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A group of veteran police officers was studied in relation to the effectiveness of a stress reduction program which utilized a cognitive-behavioral approach to training. A new instrument, the Coulson Police Job Stress Discussionaire, (CPJSD), was field tested. Two control groups, a veteran group who received no stress reduction training and an academy group which received standard basic training but not the stress reduction program, were compared on pre-test and post-test Profile of Mood States (POMS) mood disturbance scores.

Contrary to the main hypothesis formulated, there were no significant differences found between the three groups on post-test POMS measures of mood disturbance when compared with pre-test measures. The construct validity of the POMS for use with police officers is challenged. The specific format utilized is discussed and suggestions are offered for future study design. Specific difficulties inherent in the study of police groups are examined. The usefulness of the CPJSD for police job stress reduction program is suggested, as is the need for further field testing of this instrument.
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Introduction

It is commonly agreed that modern man has achieved technology superior to that of any previous civilization. An attendant ingredient of this technology is unlimited stress. While stress often is seen as a negative force that destroys health and hinders the quality of life, it is sometimes seen as a source of motivational energy and creative power that continues the impetus of technological civilization. To some people a life without stress would be stifling and lacking personal challenge. To them, the challenge offered by technology is not how to avoid stress but rather how to live with it and make it their ally.

Selye (1974) first suggested the existence of a stress factor in human behavior in 1936. He called it the "general adaptation syndrome" or "G.A.S". The importance of this construct is demonstrated by the large number of articles that have been written on the subject. Since he originally formulated the concept, Selye has written 30 books and approximately 1,500 articles on stress. More than 110,000 articles and books have been written about the G.A.S., Selye further states.

The stress construct is so popular with the lay public that almost every individual has his or her own definition of its meaning. R. T. Hoerl (1978) asked the question, "is
stress a fad?" He then suggested that a workshop entitled "anxiety management" or "tension clinic" might fail to attract many participants, while another workshop called "stress management techniques" undoubtedly would be well attended because of the popularity of the stress construct.

Many variables which affect stress are described in the literature. Some of those variables are noise (Welch and Welch 1970), (Kryter 1970), (Baron 1971); social stimuli (Bovard 1959); smoking (Dunn 1973); confinement in concentration camps (Chodoff 1970), (Ettinger 1964), (Ettinger and Strom 1973); fatigue (Bartley and Chute 1947); war (Borbe 1970), (Grinker and Spiegel 1945), (Bourne 1970); prenatal psychological stress (Archer and Blackman 1971); gravity (Gauer and Zuidema 1961); isolation (Zuckerman 1964), (Zuckerman et al. 1962); continuous change of modern society (Toffler 1970); aggression (Musaph and Mettrop 1972), (Scott 1958); frustration, illness, marriage, fertility, sterility, divorce, death, suicide, catastrophe (Liebman 1955); executive function (Page 1961), (Brady 1970); deprivation of food and emotional stimuli (Levi 1972); attack on the ego (Menninger 1962); precognition of disaster (Stevenson 1970); life-threatening illness (Hackett and Cassem 1970); outer space (McLaughlin 1970); and major change in life style (Schafer 1978). This is but a partial list
of the ever growing number of topics that relate to stress. Lazarus (1966) says that the scope of stress research is so broad that it would be devastating to the value of most psychological writing now produced if stress research were abandoned. While stress seems to be a part of almost every human endeavor, it creates more difficulty in the professional activities of some groups than in others. One professional group, law enforcement, seems to have a disproportionate amount of stress.

Joseph Wambaugh (1975), an ex-policeman turned police fiction author, says, "the physical dangers of police work are grossly overrated, but the emotional dangers make it the most hazardous job on earth." His books are replete with insights regarding the effects of stress on police officers. His book, The Onion Field (Wambaugh 1973), outlines the psychobiography of a real-life police officer through several years of stressful situations, starting with his witnessing the murder of his partner, and ending with his dismissal from the Los Angeles Police Department for shoplifting. Another book, The Choir Boys (Wambaugh 1975), describes the stress and psychological deterioration of several fictitional policemen. He seems to accurately capture the loneliness, alienation, political tensions, "be strong" attitudes, and other stressors of police work.
He seems to strive toward the goal of making his readers understand the very severe effects of job stress and the heavy toll it exacts on those men.

Gentry (1979) similarly outlines the stressful changes in police work. Public criticism, tighter budgets, and social change have been leading factors in creating police job stress. The career officer finds himself working at a very difficult job without the attendant community support necessary for adequate execution of that job. Social action groups are insisting that police methods be changed regardless of the traditional usefulness of those methods. Those groups are also insisting that female officers be added to what has been a male-dominated profession. The addition of female officers creates new tensions at home and on the job, further complicating the stress situation.

Gentry further says that tax revolts hit police officers in the pocketbook as administrative budget officers look for ways to cut city services. As manpower is decreased, already overworked officers must do more, and stress is increased. She adds that cries of "police brutality" reached a "crescendo in the turbulent 60's" (p.14) and that there is a new wave of complaints today. Public outrage has followed newspaper accounts of police
who murder citizens, making the job of the honest policeman difficult at best. The Federal Community Relations Service reported 58 incidents in which a citizen was fatally shot by an officer in 1977. The same agency had reported over 100 such incidents of police brutality in 1978 before all such complaints had been tabulated. Perhaps job-related stress had created the climate for such brutality, and perhaps it was in part responsible for such happenings.

The heavy toll taken by stress is unnecessary. Research should yield new approaches to its management. Following is an examination of current literature regarding police job stress.

Statement of the Problem

The problem addressed by this study is the reduction of stress level in police officers.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is twofold: To determine whether a specified stress reduction model is effective and to provide information on stress reduction for those who are involved in stress-reduction programs.

Limitations of the Study

This study may be limited in that

1. All participants were volunteers. As such,
they may not have been totally representative of all police officers.

2. The number of policemen available for study was limited by factors within the representative police departments and was not under the control of the experiment director.

3. An experimental bias was present in that only one teacher was used in the workshop.

4. The time allocated for the study by the police academy may not have been sufficient for practice of the skills learned or for adequate feedback from the instructor.

Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that the subjects responded honestly to the instruments used in this study. It was further assumed that the subjects were representative of other policemen in the departments studied. It was assumed that the instruments used are sufficiently valid for the purpose of this study.

Significance of the Study

This study focused on job-related stress factors as they affect police officers. Those officers wield much power in our communities. If properly utilized,
that power will be beneficial to all citizens of the community and an orderly society will result. Conversely, if that power is misused, citizens lose freedom and, in various degrees, their right to life. The officer who functions under harmful stress is also at risk of losing that sense of selfhood from which a reasonable use of power is generated. When stressors are too great, he may react out of a feeling of weakness, and abuse legitimate power.

This study is significant in that

1. A model has been created to demonstrate how common work related variables affect the policeman's perception of personal stress and

2. Which will further demonstrate the environmental changes necessary for remediation of those stressors.

Definitions of Technical Terms

Adaptation to Stress: The ability of the organism to modify or utilize stress in order to establish homeostasis.

Anxiety: A psychological phenomenon distinguished by increased inner tensions, increased psychomotor activity, restlessness, and general bodily system alarm.
Two types of anxiety are used by researchers, one being "state anxiety" which is transitory, and fluctuates over time and the other "trait-anxiety", which is a personality attribute that remains relatively stable over time. (Spielberger et al., 1970).

**City Administration:** Those persons who make decisions and rules for the city, and who also decide fiscal policy for all city departments, including the police department.

**Community-Citizen Relationships:** Interactions of police officers with civilian individuals in an official work-related capacity.

**Criminal Justice System:** The system which is charged with evaluating a person's guilt or innocence when accused of a crime, and also with seeing that prescribed penalties are applied. This system includes juries, judges, lawyers, police officers, probation officers, parole officers, and prison officials.

**Distress:** Harmful stress.

**Equipment:** Those items given to the police officer for his or her use in fulfilling assigned duties.

**Family Relationships:** Interpersonal relationships that the police officer has with his wife, children, parents, brothers, sisters, and other relatives.

Manifest Anxiety: As used by Taylor (1953), the variation in drive level of internal anxiety or emotionality.

Neurosis: See psychoneuroses.

Peer Relationships: Interpersonal interactions by police officers with other police officers who have similar job responsibilities.

Psychoneuroses: That set of psychopathological disorders, which have as their chief characteristic "anxiety" created by a threat from within the personality of the individual, with or without real external stimulation.

Recreation/Off-Duty Activities: Activities which occur when the police officer is not at his regular police department job, including sports activities, outdoor recreation, church organizations, social and fraternal organizations, and "moonlighting" or extra employment engaged in for whatever reason.

Stress: Stress is a class of phenomena which incorporates all of the nonspecifically induced changes
within a biological system. It is most clearly identified by a disturbance of biological and psychological functioning brought on by unusually demanding life conditions. Stress may have positive attributes (resulting for example, in achievement of goals, etc.) or negative attributes (for example, resulting in loss of health or incapacitation).

**Stressor:** Any agent which produce stress in a living organism.

**Stress Inoculation Training:** Training individuals to identify potential stressors in their environment so that they may either prevent the occurrence of those stressors or lessen the effects of them.

**Supervisory Relationships:** Interactions by the police officer with police officers of higher rank who make decisions about his job responsibilities.

**Work Tasks:** Those duties which are assigned to the police officer as a part of his job responsibility.
Background of the Study

Many recent works have focused on stressors as they affect policemen. Lewis (1973) relates the causes and results of police anomie. It would seem that they suffer from more feelings of meaninglessness than others do. Holdaway (1977), and Walsh (1971) discuss the stress of police professionalism as an added stressor. Niederhoffer (1967) says that three elements interact and cause the stressful ills of modern policework. Those are "professionalism, anomie, and cynicism." Sundeen (1974) also studied professionalism and identifies the added stress variable community attachment.

Schonborn (1975) states that societal violence is a great contributor to police stress. Kroes (1976) calls the policemen "society's victim." Ford, Alexander, and Lester (1971) discuss fear of death in policemen as a stressor. Wilson (1968) says that danger, violence, and maintenance of authority are significant distress variables.

Organizational pressures have been described in great detail by many authors such as Baldwin (1977), Neff (1968), Kroes, Hurrell, and Margolis (1974), Kroes, Margolis, and Hurrell (1974), Drabek and Haas (1969), Holdaway (1977), Beasley and Antunes (1974), Angell (1976),
and Neubauer (1974). Van Maanen (1975) investigated the policeman's relationship to his organization in terms of motivation, commitment, and need satisfaction. Kroes and Hurrell (1975) discuss the subject of police stress in a very comprehensive manner and make many recommendations for change.

a police officer with a phobic reaction to firearms. Danish and Brodsky (1970) suggest police training for emotional control in handling demonstrators or rioters. Parker (1975) gives methods of reducing police job stress.

Niederhoffer and Niederhoffer (1978) and Reiser (1973) describe the psychological stress experienced by a policeman’s family as being related to his stress. Sometimes the stress that the family experiences is even greater than that of the police officer.

There are many existing stress training models for policemen. Nicoletti, Benz, Hoerl and Hoerl (1978) presented such a model at their symposium on stress management at the 1978 American Psychological Association annual convention. Kroes and Hurrell (1975) and Sarason and Johnson (1978) discuss this subject. Sumrall (1977), Sumrall et al. (1977), and Sumrall and Crow (n.d.), as well as the Psychological Services Unit of the Dallas Police Department (1978), have unpublished intervention models. None that were found seemed to present a comprehensive, organized, and easily utilized model for general use.

Many police departments in large cities now have their own departmental psychology units. Some examples
of such police departments are Los Angeles, San Jose, and Oakland, California; Seattle, Washington; New York City, New York; and Dallas, Texas. Unfortunately, smaller communities have neither the resources to establish such programs nor the manpower to warrant full-time psychological intervention. In some small cities, local MHMR units have been used to provide minimal services, including testing for selection of officers. A model of training for stress identification and prevention would be especially helpful to the small department with limited resources.

A careful comparison of the various stress training models and further refinement by compatible grouping of similar variables, would allow for a more manageable model for the teaching of basic stress control methodology. The paragraphs which follow will describe such a refinement.

Nicoletti, Benz, and Hoerl (1978) gave a list of police job stressors which would seem to fit the purpose of developing a teaching model. These stressors were divided into two categories. External stressors listed were

1. Court leniency coupled with court interference in police functions.
2. Distorted media accounts of police actions.
3. Unfavorable racial bias of communities.
4. The rule that officers must live in the towns where they work, thus eliminating a possible escape from the tensions of the city.

5. Ineffectiveness of agencies to which police refer clients.

Internal stressors listed by him were

1. Poor supervision.
2. A dead-end career ladder.
3. Adversive departmental policies.
4. Poor pay.
5. Poor and outdated equipment.
6. Role conflict (the officer as enforcer versus officer as service giver).
7. Fear and danger.
8. Use of female officers.
9. Shift work.
10. Lack of closure.
11. Interdivisional hassles.
12. Mistrust with no place to direct that mistrust.
13. Other officers who overreact.
15. Supervisory referral for treatment of personal, social, and psychological problems interpreted as punishment by the police officer. Ridicule by peers subsequent to referral.

16. Inability to separate work environment from rest environment, creating a situation where the officer stays on duty most of the time.

17. Confidential nature of work.

18. Mandatory attendance in court.

The stressors presented by Nicoletti, and listed above seem to be the same ones used by many other authors. Whether the authors talk of stress in specific terms, as above, or use broader terms which seem to encompass the same general phenomena, it will be noted that there appears a general consensus as to what constitutes police stress. Identification of those stressors at work in an individual policeman's life is the first step in helping him gain control over those stressors.

Reiser (1974) mentions typical stressors as being related to work environment factors such as danger, violence, and authority. He quotes Neff (1968) as proposing organizational and role pressures as stressors. He quotes Skolnick
(1966) as saying that such pressures scare the policeman and also scare his family. Further, he discusses stressors similar to those cited by Nicoletti. He listed such stressors as authoritarian leadership, competitiveness, territorial responsibility, internal discipline, training, peer group influence, and alienation from society.

Niederhoffer and Niederhoffer (1978) examined the deleterious effects of the policeman's work assignment on family life. This book, written by an ex-policeman, who is now a college professor, and by his wife, is a combination of practical insight and well researched data about the police family. According to those authors, popular novels often describe the "hero-cop" as being unlucky at love and unable to establish a relationship with his wife and children. This notion is confirmed by divorce statistics, which are much higher for policemen than for the public at large. When the policeman's family is compared to the families of the medical doctors, similarities are found. It would seem that in both cases the family suffers from neglect because of time demands made on the father. Since policemen's wives are left alone much of the time and shift changes do not allow for an orderly progression of family life, those wives often become bitter and resentful. Their stress was made
even more onerous when women were added to the police force. Many of those wives were already suspicious of their husband's motives because policemen have a tendency to treat their job as a mistress. The Niederhoffers say that policemen's children often will lie about their father's occupation. Public service places unwanted constraints on those children in that it causes a "fishbowl effect". Additionally, most policemen have a strong middle class value system, which may place them in a double bind. This value system often creates a dissonance between two competing ideals. The officer realizes the need to be a good parent to his children, but must also give excessive time and effort toward his role as a public servant. In this devotion to public duty, the children's needs may be neglected.

Symonds (1970) discusses the emotional hazards caused by the stress of police work from his viewpoint as a consultant to New York Police Department. He divides those stressors into two categories: (1) stress which is due to police work and (2) stress which is a result of the nature of the police organization. Under the first category, he talks about the strain caused by
uncooperativeness, antagonism, and hostility of the public. Under the second category, he sees police work as being organized in a quasi-military structure which necessitates much rigidity and powerlessness to change the person or the organization. Those individuals who handle stress by hypochondriasis, or have obsessive-compulsive personalities, or who are passive-dependent individuals with demonstrated oppositional traits, or who are histrionic, or have paranoid personalities are particularly vulnerable to police stress. He says that most of these types of people could successfully pass the police screening process which typically selects conforming individuals. He believes that people with these personality types will become ineffective when placed under the unique stressors of police work.

Kroes, Margolis and Hurrell (1974) asked policemen two questions concerning job stress: (1) "What is found bothersome about your work?" (2) "What bothers other policemen doing the same job that you do?" They were then presented with a list of specific stressors and were asked if any on the list bothered them. The responses given were ranged into twelve categories. Those categories were courts, administration, equipment, community relations, changing shift routines, relations with supervisors.
non-police work, other policemen, bad assignments, isolation and boredom, pay, and others (defined as those stressors that did not fit into the other eleven categories). If a response was given by at least 20 of the respondents, it was arbitrarily decided that it was a major source of stress. Four such major stressors were identified by the authors. Those four were courts, administration, equipment, and community relations.

Kroes, Hurrell, and Margolis (1974) repeated the above study using police administrators as subjects instead of field officers. Eight categories were identified as being stressors: Administration, equipment and manpower, community relations, courts, changing shift routine, ineffectualness, work overload, and others. Those stressors which were most often mentioned by the administrators were the same ones cited by police field officers.

Three distinct classes of variables seem suggested by the above works. Those are variables imposed by the community, variables imposed by the work assignment, and variables imposed by social and off-duty circumstances. A taxonomy could be established such as the one presented in Table 1 by selecting some integral components of those three classes.
TABLE 1

A Taxonomy of Police Job Stress

I. Community
   A. Criminal Justice System
   B. City Administration
   C. Community and Citizen Relationship

II. Work
   A. Supervisory Relationship
   B. Equipment
   C. Work Assignment

III. Social and Off Duty
   A. Family Relationships
   B. Peer Relationships
   C. Recreation and Off-duty Activities

While it could be argued that a larger taxonomy might be created, the above variables seem to be the most important. They suggest an easily utilized framework for a teaching model. The model developed in this study will use the taxonomy listed in Table 1.

Further information regarding the interactions of specific stress variables in the lives of policemen have been given by Lawrence (1979) and by Spielberger, Westberry, Grier, and Greenfield (1981). Both works create instruments
for the measurement of job stress in police officers and both used the Kroes model in developing those instruments. While not used specifically in the study that follows, both of these studies have contributed significantly to this effort.
Research Design

A model for teaching stress awareness and stress control was developed utilizing the taxonomy in Table 1. This model consists of a three-step teaching process, as follows:

1. Assessment of current factors present in the policeman's life which are stressful to him.
2. Presentation of general information commonly used in stress management, including psychological and physiological factors and specific information regarding policemen and stress.
3. Didactic interchange with class participants, utilizing specific stressors listed by those participants.

An experimental teaching tool called the Coulson Police Job Stress Discussionaire (CPJSD) (Coulson 1985) was used for collecting data regarding the police officer's current perception of life stressors. This instrument has been offered for field testing and is currently being evaluated. It was developed utilizing the taxonomy in Table 1 and the theoretical material presented in
support of Table 1. No data have been presented as yet as to the validity of this instrument for those purposes. This present study served as a means of field testing the CPJSD.

Four sessions consisting of two and one-half hours each were employed in this model. Session One was an introduction to the general psychological and physiological factors present in all stress, followed by completion of a stress survey (see Appendix A). Session Two was a discussion of community factors contributing to police job stress. Session Three was a discussion of specific work factors. Session Four was a discussion of social and off-duty factors.

Instruments

The Profile of Mood States (POMS) developed by McNair, Lorr, and Droppelman (1981), was used to assess the outcome of the stress reduction teaching in a pre-test and post-test design utilizing an experimental group and a control group, as described by Huck, Cormier, and Bounds (1974). Pre-test and post-test administrations were used to measure change in certain psychological states as measured by the six subtest measures and the one overall test measure of mood state.
The POMS measures the following factors: tension-anxiety, depression-dejection, anger-hostility, vigor-activity, fatigue-inertia, and confusion-bewilderment. It also yields a total mood disturbance score. McNair and Lorr (1964) report internal consistency reliability norms as being near .90 or above. Additionally, McNair and Lorr (1964) report test-retest reliabilities for the 6 factors ranging from .61 to .69. They argue that such test-retest reliability would be low because it is supposed to be an indication of change through therapy. McNair, Lorr, and Droppelman (1981, pp. 10-20) discuss in detail numerous validity studies which have shown this instrument to be sensitive to change associated with psychotherapy and with controlled outpatient drug trials. Additionally, they report several studies which examine the effects of emotion inducing conditions on the instrument. They found in general that this instrument was sensitive to such conditioning. Studies have been done that examine the effects upon scores obtained from films that induce anxiety, from public speaking, from the use of marijuana, and from the use of alcohol. These results support the use of this instrument to study the effects of a stress reduction model as herein proposed.
Concurrent validity of the POMS has been demonstrated with the Hopkins Symptom Distress Scales (Parloff, Kelman, and Frank, 1954), and the authors report high correlations, particularly with three clinically derived distress scores: somatization, anxiety and depression. The authors also report a correlation of .80 between the usual version of the tension anxiety and the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale and report that this .80 correlation is about as high as the test-retest reliability of the manifest anxiety scale.

The CPJSD was utilized in structuring the specific teaching content of each workshop for those officers therein involved, thus making the workshop more applicable to each police officer's personal situation.

Demographic information was collected on each of the participants (see Appendix B):

1. Sex
2. Age
3. Number of Years Service as a Police Officer
4. Marital Status
5. Number of Children Living in the Home
6. Number of Hours Worked
8. Nature of Recreational Activities

Each of the items of demographic data was utilized in further personalizing the teaching session. An outline of the teaching procedure is presented in Appendix D.
Rationale

Dyer (1985, p.17) states that "there is no such thing as stress in the work place." He further states that stress "doesn't exist in the real world either." He rather thinks that people think stressfuly, and that if one can change people's thoughts, one can change the bodily manifestations of their stressful thoughts.

Dyer's statements are not new to psychology. Ellis and Harper (1961) taught that in order to counteract emotional illness, one must learn how to dispute irrational thoughts. Maultsby and Hendricks (1974) likewise use cognitive restructuring in preventive mental health.

Beck (1976, p. 76) quotes Maslow in saying "the neurotic is not only emotionally sick--he is cognitively wrong. Beck (pp. 50-55) gives a contrast between three different models of psychotherapy. He states that the conditioning model asserts that "stimulus yields emotion", the psychoanalytic model is that the "stimulus yields unconscious impulse, which yields emotion", and that the cognitive model demonstrates that "stimulus yields conscious meaning, which yields emotion." He believes, as do the others cited above, that the cognitive model is the most correct, and thus provides the best model for psychotherapy.

Beck gives models of cognitive therapy for most mental illness.
Meichenbaum and Jaremko (1983) present a large volume of works by various authors which use cognitive restructuring as their mode of stress control and remediation. Several of the articles discuss stress inoculation as an important methodology in treating stress. Janis (in Meichenbaum and Jaremko, cited above, p. 67) defines stress inoculation as "giving people realistic warnings, recommendations, and reassurances to prepare them to cope with impending dangers or losses." He further states that such stress inoculation programs can take several forms, including workshops of up to 15 hours or more of training. The effectiveness of "stress inoculation" is the topic with which this study is concerned.

Subject Pool

Police officers working for police departments represented by the Texoma Regional Police Academy were invited to volunteer as subjects for this study. Eighty-five officers volunteered and were given the opportunity to attend stress reduction workshops, or to participate as controls. Thirty-five males and five females chose to attend the workshop, with 14 males withdrawing from participation by not completing the post-test. The results from female subjects were not used in the analysis of data;
thus 21 males completed pre-test, workshop, and post-test administrations of the POMS.

Forty-two males and three females chose to participate as controls. Sixteen males withdrew after the pre-test administration of the POMS, and as with the experimental group, the female subjects were not included for analysis. Twenty-six male controls completed both pre-test and post-test POMS administrations and 21 of those were randomly selected for comparison with the experimental group.

Additionally, 29 rookie officers, who were concurrently enrolled in basic police academy studies, were invited to respond to pre and post academy administrations of the POMS in order that these new officers might be compared with veteran officers. Those academy officers included one female and 28 males. Three male subjects withdrew from participation and the female subject was eliminated from the analysis which followed. Twenty-one rookie officers were randomly selected for subsequent statistical comparisons. In summary, 105 male officers began the study and 33 subsequently withdrew from participation. Analysis was made using results from an experimental group of 21 subjects, a control group of 21 subjects, and an academy group of 21 subjects.
Some of the departments exhibited a "paranoia" when approached for volunteer subjects. For example, at one small department one of the officers stated, "I have good information that this testing will be used to get us removed from the department and will become a permanent part of our employment jacket." Only two officers from that department chose to participate after that cryptic warning. One-half of the volunteers from another department withdrew after the pre-test when the department lieutenant announced an unrelated personnel issue to which those officers strongly objected. The lieutenant had been the one who had recruited them as volunteers for this study. Another officer withdrew after he was severely wounded by an escaped prisoner in a shoot-out. Some officers withdrew without explanation.

Hypothesis

It was hypothesized that the experimental group would differ from the control group on the overall mood disturbance score of the Profile of Mood States after the stress reduction workshop had been completed, with the experimental group obtaining significantly lower scores. No hypothesis was offered regarding the rookie officers, although data obtained from those officers are presented.
**Statistical Method**

A pre-test was given to all subjects. The experimental group were given training in stress reduction methodology, utilizing the outline in Appendix D. The academy group attended regular basic course work, but were given no stress reduction training. The control group were given no training of any type at the academy during the course of this study. A statistical analysis of the data gathered was made using the analysis of covariance technique as described by Roscoe (1975) and also by Huck, Cormier, and Bounds (1974). A level of significance of .05 was used.

Additional statistical analysis was performed on the demographic variables of age and job tenure in order to demonstrate that those variables did not significantly differ between the three groups.
Results

It could be argued that age and tenure are significant variables in the ability to control stress. It would seem logical that an older, more experienced person would have a better understanding of the requirements of his environment, and thus be able to apply the necessary preventive caution in order to tolerate the problems of his employment. Likewise, one would expect those unable to tolerate those job attributes which are stressful to choose other less stressful employment. It seemed important to control for both age and tenure in this study of job stress.

The three groups used in this study did not vary significantly in age. Probability was > .05 level of significance. The mean age for the experimental group was 32.95 years, with a range in age from 22 to 55 years. The control group mean age was 32.29 years, with a range in age from 23 to 54 years. The mean age for the academy group was 29.43, with a range in age from 21 to 55 years. These data are presented in Table 2.

The academy group included mostly rookie policemen, however, a small number of veteran officers were included. These veterans were in the academy because
### TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>F Prb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>147.17</td>
<td>73.59</td>
<td>.9952</td>
<td>.3757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4436.38</td>
<td>73.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4583.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M Years</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.95</td>
<td>8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32.29</td>
<td>7.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29.43</td>
<td>10.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>8.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they did not have Texas certification, their experience being mostly in other States. It was expected that this group would have a much lower tenure as policemen, and that was indeed what was found. Probability was < .05 level of significance. This group had a mean tenure of 153 months as policemen, with a range of job experience from one month to 190 months. The mean tenure of the experimental group was 785 months, with a range of experience from three months to 210 months. The control group had a mean tenure of 776 months, with a range of experience from seven months to 240 months. The experimental and control groups did not differ significantly on this variable. Probability was > .05 level of significance. These data are presented in Table 3.

It was found that there was no difference between the groups on comparisons of pre-test and post-test measures of mood disturbance. The probability was > .05. We therefore must reject the hypothesis that the experimental group, having been given a stress reduction training workshop, would show significantly different scores on the Profile of Mood States instrument. This was true when comparisons were made using all three groups, and also when comparing the experimental and control groups only. The above data are presented in Tables, 4, 5, and 6.
### TABLE 3

Analysis of Variance for Job Tenure by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F RATIO</th>
<th>F PROB.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5518904.89</td>
<td>2759452.44</td>
<td>8.0094</td>
<td>.0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20671686.86</td>
<td>344528.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26190591.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M MONTHS</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>784.91</td>
<td>743.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>775.76</td>
<td>563.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>152.52</td>
<td>405.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>571.06</td>
<td>649.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 4

Summary of Analysis of Covariance

POMS MDI Post-Test by Group with POMS MDI Pre-Test

(Stress Training Group with Field Sample Group and Academy Group)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MDI-1</td>
<td>19789.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19789.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects Group</td>
<td>31.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>19821.03</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6607.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>28060.72</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>475.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47881.75</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>772.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROUP</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>PRE-POMS MDI</td>
<td>POST-POMS MDI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OBTAINED</td>
<td>ADJUSTED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress Training Sample</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.13</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Sample Untrained</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33.62</td>
<td>29.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.59</td>
<td>33.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy Sample Untrained</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>23.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.06</td>
<td>22.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 6

Summary of Analysis of Covariance

MDI-2 by Group with MDI-1

(Stress Training Group With Field Sample Group Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MDI-1</td>
<td>18894.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18894.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects Group</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explained</td>
<td>18913.47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9456.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>18406.82</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>471.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37320.29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>910.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion of Findings

Several reasons could be hypothesized as to why no differences were found between the groups. Some who were in the stress management group gave unsolicited testimonials as to the helpfulness of the training to their own situations. For example, one officer wrote, "I received Part Two of your research project today and after taking your class I have used your suggestions on reducing stress on the job and IT WORKS. Thank you very much." It was signed by an officer of a local sheriff's department. Testimonials are not experimental research; so empirical explanations must be sought when something which seems logical in theory is in fact not substantiated.

When looking for likely reasons for the non-significance of this study, the test instrument itself seems to be a likely place to start. The POMS manual (McNair et al., 1981) cite the benefits of using the test for measuring change brought about by treatment modalities. The examples they give are of mental patients and of student populations. It is not certain whether one could expect police populations to behave in a similar manner on the POMS as those populations.
Only one other study was found in the literature which utilized the POMS with police officers. Lester, Leitner, and Posner (1984) in an article which pre-dates the study under discussion, but does not pre-date its beginnings, utilized a very similar format for training 55 police administrators and testing the effects of that training. They argue that one would expect a stress management program to improve mood. They found that the training improved current mood on all scales and on the total score. It did not improve job satisfaction. The fact that they did not use a control group seems to be a major flaw on their part, and makes comparisons difficult. Citing lack of funds, they chose rather to measure changes in mean scores alone.

When the same procedure was applied to the Texoma regional police study, very different results were obtained. Changes were extremely small for all groups. All scores for the experimental group were found to show increased mood disturbance except for Depression-Dejection, which was found to be very slightly improved.

All of the field veteran control group scores were in the direction of improved mood state perception. The academy control group showed improved mood on some scales and reduced mood on others. Comparisons of the
scores are shown on Tables 7, 8, and 9 (see Appendix E). It could be argued that the experimental group showed no improvement, while the field veteran control group made slight improvement.

It could also be argued that the academy group showed a tendency towards improvement perhaps through new awareness brought on by that course work which in part does emphasize environmental control and human relations training. Such arguments would be erroneous, as all differences were very slight and nonsignificant. These findings do not provide concrete evidence of treatment effect thus suggesting the need for further research. Wheeler and Munz (1985) analyzed the effects of a widely used program for the treatment of stress in two separate studies. The results that they obtained suggested that some beneficial changes came about from such training, but the specific reasons are difficult to assess. They used the POMS as one of their measures and reported improvement on only four of those scales.

It is evident from the studies above and from the present study, that the utility of the POMS for use with police stress management workshop groups and other stress reduction studies is questionable. The POMS does not appear to be sensitive enough to measure
those subtle changes brought about by such training. Perhaps physiological measures, work performance measures, and other self-report psychological measures could be used. A difficulty in doing such studies with policemen is that many times they are not willing to give even minor commitment to participate. The cost benefit ratio perceived by the policemen in such studies needs to be examined, and ways should be found to help them view participation as positive rather than as an aversive endeavor.

Another possible reason for the negative results found in this study is that the particular methodology employed by the teacher is not a valid or sufficient way to present the material needed in order to change habit patterns of policemen. Future studies should utilize several teachers using the same method instead of one, in order to control for teacher variables. Then comparisons could be made between the results obtained from individual teachers, and thus the utility of this model could be better ascertained.

The ineffectiveness demonstrated by this teaching model might also be due to the fact that the time allocated for teaching was too short. Ten hours over a two-day period of time was ample to cover the subject
matter, but did not give time for practice of techniques and teacher feedback. Better results might have been obtained by spaced learning techniques, repetition, and retraining over a period of several weeks.

The results of this study might be further explained by selection factors used by police departments in recruiting. Extensive psychological testing is utilized, along with personal interviews, stress interviews, and physical agility tests. Spielberger (1979) states that the major goal of such selection is to screen out misfits and to target job performance criteria. What results from such testing is a homogeneous group of persons who are selected for their ability to act responsibly under extremely stressful circumstances. It could be argued that participation in a stress management course is another example of already highly professional individuals striving to behave more competently and professionally. Such persons come to the program not because they are incompetent or in trouble with their lives, but precisely because they are in charge of themselves in most areas of life. Changes would thus be very small for such "in control" persons. The homogeneous quality of the personalities of the groups studied and the effects of the selection
factor in the area studied, were made evident by the inclusion of the academy group and the similarity of the scores obtained by all three groups. It seems logical that the relative stability of the scores found in this study indicates that the local police departments have generally done a very good job of selecting persons who are emotionally stable.

The study was further affected by the size of the groups. It was intended that this study include a much larger N. It appeared at the beginning of the study that it would be possible to have a larger N, but as time went on and discussions with representatives from police departments were undertaken, it seemed for a while that it would not be possible to achieve the minimum N of 20 that had been set by the doctoral advisory committee. Earlier in this study the factors which kept the N low were discussed. Other factors should also be mentioned. Many policemen exhibit a trait which is adaptive for adequate job functioning, that of suspiciousness, but which also makes it difficult for them to cooperate with anyone from outside the department. Several larger city police departments were approached regarding participation, but declined, giving the excuse that the policemen's union
would not allow such studies. Some of those larger departments cited shift difficulties, work schedules, and a lack of interest in supporting the work of "outsiders." Outsiders meant researchers who are not policemen. A larger group in the study, perhaps 125 or more in each of the control and experimental groups, would have made it possible to analyze the six specific subfactors of the POMS, using the analysis of covariance technique, and might thus have produced a stronger study. Perhaps that would be possible in a future study.

The Coulson Police Job Stress Discussionaire, which was used as a discussion instrument in identifying and pinpointing specific concerns of workshop participants, proved useful. It seemed to meet the needs of the policemen in clarifying where they had control in making changes and where they did not. Tables 10 through 18 which list samples of the stressors identified by class participants, are presented in Appendix F.

A chief of police who participated as an observer for one day of the workshop made the criticism that there was a need for the workshop leader to identify very clearly the strategies which facilitate change. He also noted that some of the officers were using the time as
a "gripe session." Much of what he suggested was very helpful. His suggestions indicate a need for more than the ten-hour time frame which was utilized so that more discussion of individual concerns might be provided. He also seemed very sensitive to comments made which were critical of administration. In future workshops it might be helpful to segregate administrative police officers from lower-ranking officers.
Summary and Recommendations:

This study explored the stress phenomena in general, and specifically stress as it affects police officers. A plan for teaching stress reduction and an instrument called the Coulson Police Job Stress Discussionaire were developed out of the background study for this work. This instrument had been offered previously for use in a preliminary form of development, and had been used in workshops in California and in Canada. This was the first time it had been used in a research design. Better understanding of its specific qualities was gained during this study.

The findings of this study suggest the need for more research on the effectiveness of stress reduction programs. Many resources are being funneled into such programs in all sectors of the work force. The improvement of these programs is cost effective in terms of human resource utilization, resulting, it is hoped, in increased productivity and a more humane work setting. Conversely it could be argued that poorly designed programs might actually decrease the effectiveness of efforts aimed at employee satisfaction, comfort, and productivity.
The program used in this study is typical of stress management programs that one finds available commercially. That program emphasized a cognitive approach to behavioral control of the environment, provided policemen with information on how to be more assertive in their behavior toward other people and the use of relaxation techniques. It was somewhat unique in that those standard methods were tailored to the specific needs of policemen. While the Profile of Mood States instrument seemed inadequate for the purpose of measuring changes brought about by stress management training of policemen, there was at least some face validity that stress was lessened for some participants. It was not clear whether the method was effective or not and it is unknown what would have been found using other measures. For that reason, the study probably should be repeated using other measures which are more sensitive to change.

Spielberger et al. (1981) and Lawrence (1979) have attempted to measure specific stressors in police work. Future studies might explore ways of utilizing the instruments they developed in measuring the effectiveness of stress prevention workshops. Both of those instruments have specific inherent difficulties which make them difficult to score; so some adaptation would be required.
Policemen are vital to an orderly society and society has both an obligation and an overwhelming self-interest in maintaining the health of those individuals who are the first line of defense for the protection of basic human rights. It is hoped that this paper has contributed to our knowledge of the needs of those very important people.
The Coulson Police Job Stress Discussionaire is a copyrighted instrument. The copyright is held by the author and the instrument is published by Practical Innovations Press, 12890 Hillcrest, Suite 200, Dallas, Texas 75230. The following pages include a facsimile of that instrument for reference purposes only. For further information concerning the test and its use, please contact the author.
THE COULSON

POLICE JOB STRESS

DISCUSSIONAIRE

The questions contained inside this booklet are designed to help police officers identify areas of stress in their lives. By this process, the individual may be able to design a program of remediation and prevention, thus rendering police work less stressful, and more enjoyable.
Stressful events are a class of happenings in the individual's life which induce harmful biological and psychological changes. Circumstances which are experienced as unusually demanding on the body systems may cause pain, diminished functioning, and in some circumstances, even cause death. It is important for each individual to identify his own stressors, and to learn how to control them. This instrument is designed for helping you in that process of stressor identification. This instrument will be used for structuring the discussions which will follow.

IN THE BLANK SPACES UNDER EACH DEFINITION LIST ASPECTS OF THAT CATEGORY WHICH YOU FIND PERSONALLY DISTRESSING IN YOUR SITUATION

I. City Administration: Those persons who make decisions and rules for the city, and who also decide fiscal (financial) policy for all city departments including the police department.

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 

II. Community/Citizen Relationships: Interactions of police officers with civilian individuals in an official work-related capacity.

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5.
III. Criminal Justice System: The system which is charged with evaluating a person's guilt or innocence when accused of a crime, and also charged with seeing that prescribed penalties are applied. This system includes juries, judges, lawyers, police officers, probation officers, parole officers, and prison officials.

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 

IV. Equipment: Those items given to the police officer for his or her use in fulfilling assigned duties.

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 
V. Family Relationships: Interpersonal relationships that the police officer has with his wife, children, parents, brothers, sisters, and other relatives.

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5. 

VI. Peer Relationships: Interpersonal interactions by police officers with other police officers who have similar job responsibilities.

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
5.
VII. Recreation/Off Duty Activities: Activities which occur when the police officer is not at his regular police department job, including sports activities, outdoor recreation, church organizations, social/fraternal organizations, and "moonlighting" or extra employment engaged in for whatever reason.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

VIII. Supervisory Relationship: Interactions by the police officer with police officers of higher rank who make decisions about that policemans job responsibilities.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.
IX. Work Tasks: Those duties which are assigned to the police officer as a part of his job responsibilities.

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.
APPENDIX B
DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Code #______________

Sex: _______________  Age: _________________________

Number of Years as a Police Officer: ________________

Marital Status:
Never married____  Currently married___ Separated___
Currently divorced____

Total number of times married 1____ 2___ 3____ 4 or more____

Children:
Living at home (sex and ages):_________

Living with someone other than self (sex and ages):_____  

Number of hours worked weekly as policeman ______

Number of hours worked weekly on extra job ______

Nature of off-duty employment ________________

I engage in the following off-duty recreation on a regular basis:__________________________

I engage in the following off-duty recreation on an irregular basis:__________________________
Use of Human Subjects

Statement by Principal Investigator or Activity Director

A. Activity Director: Jesse E. Coulson
B. Activity Title: Dissertation
C. Department: Higher Education
D. Phone: (214) 458-8333 or (214) 463-5949
E. Date Submitted: 10-8-85

F. 1. Police Officers (volunteer)  
   2. Training for Stress Prevention  
      Pre-post Test Psychological Measurement of Mood States  
   3. No risks identified  
   4. Not Applicable  
   5. Information will be collected in a blind format  
   6. Subjects will benefit by gaining information on  
      how to manage his/hers own stress  
   7. Risk benefit ratio advantageous to subject  
G. 1. Information provided will be the effects of a training  
      procedure on the police officer's ability to manage  
      his/hers own stress level  
   2. This cannot be obtained by use of animals  
   3. There is no good alternative way to obtain this  
      information  
   4. Participation is voluntary  
   5. Subjects may withdraw  
   6. Free in-service class - but no other incentives

SIGNATURE of  
SUBMISSION

Principal Investigator or  
Activity Director
STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT

You have volunteered to participate in a study which will measure the effects of a new training model for managing job stress. Any information given by you will be pooled so that you cannot be identified individually.

Three instruments will be given to you: (1) You will be asked to answer a questionnaire which asks for some basic data (2) You will be asked to identify stressors that are particularly your own and (3) You will be asked to answer a questionnaire which measures feelings. The questions asked may seem personal to you, but they are necessary in order to obtain the information needed to complete this study. Your completion of the study will help us compile the data in a relevant manner. You may withdraw from participation in the study at anytime, although it is hoped that you will continue to completion.

If you have any questions about the procedures used or the results obtained by the study, I will be glad to discuss them with you.

It is hoped that you will gain much insight into how you mismanage your own stress and that you will learn new worthwhile strategies for stress prevention and reduction.

Jesse E. Coulson, Instructor
A Stress Reduction Workshop
For Police Officers

SESSION ONE: General Stress Factors

I. Introduction to materials and get acquainted  15 minutes

II. Define stress  15 minutes
   A. Selye
   B. Others

III. Discuss general effects of stress  30 minutes
   A. Psychological
   B. Physiological

IV. Discuss effects of stress in police work  30 minutes
   A. Specifics from literature

V. Developing a framework for change: Discuss specific stress reduction techniques  60 minutes
   A. Cognitive change
   B. Behavioral change
   C. Relaxation
   D. Therapy

SESSION TWO: Community Factors in Police Stress

I. Criminal justice system
   A. Define the problem - Lecture  15 minutes
   B. Identify the stressors - Discussion  15 minutes
   C. Applying the techniques - Role play  30 minutes
II. City administration
   A. Define the problem - Lecture 15 minutes
   B. Identify the stressors - Discussion 15 minutes
   C. Applying the techniques - Role play 30 minutes
III. Community-citizen relationships
   A. Define the problem - Lecture 15 minutes
   B. Identify the stressors - Discussion 15 minutes
   C. Applying the techniques - Role play 30 minutes

SESSION THREE: Specific Work Factors in Police Stress
I. Supervision and supervisors
   A. Define the problem 15 minutes
   B. Identify the stressors - Discussion 15 minutes
   C. Applying the techniques - Role play 30 minutes
II. Equipment
   A. Define the problem 15 minutes
   B. Identify the stressors - Discussion 15 minutes
   C. Applying the techniques - Role play 30 minutes
III. Work assignment
   A. Define the problem 15 minutes
   B. Identify the stressors - Discussion 15 minutes
   C. Applying the techniques - Role play 30 minutes

SESSION FOUR: Dealing With Off-Duty Stress Factors
I. Family Factors
   A. Define the problem 15 minutes
I. Family Factors - Continued
   B. Identify the stressors - Discussion  15 minutes
   C. Applying the techniques - Role play  30 minutes

II. Peers and friendships
   A. Define the problem  15 minutes
   B. Identify the stressors - Discussion  15 minutes
   C. Applying the techniques - Role play  30 minutes

III. Recreation and off duty
   A. Define the problem  15 minutes
   B. Identify the stressors - Discussion  15 minutes
   C. Applying the techniques - Role play  30 minutes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>PRE-TEST M</th>
<th>PRE-TEST SD</th>
<th>POST-TEST M</th>
<th>POST-TEST SD</th>
<th>CHANGE IN M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tension-Anxiety</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>9.29</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>+ .10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression-Dejection</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>- .76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger-Hostility</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>+ 1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigor-Activity</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>17.57</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>+ .14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue-Inertia</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>+2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion-Bewilderment</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>+0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL MOOD DISTURBANCE INDEX</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>32.13</td>
<td>21.48</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>+2.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8

**Summary of Means and Standard Deviations on Profile of Mood States Variables Field Veterans Control Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>PRE-TEST</th>
<th>POST-TEST</th>
<th>CHANGE IN M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension-Anxiety</td>
<td>11.33</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>9.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression-Dejection</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger-Hostility</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>12.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigor-Activity</td>
<td>17.19</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>16.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue-Inertia</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>8.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion-Bewilderment</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MOOD DISTURBANCE</strong></td>
<td><strong>33.62</strong></td>
<td><strong>36.59</strong></td>
<td><strong>29.38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 9

**Summary of Means and Standard Deviations**

on Profile of Mood States Variables

**Academy Control Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>PRE-TEST</th>
<th>POST-TEST</th>
<th>CHANGE IN M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension-Anxiety</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>11.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression-Depression</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger-Hostility</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>8.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vigor-Activity</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>18.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue-Inertia</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>10.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion-Bewilderment</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL MOOD DISTURBANCE INDEX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRE-TEST</th>
<th>POST-TEST</th>
<th>CHANGE IN M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>30.06</td>
<td>23.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 10

Sample of Stressors Listed

On The Coulson Police Job Stress Discussionaire

Under Topic: City Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stressor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Changing important job functions without asking for police input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demanding more education and better training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cutting back on personnel and salary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Funds allocated to Department but not given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mayor being insensitive and indecisive regarding grievances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Use of policemen as delivery service for City Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Lack of concern for police officer's survival and safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Career path for sworn personnel used to punish instead of reward.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 11

Sample Of Stressors Listed
On The Coulson Police Job Stress Discussionaire
Under Topic: Community/Citizen Relationships

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Newspaper has tendency to report police happenings in a derogatory manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Lack of respect for the uniform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Having to be pleasant to argumentative citizens when having to issue traffic citations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Stereotyping policemen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Having to answer and talk on the telephone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Having to contact persons that you know nothing about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Parents telling children: &quot;Don't be bad or disobey me or this police officer will put you in jail.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 12**

Sample Of Stressors Listed

On The Coulson Police Job Stress Discussionaire

Under Topic: Criminal Justice System

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nonprosecution of crimes even though evidence is present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Repeated probation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lowered charges, plea bargaining, cases dismissed on technicality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The fact that sometimes good-looking women and middle aged, upper class people are found not guilty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Juries are never allowed to hear all of the facts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bleeding heart liberal judges, juries and lawyers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Having to work on days off testifying in court and issuing subpoenas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>No cooperation in the total criminal justice system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(police departments, courts, probation and parole officers and prison system).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 13
Sample Of Stressors Listed
On The Coulson Police Job Stress Discussionaire
Under Topic: Equipment

1. Old and worn out equipment.
2. Unreliable and unsafe patrol cars.
3. Inexpensive radios that do not scan.
4. Poor training in the use of equipment.
5. Malfunctions in patrol unit are not repaired when reported.
6. Inadequate police building.
7. Hand-held radios are not charged when you come on duty.
8. Officer must supply himself with his own personal equipment.
| 1. | Too little time with family due to rotating shifts. |
| 2. | Poor spending habits by my wife (inadequate salary). |
| 3. | Children's peers place high expectation on police officer's children. |
| 4. | Wife does not understand police work. Sees it as just driving around in a car. |
| 5. | Difficulty in disciplining my children. |
| 6. | My family worries about the dangers of the job. |
| 7. | My values regarding police work and my wife's values regarding the same are very different. |
| 8. | Inability to leave job issues at work. |
TABLE 15
Sample Of Stressors Listed
On The Coulson Police Job Stress Discussionaire
Under Topic: Peer Relationships

1. Few nonpolice friends.
2. Too much "buddy-buddy" look the other way.
3. Police officers see themselves as better than other people.
4. Other officers jump to conclusions about people.
5. Negativism.
7. Job too political - many officers are "brown nosers."
8. Inadequate reporting of information (particularly between shifts).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sample Of Stressors Listed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On The Coulson Police Job Stress Discussionaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Under Topic: Recreation/Off-Duty Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I have no &quot;real&quot; off-duty recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Everyone knows you are police. They stay away from you or expect you to solve their personal problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Other people can't &quot;be themselves&quot; around you because you are police.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I am very tired because I work part-time in addition to my police job. I often get called back to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Going to church and seeing the same people that were drunk Saturday night.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Religious activities are stressful (don't trust preachers and small children make me nervous).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I am too competitive in my athletic activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>&quot;Who in the hell has time for recreation&quot;?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 17
Sample Of Stressors Listed
On The Coulson Police Job Stress Discussionaire
Under Topic: Supervisory Relationship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stressor Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My sergeant's temper is too quick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Supervisors think that patrolmen are idiots and unqualified to make decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Supervisors flaunt their position, are overbearing, and enforce rules by fear and intimidation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Supervisors operate on a double standard regarding rules and regulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Supervisors never give praise, but are only critical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Supervisors don't give me credit for what I know and the good job that I do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>My supervisor is a Yankee and has some old-fashioned ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Supervisors make decisions often without adequate information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 18

Sample Of Stressors Listed
On The Coulson Police Job Stress Discussionaire
Under Topic: Work Tasks

1. I hate working accidents because they are caused by lack of attention, ignorance and stupidity.
2. Family disturbance calls create much stress for me.
3. Delivering death notices and working funerals.
5. Insignificant tasks like dead animals and dog calls.
6. Being asked to check septic tanks.
7. Boredom and periods of all night quiet.
8. "Officer needs assistance" calls are scary and stressful.
January 17, 1985

Mr. Jesse E. Coulson
12890 Hillcrest at L.B.J.
Suite #200
Dallas, TX 75230

Dear Jess:

I would like to tell you how much we appreciate all the years you have helped us at the Texoma Police Academy.

We are constantly getting good reports about your method of instruction.

We hope that you will continue to help us as you have in the past, because our training program would not be the same without your help.

Thanks again for your help.

Sincerely,

Jerry Bardwell
Police Academy Director

JB/tas
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