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ABSTRACT

This study evaluates the relatively low levels of stress discovered, the presence of stressors, and degree of participation in stress reduction activities among correctional officers working in a relatively rural area of Ontario, Canada. Canadian correctional officers working in three facilities in the northern district of Ontario were found to report relatively low levels of stress. The levels of stress reported appear to be lower than levels of stress reported in most studies of stress and were substantially lower than those reported in three studies of police departments and teachers in the United States that used comparable instruments. Various models for explaining these low levels are discussed. © 1998 Elsevier Science Ltd

INTRODUCTION

Stress among criminal justice employees, particularly among law enforcement officers, has been a focus of research in recent years. As this field of interest continues to expand, attention will be directed toward other employees of the justice system. The focus of this research project is to measure stress and to identify stressors experienced by officers in correctional facilities in the northeastern region of the Province of Ontario. Most research on correctional officers and stress has been conducted in the United States. This study builds on current research by examining whether correctional officers working in the northern regions of Canada...
experience stress at levels similar to those of police officers and teachers working in three U.S. cities as measured with comparable instruments.

STRESS

In the twentieth century, the fast pace of society has let to an increase in health problems that many health professionals believe to be the result of tension and anxiety (Charlesworth and Nathan, 1982). Barton (1982:14) has noted that “one of the interesting things about stress is that it sometimes weighs heaviest on those persons whose job it is to assist other people.”

Dr. Hans Selye (Hageman, 1982), a Canadian psychologist and physician, was the first researchers to evaluate stress as a symptom of the presence of excessive stressors in the lives of his subjects. Stressors we long for and stressors we dread may be equally stressful for us. Marital problems or a substantial increase in salary have been found to produce similar degrees of stress. People in situations that are essentially the same experience different amounts of stress, but, under any kind of tension, emotional or physical, all bodies react in the same predictable manner. These physiological responses are known as the “general adaptive syndrome.”

Members of professions that require extensive interaction with a variety of people in the delivery of services, such as correctional and police officers, demonstrate high levels of chronic stress. The work demands responsibility for others, which may create an added burden. People engaged in such services also risk a phenomenon referred to as “burnout.” This is a term used to describe emotional exhaustion, cynicism, detachment, and withdrawal (Maslach, 1976, 1978; Maslach and Jackson, 1981, 1984). The emergence of the term burnout reflects a difference in orientation with stress related to physiological symptoms by some (Selye, 1978) and including psychological symptoms (Lazarus, 1968) with others. Farber (1983) identifies burnout as a condition that is produced when stress is not mediated or that can not be reduced by the individual.

Stressors that impact correctional and police officers are not necessarily limited to events that occur at work. Stratton (1978) notes that stressors for correctional and police officers can be external to the organization (such as attitude of the public and frustration with the criminal justice system), peculiar to the individual (such as marriage, responsibilities and/or lack of self-confidence), as well as internal to the organization (such as poor pay, poor training, and/or supervision), or ingrained in correctional and police work (such as shift work and role conflict) (Collingwood, 1979).

A substantial body of research has supported the proposition that police work is one of the most stressful occupations (Malloy and Mays, 1984; Sigler and Wilson, 1988; Sigler, Wilson, and Allen, 1991). Extensive research has been conducted in this field primarily because the nature of police work itself is stressful (Symonds, 1970). Police officer are required to make split-second decisions, some of which may determine the life or death of a particular individual. Moreover, the police officer is expected to be the problem solver who has a perfect solution to everyone’s problems (Barton, 1982).

Considerable research has been conducted in the last decade concerning police officers and the effects of chronic stress in their lives. Much less empirical data are available concerning the nature of stress for correctional officers. Results from the studies that have been conducted have been inconsistent (Huckabee, 1992). Cheek and Miller (1979, 1983), collected data from correctional officers with the New Jersey Department of Corrections. Cheek and Miller noted that correctional officers reported high levels of stress with some measures equivalent to those found in police officers and some measures lower than those for some other occupations. Lindquist and Whitehead (1986) reported that almost 40 percent of their sample of 241 correctional officers identified their jobs as more than moderately stressful. Brodsky (1982) reported that higher levels of stress declined after an initial period of adjustment. He suggested that higher levels of stress were associated with learning a new job, but also noted that those who could not master the job sought different careers. Lasky, Gordon, and Strebalus (1968) reported higher levels of stress for federal correctional officers than observed in a sample of normal adults. Honnold
and Stinchcomb (1985) also reported higher levels of stress for correctional officers, but noted that these higher levels were not debilitating levels.

Research by Cullen et al. (1985) identified one variable that moderates the development of stress. They report that stress is greater in maximum security environments than in minimum security environments. Blau, Light, and Chamlin (1986) found no differences by level of custody, but did find that correctional officers working in facilities close to New York City demonstrated higher levels of stress than correctional officers working in upstate New York facilities. Poole and Regoli (1980) found that stress increased as orientation toward custody increased among officers working in a maximum security setting. They suggested that as stress increases, officers attempt to reduce stress by embracing a custodial orientation. Cheek (1983) also notes that correctional officers tend to develop a defensive personality structure as a result of the stressful nature of their employment.

Stress in correctional officers has also been attributed to concerns for personal safety (Lombardo, 1981a; Cullen et al., 1985). The importance of safety was found in a more recent study (Triplett, Mullings, and Scarborough, 1996) that also identified career development concerns and concerns about the ability to handle the quality of work required as stressors for correctional officers.

Studies of the effects of various demographic characteristics have produced contradictory results. Rosefield (1981) reports that African American officers demonstrate higher stress levels while Blau, Light, and Chamlin (1986) report that Caucasians report higher levels of tension. Blau, Light, and Chamlin also reported that younger employees report higher levels of stress, but Weinberg et al. (1985) found no differences for age, gender, or education.

As is the case with police officers (Sigler, Wilson, and Allen, 1991) and probation officers (Whitehead, 1986; Whitehead and Lindquist, 1985), administrative factors have been found to be related to levels of stress for correctional officers. Brodsky (1982) first pointed out that the nature of the institutional culture affects levels of stress, a general assertion supported by Gerstein, Topp, and Correll (1987) five years later. Black (1981); Cheek and Miller (1983); Lasky, Gordon, and Strebalus, 1968; Lindquist and Whitehead (1986); Lombardo (1981b); Rosefield (1981); and Weinberg et al. (1985) all report that various administrative processes are related to higher levels of stress. Other factors, such as powerlessness (Dembo and Dertke, 1986; Gerstein, Topp, and Correll, 1987; Weinberg et al., 1985), dangerousness (Cullen et al., 1985; Triplett, Mullings, and Scarborough, 1996), and the quality of interactions with inmates (Brodsky, 1982; Cheek and Miller, 1983; Lombardo, 1981b; Lindquist and Whitehead, 1986) have been associated with higher levels of stress.

Many of the sources of stress for the correctional officer are job related and are similar to the work related stressors experienced by the police officer. There are differences between the experiences of correctional officers and police officers including training, pay, officer–inmate/offender ratios and relations, support services, and equipment (May, 1976:5). These differences may account for differences in stress, however, it is not the environmental nature of stressors in itself that is important. It is the officer’s perception of an event and his or her emotional response to it that is important (Reiser, 1976).

One area of occupational stressors relevant to corrections is change. All change involves some kind of loss that affects dependency needs and causes anxiety in dealing with the unknown (May, 1976:12). The demands made upon correctional officers by their changing role in modern correctional systems are stressors. At one time, the officers were “keepers of bodies” (Hepburn, 1989; Johnson, 1987). Presently, they are not only “keepers” but counselors, confessors, doctors, and supervisors (Crouch, 1991; Cullen et al., 1989; Hepburn, 1989; Hepburn and Albonetti, 1980; Hepburn and Knepper, 1993).

One other source of stress that, to some extent, has been ignored and is shared by police and correctional officers, is that of inactivity (Collingwood, 1979:2). A great deal of an officer’s work tends to be sedentary and results in long periods of physical inactivity (May, 1976).
Inactivity combined with poor diet, overeating, smoking, excessive drinking, and lack of exercise can act as a single stressor. According to one researcher in the field, 60–80 percent of all diseases are self-imposed (Sapin, 1979:31). The cause is chronic stress over an extended period of time. The human body has the natural ability to resist diseases, but stress had the effect of wearing down this immune system, making it easier for diseases to persist.

Officers themselves have to give attention to the problem of job stress and its management. If they do so, they will gain important returns for their efforts. Stressor emotions like love, anger, frustration, or joy give meaning to our lives, but stress is the body’s response to pleasure as well as pain, and severe or prolonged stress weakens the body.

Stress Management

Stress producing factors dominate the lives of many people, leading to stress-related disorders. These disorders can be reduced if a person understands the function of stressors, how these stressors can damage him or her physically and emotionally, and how he or she can cope with stressors to reduce stress. The awareness of stress and its control is the primary focus of stress management (Gherman, 1981; Apgar and Callahan, 1982; Charlesworth and Nathan, 1982). A number of researchers have suggested training, either general (Goldstein, 1981; Rosefield, 1981) or stress specific (Cheek, 1983; Rosefield, 1981), as a means of reducing stress. Triplett, Mullings, and Scarborough (1996) report that positive comparisons of the job of correctional officers with other occupations and the use of social support systems significantly reduced stress. A number of activities have been identified as potential stress reducers; however, the responsibility and method chosen for coping is a matter of individual choice (Black, 1981; Gherman, 1981; Lombardo, 1981b; Reese, 1989; Schafer, 1983). Another approach suggests that the working environment, particularly the administrative structure, contributes to stress and can be redesigned to reduce stress inducing processes (Brodsky, 1982; Cheek and Miller, 1983).

Webb and Smith (1980) have stated that stress prevention and alleviation strategies tend to be either proactive or reactive. Proactive strategies, which include training and selection programs, better selection criteria, and various administrative methods, are designed to prevent the development of stress. Reactive strategies, which include counseling or rehabilitation programs, attempt to alleviate or reduce the damage of stress.

One stress management technique that is found to be helpful is following a proper diet. For convenience and speed officers usually eat “junk food” (Office of General Training, 1987). This diet, however, is not nutritional. It weakens the body and causes it to function as if in a state of high stress (Phillips and Hatch, 1978). Officers are encouraged to decrease their consumption of processed foods high in sugar and fat and increase consumption of fresh fruits, vegetables, and whole grains (Office of General Training, 1987).

In addition to a proper diet, physical fitness and physical exercise can decrease the impact of coping with stressors (Black, 1981; Lombardo, 1981b). Hageman, Kennedy, and Price (1985) present three different kinds of physical fitness exercises for stress reduction: endurance, flexibility, and muscular strength development exercises. Each type of exercise, when used in a balanced fitness program, provides the officer with an effective way of reducing stress.

Unfortunately, there is no panacea to managing stress in correctional officers, or in any other occupation. Because no two people are alike, a particular coping strategy may prove successful for one person and fail for another. Some officers may find their coping strategies in other officers, family members, friends, or religion.

Within the past decade, the findings about chronic stress have initiated a vast amount of interest and subsequent research in the criminal justice field. Most research on correctional officers and stress has been conducted in the United States. This study builds on current research by examining whether correctional officers working in the northern regions of Canada experience stress at levels similar to those of police officers and teachers working in three cities in the United States for whom compara-
Stress Levels Among Canadian Officers

Little is known about the work experiences of staff working in the northern regions of Canada as compared with other areas of corrections and law enforcement; even less research has been conducted in northern regions on the nature of the stress officers experience.

In the north, the winters are long and environmental conditions and coping mechanisms may influence stress. It has been shown that a certain amount of stress is necessary for survival, and degrees of stress can challenge the individual to grow in new ways. Too much, inappropriately timed stress can place excessive demands on the individual and interfere with his or her integrated functioning. The questions examined in this study are: Does stress exist at high levels in corrections officers? What factors appear to influence the levels of stress that are experienced by correctional officers?

METHODOLOGY

Research Setting

The research focused on the employees of a jail, a regional young offender center, and a regional correctional complex in northern Canada. The correctional complex is composed of two sections—the jail section and the corrections section. The corrections section holds minimum and medium security inmates from the region. The jails hold a full range of presentation offenders and minimum security sentenced offenders. The independent jail was located in the largest town in the region (population of about 45,000) and serves as a transfer point for inmates being transferred from correctional facilities in one region to correctional facilities in other regions. Both the youth center and the correctional complex are located in rural areas near small towns.

Procedure and Sample

The instrument was administered in the workplaces of each group. The questionnaires were distributed by the researcher who identified herself as a retired employee and as a graduate student in an academic program. All questionnaires were completed at the subjects’ convenience and returned to a data collection box placed in the duty room by the researcher.

Data were collected from all employees who worked during a three- to four-day collection period at each site. The work schedule made approximately 50 percent of the employees at each site available for data collection during the three- to four-day site visits.

At the correctional complex, questionnaires were distributed by the researcher to forty of the eighty employees. Thirty-five questionnaires (which equals 87.5 percent of the employees working during the data collection) were returned properly completed. At the jail, questionnaires were distributed to thirty-eight of the seventy-three employees. Thirty-two questionnaires (which equals 84.2 percent of the employees working during the data collection) were returned properly completed. At the youth center, questionnaires were distributed to twenty-five of the forty-eight employees. Twenty questionnaires (which equals 80 percent of the employees working during data selection) were returned, but one subject had only completed section I: thus, nineteen questionnaires (which equal 76 percent of the employees working at the time of data collection) were available for analysis. Data from eighty-six subjects (which equals 83.5 percent of the employees working at the time data were collected) from a population of 201 employees were available for analysis.

This project is a population study, therefore, no sampling procedure was utilized. The population for this study included all full-time and part-time employees of the jail, regional young offender center, and regional correctional complex. Comparison of demographic measures of the respondents with population demographic measures indicated that the group of respondents was representative of the population.

Variables

The dependent variable for this study is stress. For this study, stress is defined as a physiological pathology, such as headache, or a more serious illness, such as cancer, produced when demands exceed the capability of a person...
to respond effectively to the demands. Stress is measured with two scales. One scale measures work stress (stress-related disorders experienced while at work); the other measures life stress (stress-related disorders experienced while not at work). These scales were modifications of the Holmes and Rahe (1967) Social Readjustment Scale.

Independent variables related to stress include religious activity, recreational activity, environmental factors, life stressors, job satisfaction, and work stressors. Life stressors are event that occur in life that cause stress. Job satisfaction is the extent to which a person has a positive orientation to his or her job. Work stressors are events that produce stress while at work. These scales were adapted from scales developed by Sigler and Wilson (1988) and Sigler, Wilson, and Allen (1991) that have been successfully used in a series of studies of stress. A representative sample of items from these scales can be found in Appendix A.

Scale Construction

Five scales were constructed for this analysis. Two scales measured life and work stress, two measured life and work stressors, and one measured job satisfaction. The scales measuring life and work stressors required the subject to respond yes or no. The subject’s score on each scale was the number of “yes” responses. Job satisfaction was a Likert type scale. The life and work stress scales were measured on three point scales (sometimes, seldom, and never).

Item analysis was conducted using inter-quartile t-tests for the Likert type scale measuring job satisfaction. In the job satisfaction scale, eight items failed to discriminate between the quartiles, producing a stable thirty-six-item scale.

The instrument consisted of a sixteen page questionnaire consisting of 180 questions that utilized various types of scaling. Part I gathered background data including information about distance traveled to work, participation in religious activities, and exercise habits. Parts II through VIII gathered information related to stress and stressors. Two additional sections measured cynicism and personality type. A final section measured environmental factors. A cover letter on University of Alabama letterhead defined the project as an academic exercise and identified one of the researchers as a retired colleague.

Analysis of Data

The subset of employees surveyed is not a random sample and is treated as a population with response rates for the population reported. There is no reason to believe that those not working (vacation and days off) were different than those who were working on the days that data were collected. Also, the groups of respondents appeared to be representative of the population. The comparison data are also based on populations rather than samples. As these are population studies, inferential statistical analysis is inappropriate and has not been conducted.

There were some differences in personal characteristics among the staff of the three facilities. The staff at the youth center are younger, have worked in their position for a shorter period of time, and drive further to get to work (Table 1). More women are employed at the youth center and more of the staff at the jail are married. More of the staff at the youth center

| DEMOGRAPHIC INTERVAL VARIABLES BY INSTITUTION (MEANS) |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Variable                        | Youth Center (n = 19) | Correctional Center (n = 35) | Jail (n = 32) | All (n = 86) |
| Age                            | 31.8             | 37.1            | 37.8           | 35.1           |
| Months employed
  In the field                   | 92.2             | 130.0           | 140.8          | 117.8          |
  Present position               | 68.2             | 112.0           | 109.6          | 93.9           |
| Km distance from work          | 26.94            | 15.12           | 16.7           | 20.27          |
have received stress reduction training and more have attended college (Table 2).

**Stress**

The measures of stress indicated that the employees of the three correctional facilities in the northern region of Ontario experienced exceptionally low levels of stress. About 92 percent of the subjects reported that they experienced none of the health symptoms in the job stress scale, and 88 percent reported that they experienced none of the health symptoms in the life stress scale. None of the staff at the youth center reported experiencing a single symptom from the work stress scale.

The reported stress levels were compared with scores reported in a study of stress in teachers and police officers in three United States cities (Sigler, Wilson, and Allen, 1991). City 1 and city 2 are two medium-sized cities in Alabama, and city 3 is a small suburban city in New York. The stress scales were identical, scored in the same manner, and had maximum possible scores of fourteen. Both studies were population studies. While it is reasonable to believe that U.S. teachers and law enforcement officers will be different than Canadian correctional officers in many ways, the fact that the same scales were used in the same manner provides a comparative base. Given the very low levels of stress reported by the Canadian subjects, the comparison provides some perspective for assessment of the findings. Although the findings reflect lower levels of stress for Canadian correctional officers than reported in other studies of stress in correctional officers (Blau, Light, and Chamlin, 1986; Brodsky, 1982; Cheek and Miller, 1979, 1983; Cullen et al., 1985; Honnold and Stinchcomb, 1985; Huckabee, 1992; Lasky, Gordon, and Strebalus, 1968; Lindquist and Whitehead, 1986; Poole and Regoli, 1980; Triplett, Mullings, and Scarborough, 1996), the measures in other studies of correctional officers are not sufficiently similar to permit direct comparison.

Both teachers and police officers consistently reported higher levels of stress than Canadian correctional officers (Table 3). The same pattern appears in the data for life stressors (maximum score is twenty). While the differences are not as great as those observed for stress, the Canadian correctional officers consistently reported fewer stressors than U.S.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Correctional Center (n = 19)</th>
<th>Jail (n = 35)</th>
<th>Youth Center (n = 32)</th>
<th>All (n = 86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single again</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress reduction training</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate of Arts degree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor of Arts degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Study 1: United States Police Departments</td>
<td>Study 3: Ontario, Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City 1 (n = 132)</td>
<td>City 2 (n = 265)</td>
<td>City 3 (n = 56)</td>
<td>All (n = 457)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stressors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life stressors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work stressors&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The job stressor and job satisfaction scales were not comparable for two studies.
teachers or police. The work stressors scale and the job satisfaction scales in this study were corrections specific and, thus, were not comparable with the scales in the study of U.S. police and teachers.

The scores among the three Canadian facilities were relatively similar with the exception of work and life stress. Youth center staff reported the lowest level of life stress while correctional center staff reported higher levels of work stress.

The original design anticipated the comparison of levels of stress with a number of variables such as stressors, job satisfaction, cynicism, and a number of environmental variables. The low levels of stress reported prevent a mathematically sound analysis of variation across categories of the comparison variables. More sophisticated analysis will need to be based on a sample large enough to provide a greater number of subjects who report moderate and high levels of stress.

DISCUSSION

Although there is some variation for a number of variables, most studies of stress in correctional officers report medium to high levels of stress (Black, 1981; Blau, Light, and Chamlin, 1986; Brodsky, 1982; Cheek, 1983; Cheek and Miller, 1979, 1983; Cullen et al., 1989; Dembo and Dertke, 1986; Gerstein, Topp, and Correll, 1987; Honnold and Stinchcomb, 1985; Lasky, Gordon, and Strebalus, 1968; Lindquist and Whitehead, 1986; Lombardo, 1981a; Poole and Regoli, 1980; Rosefield, 1981; Tripplett, Mullings, and Scarborough, 1996; Weinberg et al., 1985). The study reported found very low levels of stress in this population of Northern Canadian correctional officers.

The unanticipated low rates of stress might be attributable to inaccurate measures. It appears likely, however, that the subjects made a good faith effort to complete the questionnaires accurately. It was easy to avoid the study, responses were anonymous, and the subjects were helping a retired colleague. The stress scales inquired about common illnesses and the stressor scales asked about specific events. The retired colleague had worked as a nurse and provided services to staff as well as to inmates. From her experience, the employees demonstrated good health with few reported illnesses.

A number of possible explanations can be advanced for these findings. Although the data collected will not permit an assessment of the utility of these explanations, they might serve as a basis for future investigation of the low levels of stress reported in these data.

The low levels of stress might be attributable to environmental factors. The northern district of Ontario is predominately rural with a limited number of small towns. Given the reported average driving distance of twenty kilometers, it is likely that most of the employees live outside of the small towns near the facilities. Only 19.8 percent live within a radius of five kilometers or less from the work complex. Another 29.1 percent live up to thirty kilometers from the place of employment. All additional officers live thirty to seventy kilometers from their workplace and travel on both city streets and highways on their way to work. Although relatively little attention has been directed toward varying levels of stress in urban and rural areas, it is generally accepted that rural areas have fewer stressors than urban areas. Of course, future research will need to measure the validity of these beliefs.

Sociobiology might explain the low rates of stress. Stress is physical illness. The northern Ontario environment is particularly harsh. Temperatures regularly fall to less than minus thirty degrees centigrade for long periods of time with strong winds that produce extreme wind chill factors. It is possible that those with weak constitutions die at an early age, removing their genes from the gene pool, and help to produce a particularly disease resistant population. Future research can assess the relative levels of illness in the general population and in the populations of various stress prone occupations.

The nature of the work environment might be such that stressors and their impact are minimal. The three facilities have relatively small populations (youth center = 100, correctional center = 128, jail = 171) and are not crowded (typically 80–90 percent capacity) with limited
administrative separation among employees. Canadian corrections has been committed to comprehensive staff training for more than three decades, and almost 60 percent of the subjects report that they have received training in stress reduction. Future research can examine the specific nature of the working environment in facilities in northern Ontario.

Lower stress levels might be attributable to healthy life styles. The subjects report high levels of physical activity. About two-thirds of all officers are involved in regular exercise activities, either in groups or individually. Temperature and season apparently do not make a significant difference. Vacations are extremely popular during hunting seasons, especially the “moose season.” Hunting and fishing, popular activities for both men and women in the northeastern section of the province, supply enjoyment, outdoor activities, relaxation, and an additional income. Walking was mentioned most frequently as an individual sport, but was also regarded as a community affair to raise money or as a social event. Baseball was the favorite team sport in the summer, hockey in the winter. The rural nature of the environment reduces the availability of fast food. The institutions prepare meals from locally produced meat and vegetables, which are available to the employees. Hunting and fishing provide healthy food as well as recreation.

SUMMARY

The results from various studies that have attempted to examine the nature of stress in correctional officers have been mixed and, to some extent, contradictory. Although this study sought to provide some clarity to the relationship between stress and a number of variables for Canadian correctional officers, the low levels of stress reported made such an analysis inappropriate. While a number of models can be advanced to explain these low reported levels of both stress and stressors, the data collected were not sufficient to address any of the models. Additional research is obviously needed to clarify the nature of stress in correctional officers and the factors that increase, decrease, or mediate the impact of stressors on correctional officers.

REFERENCES


APPENDIX A: REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE OF SCALE ITEMS

This section deals with general life stress. If you have experienced any of these within the past six months, please check the yes box.

1. Death of a spouse
   yes___ no___

3. Marital separation
   yes___ no___

5. Unemployment of head of household
   yes___ no___

11. Sudden increase of spousal arguments
    yes___ no___

12. Onset of heavy drinking by a family member
    yes___ no___

13. Serious illness/injury
    yes___ no___

17. Purchase of a new home
    yes___ no___

19. Development of friendship with new people
    yes___ no___

This section deals with on the job stress. If you have experienced any of these within the past six months, please check the yes box.

21. Promotion
    yes___ no___

24. Increased recognition for good work
    yes___ no___

26. Change in hours on the job
    yes___ no___

28. Target of formal disciplinary action on job
    yes___ no___

32. Job related accident
    yes___ no___

34. Target of a citizen complaint
    yes___ no___

35. Received a commendation
    yes___ no___

40. Serious disagreement with a colleague
    yes___ no___

This section measures job satisfaction. Please tell us the extent to which you agree with each statement: SA = strongly agree, A = agree, U = uncertain, D = disagree, SD = strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44. My job is more than a paycheck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Differences of opinion are solicited by management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. I do not have a chance to utilize my skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. I know exactly how much authority I have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. I only get feedback when my performance is deemed inadequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. I rarely see the results of my work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Agency procedures are more than adequate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>