 2007). Dietrich and Smith (1986) found that "alcohol is not only used but is very much accepted as a way of coping with the tensions and stresses of the day" (p. 304). Menard and Arter (2013) reported that police officers had higher incidences of alcohol abuse, binge drinking, and rates of death due to liver disease resulting from alcohol. This method of coping with stress, while fundamentally accepted throughout the police culture, lends credence to the elevated rates of suicide among police officers (Nock et al., 2008; Violanti, 1995).

5

In their 2003 study on mental health in policing, Collins and Gibbs found that officers with measureable ill health had doubled since 1993. It seems reasonable then, to presume that that trend has continued, contrasting the perception that society has become more aware of mental health issues and more willing to help. While organizational stressors tend to be more frequent and more causal of distress in officers, those relatively rare critical incidents such as witnessing a death in the field, contribute to psychological distress as well (Menard and Arter, 2008).

Police Subculture

Reliance on maladaptive coping mechanisms is explained, in part, by the nature of the police culture, which is male-dominated and places a premium on being "tough" and impervious to the stressors of the job. The definition of culture is widely debated, however, Herbert (1998) describes it as "a grab bag of assorted schemas, tools, and frames, which are reflexively adapted by active agents to new and uncertain scenarios" (p. 346). Of even more complexity is the notion of what constitutes a subculture. Gaines and Kappeler (2008) describe a subculture as people who form a unique group within a given culture.

Police officers fit in this category, for while they share many of the values and beliefs of the larger, more dominant culture of society, they also have separate and distinct values. The unique role and social status that American police officers play place them into their own subculture largely because they have a "legal monopoly" on the sanctioned use of violence and coercion against other members of society in order to keep the peace (Gaines and Kappeler, 2008; Bittner, 1973; Skolnick, 2011).

6

The subculture of policing strongly encourages traits such as bravery, autonomy, secrecy, isolation and solidarity (Kappeler et al., 1998). The fundamental "us versus them" mentality is often created through formal socialization from the academy as a means of breeding mistrust and suspicion towards the public (Herbert, 1998). Here, group cohesiveness is strongly encouraged, as is the real and encouraged sense of danger instilled in police officers, causing everyday citizens to become "symbolic assailants" who could pose a real threat at any moment (Gaines and Kappeler, 2008). This leads police officers to resort to perceptual shorthand and reliance on stereotypes to make it through their shift.

Parsons and colleagues (1937) are credited with coining the term "normative order" that has been built upon to describe a set of rules and practices that are centered on a primary value. These form the informal rules that persist throughout the police subculture and include six valued concepts. The first, law, is used as a resource for police officers to achieve their overarching purpose of peacekeeping. Bureaucratic control is the second normative order, and it follows to foster structure to the organization and to provide upper-level management a means to control the behavior of those beneath them (Herbert, 1998).

The third normative order, one that may be seen as most prominent in the subculture, is adventure and 'machismo.' Officers must demonstrate their courage and bravery by placing themselves in dangerous situations. Officers demonstrating 'machismo' seem to embrace a more aggressive attitude, conforming to militaristic behaviors. Safety is the fourth normative order, whereby officers encourage one another

7

to ensure their own preservation. Herbert (1998) follows that some officers even invoke

the saying, "It is better to be judged by twelve than carried by six" (p. 357), indicating

they would rather be placed on trial than killed in the line of duty. Perceptual shorthand

and stereotypes tend to come into play here in order to help the officers adapt to whatever

situation they are thrown into.

Competence, the fifth normative order, shapes the police culture in that a strong

sense of pulling one's weight and fulfilling their responsibilities is paramount to gaining

respect among other officers. This normative order tends to be in play during use of force

incidents. The last normative order is morality, whereby police officers often take their

responsibility of upholding the law as more than that, and see it as a battle between good

and evil (Herbert, 1998).

These normative orders and the subculture they create form a barrier, or the 'Thin

Blue Line' that separates officers from civilians. Just as important, this subculture

prevents officers from seeking the help they need to manage their stress (Waters and

Ussery, 2007).

Stress in Policing

While, it is well established in the literature that policing is a highly stressful

occupation (Collins and Gibbs, 2003; Anshel, 2000; Spielberger et al., 1981; Violanti and

Aron, 1993), the precise levels of that stress seemingly has differed between various

studies. Some say that police officers are under no more stress than other occupations

(Cooper et al., 2005) and other researchers state that the nature of the stress involved in

policing is disproportionate (Collins and Gibbs, 2003). A commonly disputed concept in

policing literature, and in most literature to an extent, is how to actually define stress (Stinchcomb, 2004). Some of the more widely used definitions of stress range from an inability to cope with the demands placed upon an individual (Gaines and Kappeler, 2008) to a self-perceived negative or unpleasant impact (Brown and Campbell, 1990).

What is in agreement between the scientific communities is that officers tend to classify their stress into one of two categories: 1) stressors caused by the organization itself and 2) those inherent to the policing profession (Violanti and Aron, 1993; Brown and Campbell, 1990; Collins and Gibbs, 2003). Organizational stressors can include scenarios such as excessive paperwork, dealing with an ineffective or unsupportive supervisor. Operational stressors include circumstances inherent to policing, such as writing a traffic ticket or responding to a high risk call in progress. What is found in most self-report survey studies on police stressors is that stress due to the organization itself – the bureaucratic structure, the amount of paperwork, the high levels of supervision – for example, tend to be more problematic – in some cases, organizational features are six times more stressful than operational features (Violanti and Aron, 1993).

In accordance with the emphasis on organizational stressors, Brown and Campbell (1990) found that for their sample of English officers, sources of stress were tied more frequently to the organization itself. In that study, it was concluded that organizational and management features were more stressful to officers than the inherent duties of an officer by a ratio of 4:1. Collins and Gibbs (2003) drew similar conclusions in their cross-sectional survey of over 1,200 officers, as respondents rated organizational issues as more stressful than even the inherent risk of exposure to violence and traumatic

9

events. It may be posited that these inherent risks were expected from the officers that they posed little stress.

One of the most common results of long-term exposure to stress is burnout, which can be defined as a set of negative psychological experiences that lead to a 'wearing out' on the part of the individual (Kop et al., 1999). This psychological state consists of three distinct dimensions: emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal accomplishment. Emotional exhaustion refers to the process by which an individual's emotional resources are effectively depleted and their ability to psychologically perform at work is diminished (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). The second component, depersonalization, is characterized by the development of negative and cynical attitudes towards the clientele being served (Maslach & Jackson, 1981). The final component, reduced personal accomplishment, seems to stand more on its own as the tendency to feel unhappy with oneself and dissatisfied with performance at work.

Previous research has concluded that police officers may not actively engage in effective coping strategies, with many suffering from various short-term and long-term consequences of stress (Singleton, 1977; Ely and Mostardi, 1986, Stratton, Parker, and Snibbe, 1984). Overall consequences of stress can be seen in various dimensions of police life. There are physiological consequences, including increased rates of cardiovascular disease and high blood pressure (Frank, Ramey, and Shelley, 2002; U.S. DOJ, 2015), as well as elevated levels of insomnia and chronic pain problems (Gershen et al., 2009). Some of the emotional consequences of prolonged stress on police officers include depression, post-traumatic stress disorder, anxiety and exhaustion (Gershen,

Barocas, Canton, Li, and Vlahov, 2009; Stinchcomb, 2004). These can all manifest into physiological symptoms when attempts to manage these emotional consequences are not handled properly.

Family life is also at risk of being disrupted due to stress on police officers, with higher rates of divorce among police officers (Nordlicht, 1979), as well as incidences of domestic violence (Gibson, Swatt, and Jolicoeur, 2001; Violanti et al., 1995) compared to the general population. In regards to consequences for the police department itself, officers who are under long-standing stress with limited supervisor support, cohesiveness within the department, and opportunities for promotion are less committed to the department and thus have higher turnover rates (Jaramillo, Nixon, and Sams, 2004). Aside from the turnover risks of stressed officers, their health consequences can hurt the department as well, appearing in numerous sick days, limiting resources and lowering performance of the department as a whole (Gershen et al., 2009; U.S. DOJ, 2015).

<div align="center">Suicide During Service and After Retirement</div>

Studies tend to have mixed results regarding the rates of police officer suicide compared to the general population. Some reports state that more police officers die by their own hand than are killed in the line of duty (Davis, 2013) and the President's Task Force for 21st Century Policing indicated that "police died from suicide 2.4 times as often as from homicide" (U.S. DOJ, 2015, p. 61). A Detroit study found that there is a tenfold increase in suicide rates (334.7 vs 33.5) among retired policemen compared to white males aged 27-78 in the general population of the United States for the period of 1944-1978 (Gaska, 1980). Approximately every 17 hours, a peace officer ends his or her own

life (Larned, 2010). As reported in *A Study of Police Suicides from 2008-2012*, the average age of police officers when they commit suicide is 42 years, with 16 years on the job. 91 percent of these officers were single males (Davis, 2013).

In general, statistics on police officer suicide are often difficult to gather due to the desire to shield victim officers, their families, and their departments from the stigma of suicide, leading investigators to overlook certain evidence intentionally during the classification process (Violanti, 1995). Aamodt and Stainaker (2001) found that the rate of police officer suicides was 18 per 100,000 officers; compared to the general population's rate of 11 per 100,000 and active duty military's rate of 20 per 100,000.

In Violanti's (1995) study of Quebec officers, suicide was found as more common among older officers and was related to alcoholism, physical illness, impending retirement, continuous exposure to death and injury, the social strain resulting from shift work, and the perception among police officers that they work under a negative public image. Related specifically to retired police officers, the fear of separation from the police subculture as officers near the end of their law enforcement career coupled with increasing age, loss of friends, loss of status as a police officer, and a loss of self-definition has the potential to add to the risk of suicide.

The constant stress of life and death within the law enforcement occupation itself can easily lead to depression (Larned, 2010). The coping mechanisms that police officers use can be maladaptive and include alcohol abuse, substance abuse, anger, impatience, violence and arguments with loved ones, and more permanently, suicide. The accessibility to firearms is one substantial way that suicide among police officers differs

from the general population, and Larned (2010) so eloquently stated that, "officers do not need to seek out a means for committing suicide, for they carry one with them." Violanti (1995) speaks of police officer's over-exposure to death and human suffering as resulting in the creation of a numbing effect whereby death becomes easier to accept as a possible solution to seemingly impossible problems.

<div align="center">Use of Force Incidents</div>

The high amount of stress and depersonalization experienced by officers, as well as their overall exhaustion, may lead officers to hastily make decisions that can impact their future as well as the future of those surrounding them. When a citizen encounters a police officer, their interaction is supposed to follow a routine continuum. This continuum allows the officer's use of force to match the intensity of the citizen's, and mandates that their use of force decline should the situation call for it, and increase as the situation calls for it. In regard to citizen-police encounters, the media-sensationalized fatal encounters are relatively rare compared to the number of everyday encounters. As Samuel Walker (2015) explained during a Symposia on Racial Justice, those relatively rare instances are just the tip of the iceberg in terms of actual encounters, with the majority of all citizen-police encounters falling below the surface of the figurative water. While force is used in less than 2 percent of all police encounters and about 20 percent of arrests (Hickman, Piquero, and Garner, 2008), those under extreme stress are less likely to consider available alternatives before making a decision (Keinan, 1987).

Services Typically Provided

A systematic review of the effects of stress management interventions on police officers conducted by Patterson, Chung, and Swan (2012) provide that in general, evaluations of stress management programs are pursued out of research interest, rather than as a department evaluation. The relatively few studies also fail to focus on a specific type of stress, which would require a specific type of intervention. Patterson and colleagues found that within these relatively limited studies, there are no significant effects of stress management interventions on physiological, psychological, or behavioral outcomes. This would indicate that police departments tend to vary considerably in what services are provided and how effective those services are.

The sample department employs a police psychologist and employee assistance program to conduct fit-for-duty evaluations and regular sessions with officers, as well as make referrals to private psychologists. The issue that may arise out of this set-up is that the psychologist, while dealing primarily with police officers, does not always have experience as a police officer, so the officers may not be candid about discussing their issues simply because the psychologist cannot relate.

Larned (2010) also advises on some appropriate coping channels, including: Employee Assistance Programs, peer groups, social support systems, exercise as stress relief, training for family and friends on the demands and pitfalls of the job, and more simply, rest, relaxation, and recreation. A common coping mechanism for police officers involves using 'cop humor' as a means to deal with what they encounter and to control what they cannot fix (Pangaro, 2010). Ultimately, while officers are trained to identify

threats from the outside, they may miss or dismiss the obvious clues of danger present in themselves.

Aside from department sponsored services, there are hotlines available for current or former officers to speak with retired law enforcement personnel about mental health issues, if they so choose to do so. New Jersey's Cop2Cop program sought to address the rising issue of police officer suicide in their state in the late 90's and has seen great support and success with mental health education and suicide prevention (New Jersey Police Suicide Task Force Report, 2009). The Cop2Cop program currently only resides in New Jersey, and similar programs should follow suit.

Gender and Stress

In 1977, Kanter posited a tokenism hypothesis stating that being in a minority group comprising less than 15 percent of the total group leads to increased visibility, isolation, and inhibited opportunities to advance in the workplace. Women in policing fit that mold. The vast majority of research on stress in policing has focused on male officers. However, female officers are increasing in numbers, and in 2003 they constituted approximately 11 percent of the workforce (McCarty et al., 2007). Previous research indicates that while male and female police officers do not vary in levels of stress, they do vary in sources of stress and the manifestations that stress take on in their lives (McCarty, Zhao, and Garland, 2007).

The studies of female police officers and stress have produced mixed results. For example, Kop et al. (1999) found no difference between female and male police officers on their rates of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and reduced personal

accomplishment, while McCarty et al. (2007) found that females reported a slightly

higher level of work-related stress than males. Morash and Haarr (1995) found that while

women did not appear to experience much more stress than men, the circumstances

relating to their stress were different. Of particular interest with the Morash and Haarr

(1995) study was that once race and ethnic subgroups were considered, there were no

significant differences between whites and Hispanics; black women, however, reported

significantly higher stress levels than black men.

There are a number of explanations for gender differences in police stress. First,

female officers may simply be more likely to admit difficulties than men. Second, female

officers may also experience higher rates of stress in the policing workplace due to

differential treatment by their colleagues and superiors (Collins and Gibbs, 2003).

Females may be subjected to gender discrimination from both male officers and

supervisors, not to mention the 'triple jeopardy' that plagues minority female officers in

their possible experience of both gender discrimination and racial discrimination

(McCarty et al., 2007).

McCarty and colleagues (2007) offer three stressors that may disproportionately

influence female officers. First, the police organization may carry an attitude unfavorable

to female officers. There may be perceptions of inequality from female officers that are

trying to break into the historically male-dominated occupation of policing. Second,

female officers may also be the primary caregivers in their household and irregular hours

and shift changes may cause a considerable amount of stress on them (McCarty et al.,

2007). Finally, male and female officers simply may handle the stressors inherent to police work differently.

Because women typically bear primary responsibility of family caretaking, any emotional exhaustion and depersonalization they accrue in the workplace may transfer over into their familial environment (Thompson et al., 2005). When using Maslach's Burnout Inventory, it was found that supervisor support was the only source of work-based support that affected female police officer's emotional exhaustion. In addition, Maslach (1978) posited, "the potential for emotional strain is high in professions that deal with people and their problems, especially emotionally charged situations" (Thompson et al., 2005, p. 202). Overall, Thompson and colleagues' findings point to an increased potential for female police officers' work to spill over and affect their family.

<div align="center">Race and Stress</div>

Kanter's (1977) tokenism theory, while originally posited to discuss women, translates well to the discussion of race, and one's status as a "token" within the department has the potential to increase levels of stress and decrease one's satisfaction with their job (Morash, Haar, and Kwak, 2006). Those in the minority group experience a "variety of professional maladies" (Stroshine and Brandl, 2011, p.345) and tend to be forced into roles consistent with their minority identity.

Stroshine and Brandl (2011) explored tokenism as it pertains to Latinos in policing and found that Latinos perceived greater feelings of reduced opportunity compared to their white male counterparts, which led to isolation in the workplace. Latinos also were more likely to have had derogatory comments made towards them and

were more likely to feel discriminated against due to their ethnicity, as well as be excluded from both formal and informal networks at work (Stroshine and Brandl, 2011; see also Liberman, Best, Metzler, Fagan, Weiss, and Marmar, 2002).

In a British study on minority police officers, Cashmore (2001) reported that a portion of the officers concluded that some form of racism existed within law enforcement that stems from "the exigencies of police work" (p. 657) rather than individual personality types. These minority officers viewed racial profiling of communities and citizens as a result of pressures from within the department to produce results. Many had personally experienced discrimination within the department, but attributed it to being 'tested' instead of overt racism (Cashmore, 2001, p. 657) from their peers, thus it is "reasonable to assume" that minority police officers may show lower levels of job satisfaction, and presumed higher levels of stress compared to their white male counterparts (Zhao, Thurman, and He, 1999, p. 156).

CURRENT FOCUS

The current study involved primary data collection using a modified version of Spielberger et al's (1981) Police Stress Survey (PSS) (Appendix A). Spielberger and colleagues used factor analysis to categorize stressors into 'Administration/Organization Pressures,' and 'Physical/Psychological Threats' groupings. The reliability of the instrument was tested by Martelli and Martelli (1989) which reported a 0.97 coefficient alpha reliability value for the overall survey, a 0.95 value for the 'Administration/Organization Pressures' subscale, and a 0.94 value for the 'Physical/Psychological Threats' subscale.

18

The original survey used by Spielberger and colleagues included sixty scenarios that officers may or may not have encountered in the course of their daily work, ranging from "feelings of paranoia about your or your family's safety" to "fellow officer killed in the line of duty" to "excessive paperwork." Also included was a scale to capture the frequency of occurrence for the past month and year for each scenario, 0 to 10 or more times and 0 to 25 or more times, respectively, and a 0-100 overall stress value for each scenario. The researcher condensed some of these scenarios to reduce redundancy and decreased the overall stress value to a 0-10 scale to make it more user-friendly and more efficient for the officers. Also included was a social media component, "increasing possibility of police-citizen encounters surfacing online," in an effort to modernize the survey.

In addition to the PSS, the researcher included ten questions regarding personal stress management, knowledge about services that may be offered within the department to help the officer manage their stress, and whether or not the officer chose to take part in any services. Of particular interest was the reasoning behind why an officer may choose to not take part in services offered through the department. The final question asked for personal recommendations for stress management services within the department.

The researcher administered surveys to a portion of the sworn male and female police officers of a small Southwestern police department, which employs approximately 180 officers. To provide some background on the community in which the department resides, the FBI's UCR reports indicate that in 2014, the city had a violent crime rating of 295 per 100,000 residents, while the national average was 365 per 100,000 residents.

While the rate is lower than the national average, there are only four cities in the sample department's state with higher rates of violent crime.

The surveys were handed out and collected during roll calls and patrol briefings from October 8, 2015 to October 15, 2015. The packet included a notice of informed consent notifying the officers that participation was voluntary and confidential. It was also made known that the surveys were being used to aid in an Arizona State University study of police and stress, and that no police department personnel would have access to the results. A broad demographics page was included to indicate gender, race, rank, and tenure. Due to the short time frame of surveying, 151 officers were approached for survey during predetermined roll calls with 147 police officers responding, resulting in a 97 percent response rate.

The sample of officers who participated in the survey can be seen in Table 1 and respondents are similar to the overall demographics of the department. As of July 2015, there were 182 males, 21 females with Hispanics comprising 61.6 percent of the racial/ethnic breakdown. This indicates that Hispanics in general were underrepresented in the sample, and Caucasians were overrepresented in the sample. It is important to note that while Table 1 provides that the department employs 60 white officers, 65 in the sample self-identified as white, an issue that arises with allowing sample participants to write-in their identified race.

Table 1. Demographics

		Sample		Department*	
		N	Percentage	N	Percentage
Gender					
	Male	132	89.8	163	91.5
	Female	12	8.2	15	8.5
Race/Ethnicity					
	White	65	46.76	60	33.7
	Non-White	74	53.24	118	66.2
Rank					
	Officer	93	65.96	-	-
	Supervisory Role	48	34.04		
Tenure					
	9 Years or Less	72	50.35	-	-
	10 Years or More	71	49.65		

* Department demographics were not provided indicating rank or tenure

The expectations of the current study are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Police officers will rank organizational characteristics as more
        stressful than inherent police work characteristics.
Hypothesis 2: Females and male officers will experience different levels of stress.
Hypothesis 3: White and non-white officers will experience different levels of
        stress.
Hypothesis 4: Line officers and supervisors will experience different levels of
        stress.
Hypothesis 5: Officers will experience different levels of stress depending on
        their tenure.
Hypothesis 6: Officers will not be willing to take advantage of available services.
Hypothesis 7: The 'macho' subculture that characterizes policing will be a key
        reason why officers choose to not take part in services.

RESULTS

Table 2. Frequencies for Stress Survey

Scenario	Type of Stress	Overall Mean Value
Making critical on-the-spot decisions	Operational	5.66
Experiencing negative attitudes toward police officers by citizens or media press	Operational	5.29
Ineffectiveness of the judicial system or correctional system	Operational	5.22
Responding to high risk calls in progress	Operational	5.12
Feelings of paranoia about your or your family's safety	Operational	5.09
Public criticism of police	Operational	5.01

21

Excessive paperwork	Organizational	4.96
Situations requiring use of force	Operational	4.69
Demands made by family for more time	Organizational	4.60
Insufficient manpower to adequately handle a job	Organizational	4.59
Inadequate support/respect by supervisor or department	Organizational	4.45
Job conflict (by-the-book vs. by-the-situation)	Organizational	4.39
Political pressure from within the department	Organizational	3.99
Difficulty getting along with supervisors	Organizational	3.83
Disagreeable departmental policies or procedures	Organizational	3.75
Court appearances on day off or day following night shift	Operational	3.66
Confrontations with aggressive crowds	Operational	3.53
The increasing possibility of police-citizen encounters surfacing online	Operational	3.50
Inadequate salary	Organizational	3.45
Political pressure from outside the department	Organizational	3.32
Assignment of incompatible/ineffective partner	Organizational	3.28
Exposure to death or injury of civilians	Operational	3.27
Assignment to new or unfamiliar duties	Organizational	3.26
High speed chases	Operational	3.22
Lack of recognition for good work	Organizational	3.06
Excessive or inappropriate discipline	Organizational	2.96
Demands for high moral standards	Organizational	2.93
Pressures to stay physically fit	Operational	2.73
Conducting traffic stops or issue traffic citations	Operational	2.65
Competition for advancement	Organizational	2.51
Changing between day-evening-night shift	Operational	2.47
Incapacitating physical injury on the job	Operational	2.36
Strained relations with nonpolice friends	Operational	2.28
Inadequate or poor quality equipment	Organizational	2.24
Delivering a death notification	Operational	2.23
Performing nonpolice tasks	Operational	2.21
Accident in a patrol car	Operational	2.06
Perceived inability to work sufficient overtime hours	Organizational	1.97
Lack of participation on policy-making decisions	Organizational	1.83
Discrimination based on gender or race/ethnicity	Organizational	1.65
Fellow officer killed in the line of duty	Operational	1.60
Racial pressures or conflicts	Organizational	1.44
Promotion or commendation	Organizational	1.38
Killing someone in the line of duty	Operational	0.28

Table 2 presented above depicts the raw data from the first section of the modified

stress survey. The values indicated as the overall mean value are the average values from

the 0-10 scale that officers were reporting based on. The scenarios, "making critical on-the-spot decisions," "experiencing negative attitudes toward police officers by citizens or media press," "ineffectiveness of the judicial system or correctional system," "responding to high risk calls in progress," and "feelings of paranoia about your or your family's safety," are the highest reported stressors across the board for the officers in this department. Contrary to the first hypothesis, these high values correspond with operational stressors rather than organizational stressors.

The scenarios with the highest frequency ratings (Appendix B) (i.e., experienced 10 times or more in the last month or 25 times or more in the last year) correspond with three of the overall highest stress values ("making critical on-the-spot decisions," "experiencing negative attitudes toward police officers by citizens or media press," "responding to high risk calls in progress,"), indicating that events that occur frequently, regardless of the severity, have the largest impact on stress levels for police officers.

Table 3. Frequencies for Policies

		N	Percent
Services are Provided			
	Strongly Disagree	17	11.64
	Disagree	24	16.44
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	40	27.40
	Agree	53	36.60
	Strongly Agree	12	8.22
What Services			
	Employee Assistance Program	37	25.34
	City Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	65	44.52
	Departmental Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	33	22.60
	Contract Business Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	9	6.16
	Private Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	6	4.11
	Don't Know	41	28.08
Would You Take Part in			

23

Services			
	Definitely Would Not	23	15.75
	Might	82	56.16
	Definitely Would	41	28.08
Definitely Would or Might – Why?			
	Alcohol	10	8.13
	Depression	14	11.38
	Marital Issues	34	27.64
	Duty Related Incidents	38	30.89
	Drugs	0	0
	Stress	65	52.85
	Financial Issues	14	11.38
	Sleeplessness	27	21.95
	Self-Identity	4	3.25
	Anxiety	23	15.65
	Exhaustion	14	11.38
	Absenteeism	0	0
Definitely Would Not – Why?			
	Fear of Peers Finding Out	24	26.37
	Fear of Supervisor(s) Finding Out	18	19.78
	Fear of Subordinates Finding Out	10	10.99
	Macho Subculture – Don't Want to Appear Weak	17	18.68
	Don't Know the Process to Activate Services	19	20.88
	Don't Believe in These Types of Services	13	14.29
	Fear of Retaliation	15	16.48
	Don't Have Time/Process is too Cumbersome	24	26.37
Would You Take Part in a Mental Health Check-up?			
	No	49	34.75
	Yes	92	65.25
Would You Take Part in a Mental Health Class?			
	No	42	29.58
	Yes	100	70.42

Table 3 depicts the raw data from the second section of the modified survey.

Forty-four percent of officers either agreed or strongly agreed that the department offered

at least some services to aid in maintaining good mental health. However, 28 percent of those officers did not know exactly what that entailed, even while a majority (56 percent) of the officers indicated that they might take part in any offered services. This indicates that education and increased disbursement of information would be beneficial to getting more officers to receive more help. To drive this point further, one officer described their knowledge of services as, "provided by nobody."

A majority of officers indicated that they would be willing to take part in a mental health check-up or an annual or bi-annual mental health class (65 percent and 70 percent, respectively). These numbers indicate that the historically 'macho' nature of policing that places value on being emotionally bulletproof may be shifting to one that acknowledges and understands the stress their job places on them. By far, the most prevalent reason officers indicated they would choose help was for stress related reasons (52 percent), followed by duty-related incidents (30 percent) and marital issues (27 percent).

Table 4. Self-Reported Stress Management

	N	Percentage
Fitness-Related	125	85.03
Family/Friends	92	62.58
Extracurricular Activities	51	34.69
Other	11	7.48
Maladaptive	10	6.80

Personal methods of stress management were given in an open-ended question and then qualitatively coded into categories. When asked how stress and mental health is currently managed, the majority of respondents (N=125) indicated methods of management that could be grouped into a fitness category and included backpacking, running, mountain biking/racing, hunting, working out, lifting weights, playing sports,

hiking, CrossFit, camping, shooting/reloading, archery, golf, fishing and boxing (see

Table 4). Another large group (N=92) reported coaching sports, traveling and taking out

of town trips, hanging out with friends and pets, and family activities, although it was

noted that sometimes those family activities produced more stress than work. A third

group of respondents (N=51) reported extracurricular activities including reading and

writing, playing music, watching movies and TV, playing video games, working on cars,

yard work, home renovations, cooking and baking, billiards, poker, and attending church

as methods of reducing their stress. A fourth group of respondents (N=11) reported

methods such as sleeping and spending time alone. Finally, a substantially smaller group

of respondents (N=10) reported maladaptive coping methods, with responses including

the use of the mini-fridge, "happy hour!" and "lots of drinking."

Table 5. Self-Reported Time Off

	N	Percentage
Zero Times	112	76.19
One Time	18	12.24
Two or More Times	8	5.44

Of the officers surveyed, Table 5 shows that 112 of them had never had to take

time off of work due to work-related instances, while 18 had taken time off once in their

career, and 8 had taken time off two or more times in their career. There were 9 reports of

being involved in a shooting during their career which resulted in administrative leave.

Emphasizing the stress on family life, one officer reported having taken time off work "to

save my marriage [because] my wife said she would leave if I didn't quit." Another, more

optimistic anecdote stated, "I have been very blessed and fortunate that I have not YET

had to go through this."

26

In regard to the reasons chosen to not seek out any services, 26 percent indicated that they feared their peers would find out, and 26 percent indicated that the process was too cumbersome and took up too much time (see Table 3). The next highest percentage was simply that the officer did not know the process to activate these services (20 percent), again, indicating that education is a large factor in getting officers the help they need. Contrary to the last hypothesis (hypothesis 7), the sense of a macho subculture and not wanting to appear weak was only indicated by 18 percent of the sample. Several officers noted that they feared losing their job or that their cases would be handled improperly if they took any time off of work.

Overwhelming support was provided for a mental health check-up. Similar to an annual physical check-up, a mental health check-up could simply be a discussion with a contract or employed psychologist to ensure an officer is in a good state of mental health. Also vastly supported was an annual or bi-annual class on the importance of good mental health, indicating they are open to the prospect of learning more about it. Other support was provided in open-ended questions within the instrument, including [DEPARTMENT] Crisis Response Team and having "supervisors…approve more leave."

<div align="center">Gender and Stress</div>

Table 6. Organizational v. Operational - Gender Comparison

	Female Mean	Male Mean	t Test	P-Value
Organizational	3.31	3.13	0.27	0.78
Operational	3.50	3.40	0.20	0.83

Given that women made up only 8.2 percent of the sample, all results should be interpreted with caution. Another component to keep in mind is the high volume of comparisons that were made would result in at least some statistically significant results by chance alone. The scenarios were collapsed into "organizational" and "operational" categories, taking the average of each organizational and operational scenario, respectively to look for overall differences in stress type. Women did appear to have a higher overall mean level of stress in both groups compared to men. It is important to note that contrary to the first hypothesis that organizational stressors would be rated at a higher level than operational stressors, both men and women generally rated operational stressors as more prevalent.

Table 7. T-Tests – Scenario Gender Comparison

Scenario	Scenario Type	Female Mean	Male Mean	T-Statistic	P-Value
Discrimination based on gender or race/ethnicity	Organizational	4.90	1.37	3.90***	0.0001
Changing between day-evening-night shift	Operational	4.09	2.32	2.14*	0.03
The increasing possibility of police-citizen encounters surfacing online	Operational	6.40	3.26	2.82**	0.005
Killing someone in the line of duty	Operational	0.00	2.29	-1.96*	0.05

Note: To maintain space, only those scenarios with statistically significant t-statistics were included in tables; Full Table 7 in Appendix; * p≤0.05   ** p≤0.001   *** p≤0.0001

There were four scenarios that provided statistically significant T-statistics between men and women in the sample. Women reported higher levels of stress for "discrimination based on gender or race/ethnicity," "changing between day-evening-night shift," and "the increasing possibility of police-citizen encounters surfacing online." Men on the other hand, reported higher levels of stress for "killing someone in the line of

28

duty," although this was a lower reported scenario overall. Of noted interest was the

account of one female officer who stated that she "[didn't] want to appear weak,

especially as a woman in this job." This could indicate that while statistically there were

not many significant differences between men and women in the department, the tensions

could still be felt by the small number of women that are there.

Table 8. T-Tests – Policy Gender Comparisons

		Female (N)	Male (N)	Total (N)	T-Statistic	P-Value
What Services						
	Employee Assistance Program	6	31	37	2.00*	0.04
Definitely Would or Might – Why?						
	Exhaustion	4	10	14	2.77**	0.006

Note: To maintain space, only those scenarios with statistically significant t-statistics were included in tables; Full Table 8 in Appendix; * p≤0.05   ** p≤0.001

When comparing knowledge about services and intent to participate in such

services, employee assistance programs was significant in that female officers indicated

knowledge about these services at a higher rate than men did. The decision to take part in

such services due to exhaustion was also higher for women than it was for men.

Race and Stress

Table 9. Organizational v. Operational - Race Comparison

	Non-White Mean	White Mean	*t* Test	P-value
Organizational	3.28	2.93	1.08	0.28
Operational	3.55	3.21	1.16	0.24

When the scenarios were collapsed into their respective "organizational" versus

"operational" categories, overall, non-white officers had higher mean levels of stress in

both groups compared to white officers, however, that difference was not statistically

significant. This comparison followed suit with the gender comparison in that operational

stressors were rated at a higher level than organizational stressors for both white and non-

white officers.

Table 10. T-Tests – Scenario Race Comparison

Scenario	Type of Stress	White Mean	Non-White Mean	T-Statistic	Applicable P-Value
Feelings of paranoia about you or your family's safety	Operational	4.27	5.65	2.18*	0.03
Pressures to stay physically fit	Operational	2.17	3.21	1.93*	0.05

Note: To maintain space, only those scenarios with statistically significant t-statistics were included in tables; Full Table 10 in Appendix; * p≤0.05

There were two scenarios that were statistically different, "feelings of paranoia

about you or your family's safety" and "pressures stay physically fit," both of which were

reported higher by nonwhite officers. One conclusion that could be drawn here is that in

this department, which is majority non-white (Hispanic), the racial and ethnic integration

of the department has resulted in no elevated rates of stress for minority officers. The

small percentage of female officers have not experienced that same benefit.

Table 11. T-Tests – Policy Race Comparisons

	Non-White (N)	White (N)	Total (N)	T-Statistic	P-Value
What Services					
Private Psychologist / Counselor / Therapist	5	0	5	2.17*	0.03
Would You Take Part in a Mental Health Class?				2.42**	0.01
No	15	25	40		
Yes	57	38	95		

Note: To maintain space, only those scenarios with statistically significant t-statistics were included in tables; Full Table 11 in Appendix; * p≤0.05 ** p≤0.01

When comparing knowledge about services and intent to participate in such

services, knowledge about private psychologists, counselors, and therapists was reported

more by nonwhite officers. The willingness to take part in an annual or bi-annual class on mental health was also significantly reported by nonwhite officers, indicating that non-white officers were more likely than white officers to take part in such a class.

Rank and Stress

Table 12. Organizational v. Operational - Rank Comparison

	Supervisory Role Mean	Officer Mean	*t* Test	P-Value
Organizational	3.39	2.97	1.21	0.22
Operational	3.02	3.59	-1.83	0.06

When the scenarios were collapsed into their respective "organizational" versus "operational" categories, overall, the differences between officers in a supervisory role (e.g., sergeants, lieutenants, deputy chiefs, and chief) and officers in a patrol role did not reach significance. Officers with supervisory functions reported higher mean values for organizational stressors than their patrol officer counterparts, presumably because they deal with more administrative duties than patrol officers. Similarly, those officers not in a supervisory role reported higher mean values for operational stressors than did their supervisors, indicating that as one rises in rank, their stressors shift.

Table 13. T-Tests – Scenario Rank Comparison

Scenario	Type of Stress	Officer Mean	Supervisory Role Mean	T-Statistic	Applicable P-Value
Assignment to new or unfamiliar duties	Organizational	2.62	4.41	3.30**	0.001
Perceived inability to work sufficient overtime hours	Organizational	1.68	2.69	1.92*	0.05
Insufficient manpower to adequately handle a job	Organizational	4.04	5.56	2.58**	0.01
Demands made my	Organizational	4.41	5.39	1.91*	0.05

31

family for more time

Racial pressures or conflicts	Organizational	1.75	0.80	-2.28*	0.02
Competition for advancement	Organizational	1.91	3.41	2.46**	0.01
Excessive paperwork	Organizational	4.49	5.60	1.92*	0.05
Court appearances on day off or day following night shift	Operational	4.60	2.04	-4.71***	0.000
High speed chases	Operational	3.81	1.95	-3.22***	0.001
Responding to high risk calls in progress	Operational	5.81	3.80	-3.47***	0.0007
Conducting traffic stops or issue traffic citations	Operational	3.13	1.71	-3.24***	0.001
Confrontations with aggressive crowds	Operational	3.96	2.65	-2.45**	0.01
Situations requiring use of force	Operational	5.56	3.04	-4.24***	0.000

Note: To maintain space, only those scenarios with statistically significant t-statistics were included in tables; Full Table 13 in Appendix; * $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.001$ *** $p \leq 0.0001$

Rank is where the majority of the differences in stressors lies. Scenarios including: "assignment to new or unfamiliar duties," "perceived inability to work sufficient overtime," "insufficient manpower to adequately handle a job," "demands made by family for more time," "competition for advancement," and "excessive paperwork were all statistically significant scenarios where officers in a supervisory role reported higher mean levels of stress compared to their patrol officer counterpart.

Of interest here is that "demands made by family for more time" could indicate that administrative duties may keep officers from spending an adequate amount of time with their family, something that could certainly decrease some of their levels of stress. Also interesting is the "perceived inability to work sufficient overtime." Anecdotally one

officer put off becoming a lieutenant because he knew he would not be able to work the same amount of overtime that he worked while a metro sergeant.

Line officers ranked several scenarios as significantly more stressful than their supervisor counterparts, including: , "racial pressures or conflicts," "court appearances on day off or day following night shift," "high speed chases," "responding to high risk calls in progress," "conducting traffic stops or issuing traffic citations," "confrontations with aggressive crowds," and "situations requiring use of force."

Table 14. T-Tests – Policy Rank Comparisons

		Supervisory Role (N)	Officer (N)	Total (N)	T-Statistic	P-Value
What Services						
	Employee Assistance Program	21	13	34	4.07***	0.0001
	Contract Business Psychologist / Counselor / Therapist	6	3	9	2.13*	0.03
Would You Take Part in a Mental Health Check-up?					2.41**	0.01
	No	9	37	46		
	Yes	36	54	90		

Note: To maintain space, only those scenarios with statistically significant t-statistics were included in tables; Full Table 14 in Appendix; * p≤0.05   ** p≤0.001   *** p≤0.0001

In regard to knowledge of services, there were statistically significant differences in knowledge of the employee assistance program and contract business psychologists, counselors, and therapists with those in a supervisory role having more knowledge about that program. As far as the willingness to participate in an annual or bi-annual class on mental health, those in a supervisory role were more likely to provide intent to participate than were their line officer counterparts.

Table 15. Organizational v. Operational – Tenure Comparison

	9 Years or Less Mean	10 Years or More Mean	*t* Test	P-Value
Organizational	2.90	3.38	-1.51	0.13
Operational	3.62	3.17	1.51	0.13

The comparison between officers with 9 or less years of experience and those with 10 years of experience or more parallels the comparison between supervisors and officers, although neither of these differences were statistically significant. Those with 9 years of experience or less reported a higher mean value for operational stressors than organizational stressors. Those with 10 years of experience or more reported a higher value for organizational stressors than operational stressors.

Table 16. T-Tests – Scenario Tenure Comparison

Scenario	Type of Stress	9 Years or Less Mean	10 Years or More Mean	T-Statistic	Applicable P-Value
Political pressure from within the department	Organizational	2.95	4.95	-3.49***	0.0006
Inadequate support/respect by supervisor or department	Organizational	3.61	5.38	-2.81**	0.005
Racial pressures or conflicts	Organizational	1.88	0.93	2.41**	0.01
The increasing possibility of police-citizen encounters surfacing online	Operational	2.94	4.09	-1.93*	0.05
Court appearances on day off or day following night shift	Operational	5.22	1.89	6.98***	0.000
High speed chases	Operational	4.22	2.20	3.71***	0.0003
Responding to high	Operational	5.81	4.35	2.58**	0.01

risk calls in progress

Confrontations with aggressive crowds	Operational	4.27	2.67	3.19***	0.001
Situations requiring use of force	Operational	5.60	3.66	3.34***	0.001

Note: To maintain space, only those scenarios with statistically significant t-statistics were included in tables; Full Table 16 in Appendix; * p≤0.05   ** p≤0.001   *** p≤0.0001

A deeper review shows that officer tenure is related to differential stress levels across several scenarios, including: "political pressure from within the department," "inadequate support/respect by supervisor or department," and "the increasing possibility of police-citizen encounters surfacing online," disproportionately being reported by officers with 10 years of experience or more.

For those officers with 9 years of experience or less, several scenarios emerged as significantly more stressful such as: "racial pressures or conflicts," "court appearances on day off or day following night shift," "high speed chases," "responding to high risk calls in progress," "confrontations with aggressive crowds," and "situations requiring use of force."

These trends can be compared to those seen in rank (see Table 13) in that those officers with ten years or more of experience are more likely to be in a supervisory role and therefore more likely to report higher levels of stress related to administrative duties. Conversely, those with nine years or less of experience are more likely to be line officers and therefore report higher levels of inherent job stressors.

Table 17. T-Tests – Policy Tenure Comparisons

		9 Years or Less (N)	10 Years or More (N)	Total (N)	T-Statistic	P-Value
What Services						
	Employee Assistance	10	27	37	-3.46***	0.0007

					t-stat	p
	Program					
Would You Take Part in Services					-2.15*	0.03
	Definitely Would Not	15	6	21		
	Might	41	41	82		
	Definitely Would	26	23	39		
Definitely Would or Might – Why?						
	Depression	3	11	14	-2.37**	0.01
	Financial Issues	11	3	14	2.23*	0.02
	Self-Identity	4	0	4	2.01*	0.04
Would You Take Part in a Mental Health Class?					-1.99*	0.04
	No	26	14	40		
	Yes	46	53	99		

Note: To maintain space, only those scenarios with statistically significant t-statistics were included in tables; Full Table 17 in Appendix' * $p \leq 0.05$ ** $p \leq 0.001$ *** $p \leq 0.0001$

In regards to knowledge about services, knowledge about the employee assistance program was statistically significant in that those with 10 years of experience or more were more likely to know about the program. The decision about whether or not an officer would take part in services and the willingness to take part in an annual or bi-annual mental health class were significant in the same direction, with officers with 10 years or more of experience being more likely to take part. Officers with 10 years of experience or more were more likely to cite depression as a motivation to seek out services, while financial issues and self-identity were statistically significant among those officers with 9 years of experience or less.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Given an open-ended question of what the department could do more of, or do differently in regard to mental health, the responses provided by the officers could be

grouped into three general categories; better relationships with their superiors and administration, more education starting at the academy, and more fitness-related policies.

Improved Relations

Contrary to what the public may think of the inner workings of a police department, most of the officers in the sample wanted simply to be able to talk to each other and their superiors about how to deal with stress. One example of this was, having "the supervisor and upper heads of the department deliver messages of their past experiences that helped them to de-stress and how it can relate to families as well." The transmission of useful methods for handling stress from veteran officers to new officers was an issue that was constantly raised by respondents. Aside from that benefit, it would provide informal stress management for all involved simply by being able to discuss what happened during the day and how that leaves officers feeling in an environment free from scrutiny.

Another example regarding improved relations between levels of the department asked for "less scrutiny for police related get-togethers off duty between officers / supervisors…as well as…support from supervision in improving morale rather than punitive action on a frequent basis." For the most part, the officers in the sample want to boost morale within the department and build relationships with one another, both peers and superiors. Objectives like these help maintain one of the fundamental aspects of joining police work, having comradery. Departmental gatherings and group talks can aid tremendously in mending the relationship between officer and administrator. The latter

part of officer testimony provides desire for less punitive action and more learning opportunities from officer's mistakes.

<div align="center">Education</div>

Regarding educational value, having a mentor program to help academy cadets learn the ropes before entering FTO would be helpful. Gearing towards more formal educational recommendations, such as a class at the academy, some of the officers wished "for the department to have recommended readings such as books, magazines, or news that could help with the job (stress related, performance, or laws)" or "more training on dealing with stress, signs of stress, and its effects on family." Similar to post-deployment mental health screenings in the military (Hoge, Auchterlonie, & Milliken, 2006), general 'debriefing' periods after critical incidents, not just officer-involved shootings, would be beneficial as well.

For the most part, the sample of officers recognized they had issues, stress or otherwise, that could be dealt with. They understood that receiving help of any kind would help them manage said issues, and generally were very welcoming to the idea of mental health classes, provided it be targeted at not just the officers themselves, but rather geared towards their family members as well.

Related to management, training for supervisors on managing stressed employees and leadership classes once an officer gets promoted to a leadership role would aid in both mending relationships as well as improving the psyche of both officer and supervisor. One officer put succinctly, they want the supervisor to "[remember] what it's like to be a cop," and have empathy with what they are going through. Disbursing

information about what is available and the confidentiality of what is available would be a huge step for most of these officers.

Fitness

By and large the most common recommendations from the sampled officers were on-duty gym time and paid workouts. What was done once a few years ago, and what they would like to see brought back is department fitness challenges, playing into the competitiveness of the officers in each sector. Similarly, having intramural sports leagues with the department would be a great way to help the officers stay fit without feeling like it was a requirement. What was a recommendation by some, and a critique by others was a yearly fitness test.

Almost every officer surveyed mentioned fitness-related personal methods of de-stressing, ranging from weight lifting to days out at the shooting range. A shooting range is one of the best methods of de-stressing and providing days at the range with semi-routine competitions would both hone and maintain shooting tactical abilities, but more than that, it would also provide time for comradery, education, and fitness benefits.

LIMITATIONS

The present study suffers from a number of limitations. First and foremost, the survey employed 44 different scenarios that were analyzed in a variety of ways. The sheer number of tests ran would provide some significant findings by chance alone. While this does not mean that the significant findings reported are not important, they should be interpreted with caution.

The very nature of policing and its 'macho' subculture may limit the truthfulness of respondents on the self-report surveys, a limitation specifically noted by Kop and colleagues in their 1999 study. The study relies on self-report responses from officers on a sensitive topic. The candidness of their responses remains unknown. However, prior research using similar designs has successfully captured officer attitudes on sensitive issues such as stress and its sources (Evans and Coman, 1993; Barlow and Hickman Barlow, 2002; Brown and Fielding, 1993). Moreover, the current study aimed to reduce the possibility of this type of limitation by ensuring to the participants that no police department personnel would have access to their surveys and information.

The marital status and education levels of participants were not captured. Another variable-related limitation of the study is that race and ethnicity were used as one variable, instead of teasing out race and ethnicity, which would have been beneficial in regards to analyzing differences between racial and ethnic groups. A third limitation to the current study involves the generalizability of the findings beyond the study department. The department was chosen specifically because of the researcher's access to officers. The findings may have limited external validity, as the study department is mid-sized and is in the southwestern part of the United States.

CONCLUSION

Overall, partial support was found for hypothesis 1, as organizational stressors were reported higher than operational stressors when looking at those in a supervisory role and those with 10 or more years with the department. No significant differences were found with regard to gender or race.

In regard to hypothesis 2, that male and female officers identified slightly higher levels of stress, though the overall number of women in the study limited the use of statistical tests. The gender differences identified in the current study are consistent with findings from prior research (Morash and Haarr, 1995).

Hypothesis 3, that non-white officers and white officers would experience different levels of stress, support was not found, as only one scenario was significantly different for the groups. The integration within the department may be a reason why race is not a big factor in how officers are treated or go about their daily duties.

Substantial support was found for hypotheses 4 and 5, that line officers and supervisors would differ in levels and sources of stress, and that those with 9 years or less tenure and those with 10 or more years tenure would differ in levels and sources of stress. Those in a supervisory role and those with 10 or more years tenure reported organizational stressors as much more profound for them whereas the line officers and those with 9 or less years tenure rated operational stressors as more profound. This finding indicates a shift in sources of stress as one works their up in a department, a shift that is also bound to occur the longer one is with a department.

Contrary to hypothesis 6, there was overwhelming support and willingness to participate in mental health services (84 percent) indicating that a change within the culture may be occurring. The current study found modest support for hypothesis 7, that lack of willingness to participate in services offered was a result of the 'macho subculture.' This suggests that the 'macho subculture' is a persistent theme for some officers, perhaps to their detriment.

This study was able to take a small glimpse into what departments are doing and could be doing, as well as what officers would be willing to do to improve and maintain their mental well-being. In this small, southwestern department with a racially diverse group of officers, the sources of stress did not vary by officer demographics. However, a number of important differences emerged by rank and tenure on the job. Perhaps most importantly, officers expressed a general willingness to access services, to take a class on stress, and to participate in annual mental health check-ups. These last two findings suggest that the traditional reluctance among officers to acknowledge stress and its negative effects may have dissipated over time. The breakdown of these barriers represents an important development, as policing in the 21st century continues to change in important ways. And in ways that may increase stress. How officers are taught and encouraged to manage their stress levels will determine whether they cope adaptively or not. These lessons start at the academy and must be constantly reinforced and refined. More research into policies surrounding stress management in policing is needed in the future, and the stress patterns of police officers overall should be further explored.

REFERENCES

2014 Crime in the United States. (n.d.). Retrieved April, 2016, from https://www.fbi.gov

Aamodt, M. G., & Stalnaker, N. A. (2001). Police officer suicide: Frequency and officer profiles. *Suicide and Law Enforcement*, 383-398.

Agnew, R. (1985). A revised strain theory of delinquency. *Social Forces*, *64*(1), 151-167.

Agnew, R., & White, H. R. (1992). An Empirical Test of General Strain Theory*. *Criminology*, *30*(4), 475-500.

Anshel, M. H. (2000). A conceptual model and implications for coping with stressful events in police work. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *27*(3), 375-400.

Barlow, D. E., & Barlow, M. H. (2002). Racial profiling: A survey of African American police officers. *Police Quarterly*, *5*(3), 334-358.

Bittner, E. (1973). *The functions of the police in modern society*. National Institute of Mental Health, Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency.

Brown, J. M., & Campbell, E. A. (1990). Sources of occupational stress in the police. *Work & Stress*, *4*(4), 305-318.

Brown, J., & Fielding, J. (1993). Qualitative differences in men and women police officers' experience of occupational stress. *Work & Stress*, *7*(4), 327-340.

Burke, R. J., & Deszca, E. (1986). Correlates of psychological burnout phases among police officers. *Human Relations*, *39*(6), 487-501.

Cashmore, E. (2001). The experiences of ethnic minority police officers in Britain: under-recruitment and racial profiling in a performance culture. *Ethnic and racial studies*, *24*(4), 642-659.

Collins, P. A., & Gibbs, A. C. C. (2003). Stress in police officers: a study of the origins, prevalence and severity of stress-related symptoms within a county police force. *Occupational Medicine*, *53*(4), 256-264.

Cooper, C. L., Dewe, P. J., & O'Driscoll, M. P. (2001). Organizational stress: A review and critique of theory, research, and applications. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cullen, F., Wright, J., & Blevins, K. (2006). General Strain Theory: Current Status and Directions for Future Research. In *Taking stock: The status of criminological theory*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction.

Davis, K. (2013, October 13). The Sad Incidence of Police Suicide | Officer.com. Retrieved January 1, 2015, from http://www.officer.com/article/11217367/the-sad-incidence-of-police-suicide

Dietrich, J., & Smith, J. (1986). The nonmedical use of drugs including alcohol among police personnel: A critical literature review. *Journal of Police Science & Administration, 14,*300–306.

Ely, D. L., & Mostardi, R. A. (1986). The effect of recent life events stress, life assets, and temperament pattern on cardiovascular risk factors for Akron City police officers. *Journal of Human Stress*, *12*(2), 77-91.

Evans, B. J., & Coman, G. J. (1993). General versus specific measures of occupational stress: An Australian police survey. *Stress Medicine*, *9*(1), 11-20.

Evans, B. J., Coman, G., Stanley, R. O., & Burrows, G. D. (1993). Police officers' coping strategies: An Australian police survey. *Stress Medicine*, *9*(4), 237-246.

Franke, W. D., Ramey, S. L., & Shelley, M. C. (2002). Relationship between cardiovascular disease morbidity, risk factors, and stress in a law enforcement cohort. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, *44*(12), 1182-1189.

Gaines, L. K., & Kappeler, V. E. (2011). *Policing in America*. Routledge. Gaska, C. W. (1980). *The rate of suicide, potential for suicide, and recommendations for prevention among retired police officers* (No. 80-22754 UMI).

Gershon, R. R., Barocas, B., Canton, A. N., Li, X., & Vlahov, D. (2009). Mental, physical, and behavioral outcomes associated with perceived work stress in police officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *36*(3), 275-289.

Gibson, C. L., Swatt, M. L., & Jolicoeur, J. R. (2001). Assessing the generality of general strain theory: The relationship among occupational stress experienced by male police officers and domestic forms of violence. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *24*(2), 29-57.

Herbert, S. (1998). Police subculture reconsidered. *Criminology*, *36*(2), 343-370.

Hoge, C. W., Auchterlonie, J. L., & Milliken, C. S. (2006). Mental health problems, use of mental health services, and attrition from military service after returning from deployment to Iraq or Afghanistan. *Jama*, *295*(9), 1023-1032.

Jaramillo, F., Nixon, R., & Sams, D. (2005). The effect of law enforcement stress on organizational commitment. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *28*(2), 321-336.

Hickman, M. J., Piquero, A. R., & Garner, J. H. (2008). Toward a national estimate of police use of nonlethal force*. *Criminology & Public Policy*, *7*(4), 563-604.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). Some effects of proportions on group life: Skewed sex ratios and responses to token women. *American Journal of Sociology*, 965-990.

Kappeler, V. E., Sluder, R. D., & Alpert, G. P. (1998). *Forces of deviance: Understanding the dark side of policing*. Waveland Press.

Keinan, G. (1987). Decision making under stress: scanning of alternatives under controllable and uncontrollable threats. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *52*(3), 639.

Kop, N., Euwema, M., & Schaufeli, W. (1999). Burnout, job stress and violent behaviour among Dutch police officers. *Work & Stress*, *13*(4), 326-340.

Larned, J. (2010). Understanding Police Suicide. *The Forensic Examiner Fall 2010, 19*(3), 64-64. Retrieved January 1, 2015, from http://www.theforensicexaminer.com

Liberman, A. M., Best, S. R., Metzler, T. J., Fagan, J. A., Weiss, D. S., & Marmar, C. R. (2002). Routine occupational stress and psychological distress in police. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *25*(2), 421-441.

Libicer, S. ". (Director) (2015, January 16). "Running in the Fog" Police Stress, Burnout and Emotional Survival. Lecture conducted from East Mesa Group, Las Cruces, New Mexico.

Martelli, T. A., Waters, L. K., & Martelli, J. (1989). The police stress survey: Reliability and relation to job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Psychological reports*, *64*(1), 267-273.

Maslach, C. (1978). The client role in staff burn-out. *Journal of social issues*, *34*(4), 111-124.

Maslach, C., & Jackson, S. E. (1981). The measurement of experienced burnout. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *2*(2), 99-113.

McCarty, W. P., "Solomon" Zhao, J., & Garland, B. E. (2007). Occupational stress and burnout between male and female police officers: Are there any gender differences?. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, *30*(4), 672-691.

Menard, K. S., & Arter, M. L. (2013). Police officer alcohol use and trauma symptoms: Associations with critical incidents, coping, and social stressors. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *20*(1), 37.

Merton, R. K. (1938). Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review*, *3*(5), 672-682.

Morash, M., & Haarr, R. N. (1995). Gender, workplace problems, and stress in policing. *Justice Quarterly*, *12*(1), 113-140.

Morash, M., Haarr, R., & Kwak, D. H. (2006). Multilevel influences on police stress. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, *22*(1), 26-43.

New Jersey Police Suicide Task Force. *New Jersey Police Suicide Task Force Report.* 2009.

Nock, M. K., Borges, G., Bromet, E. J., Cha, C. B., Kessler, R. C., & Lee, S. (2008). Suicide and suicidal behavior. *Epidemiologic reviews*, *30*(1), 133-154.

Nordlicht, S. (1979). Effects of stress on the police officer and family. *New York State Journal of Medicine*.

Pangaro, J. (2010, February 1). Perspective: The Tragic Toll of Police Work: It's Time for a Compassionate Approach. Retrieved January 1, 2015, from http://leb.fbi.gov/2010/february/perspective-the-tragic-toll-of-police-work-its-time-for-a-compassionate-approach

Parsons, T., Durkheim, E. Marshall, A., & Pareto, V. (1937). *The Structure of Social Action. A Study in Social Theory with Special Reference to a Group of Recent European Writers (Alfred Marshall, Vilfredo Pareto, Emile Durkheim, Max Weber).*

Patterson, G. T., Chung, I. W., & Swan, P. G. (2012). The effects of stress management interventions among police officers and recruits.

Robinson, H. M., Sigman, M. R., & Wilson, J. P. (1997). Duty-related stressors and PTSD symptoms in suburban police officers. *Psychological reports*, *81*(3), 835-845.

Singleton, G. W., & Teahan, J. (1977). *Effects of job-related stress on the physical and psychological adjustments of police officers* (No. 77-24015 UMI). Wayne State University.

Skolnick, J. H. (2011). *Justice without trial: Law enforcement in democratic society.* Quid pro books.

Stinchcomb, J. B. (2004). Searching for stress in all the wrong places: Combating chronic organizational stressors in policing. *Police Practice and Research*, *5*(3), 259-277.

Stratton, J. G., Parker, D. A., & Snibbe, J. R. (1984). Post-traumatic stress: Study of police officers involved in shootings. *Psychological Reports*, *55*(1), 127-131.

Stroshine, M. S., & Brandl, S. G. (2011). Race, gender, and tokenism in policing; An empirical elaboration. *Police Quarterly*, *14*(4), 344-365.

Tan, M. (2011, September 4). Dwell time increases to 2 years next month. Retrieved January 1, 2015, from http://archive.armytimes.com/article/20110904/NEWS/109040311/Dwell-time-increases-2-years-next-month

Thompson, B. M., Kirk, A., & Brown, D. F. (2005). Work based support, emotional exhaustion, and spillover of work stress to the family environment: A study of policewomen. *Stress and Health*, *21*(3), 199-207.

United States Department of Justice. (2015). *Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing.*

Van Maanen, J. (1978). The asshole. *Policing: A view from the street*, 221-238. Violanti, J. M., & Aron, F. (1993). Sources of police stressors, job attitudes, and psychological distress. *Psychological Reports*, *72*(3), 899-904.

Violanti, J. M., & Aron, F. (1995). Police stressors: Variations in perception among police personnel. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *23*(3), 287-294.

Walker, S. (Director) (2015, April 10). "Getting Serious about Day-to-Day Police Misconduct:Verbal Abuse, De-Escalation, and More". *April Symposia on Racial Justice*. Lecture conducted from Arizona State University, Phoenix, Arizona.

Waters, J. A., & Ussery, W. (2007). Police stress: History, contributing factors, symptoms, and interventions. *Policing: an international journal of police strategies & management*, *30*(2), 169-188.

Westberry, L. G., Grier, K. S., & Greenfield, G. (1981). *The police stress survey: Sources of stress in law enforcement*. National Institute of Justice.

Zhao, J., Thurman, Q., & He, N. (1999). Sources of job satisfaction among police officers: A test of demographic and work environment models. *Justice quarterly*, *16*(1), 153-173.

APPENDIX A

MODIFIED POLICE STRESS SURVEY

The following are scenarios you may have encountered on the job. For each scenario, indicate how often this has happened to you on the job. Then, indicate how stressful each experience was to you.

Job Event	Frequency in the Past Month (Circle One)	Frequency in the Past Year (Circle One)	Stress Rating (rate from 0-10)
Changing between day-evening-night shift	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Assignment to new or unfamiliar duties	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Political pressure from within the department	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Political pressure from outside the department	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
The increasing possibility of police-citizen encounters surfacing online	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Incapacitating physical injury on the job	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Perceived inability to work sufficient overtime hours	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Strained relations with nonpolice friends	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Exposure to death or injury of civilians	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Inadequate support/respect by supervisor or department	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Court appearances on day off or day following night shift	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	

Job Event	Frequency in the Past Month (Circle One)	Frequency in the Past Year (Circle One)	Stress Rating (rate from 0-10)
Assignment of incompatible/ineffective partner	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Delivering a death notification	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
High speed chases	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Difficulty getting along with supervisors	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Responding to high risk calls in progress	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Experiencing negative attitudes toward police officers by citizens or media press	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Public criticism of police	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Disagreeable departmental policies or procedures	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Conducting traffic stops or issue traffic citations	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Confrontations with aggressive crowds	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Fellow officer killed in the line of duty	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Making critical on-the-spot decisions	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	

Job Event	Frequency in the Past Month (Circle One)	Frequency in the Past Year (Circle One)	Stress Rating (rate from 0-10)
Ineffectiveness of the judicial system or correctional system	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Insufficient manpower to adequately handle a job	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Lack of recognition for good work	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Excessive or inappropriate discipline	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Performing nonpolice tasks	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Demands made by family for more time	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Promotion or commendation	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Inadequate or poor quality equipment	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Racial pressures or conflicts	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Lack of participation on policy-making decisions	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Inadequate salary	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Accident in a patrol car	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Feelings of paranoia about your or your family's safety	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	

Job Event	Frequency in the Past Month (Circle One)	Frequency in the Past Year (Circle One)	Stress Rating (rate from 0-10)
Demands for high moral standards	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Situations requiring use of force	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Job conflict (by-the-book vs. by-the-situation)	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Killing someone in the line of duty	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Discrimination based on gender or race/ethnicity	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Competition for advancement	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Excessive paperwork	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	
Pressures to stay physically fit	0 1-2 3-5 6-9 10+	0 1-5 6-10 11-24 25+	

The following are questions regarding stress management. Please refrain from using your own name or any other identifying information.
What hobbies or extracurricular activities do you engage in as a way to relieve stress (eg. working out, sports, family activities)?

_____
_____
_____

How often have you had to take time off of work due to work-related instances (eg. the use of your firearm on-duty, car accidents, witnessing a fellow officer get injured, witnessing death)?

_____
_____
_____

Do you agree or disagree that your agency provides services that help manage stress or mental health?

( ) Strongly Agree
( ) Agree
( ) Neither Agree or Disagree
( ) Disagree
( ) Strongly Disagree

If you know your agency provides services to manage stress or mental health, who performs these functions:

( ) Employee Assistance Program
( ) City Psychologist / Counselor / Therapist
( ) Departmental Psychologists / Counselors / Therapists
( ) Contract Business Psychologists / Counselors / Therapists
( ) Private Psychologists / Counselors / Therapists
( ) Don't Know
( ) Other _____

Would you utilize these provided services to manage your stress or mental health?

( ) Definitely would utilize services
( ) Might utilize services
( ) Definitely would not utilize services

If you definitely would or might utilize these services, why?

( ) Alcohol	( ) Stress	( ) Exhaustion
( ) Depression	( ) Financial	( ) Absenteeism
( ) Marital Issues	Issues	( ) Other
( ) Duty Related	( ) Sleeplessness	_____
Incidents	( ) Self-Identity	
( ) Drugs	( ) Anxiety	

If you definitely would not utilize these services, why not?

( ) Fear of peers finding out
( ) Fear of subordinates finding out
( ) Fear of supervisor(s) finding out
( ) Macho subculture- Don't want to appear weak
( ) Don't know the process to activate services
( ) Don't believe in these types of services
( ) Fear of retaliation
( ) Don't have time / process is too cumbersome
( ) Other _____

Would you consider taking part in a voluntary annual mental health check-up, similar to an annual physical check-up?

Yes/No

Would you consider taking part in an annual or bi-annual class on the importance of good mental- and emotional-health?

Yes/No

What else would you like to see offered as a way to manage your stress levels and promote good mental-health?
_____
_____
_____

Gender: _____
Race: _____
Rank: _____
Years in Law Enforcement: _____

APPENDIX B

FREQUENCIES AND VALUES FOR PSS

Frequencies and Values

Scenario	Month Frequency (Mode)	Year Frequency (Mode)	Overall Stress (Mean / Mode)
Changing between day-evening-night shift	0	1-5	2.47/0
Assignment to new or unfamiliar duties	0	1-5	3.26/0
Political pressure from within the department	0	1-5	3.99/0
Political pressure from outside the department	0	1-5	3.32/0
The increasing possibility of police-citizen encounters surfacing online	0	1-5	3.50/0
Incapacitating physical injury on the job	0	0	2.36/0
Perceived inability to work sufficient overtime hours	0	0	1.97/0
Strained relations with nonpolice friends	0	0	2.28/0
Exposure to death or injury of civilians	1-2	1-5	3.27/0
Inadequate support/respect by supervisor or department	0	1-5	4.45/0
Court appearances on day off or day following night shift	0	0	3.66/0
Assignment of incompatible/ineffective partner	0	0	3.28/0
Delivering a death notification	0	0	2.23/0
High speed chases	0	1-5	3.22/0
Difficulty getting along with supervisors	0	0	3.83/0
Responding to high risk calls in progress	1-2	25+	5.12/5
Experiencing negative attitudes toward police officers by citizens or media press	3-5	25+	5.29/6
Public criticism of police	1-2	25+	5.01/5
Disagreeable departmental policies or procedures	0	1-5	3.75/0
Conducting traffic stops or issue traffic citations	10+	25+	2.65/0
Confrontations with aggressive crowds	0	1-5	3.53/0
Fellow officer killed in the line of duty	0	0	1.60/0

Making critical on-the-spot decisions	3-5	25+	5.66/8
Ineffectiveness of the judicial system or correctional system	1-2	1-5	5.22/5
Insufficient manpower to adequately handle a job	1-2	6-10	4.59/0
Lack of recognition for good work	0	0	3.06/0
Excessive or inappropriate discipline	0	0	2.96/0
Performing nonpolice tasks	0	0	2.21/0
Demands made by family for more time	0	0	4.60/0
Promotion or commendation	0	0	1.38/0
Inadequate or poor quality equipment	0	0	2.24/0
Racial pressures or conflicts	0	0	1.44/0
Lack of participation on policy-making decisions	0	0	1.83/0
Inadequate salary	0	0	3.45/0
Accident in a patrol car	0	0	2.06/0
Feelings of paranoia about your or your family's safety	0	0	5.09/0
Demands for high moral standards	0	0	2.93/0
Situations requiring use of force	0	0	4.69/0
Job conflict (by-the-book vs. by-the-situation)	1-2	1-5	4.39/0
Killing someone in the line of duty	0	0	0.28/0
Discrimination based on gender or race/ethnicity	0	0	1.65/0
Competition for advancement	0	0	2.51/0
Excessive paperwork	0	6-10	4.96/0
Pressures to stay physically fit	0	0	2.73/0

APPENDIX C

FULL LENGTH TABLES (7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17)

Table 7. T-Tests – Scenario Gender Comparison

Scenario	Female Mean	Male Mean	T-Statistic	P-Value
Organizational				
Assignment to new or unfamiliar duties	3.63	3.22	0.42	0.66
Political pressure from within the department	4.72	3.86	0.79	0.42
Political pressure from outside the department	4.90	3.15	1.63	0.10
Perceived inability to work sufficient overtime hours	1.20	2.04	-0.88	0.37
Inadequate support/respect by supervisor or department	5.40	4.40	0.81	0.41
Assignment of incompatible/ineffective partner	2.58	3.31	-0.70	0.48
Difficulty getting along with supervisors	5.30	3.72	1.23	0.21
Disagreeable departmental policies or procedures	2.70	3.80	-1.06	0.28
Insufficient manpower to adequately handle a job	5.00	4.57	0.39	0.69
Lack of recognition for good work	3.30	2.99	0.25	0.79
Excessive or inappropriate discipline	2.40	2.97	-0.45	0.65
Demands made by family for more time	4.44	6.18	1.54	0.12
Promotion or commendation	1.50	1.37	0.12	0.90
Inadequate or poor quality equipment	2.20	2.25	-0.05	0.95
Racial pressures or conflicts	1.45	1.41	0.05	0.95
Lack of participation on policy-making decisions	2.09	1.79	0.34	0.73
Inadequate salary	2.40	3.49	-0.92	0.035
Demands for high moral standards	4.11	2.87	1.06	0.28
Job conflict (by-the-book vs. by-the-situation)	3.10	4.49	-1.21	0.22
Discrimination based on gender or race/ethnicity	4.90	1.37	3.90***	0.0001
Competition for advancement	2.80	2.43	0.32	0.74
Excessive paperwork	5.20	4.91	0.27	0.78
Operational				
Changing between day-evening-night shift	4.09	2.32	2.14*	0.03
The increasing possibility of police-citizen encounters surfacing online	6.40	3.26	2.82**	0.005
Incapacitating physical injury on the job	2.18	2.36	-0.17	0.85
Strained relations with nonpolice friends	2.00	2.21	-0.24	0.80
Exposure to death or injury of civilians	3.00	3.29	-0.33	0.73
Court appearances on day off or day following night shift	3.90	3.61	0.28	0.77
Delivering a death notification	2.19	2.27	0.08	0.93

High speed chases	2.80	3.26	-0.42	0.67
Responding to high risk calls in progress	4.60	5.16	-0.51	0.60
Experiencing negative attitudes toward police officers by citizens or media press	5.60	5.22	0.40	0.68
Public criticism of police	6.20	4.87	1.29	0.19
Conducting traffic stops or issue traffic citations	2.30	2.67	-0.45	0.64
Confrontations with aggressive crowds	4.20	3.47	0.73	0.46
Fellow officer killed in the line of duty	0.90	1.68	-0.70	0.47
Making critical on-the-spot decisions	5.60	5.70	-0.11	0.91
Ineffectiveness of the judicial system or correctional system	4.60	5.26	-0.55	0.58
Performing non-police tasks	3.00	2.16	0.92	0.35
Accident in a patrol car	1.81	2.09	-0.26	0.79
Feelings of paranoia about you or your family's safety	5.45	5.04	0.34	0.73
Situations requiring use of force	3.20	4.80	-1.40	0.16
Killing someone in the line of duty	0.00	2.29	-1.96*	0.05
Pressures to stay physically fit	2.36	2.73	-0.37	0.70

Table 8. T-Tests – Policy Gender Comparison

		Female (N)	Male (N)	Total (N)	T-Statistic	P-Value
Services are Provided					-0.11	0.91
	Strongly Disagree	2	15	17		
	Disagree	2	21	23		
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	2	38	40		
	Agree	5	47	52		
	Strongly Agree	1	10	11		
What Services						
	Employee Assistance Program	6	31	37	2.00*	0.04
	City Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	3	60	63	-1.38	0.16
	Departmental Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	5	28	33	1.60	0.11
	Contract Business Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	2	7	9	1.54	0.12
	Private Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	0	6	6	-0.75	0.45
	Don't Know	3	37	40	-0.23	0.81
Would You Take Part in Services					0.73	0.46
	Definitely Would Not	1	21	22		
	Might	7	75	82		
	Definitely Would	4	35	39		
Definitely Would or Might – Why?						
	Alcohol	0	10	10	-1.03	0.30
	Depression	0	14	14	-1.24	0.21
	Marital Issues	5	29	34	1.36	0.17
	Duty Related Incidents	1	37	38	-1.66	0.09
	Drugs	0	0	0	-	-
	Stress	6	58	64	0.14	0.88
	Financial Issues	0	14	14	-1.24	0.21
	Sleeplessness	4	23	27	1.18	0.23
	Self-Identity	0	4	4	-0.63	0.52
	Anxiety	4	19	23	0.86	0.38

	Exhaustion	4	10	14	2.77**	0.006
	Absenteeism	0	0	0	-	-
Definitely Would Not – Why?						
	Fear of Peers Finding Out	2	22	24	0.68	0.49
	Fear of Supervisor(s) Finding Out	1	17	18	0.00	1.00
	Fear of Subordinates Finding Out	0	10	10	-0.80	0.42
	Macho Subculture – Don't Want to Appear Weak	1	16	17	0.06	0.94
	Don't Know the Process to Activate Services	0	13	13	-0.93	0.35
	Don't Believe in These Types of Services	0	18	18	-1.14	0.25
	Fear of Retaliation	0	15	15	-1.02	0.30
	Don't Have Time/Process is too Cumbersome	3	21	24	1.74	0.08
Would You Take Part in a Mental Health Check-up?					0.47	0.63
	No	3	44	47		
	Yes	8	84	92		
Would You Take Part in a Mental Health Class?					0.09	0.92
	No	3	37	40		
	Yes	8	92	100		

Table 10. T-Tests – Scenario Race Comparison

Scenario	White Mean	Non-White Mean	T-Statistic	P-Value
Organizational				
Assignment to new or unfamiliar duties	3.27	3.09	-0.33	0.74
Political pressure from within the department	3.53	4.12	0.99	0.32
Political pressure from outside the department	3.16	3.51	0.57	0.56
Perceived inability to work sufficient overtime hours	1.59	2.30	1.38	0.16
Inadequate support/respect by supervisor or department	4.63	4.28	-0.53	0.59
Assignment of incompatible/ineffective partner	3.15	3.24	0.14	0.88
Difficulty getting along with supervisors	3.68	3.85	0.24	0.80
Disagreeable departmental policies or procedures	3.62	3.68	0.10	0.91
Insufficient manpower to adequately handle a job	5.03	4.24	-1.37	0.17
Lack of recognition for good work	2.65	3.14	0.76	0.44
Excessive or inappropriate discipline	2.90	2.82	-0.10	0.91
Demands made by family for more time	4.08	4.90	1.31	0.19
Promotion or commendation	1.45	1.40	-0.08	0.93
Inadequate or poor quality equipment	1.95	2.42	0.92	0.35
Racial pressures or conflicts	1.59	1.27	-0.78	0.43
Lack of participation on policy-making decisions	1.87	1.76	-0.22	0.82
Inadequate salary	2.93	3.94	1.59	0.11
Demands for high moral standards	2.52	3.34	1.39	0.16
Job conflict (by-the-book vs. by-the-situation)	4.18	4.50	0.50	0.61
Discrimination based on gender or race/ethnicity	1.30	1.87	1.14	0.25
Competition for advancement	2.30	2.74	0.74	0.45
Excessive paperwork	4.75	5.08	0.60	0.54
Operational				
Changing between day-evening-night shift	2.39	2.50	0.24	0.80
The increasing possibility of police-citizen encounters surfacing online	3.65	3.30	-0.56	0.57
Incapacitating physical injury on the job	2.11	2.57	0.81	0.41
Strained relations with nonpolice friends	2.36	1.81	-1.18	0.23
Exposure to death or injury of civilians	3.13	3.31	0.39	0.69
Court appearances on day off or day	3.65	3.75	0.18	0.85

following night shift

Delivering a death notification	2.24	2.24	0.001	0.99
High speed chases	3.42	3.25	-0.28	0.77
Responding to high risk calls in progress	5.24	5.07	-0.29	0.76
Experiencing negative attitudes toward police officers by citizens or media press	5.04	5.30	0.50	0.61
Public criticism of police	4.70	5.10	0.72	0.47
Conducting traffic stops or issue traffic citations	2.57	2.62	0.11	0.91
Confrontations with aggressive crowds	3.34	3.68	0.65	0.51
Fellow officer killed in the line of duty	1.12	2.17	1.70	0.09
Making critical on-the-spot decisions	5.63	5.82	0.38	0.70
Ineffectiveness of the judicial system or correctional system	5.70	4.75	-1.58	0.11
Performing non-police tasks	2.54	1.85	-1.45	0.14
Accident in a patrol car	1.59	2.50	1.58	0.11
Feelings of paranoia about you or your family's safety	4.27	5.65	2.18*	0.03
Situations requiring use of force	4.96	4.40	-0.92	0.35
Killing someone in the line of duty	1.72	2.55	1.26	0.20
Pressures to stay physically fit	2.17	3.21	1.93*	0.05

Table 11. T-Tests – Policy Race Comparisons

		Non-White (N)	White (N)	Total (N)	T-Statistic	P-Value
Services are Provided					-1.47	0.14
	Strongly Disagree	10	7	17		
	Disagree	16	7	23		
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	15	22	37		
	Agree	30	20	50		
	Strongly Agree	2	9	11		
What Services						
	Employee Assistance Program	20	16	36	0.36	0.71
	City Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	28	31	59	-1.10	0.27
	Departmental Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	15	17	32	-0.77	0.43
	Contract Business Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	5	4	9	0.16	0.87
	Private Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	5	0	5	2.17*	0.03
	Don't Know	21	18	39	0.13	0.88
Would You Take Part in Services					1.32	0.18
	Definitely Would Not	10	11	21		
	Might	39	40	79		
	Definitely Would	24	14	38		
Definitely Would or Might – Why?						
	Alcohol	4	6	10	-1.02	0.30
	Depression	10	3	13	1.65	0.10
	Marital Issues	16	16	32	-0.72	0.47
	Duty Related Incidents	16	21	37	-1.81	0.07
	Drugs	39	23	62	-	-
	Stress	40	23	63	1.70	0.08
	Financial Issues	5	8	13	-1.30	0.19
	Sleeplessness	15	11	26	0.25	0.79
	Self-Identity	2	1	3	0.39	0.69

	Anxiety	13	10	23	1.28	0.20
	Exhaustion	7	6	13	-0.12	0.90
	Absenteeism	0	0	0	-	-
Definitely Would Not – Why?						
	Fear of Peers Finding Out	16	6	22	1.06	0.29
	Fear of Supervisor(s) Finding Out	10	7	17	-0.41	0.67
	Fear of Subordinates Finding Out	6	4	10	-0.22	0.82
	Macho Subculture – Don't Want to Appear Weak	10	7	17	-0.41	0.67
	Don't Know the Process to Activate Services	5	7	12	-1.67	0.09
	Don't Believe in These Types of Services	8	10	18	-1.87	0.06
	Fear of Retaliation	8	6	14	-0.50	0.61
	Don't Have Time/Process is too Cumbersome	15	9	24	-0.08	0.93
Would You Take Part in a Mental Health Check-up?					0.49	0.61
	No	23	23	46		
	Yes	48	40	88		
Would You Take Part in a Mental Health Class?					2.42**	0.01
	No	15	25	40		
	Yes	57	38	95		

Table 13. T-Tests – Scenario Rank Comparison

Scenario	Officer Mean	Supervisory Role Mean	T-Statistic	P-Value
Organizational				
Assignment to new or unfamiliar duties	2.62	4.41	3.30**	0.001
Political pressure from within the department	3.54	4.56	1.62	0.10
Political pressure from outside the department	3.15	3.28	0.20	0.83
Perceived inability to work sufficient overtime hours	1.68	2.69	1.92*	0.05
Inadequate support/respect by supervisor or department	4.05	5.08	1.51	0.13
Assignment of incompatible/ineffective partner	3.42	3.00	-0.67	0.49
Difficulty getting along with supervisors	3.83	3.80	-0.04	0.96
Disagreeable departmental policies or procedures	3.50	4.13	1.07	0.28
Insufficient manpower to adequately handle a job	4.04	5.56	2.58**	0.01
Lack of recognition for good work	3.19	2.65	-0.81	0.41
Excessive or inappropriate discipline	2.89	2.97	0.11	0.90
Demands made by family for more time	4.14	5.39	1.91*	0.05
Promotion or commendation	1.14	1.73	1.03	0.30
Inadequate or poor quality equipment	1.91	2.86	1.77	0.07
Racial pressures or conflicts	1.75	0.80	-2.28*	0.02
Lack of participation on policy-making decisions	1.76	1.77	0.02	0.98
Inadequate salary	3.49	3.47	0.02	0.98
Demands for high moral standards	2.95	2.73	-0.34	0.72
Job conflict (by-the-book vs. by-the-situation)	4.49	4.17	-0.49	0.62
Discrimination based on gender or race/ethnicity	1.51	1.45	-0.12	0.90
Competition for advancement	1.91	3.41	2.46**	0.01
Excessive paperwork	4.49	5.60	1.92*	0.05
Operational				
Changing between day-evening-night shift	2.36	2.65	0.59	0.55
The increasing possibility of police-citizen encounters surfacing online	3.36	3.63	0.42	0.67

Incapacitating physical injury on the job	2.11	2.67	0.95	0.34
Strained relations with nonpolice friends	2.13	2.21	0.16	0.87
Exposure to death or injury of civilians	3.34	3.15	-0.39	0.69
Court appearances on day off or day following night shift	4.60	2.04	-4.71***	0.000
Delivering a death notification	2.03	2.55	0.93	0.35
High speed chases	3.81	1.95	-3.22***	0.001
Responding to high risk calls in progress	5.81	3.80	-3.47***	0.0007
Experiencing negative attitudes toward police officers by citizens or media press	5.57	4.63	-1.85	0.06
Public criticism of police	5.17	4.56	-1.06	0.28
Conducting traffic stops or issue traffic citations	3.13	1.71	-3.24***	0.001
Confrontations with aggressive crowds	3.96	2.65	-2.45**	0.01
Fellow officer killed in the line of duty	1.64	1.45	-0.30	0.76
Making critical on-the-spot decisions	5.83	5.45	-0.73	0.46
Ineffectiveness of the judicial system or correctional system	5.31	4.97	-0.49	0.62
Performing non-police tasks	2.05	2.35	0.58	0.55
Accident in a patrol car	2.17	1.97	-0.31	0.75
Feelings of paranoia about you or your family's safety	4.95	5.47	0.76	0.44
Situations requiring use of force	5.56	3.04	-4.24***	0.000
Killing someone in the line of duty	2.31	1.62	-1.00	0.31
Pressures to stay physically fit	2.32	3.36	1.86	0.06

Table 14. T-Tests – Policy Rank Comparisons

		Supervisory Role (N)	Officer (N)	Total (N)	T-Statistic	P-Value
Services are Provided					-1.21	0.22
	Strongly Disagree	6	11	17		
	Disagree	12	11	23		
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	11	29	40		
	Agree	17	32	49		
	Strongly Agree	2	9	11		
What Services						
	Employee Assistance Program	21	13	34	4.07***	0.0001
	City Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	22	39	61	0.38	0.69
	Departmental Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	11	19	30	0.30	0.75
	Contract Business Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	6	3	9	2.13*	0.03
	Private Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	3	2	5	1.23	0.22
	Don't Know	11	29	40	-1.06	0.28
Would You Take Part in Services					0.69	0.49
	Definitely Would Not	5	17	22		
	Might	30	50	80		
	Definitely Would	13	25	38		
Definitely Would or Might – Why?						
	Alcohol	2	8	10	-1.00	0.31
	Depression	7	7	10	1.30	0.19
	Marital Issues	12	20	32	0.42	0.67
	Duty Related Incidents	15	22	37	0.93	0.35
	Drugs	0	0	0	-	-

	Stress	24	38	62	1.01	0.31
	Financial Issues	4	10	14	-0.48	0.62
	Sleeplessness	6	21	27	-1.52	0.13
	Self-Identity	1	3	4	-0.40	0.68
	Anxiety	9	14	23	0.29	0.76
	Exhaustion	6	8	14	0.69	0.48
	Absenteeism	0	0	0	-	-
Definitely Would Not – Why?						
	Fear of Peers Finding Out	8	16	24	0.51	0.60
	Fear of Supervisor(s) Finding Out	5	13	18	-0.14	0.88
	Fear of Subordinates Finding Out	3	6	9	0.28	0.77
	Macho Subculture – Don't Want to Appear Weak	6	11	18	0.60	0.54
	Don't Know the Process to Activate Services	5	8	13	0.78	0.43
	Don't Believe in These Types of Services	3	15	18	-1.30	0.19
	Fear of Retaliation	4	11	15	-0.23	0,81
	Don't Have Time/Process is too Cumbersome	9	15	24	1.03	0.30
Would You Take Part in a Mental Health Check-up?					2.41**	0.01
	No	9	37	46		
	Yes	36	54	90		
Would You Take Part in a Mental Health Class?					1.36	0.17
	No	10	30	40		
	Yes	36	61	97		

Table 16. T-Tests – Scenario Tenure Comparison

Scenario	9 Years or Less Mean	10 Year or More Mean	T-Statistic	P-Value
Organizational				
Assignment to new or unfamiliar duties	3.12	3.28	-0.30	0.75
Political pressure from within the department	2.95	4.95	-3.49***	0.0006
Political pressure from outside the department	2.97	3.69	-1.21	0.22
Perceived inability to work sufficient overtime hours	1.70	2.31	-1.23	0.21
Inadequate support/respect by supervisor or department	3.61	5.38	-2.81**	0.005
Assignment of incompatible/ineffective partner	3.68	2.65	1.77	0.07
Difficulty getting along with supervisors	3.61	4.03	-0.61	0.53
Disagreeable departmental policies or procedures	3.21	4.21	-1.86	0.06
Insufficient manpower to adequately handle a job	4.28	4.92	-1.12	0.26
Lack of recognition for good work	2.84	3.20	-0.56	0.57
Excessive or inappropriate discipline	2.51	3.29	-1.18	0.23
Demands made by family for more time	4.62	4.52	0.16	0.86
Promotion or commendation	1.21	1.57	-0.65	0.51
Inadequate or poor quality equipment	1.86	2.60	-1.44	0.15
Racial pressures or conflicts	1.88	0.93	2.41**	0.01
Lack of participation on policy-making decisions	1.53	2.09	-1.16	0.24
Inadequate salary	3.25	3.63	-0.60	0.54
Demands for high moral standards	2.61	3.35	-1.27	0.20
Job conflict (by-the-book vs. by-the-situation)	4.27	4.49	-0.34	0.72
Discrimination based on gender or race/ethnicity	1.54	1.75	-0.41	0.67
Competition for advancement	2.32	2.64	-0.55	0.58
Excessive paperwork	4.79	5.15	-0.65	0.51
Operational				
Changing between day-evening-	3.12	3.28	-0.30	0.75

night shift				
The increasing possibility of police-citizen encounters surfacing online	2.95	4.95	-3.49***	0.0006
Incapacitating physical injury on the job	2.97	3.69	-1.21	0.22
Strained relations with nonpolice friends	1.70	2.31	-1.23	0.21
Exposure to death or injury of civilians	3.61	5.38	-2.81**	0.005
Court appearances on day off or day following night shift	3.68	2.65	1.77	0.07
Delivering a death notification	3.61	4.03	-0.61	0.53
High speed chases	3.21	4.21	-1.86	0.06
Responding to high risk calls in progress	4.28	4.92	-1.12	0.26
Experiencing negative attitudes toward police officers by citizens or media press	2.84	3.20	-0.56	0.57
Public criticism of police	2.51	3.29	-1.18	0.23
Conducting traffic stops or issue traffic citations	4.62	4.52	0.16	0.86
Confrontations with aggressive crowds	1.21	1.57	-0.65	0.51
Fellow officer killed in the line of duty	1.86	2.60	-1.44	0.15
Making critical on-the-spot decisions	1.88	0.93	2.41**	0.01
Ineffectiveness of the judicial system or correctional system	1.53	2.09	-1.16	0.24
Performing non-police tasks	3.25	3.63	-0.60	0.54
Accident in a patrol car	2.61	3.35	-1.27	0.20
Feelings of paranoia about you or your family's safety	4.27	4.49	-0.34	0.72
Situations requiring use of force	1.54	1.75	-0.41	0.67
Killing someone in the line of duty	2.32	2.64	-0.55	0.58
Pressures to stay physically fit	4.79	5.15	-0.65	0.51

Table 17. T-Tests – Policy Tenure Comparisons

		9 Years or Less (N)	10 Years or More (N)	Total (N)	T-Statistic	P-Value
Services are Provided					0.34	0.72
	Strongly Disagree	10	7	17		
	Disagree	9	17	23		
	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	26	13	39		
	Agree	23	29	52		
	Strongly Agree	7	4	11		
What Services						
	Employee Assistance Program	10	27	37	-3.46***	0.0007
	City Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	32	31	63	0.01	0.98
	Departmental Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	14	19	33	-1.08	0.28
	Contract Business Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	2	7	9	-1.77	0.07
	Private Psychologist/Counselor/Therapist	2	4	6	-0.86	0.38
	Don't Know	23	16	39	1.21	0.22
Would You Take Part in Services					-2.15*	0.03
	Definitely Would Not	15	6	21		
	Might	41	41	82		
	Definitely Would	26	23	39		
Definitely Would or Might – Why?						
	Alcohol	5	5	10	-0.05	0.95
	Depression	3	11	14	-2.37**	0.01
	Marital Issues	15	19	34	-0.91	0.36
	Duty Related Incidents	18	20	38	-0.05	0.95
	Drugs	0	0	0	-	-
	Stress	31	33	64	-0.54	0.58

	Financial Issues	11	3	14	2.23*	0.02
	Sleeplessness	18	9	27	1.87	0.06
	Self-Identity	4	0	4	2.01*	0.04
	Anxiety	10	13	23	0.18	0.85
	Exhaustion	10	4	14	1.64	0.10
	Absenteeism	0	0	0	-	-
Definitely Would Not – Why?						
	Fear of Peers Finding Out	12	11	23	-0.31	0.75
	Fear of Supervisor(s) Finding Out	8	9	17	-0.73	0.46
	Fear of Subordinates Finding Out	5	5	10	-0.33	0.73
	Macho Subculture – Don't Want to Appear Weak	10	7	17	0.34	0.73
	Don't Know the Process to Activate Services	10	3	13	1.72	0.08
	Don't Believe in These Types of Services	13	5	18	1.64	0.10
	Fear of Retaliation	8	6	14	0.16	0.86
	Don't Have Time/Process is too Cumbersome	14	10	24	0.37	0.70
Would You Take Part in a Mental Health Check-up?					-0.47	0.63
	No	25	21	46		
	Yes	46	46	92		
Would You Take Part in a Mental Health Class?					-1.99*	0.04
	No	26	14	40		
	Yes	46	53	99		

70