2017

A Phenomenological Study of Correctional Officers' Perceived Emotions on the Job

Heather Susan Grammatico
Walden University

Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Heather Grammatico

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. James Herndon, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty
Dr. William Czander, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Christopher Bass, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University
2017

Abstract

A Phenomenological Study of Correctional Officers' Perceived Emotions on the Job

by

Heather Susan Grammatico

MS, Walden University, 2012

BS, Park University, 2000

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Forensic Psychology

Walden University

June 2017

Abstract

Correctional officers work in a stressful environment and are regularly exposed to dangerous and emotionally charged situations. Researchers have detailed the potential negative outcomes of this occupation, yet little research has examined the extent to which correctional officers experience emotion while on their shifts, and how those emotions may translate into stress, divorce, substance abuse issues, domestic violence, and high mortality rates upon retirement. The purpose of this phenomenological study was to learn how correctional officers experience their felt and expressed emotions while at work. Data collection was done using a 15-item open ended questionnaire designed by the researcher and accessed via an online website. The 15-item questionnaire was prescreened by correctional officers not participating in the survey to assure for trustworthiness. Anonymous online survey data was collected from 23 correctional custody staff members working throughout California. The responses from the survey were coded and analyzed using NVivo and Survey Monkey software to account for reoccurring themes in the data. The findings of this study show a high percentage of respondent's report feelings of anxiety throughout a shift at work. Further, the findings show that the participants consistently report a disconnect between felt and expressed emotions while at work. These findings may be used to reform training programs for correctional officers to offer them better ways to process the emotions they experience throughout their career.

A Phenomenological Study of Correctional Officers' Perceived Emotions on the Job

by

Heather Susan Grammatico

MS, Walden University, 2012

BS, Park University, 2000

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Forensic Psychology

Walden University

June 2017

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents, Mike and Karen Celani. It is not possible to convey the amount of support they have given me throughout my life. One does not travel down the road that leads them to a doctoral degree without an immense amount of self-confidence and belief that all things are possible. I have that self-confidence and belief because of my parents. When you have been told since birth that you can accomplish anything, you do.

This dissertation is dedicated to my children Josh and Skylar. Thank you for sacrificing you time with me so that I could sit and write for hours on end. I hope that seeing your mom accomplish this goal illustrates to you that you can do anything in this world with hard work and determination.

This dissertation is dedicated to my husband Tony. Thank you for pushing me and never letting me quit on any of the millions of occasions I wanted to. I know the ups and downs I experienced throughout this journey were not always fun. I could not have finished this without your unwavering love and support.

This dissertation is dedicated to correctional custody staff throughout California. You do a dangerous and thankless job with very little recognition. I hope this research serves as a vessel to start effecting change in an occupation that is greatly needed but often overlooked. Thank you for your support and candor during the process of this research.

Acknowledgments

I wanted to take a moment and acknowledge all those that have assisted me in this dissertation process. First, I would like to say thank you to my dissertation chair, Dr. James Herndon. I have never been challenged and pushed harder by anyone in my life. I am honored to have been given the opportunity to learn from you. Your knowledge and expertise have been invaluable to me throughout this process.

Thank you to Dr. William Czander. Dr. Czander served as the qualitative research expert on my committee and I appreciate your expertise and insight through the process.

I went through this dissertation process in a cohort of individuals all being chaired by Dr. Herndon. Several of those individuals have finished this process before me and have helped me along the way. I wanted to say a special thank you to Dr. Ellen Chism. Without her support and guidance, I am not sure I would have completed this process. I appreciate you working with me and letting me know it could be done if I just pressed on. To the rest of you in my dissertation cohort, thank you for the support, the advice, and the knowledge that I was not in this alone.

Finally, I would like to thank my "soul sister" Dr. Kristy Donaldson. We met early in this process when we both had no clue what we had gotten into. We have shared many laughs, and many cuss words (mostly mine) along the crazy road that is dissertation. I am positive I would not have completed this process without you walking this road with me.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

They work behind locked doors, in gun towers, behind razor wire and electric fences, and are locked away for their shifts along with the convicted criminals they are sworn to secure. The job of correctional officer is hard to define. They are tasked with the security, safety, movement, daily needs, and general well-being of society's felons (Brimeyer, Delprino, & Hepner, 2005). Researchers have shown that correctional officers are often faced with the paradox of dealing with conflicting roles and conflicting emotions on the job (Tracy, 2004). Specifically, researchers have reported that the traits required to work as a safe and effective correctional officer may also cause some of the negative stressors experienced by correctional officers (Brimeyer et al., 2005). Issues such as high mortality rates, high divorce rates, high suicide rates, substance abuse issues, and domestic violence are often reported in the literature detailing the corrections occupation (Shwartz & Lavitas, 2012). In this study, I addressed the emotions experienced by correctional officers on the job and how those emotions contribute to the quality of the correctional officer's private life.

Background of the Study

Typing in the term "correctional officer" in any search engine will yield an extensive body of literature regarding the prison environment, correctional staff, the relationship between inmate and officer, and how prison affects both the officer and the inmate. For example, Altheimer, Logan, and Lambert (2005) discussed the types of support systems needed for correctional officers to lower their stress levels. They found that though support in the personal lives of officers was important, significant support

systems at work were needed to lower stress levels (Altheimer et al., 2005). In another study, researchers looked at the correlation between job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment as it related to burnout in correctional officers (Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker-Gail, & Baker, 2010). These researchers discovered that job stress in correctional officers had a positive relationship to depersonalization and emotional exhaustion at work (Griffin et al., 2010). Though there are volumes to be read regarding the prison experience, there is very little written regarding how correctional officers themselves feel about working within a prison. That is, there is a gap in the literature regarding the emotions experienced by correctional officers (from the perspective of the correctional officers), and how the officers feel those emotions affect their overall quality of life.

The correctional environment is unlike other work environments in that correctional custody staff enter and work within the same physical environment used to house convicted criminals. Throughout their shifts, correctional officers are required to observe and interact with incarcerated, often violent individuals, return home, and then come back next shift and repeat the process (Tracy, 2004). To be successful in a rigid, sterile, unpredictable environment, correctional officers must adapt their work persona, emotions, and affect to be effective (Tracy, 2005).

Emotional labor is a concept often discussed in research regarding correctional officers (Tracy, 2005). Emotional labor is the process by which an individual manages their true feelings or emotions while displaying the “organizationally desired” emotions (Mesmer-Magnus, DeChurch, & Wax, 2012). Research has shown that the use of

emotional labor can have harmful consequences for the individual using it (Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2012). Tracy examined officers working at a women's prison and described what she referred to as their emotional labor as they were forced to stifle emotions that they may have been experiencing because of the prison atmosphere (Tracy, 2005). For example, when an officer arrives on the scene of an inmate altercation, the officer may feel empathy for the inmate assaulted; however, the officer does not express or process the emotional response they are having. Instead, the officers respond by securing the scene and enacting any disciplinary measures required. The officer's tone and demeanor will reflect what is expected within the institutions, but may be contradictory to what the officer is feeling (Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2012). Thus, it is possible this suppression may cause the officer distress (Tracy, 2005). Tracy concluded that emotional labor could be a source of stress for the correctional officer because what they are feeling and what they portray are often contradictory (2005).

The emotions experienced by correctional officers can have potentially negative effects on their families (Crawley, 2002). This is evidenced in a qualitative ethnographic study regarding the potential impact of correctional officer's occupation on their personal lives (Crawley, 2002). Crawly (2002) interviewed officers working in six English prisons, as well as their families, over a 2-year period. Both officers and their family members reported a marked change in officers' personalities from how they were prior to working in an institution to the present time (Crawley, 2002). Further, officers indicated that they were much more suspicious, alert, and rigid than they had been in the past

(Crawley, 2002). Crawley's research showed that the emotions and experiences of the officers inside the institution can carry over into their daily lives (2002).

In yet another study that targeted a specific aspect of emotion in correctional officers, Farkas (2000) researched officers' prison "personae" In the study of 79 correctional officers at two medium security prisons, Farkas found that officers adhere to distinct personalities or personas while working within the prison. Using extensive surveys and questionnaires, Farkas found that the personas used by officers generally fall into a few distinct categories. The most common category is referred to as the *rule enforcer*. The rule enforcer persona is one that is rigid and follows the institutional rules to the letter. These individuals do not allow personal thought or opinion to dictate any decisions made at work. They are rigid and adhere strictly to the structure of the institution. However, Farkas found that those who adopt the rule enforcer persona may have a distinctly different personality outside of the prison work environment. Farkas concluded that the prison setting required the officers to adopt a persona to be effective while at work; thus, the use of a persona that is incongruent with the officer's true personality could be a specific cause of stress in correctional officers.

In summary, correctional officers must maintain a high level of vigilance while being strict and rigid during their daily shifts (Brimeyer et al., 2005). These emotions may be cause for alarm and confusion in officers (Tracy, 2005). The current literature addresses organizational structure, emotional labor, and the rigidity of the prison as sources of personal conflict and stress for correctional officers. However, there is a void

in the literature regarding how correctional officers view their own emotions during their time within the walls, and how they feel those emotions may affect their quality of life.

Problem Statement

Correctional officers work in a unique environment. Their occupation requires that they work within the same walls that are designed to house society's most dangerous criminals (Brimeyer, Delprino, & Hepner, 2005). In addition, correctional officers have little to no interaction with the public, and are often portrayed in a negative light by the media (Brimeyer et al., 2005). High levels of stress along with high rates of divorce and domestic violence have been reported in the lives of correctional officers (Brimeyer et al., 2005). Further, correctional officers have the second highest mortality rate of any occupation, and their life expectancy is just 58 years old (Shwartz & Lavitas, 2012). In this study, I looked at the emotions experienced by correctional officers on the job and how those emotions may contribute to the quality of correctional officers' private lives.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to learn what types of emotions correctional custody staff experience throughout their shifts at correctional institutions, and how these emotions affect their private and professional lives. Officers may experience a variety of emotions throughout their shifts, and these emotions could have profound long-term effects on their quality of life (Tracy, 2004). In this study, I was able to gain a better understanding of the emotions experienced by correctional officers while on the job. The published literature has shown that correctional officers are among the most highly stressed professionals of any occupation (Shwartz & Lavitas, 2012). Understanding the

emotions experienced throughout a shift by correctional custody staff can contribute to further research and/or additional training methods that will serve to help officers better manage the emotions they experience. If officers have a better understanding of what they are feeling during a shift, then they can use coping strategies to deal with these emotions prior to them manifesting in negative symptomology. The results of this study will provide the correctional community with better insight as to how the emotions experienced on the job are effecting the overall quality of life of correctional custody staff, thus laying the groundwork for further research in this area.

Research Questions

Research Question 1 (RQ1): What emotions do correctional officers experience throughout a shift within a prison?

Research Question 2 (RQ2): What emotions do correctional officers allow himself/herself to show while at work?

Research Question 3 (RQ3): What negative symptoms in her or his private life do the officers attribute to the emotions experienced on the job?

Conceptual Framework

In this study, I investigated the emotions experienced by correctional officers and how officers exhibit or portray those emotions. The framework for this study is built on the premise that correctional officers feel any number of emotions throughout their shifts, that that they make choices based on their needs regarding what emotions they will physically display, and that the emotions they experience may not be congruent with the displayed emotions. The concepts that drove this research are supported by several

theories regarding emotion. Glasser's choice or control theory and Schacter's theory of emotion help to develop a framework for understanding the incongruent emotions displayed by correctional officers (see William Glasser Institute, 2010). Individuals are controlled by internal stimulus and not external events, and they make choices to respond or behave in specific ways based on the desired outcome (Glasser, 2006). In this study, I addressed whether correctional officers experienced negative symptoms (depression, high mortality rates, substance abuse, domestic violence, and high divorce rates) because of the incongruent emotions they felt and the emotions they chose to express. I used choice theory and Schacter's theory of emotion to explain the possible negative effects of exhibiting incongruent emotion. For example, if a correctional officer feels empathy towards an inmate, then he or she may want to exhibit that emotion. However, the conceptual framework holds that the officer will make a choice based on what will meet his or her needs, and thus may compel the correctional officer to decide that it is in his or her best interest to act according to the organizational norms of the institution. Thus, though the officer may feel a contradictory emotion, he or she will choose to exhibit an emotion that is in accordance with what will benefit him or her on the job (Glasser, 2006).

Schachter's theory of emotion also provides a framework for understanding the negative symptoms experienced by correctional officers. (Reisenzein, 1983). The Schachter theory of emotion holds that there are two components that make up an individual's emotional response: a physiological response and a cognitive response (Reisenzein, 1983). Specifically, Schachter proposed that an individual experiences a

physiological stimulus or arousal, but that it is "non-descript," and only through a cognitive process does the individual exhibit a specific emotional response (Reisenzein, 1983). According to Schachter, a specific emotion cannot occur without both responses. I used Schachter's theory to help illustrate the internal dialogue between physiological and cognitive responses that conflict within a correctional officer prior to the display of any emotion.

I developed the conceptual framework for this study to address the need for a clear understanding of what emotions correctional officers experience and how the officers decide which emotions to display. The research questions I developed speak directly to the conceptual framework and were designed to elicit what officers feel at work and what officers allow themselves to exhibit.

Nature of the Study

This was a qualitative, phenomenological study. A qualitative approach was the most beneficial for the research because there was no definitive hypothesis proposed. Qualitative research is often used when the researcher is exploring a topic and looking for potential variables (Creswell, 2009). Current research has indicated that correctional officers experience negative symptoms and conflicting emotions regarding working within correctional environments (Tracy, 2005). In addition, there is some research that has pointed to emotional labor as a potential source of the negative symptoms experienced by correctional officers (Farkas, 2002). However, there is a gap in the literature regarding how correctional officers view the emotions they experience and potential effects of those emotions. Thus, I conducted a qualitative study to explore

correctional officer emotions from the perspective of the officer. For the purposes of the study, emotions are defined as the feelings an officer expresses physically or verbally. Examples of emotions include happiness, joy, sadness, anger, confusion, or fear. In addition, the physical prison environment was defined as the locked physical structure that officers work within.

I used the qualitative method to gain a clearer understanding of the specific emotions and experiences that correctional officers encounter while on duty within the physical prison environment. In addition, I determined that a qualitative research study was the most appropriate for gaining a better understanding of how officers handle those emotions and if those emotions carry over into the officers' personal lives. I addressed the theories that have been developed regarding emotion and emotional labor. Issues such as the organizational structure, emotional labor, management support, family support, work conditions, and co-worker support are all issues that have been previously researched and addressed on the topic of correctional officers. These issues serve as a starting point from which I conducted this study.

Definitions

Emotion: The feeling aspect of consciousness. Characterized by three elements, a certain psychological arousal, a behavior that reveals the feeling to the outside world, and an inner awareness of the feeling (Ciccarelli & White, 2012).

Emotional labor: The display of emotions that are defined and controlled by what is seen as acceptable in the workplace (Miller, Considine, & Gardner, 2007).

Correctional officer: A sworn peace officer responsible for overseeing and securing individuals who have been arrested and are awaiting trial or who have been sentenced to serve time in jail or prison. Most often working within a jail or prison facility (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015).

Correctional custody staff: Staff members in a correctional facility who have direct contact with inmates. This job classification often includes all ranks besides management (CDCR.GOV, 2015).

Assumptions

I assumed that all participants in the study were full time employees of any correctional institution in the State of California. The participants were all believed to be correctional custody staff having direct inmate contact throughout their shifts and who all worked in a level 1-4 facility. I assumed that, given their position as correctional custody staff, participants had all been to a correctional training academy, had a psychological evaluation, and gone through a background check prior to hire. Further, I assumed that all participants answered the questions provided as honestly and directly as possible.

Scope and Delimitations

In the study, I focused on the emotions experienced and displayed by correctional custody staff at prisons located within the state of California. The sample of participants was assumed to represent the vast ethnic, age, gender, and geographical population that make up the correctional custody staff employed at correctional institutions in the State of California. Though the data collection tool was made available to anyone working in corrections in California, I assumed that it did not reach all potential participants, and

may not represent all types of institutions in California. The study participants may not have included individuals from every race or geographic background working in corrections in California.

Limitations

One limitation to the study was the potential for a participant to be reluctant to share information on the questionnaire. It was possible that participants could embellish or distort their answers. Clear directions were given prior to distribution of the questionnaires to help to safeguard against this. I took precautions to maintain confidentiality, and all participants were informed that the study was confidential. However, participants may have felt that their responses could potentially have adverse effects at work. Another potential limitation was that officers may not have been willing to elaborate or fully disclose the personal issues surrounding emotions.

Significance of the Study

All the relevant research related to correctional officers makes mention of the high levels of stress and the potential for adverse personal issues in relation to the occupation of corrections. High levels of mortality shortly after retirement, substance abuse, domestic violence, high levels of divorce, and high rates of suicide are all consistently referred to in correctional research (Brimeyer et al., 2005). Family members consistently discuss a “change” in the behavior or personality and a lack of empathy in their loved ones working in corrections (Crawley, 2002).

This study addressed how officers said they felt during their shifts, and addressed whether those emotions were congruent with the emotions they express or, if emotional

labor was occurring. The results of this study can serve as a starting point for future studies that could address the potential damage of expressing inauthentic emotions. Corrections departments can use the results of this study to develop training and programs to help offset the adverse effects of the emotions officers experience in the correctional setting.

Summary and Transition

The correctional environment is unique and requires those who work in it to be immersed in a negative, cynical, and potentially dangerous environment daily (Brimeyer et al., 2002). Though the occupation of corrections serves a needed social purpose, the literature I reviewed for this study consistently depicted the occupation as involving many negative factors. Correctional officers enter their career after training in an academy setting, and learning the skills necessary to be an effective and safe correctional officer (CDCR, 2015). However, little is addressed in the academy regarding the emotional toll that the occupation of correctional officer can have on individuals and his or her private life. Further, the literature I reviewed indicated that the organizational structure of the corrections environment is not conducive to asking for assistance if the emotional toll becomes too great for the officers. In this study, I addressed the gaps in the literature regarding what the officers say they feel and what they express while on shift in the correctional institution.

In the following chapter, I review previous research on correctional officer stress and burnout, correctional officer occupations and the effects on their family, the typology

of correctional officers, emotional labor as it relates to correctional officers, and emotional dissonance and correctional officers.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The United States prison population as of December 2013 was 1,574,700 (Carson, 2014), which marked a 4% increase in the number of inmates incarcerated in federal or state institutions from 2012 to 2013 (Carson, 2014). The prison population of the United States is the highest in the world; thus, there is an abundance of research surrounding the field of corrections (Prisonstudies.org, 2014). Much of the literature has been focused on the stressors related to the field of corrections and the high burn out rate associated with correctional officers (Brimeyer et al., 2005). In the following literature review, I will detail the existing literature regarding how working within a prison setting can affect correctional officers' personal and family lives. I will discuss the body of literature as it relates to correctional officers' stress, burnout, negative family impact, and emotional labor. The literature I reviewed included the most current research relating to the emotions experienced by correctional officers on and off the job. The collective body of literature served as a background for the research study I conducted.

Literature Search Strategy

The databases I used to obtain peer-reviewed scholarly literature include PsycINFO, SAGE Premier, Academic Search Complete, PsycARTICLES, and ProQuest Central. I used keywords to search for relevant related literature. The keyword search consisted of the terms and phrases *correctional officer, corrections, stress, emotional labor, correctional officer stress, correctional officer emotions, prison guards, correctional custody staff, prison organizational structure, correctional organizational structure, law enforcement stress, law enforcement spillover stress, police stress, police*

and *emotional labor*. My search for *correctional officer stress* yielded the most literature, and I found the majority of the literature using SAGE Premier and Academic Search Complete. I found no specific literature found using the search words *correctional officer emotions*. I used research on emotional labor in the workforce, police and emotional labor, and correctional officer stress in much of the literature review.

Correctional Officer Stress and Burnout

Correctional officers experience stress at higher rates than individuals in many other occupations (Shwartz & Lavitas, 2012). There is an extensive body of research addressed to the potential variables that contribute to correctional officers' stress and the resulting symptoms. For example, researchers such as the Griffin et al. (2010) have addressed how job satisfaction and job stress can lead to high levels of burnout. Job stress is often discussed in the literature as a physical or emotional negative response to stressors (Griffin et al., 2010). In the field of corrections, examples of stressors could include role conflict, role ambiguity, role overload, and dangerousness. Correctional officers may feel that they receive conflicting orders, that they have unclear definitions regarding their expected role, that they do not have the resources at their disposal to complete tasks, or that their work environment is dangerous.

In their research, Griffin et al. noted that job stress very often leads to job burnout. Job burnout is one of the many potential side effects seen in correctional officers who report high levels of stress (Griffin et al., 2010). Griffin et al. looked at the dependent variables of the three indicators of job burnout (depersonalization, emotional exhaustion, and feeling of reduced sense of accomplishment) in relation to the independent variables

job stress, job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Their research, which was conducted at a private maximum-security facility for young offenders, showed that job burnout was correlated to high levels of job stress. That is, correctional officers who had reported high levels of stress with their job were found to have higher levels of burnout. In addition, the study found that officers who were highly dedicated to their job or who believed strongly in the mission of their employment suffered burnout at higher rates than those who looked at their job as a means of collecting a paycheck. Specifically, those who were highly dedicated to the occupation of corrections experienced negative emotions (dissatisfaction, burnout, job stress) when the job did not meet their expectation (Griffin et al., 2010).

This finding is significant in that it shows a negative correlation between job satisfactions and job burnout. Participants who reported job satisfaction were less likely to report emotional exhaustion or reduced sense of accomplishment. The Griffin et al. (2010) study showed that those correctional officers who felt a high level of satisfaction with their occupation were less likely to suffer burnout, and that job involvement, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment all had moderate negative correlations with the depersonalization component of burnout (Griffin et al., 2010). In contrast, job stress had a positive correlation to job burnout (Griffin et al., 2010). Griffin et al. were unable to support their hypothesis that job stress could accurately predict a sense of accomplishment in the workplace. Specifically, they found that the presence of stress did not automatically indicate that correctional officers did not feel accomplished in their

work. Their study showed that not all job stress resulted in job burnout; however, all job burnout contains components of job stress.

The Griffin et al. (2010) study was conducted using only 160 participants at one maximum-security Midwest prison. Larger sample sizes and more participating prisons would be beneficial to the validity of the results. Also, though Griffin et al. discussed stress and burnout in the occupation of corrections, they did not draw any conclusions regarding the emotions the correctional officers experience while on the job. The research I reviewed regarding correctional officer stress continues to report that corrections is a stressful occupation and that correctional officers experience high levels of stress and job burnout. It does not, however, offer any explanation regarding how the emotions experienced by the correctional officer's correlate to the high levels of stress. Griffin et al. called for further research in correctional officer stress and burnout, specifically as it relates to the unique environment in which correctional officers work and their potential motivations for working within the field of corrections (2010).

Correctional Occupations and the Effects on Officers' Families

The stressors of a correctional occupation are not exclusive to the work environment (Brimeyer et al., 2005). Correctional officers spend long hours at work. However, at some point they must exist outside the prison walls. Within the body of literature that has focused on corrections, there is limited research on how the correctional occupation affects the personal lives of the officers. High rates of divorce, domestic violence, and substance abuse are reported in correctional officers, suggesting

that the symptoms of correctional officer stress may have a negative impact on the family life of the officer (Brimeyer et al., 2005).

Lambert et al. (2014) conducted research addressing the type of organizational commitment an officer may have (affective or continuance) and the potential correlation between the three types of work-family conflict variables (time-based, strain-based, and behavior-based). The researchers defined organizational commitment as the bond the employee forms with the employing organization. Specifically, affective organizational commitment is defined as the positive relationship between an employee and the organization. This occurs when the employee feels a sense of pride and loyalty to the organization. In contrast, continuance organizational commitment refers to a commitment to the employer out of a sense of obligation or necessity. Lambert et al. discussed the relationship between these types of organizational commitment and the three types of work-family conflict. The results indicated that correctional officers who had high levels of affective commitment to their job had a negative correlation with work-family conflict; conversely, officers with high levels of continuance commitment had much higher levels of work-family conflict (Lambert et al., 2014). As in the Griffin et al. (2010) study, around 200 participants were surveyed at one prison site. Lambert et al. briefly addressed how conflicting emotions may elicit stress for the officer, and discussed how a correctional officer's suspicious nature at work may cause conflict in the home. Conversely, the home life expectation of being caring or nurturing within the family may cause conflict for the officer at work. Though Lambert et al. make mention of the potential emotional conflict an officer might face, their research centered on work-family

conflict within the constructs of affective and continuance organizational commitment. In summation, Lambert et al., found that correctional officers who feel positively about the occupation of corrections and the employing organization have lower levels of stress and work-home conflict. They concluded that the organizational commitment by the officer played a large role in the work-family conflict. Though the researchers were able to determine correlations between the organizational commitment of the officer and conflict at home, Lambert et al. called for further research in this area. Specifically, they indicated that research centered on understanding the role of organizational commitment in officer stress and work-home conflict would be valuable.

Other researchers have addressed the work-home conflict from the perspective of the spouse. Crawley (2002) published the results of her 6-year long ethnographic study of correctional officers and their spouses in which she sought to understand what effects working within a prison might have on the family life of the officer. She conducted numerous interviews, shadowed correctional officers while at work, and interviewed their spouses and children. Crawley reported that the correctional officers observed and interviewed were suspicious of individuals they encountered both in and out of the prison. These findings appear to be in line with the conclusions of Lambert et al. (2014) indicating that the suspicious nature of correctional officers may have an adverse effect on their family life. Crawley further reported that officers encouraged new recruits to adopt a "suspicious worldview" in the interest of security.

Previous and subsequent literature regarding correctional officers has included similar findings regarding the suspicious and untrusting nature of the correctional staff.

Specifically, Brimeyer et al. (2005) and Farkas (2002) both reported that correctional officers can exhibit suspicious or paranoid behaviors. Crawley (2002) reported that when speaking with the spouses of the correctional staff, many of them made similar statements regarding the personality changes observed in their spouses. Spouses reported that after a short time working within the prison, the officer's character became "suspicious" and "rigid," that the spouse had a "loss of affect" and became "hardened" and "desensitized." It should be noted that Crawley did touch on the theory of emotional labor and concluded that further research would be needed in this area to determine if the officer was suppressing or changing emotional expressions while on the job to fit the expected "norms" of a correctional officer.

Another of Crawley's (2002) findings was related to the idea of institutionalization and the correctional officer (2002). Crawley reported that the spouses interviewed described the correctional officer as institutionalized, rigid, unable to break routine even at home, and needed to maintain order and control even within their households. Brimeyer et al. (2005) reported findings along the same lines, explaining that the correctional officer is trained to be routine and suspicious of inmate behavior. Brimeyer et al. noted that the training given to correctional officers for them to be effective on the job may be counterproductive to a positive home life. Farkas (2002) reported similar findings in her study regarding the typology of the correctional officer. She found that correctional officers adhere to specific personality typologies, and one such typology is rigid and structured.

The Crawley (2002) study was the first research I identified as mentioning the use of emotional labor. She discussed the potential internal conflict that an officer may be struggling with regarding the emotions necessary to be an effective correctional officer and the emotions needed to be useful in family life. Crawley's ethnographic research and extensive interviews illustrate how the reportedly "rigid" personality trait of the correctional officer can lead to conflict and stress in the home. Though Crawley's research touched on the emotions experienced by correctional officers, further research specific to the emotions felt by correctional officers in the workplace needs to be conducted to determine if these feelings or conflicting emotions may be contributing to the high levels of stress in the occupation.

Typology of Correctional Officers

A subset of research within the field of corrections focuses on the typology of a correctional officer. This study looks at the personality types that correctional officers exhibit within the institution (Farkas, 2002). Research on the typology of the correctional officers is relevant in that it indicates that officers may adapt their personality to cope with the institutional setting. Literature regarding the typology of correctional officers is significant in illustrating the potential issues officer's face when experiencing conflicting emotions.

Tait (2011) conducted a study of male and female officers in both a men's and women's prison. The study was designed to look at the typology of correctional officers and their approach to care for the inmate population. Tait identified five distinct approaches to care within the prison: they were the "true carer, limited carer, old school,

conflicted, and damaged". Each of these typologies was found to have particular traits. Specifically, the "true carer" felt that their job description included assisting the inmate, listening to them, and attempting to make the inmate's situation better in some way. This typology of officer often volunteered for positions on smaller units where they had a better likelihood of effecting change. Also, this typology of officer is not unlike the typology described in the Farkas study. In the Farkas (2000) study, the officer most like the "true carer" is referred to as the "people worker." This officer is similar in typology to the "true carer", specifically, the "people worker", tends to work in not segregated units, feels his job is to be helpful, is less rigid and "by the book" than other officers, and is often older or female (Farkas. Though the typology is referred to by different names, the literature on this topic is consistent with the traits displayed by the officer.

The highest percentage of officers in both the Tait and Farkas studies fell into a typology that was referred to in the Tait study as "Old School" and in the Farkas study as "Rule Enforcer" (Farkas, 2000 & Tait, 2011). This typology of officer is similar to officers described in the Crawley study. These officers tend to be rigid, maintain order, help when inmate adheres to protocol, have a loyalty to their fellow officers, and to the structure of the institution (Farkas 2000 & Tait, 2011). Thus, the literature shows consistency in its findings of the typology of correctional custody staff. Though not all correctional officers fall into the rigid, rule following typology, this typology is consistently seen in high percentages in the body of literature regarding correctional officers. Further, any literature that has discussed the rigid or suspicious officer has done so in the context of high stress, high burnout, or family conflict.

Thus far, the literature has illustrated that correctional officers who have a high degree of loyalty or commitment to the organization tend to suffer the greatest level of stress or burnout when they feel the organization does not meet their expectations (Griffen et al., 2010). The research depicts officers who need clear cut directives, rules, order, chain of command, and structure within the institution to maximize their job performance. This character type is also mentioned in the Crawley literature when she discusses the structure and rigidity exhibited by officers in their home life (Crawley, 2002). Additionally, this structured personality typology is discussed by Farkas, 2000, Tait, 2011 and Brimeyer et al., 2005 as being necessary for the officer to safely and efficiently do their jobs within the prison. The literature may also be illustrating that the typology, emotions, or persona needed to be effective within a prison may conflict with the officer's real persona and emotions (Tait, 2011)

What has yet to be addressed is how officers may come to exhibit a particular typology, or why they might allow only certain emotions to be seen while inside the institution. Though Brimeyer et al., discusses training provided while in the correctional officer academy as a contributing factor to officer typology, other potential explanations need to be addressed through further research (2005). An additional explanation as to how officer typologies arise could be found in the phenomenon of emotional labor.

Emotional Labor as it Relates to Correctional Officers

Emotional Labor is the display of inauthentic emotions that are defined and controlled by what is acceptable in the workplace (Miller, Considine, & Gardner, 2007). Literature explains that emotional labor can be described as either "surface acting" or

"deep acting." "Surface acting" occurs when an individual displays an emotion they do not feel. For example, a correctional officer may respond to a cell in which one inmate has seriously beaten his cell mate. The officer may feel sad, scared, or sick, but he must display a control, calm, assertive, and authoritative presence in order effectively do his job. In contrast, another type of emotional labor is described in the literature as "deep acting. "Deep acting" occurs when the individual deceives himself as much as he deceives others (Miller, et al., 2007). For example, a new correctional officer starts work in a prison, this officer is not a suspicious individual but has been told in the academy to "watch his back while inside." While at work, the officer has told himself that every inmate is a potential threat, thus, he does not trust any inmate and is suspicious of all his interactions with inmates. He portrays these feelings by questioning their motives, and being hyper-vigilant while at work.

Miller et al., discussed the potential harm in emotional labor (2007). They suggest it is possible that when emotional labor is regularly used within the workplace that the individual may become inauthentic to their real self. This phenomenon is seen in interviews conducted by Crawley (2002). Crawley reported that many of the family members of officers explained that their spouse had "changed" after they started working within the prison, that they had become stricter, rigid, and had a need for order that they did not require prior to prison work (Crawley, 2002). Further, the Miller et al., study found that negative emotional labor is often necessary for an individual to be competent in their job (2007). An example given in the study was of the command presence needed by a Border Patrol Agent when approaching potential subjects (Miller et al., 2007). The

agent explained that though he may not be feeling particularly authoritative or brave it was important that he express that outwardly for his safety and the effectiveness of his duties.

The literature continues to paint a picture of the need for correctional officers to display certain emotions, to adhere to rigid constructs and to not allow themselves to show emotions that are contradictory to what is expected of them within the prison. This is further illustrated by qualitative research conducted regarding the emotional constructions that occur in correctional officers within the institutional setting (Tracy, 2004). Tracy did her research over an 11-month period within the confines of a prison and a county jail (2004). Her research consisted of over 170 research hours logged by conducting interviews, observing, shadowing, and attending training sessions (Tracy, 2004). This qualitative research study was designed in a "layered account" format and illustrates the data collected in a narrative non-fictional approach. The Tracy study touches on the experiences of correctional officers by detailing observations and interviews conducted with correctional officers. She discusses the incidents that officer's encounter regularly (fights, riots, attempted murders, throwing of feces and urine, sexual deviance) and the atmosphere (violent, cynical, hopeless, and paranoid) that the officers exist in while on their shifts. Tracy recounted example after example of emotional labor used by the officers and explained that it is often difficult for the officers to recount what their real emotion was during the incident (Tracy, 2004). Tracy argues in her research that correctional officers are highly stigmatized, cynical and suspicious (2004). Her research supports these claims and discusses that officers often use emotional labor to

conform their responses to the expectations of the organization (Tracy, 2004). Tracy explains that the organizational structure of the prison requires a constant contradiction of responses from the officers. (2004) For example, an officer is instructed to distrust inmates, to be unaffected by violence, extreme foul language, having feces thrown on them, being threatened with violence and witnessing deviant sexual acts. Officers are trained to remain in charge, under control, and not show weakness in during these incidents. Conversely, they are required to care for, protect, and facilitate rehabilitation for the inmates in their charge (Tarcy, 2004). Though the Tracy research discusses emotional labor, it does not delve into the specific emotions experienced by the correction officer or if the correctional officer is aware of the emotional labor occurring. The Tracy study is the only account I could find regarding what officers say they feel and experience on the job. It suggests the need for further research regarding the emotions experienced by correction custody staff. The Tracy research is the most conclusive in the body of literature regarding the emotional inconsistencies experienced by the correctional officer. The findings in the Tracy study lay the groundwork for further research regarding emotions experienced by correctional officers.

The state of discrepancy between felt and displayed emotions is referred to as emotional dissonance (van Gelderen, Bakker, Konijn, Demerouti, 2011). Emotional dissonance can occur when an officer is forced to partake in emotional labor and is reported to be detrimental to one's psychological and physical well-being (van Gelderen et al., 2011). A three-part study by van Geleren et al., was conducted to determine the potential effects of emotional dissonance on law enforcement and police call center

workers (2011). The study was a qualitative study consisting of survey and diary response entries from its participants in three separate studies. Study 1 included 25 police dispatchers who were asked to fill out questionnaires and diary entries at the beginning and end of their shifts for a five-day period. In this portion of the study, van Gelderen et al., examined the relationship between the suppression of the emotions, anger, and happiness (2011). The results of Study 1 showed that the suppression of the emotion anger was positively related to exhaustion at the end of the shift. In contrast, the suppression of happiness did not result in exhaustion for the worker. These findings support van Gelderen's assumptions that the suppression of negative emotions may be more detrimental to an individual then the suppression of positive emotions (2011). In Study 2 and Study 3, law enforcement officers were used as participants. Study 2 was designed as a pilot study to determine what types of negative emotions law enforcement officers had to suppress most during their shifts. The top three negative emotions (anger, abhorrence, and sadness) were examined further in Study 3. Study 3 included 29 police officers and maintained the design of Study 1; diary entries and questionnaires filled out at the beginning and end of each shift over a five-day period. In accordance with the results of Study 1, Study 3 showed a positive correlation between the suppression of anger and the suppression of abhorrence and exhaustion at the end of the shift. The repression of sadness did not result in exhaustion at the end of the shift. The van Gelderen et al., study served to illustrate the negative emotional impact that emotional dissonance can create in law enforcement officers. Their findings suggest that different emotions may elicit different emotional or physical responses. Also, these findings

validate prior research in emotional labor indicating that emotional labor is positively related to job burnout (Griffin et al., 2010). The limitations of this study are found in small number of participants. Van Gelderen et al., reported that data collection method of diary reporting used in the study lent to a small response rate (2011). Further, they indicated that they only looked at a very specific occupation and further research could be conducted on similar occupations to determine if similar results could be yielded. Van Gelderen et al., called for further research regarding the suppression of emotions in law enforcement and similar professions (2011). They argue that professions such as law enforcement require the use of emotional labor and that emotions are not only suppressed but "faked' any number of times throughout their shifts, thus, causing adverse effects for the officer (van Gelderen et al., 2011).

Emotional Dissonance and Correctional Officers

Throughout this literature review much has been discussed regarding the potential variables surrounding correctional officer stress, the effects of stress on the officer and their family, and the possible negative symptoms that manifest given the use of emotional labor. A study done by Tewksbury and Higgins on the role of organizational and emotional influences on correctional officers lends significant credibility to the results of the Griffen et al., 2010, van Gelderen et al., 2011. Crawly, 2002, and Tracy, 2004 studies. Each of these studies contributed to the body of literature discussing correctional officer stress and to some extent touched on the idea that conflicting emotions may contribute to the overall stress of the officer. Tewksbury and Higgins conducted their research at two medium-security prisons in Kentucky (2006). All staff members at each prison were

given a four-page, sixty item questionnaires, for a total of 650 surveys distributed. The questionnaires circulated in this study consisted of items addressing variables previous literature had indicated might contribute to correctional officer stress. The variables addressed in the questionnaire included emotional dissonance, work stress, satisfaction with supervisor, organizational fairness, negative affect in corrections, negative affect in institution, role conflict, job performance, pay, organizational commitment, and task control. Sections on emotional dissonance and organizational commitment had the most questions. The Tewksbury and Higgins research yielded some expected and some unexpected results (2006). Of the eleven variables addressed four showed a direct correlation between levels of work stress. Specifically, emotional dissonance, role conflict, and task control had a positive correlation to work stress (Tewksbury and Higgins, 2006). Conversely, direct contact with inmates had a negative correlation to work stress. The results of the Tewksbury and Higgins research lends further authority that emotional dissonance or the "faking" of emotions required by correctional officers is a noteworthy cause of stress (2006). Tewksbury and Higgins call for further research in this area, specifically calling for further research on emotional dissonance as it relates to stress in correctional officers (2006). More than any other piece of literature reviewed, the Tewksbury and Higgins study illustrates the need for a clearer understanding of the emotions correctional officers experiences on the job and how those emotions affect their levels of stress.

Table 1 presents a side by side comparison of method, sample, and findings of each study presented.

Table 1

Research Studies of Importance

Authors/year	Method	Sample	Findings
Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker-Gail, and Baker (2010)	Survey	Staff at a maximum-security prison. Including correctional officers, case managers, medical staff, food service workers, and office staff	Job satisfaction, job stress, and job involvement were more important predictors of job burnout than personal characteristics. Job satisfaction had a negative relationship with job burnout. Those who had job satisfaction had low incidents of exhaustion and reduced sense of accomplishment. Job stress was found to be a significant predictor of job burnout.
Lambert, Hogan, Kelley, Kim, and Garland (2014)	Survey	160 staff members at a private maximum-security prison for men. Included all classification of staff except upper	Six of the eight hypotheses were supported. Affective commitment was negatively associated with the three forms of work on family conflicted presented. Continuance commitment was positively linked with time, strain, and behavior based conflict. It is clear that work-on-family conflict occurs there is no definitive answer per this study as to which one causes the other.

(Table continues)

Research Studies of Importance

| Authors/year | Method | Sample | Findings |

Crawley (2002)	Interview	Nine family members of correctional officers in England	All family members reported a type of "institutionalization" of their loved one working in the prison, a hardening of their personalities, and a depersonalization. Crawley concluded that the potential for "role engulfment" is high and the ability for the prison officer to come "out of their role" is low.
Farkas (2002)	Interview and archival data	Seventy-nine officers (23% of the institution staff) at two medium security prisons in the Midwest	Farkas identified the major "types" of correctional officers. Officers were found to be rule enforcers, hard liners, loners, people workers, synthetic officers, and lax officers. Each typology carried out the expectation of the organization in different ways. The first three types carried out the rules and regulations inherent to custody and control. They followed the organizational rules to the letter. The people workers and synthetic officers developed their own definitions of their roles as officers, and the lax officer rejected the mission of the organization

(Table continues

Research Studies of Importance

Authors/year	Method	Sample	Findings
Miller, Considine, and Garner (2007)	Textual study of narratives from books. Coded only	115 out of 126 narratives available were used in the research.	Authors found that emotion is a factor in the work place. Emotional labor is used and can result in dissonance and resentment by the worker. The study found that workers are often aware of their emotional labor and feel they should be allowed to be authentic.

	narratives involving direct contact with clients.		
Tracy (2004)	Interview and observation	Correctional officers at a county jail and a women's prison.	Correctional officers experience a paradox involving the organizational mandate to respect and nurture inmates yet at the same time to be suspicious and discipline them. Thus, causing feelings of paranoia detachment, and an "us/them" mentality.
van Gelderen, Bakker, Konijn, and Demerouti (2011)	Diary study	Twenty-five employees at a police dispatch center	Suppression of the emotion of anger was positively related to exhaustion. The suppression of happiness did not relate to exhaustion.

(Table continues)

Research Studies of Importance

Authors/year	Method	Sample	Findings
Tewksbury and Higgins (2006)	Survey	228 Department of Corrections and free staff working at two medium	Work stress was shown to be primarily caused by organizational issues rather than inmates. Stress occurred when respondents felt they had to "fake" the appropriate responses. Emotional dissonance, role conflict, and task control have positive links to levels of work stress.

	security prisons in Kentucky.

Summary and Conclusions

There is a significant amount of literature that focuses on correctional officer stress. This literature, such as the Griffin et al., study continues to indicate that correctional officers work in a high-stress environment and that the environment contributes to burnout (2010). Further research, such as the work done by Farkas (2000) and Tait (2011), illustrate that correctional officers adhere to a persona or typology while on the job. The research on typology lends credibility to the findings Miller et al., who discussed the use, and potential harm of emotional labor in the workplace (2007). The Crawley (2002) and Tracy (2004) research considered the significance that the prison environment might have on the family life of the correctional officers as well as the potential changes in personality experienced by correctional officers. Finally, and most important to this study, are the van Gelderen et al., and Tewksbury et al., studies. These studies both discuss the adverse effect that the suppression of emotions has on officers and the potential repercussions of continued emotional dissonance. The collective body of literature on correctional officers continues to illustrate the stresses of the job, the high burnout rates, issues in the family life of the officers and a potential for incongruence with the personality of the officer and the persona displayed on the job. There is a continued call for further research in the areas surrounding the effects of emotional labor on the officer and their families, and for a clearer understanding of what emotions the officer experiences on the job.

After a review of what has been written regarding correctional officer's emotions, it is evident that this study is relevant to the field of corrections. Specifically, prior to this study there was little written regarding how officers feel on and off the job and if correctional officers are masking their emotions to be effective in the prison environment. This study found that the emotions displayed are not often congruent with those felt by officers, and that the incongruence of emotions does have an adverse effect on the family life of the officer. Throughout the research reviewed consistencies in typologies of officers and potential stressors were revealed. However, this study addressed the specific emotions experienced by correctional officers on the job.

The next chapter will present the research design, methodology, and data collection procedures used to complete this study.

Chapter 3: Research Method

I designed this study to discover what types of emotions correctional custody staff experience throughout their shifts at a maximum security correctional institution. The research questions were written to address the emotions felt by the correctional staff and the emotions they chose to exhibit. In addition, I designed the study to address how these emotions affect the private and professional lives of the participant. The research consisted of a phenomenological qualitative study with a 15 item-questionnaire designed for data collection. My goal in this study was to gain a better understanding of the emotions experienced by correctional custody staff and how those emotions affect their overall quality of life.

In this chapter I discuss the design of the research and detail the steps I took to ensure the study was ethical and produced sound data. The overall design and rationale for the study will be addressed as well as the role I played in the study. I also discuss methodology including how participants were selected, and the instruments used in data collection. Further, issues surrounding the trustworthiness of the research and any ethical issues are covered.

Research Design and Rationale

This was a phenomenological qualitative study. The phenomena I addressed were the emotions experienced by correctional custody staff while on the job. I used a qualitative approach because there was no specific hypothesis to test. In the study, I explored the emotions experienced by correctional officers during their shifts in a

correctional institution and if correctional officers suppress the emotions felt or physically exhibit contrasting emotions.

Research Question 1 (RQ1) - Qualitative: What emotions do correctional officers experience throughout a shift within a prison?

Research Question 2 (RQ2) – Qualitative: What emotions do correction officers allow themselves to show while at work?

Research Question 3 (RQ3) - Qualitative: What negative symptoms in her or his private life do the officers attribute to the emotions experienced on the job?

Role of the Researcher

My role as researcher in the study was to design the data collection tool and collect data. I did not participate in the study or interact with the participants in any other way. The data collection tool was a 15-item questionnaire that I distributed via the snowball sampling method. I had no direct contact with the participants. Though there was no conflict of interest, in keeping with transparency, I acknowledge that my husband is a Lieutenant with a correctional institution in California. I have no knowledge if he participated in the study or not. I do have some personal and professional relationships with other individuals within the correctional industry. However, due to the completely anonymous nature of this study, I have no knowledge of which, if any, of these individuals participated in the study. The only individuals who I am aware of participating are the initial four individuals I used to start the snowball sampling. I approached the initial four potential participants; however, I have no knowledge of which, if any participated in the survey, or which individuals passed on the survey link to

other participants. Requesting that the questionnaires be anonymous allowed participants to feel more secure and to eliminate fear of retaliation or scrutiny from fellow officers or management. It also ensured I had no indication of who participated in the study.

Methodology

Participant Selection Logic

The population addressed in this study was comprised of any correctional custody staff working in the state of California. For this study, correctional custody staff were defined as correctional officers, sergeants, and lieutenants working within an adult institution. These are individuals who have access to and interaction with the inmate population as part of their job description. To obtain a sample from a population of correctional custody staff working at institutions throughout the state of California, I used snowball sampling. This type of sampling strategy requires making initial contact with a few potential participants. In the case of this study, I contacted the initial participants. The potential participants then passed on the survey information and online link to other qualified potential participants via personal email. This process repeated itself until enough participants had completed the online survey. I assumed the sample represented all ethnic, gender, age, and job descriptions included in the overall correctional custody staff population.

Participants in the study received an introductory email explaining the purpose of the study. The consent form was attached to the introductory email was the consent form. In this introductory email, I explained the intent of study and gave instructions regarding

how to access the SurveyMonkey link. I assumed that participants who chose to move forward had given consent by opting in to the survey.

Instrumentation

I used a 15-item questionnaire to collect data. This questionnaire is not published and is researcher produced to elicit data based on the research questions. This questionnaire contained all open-ended questions to avoid leading participants and to gain as much information on the phenomenon as possible (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2008). I designed the questionnaire to allow the participants the ability to articulate the emotions they experience throughout their shifts at the prison. The questionnaire was used to determine if participants experience one emotion but exhibit a different one. The questionnaire also addressed how the correctional officers feel their experienced and displayed emotions may be affecting their personal lives.

The questionnaire was developed based on the situations, experiences, stressors and job requirements stated in the literature I covered in the literature review. I designed the questions to allow the participant to articulate a specific emotion felt or a specific incident or job duty that elicits a particular emotion for that participant. No formal pilot study was conducted, but the questionnaire had been read and tested by five correctional custody staff not participating in the study. These individuals encompass all ranks, genders, and ages that are representative of the participants included in the study. It was not possible to test the questionnaire on individuals of every potential ethnicity that might be included in the participant pool. Testing the questionnaire helped to ensure the validity

of the data collection tool and allowed me to ensure the questions made sense to the participant.

The questionnaire was the sole data collection tool in this study, and was accessible online via the SurveyMonkey website. Each participant filled out and completed the survey in a self-reporting style and returned the questionnaire to me via a web link. There was a 3-week window of time that potential participants could access the survey link. I collected data and then coded it after the survey completion window closed. If participants wanted to contact me, they were given my contact information for any clarification or questions.

Data Analysis Plan

The data collection instrument was an open ended 15-item questionnaire designed to elicit data regarding the emotions experienced by correctional custody staff. I coded the responses elicited from the questionnaire using inductive coding (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2008). To assist in the coding process, I used the NVivo computer program to identify potential themes present in the non-numerical data collected. In addition, I also used the SurveyMonkey website coding tools provided for qualitative research.

Issues of Trustworthiness

Credibility

Credibility in qualitative research refers to the validity of the data collection instrument. In this study, the data collection instrument was a questionnaire (see Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias). To ensure credibility, I designed the questionnaire to cover all aspects of the phenomenon being addressed. In order to further assure

credibility in the study, I gave a detailed explanation of the purpose of the study in writing to all participants. This was done to ensure participants had no confusion regarding questionnaire instructions.

Transferability

Transferability refers to the extent that the results of the study can be applied to the overall population being researched (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2008). To ensure for high transferability, I obtained the sample using the snowball sampling strategy. The participants were all correctional custody staff members working at any institution in the state of California. The overall transferability is reported in the results section of this study.

Dependability

Dependability or reliability refers to the extent that the data collection device measures what it is designed to measure (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2008). To determine the dependability of the collected data, I used negative case analysis to address themes in the data that did not fit into the coding (see Creswell, 2013). This means I looked for data that may have been contrary to the other data collected, and I used all the data collected to explain the overall findings of the research. Further, prior to the start of the study, I tested the dependability of the data collection tool by having non-participants read through the questionnaire to ensure the questions were clear and understandable.

Confirmability

Reflexivity in qualitative research is a consciousness of the researcher to address their biases, values, and experiences that relate to the study (Creswell, 2007). In order to

assure for confirmability in this study, I used reflexivity to disclose and explain any personal connections or pre-conceived ideas (see Creswell, 2007). Specifically, I addressed the connections or relationships I had with anyone in the correctional occupation.

Ethical Procedures

To conduct the study using the population of correctional custody staff, I made all potential participants aware of the study and its purpose. All participants had the option to opt in or out of the study prior to answering any questions. All participants had my contact information and the option to request further information or ask any questions prior to, or after completion of the survey. The population needed for this study was not considered to be a vulnerable population and did not need additional approvals besides IRB clearance (07-27-16-0222346) and participant consent. Each participant received a letter explaining the general intent of the study and detailing the confidentiality and anonymity of the questionnaire. I gave the participants a waiver requesting their consent and explaining that by taking the survey they were "implying consent." All data obtained is secured on my personal computer and is code protected. It is further secured and code protected on the Survey Monkey website. No identifying information was collected from any participant.

Summary

Chapter 3 included an overview of the methodological approach that I used in the study. I have included explanations of the type of study conducted as well as the rational and procedure for the sample selection, instruments for data collection, and any potential

ethical concerns. In addition, issues of credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability have been addressed.

Chapter 4: Results

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the emotions experienced by correctional officers and to address whether the emotions they felt were congruent with the emotions they expressed. In addition, my intent was to address what, if any, negative symptoms correctional custody staff might experience in their private lives that they attribute to emotions experienced on the job. My goal to explore what correctional custody staff had to say in regard to their emotions when asked directly to address the topic. Though much has been written regarding the stressors associated with a correctional occupation, my approach was to allow the correctional officers to explain what emotions they feel, when they feel them, and if they express those feelings transparently, and to do so in their own words.

To address the research questions presented in Chapter 1, I conducted a qualitative phenomenological study using a self-designed 15-item questionnaire distributed through the website Survey Monkey. The questions asked in the study were designed to address components relating to each of the following three research questions: (a) What emotions do correctional officers experience throughout a shift within a prison? (b) What emotions do correctional officers allow themselves to show while at work? and (c) What negative symptoms in her or his private life do the officers attribute to the emotions experienced on the job? In this chapter, I present the study's setting and demographics and the data collection procedures and techniques, and I discuss my use of NVivo software and the SurveyMonkey website to determine patterns

and themes in the collected responses. In addition, I discuss the issues of trustworthiness I introduced in Chapter. 3. Finally, I present the results of the research study with an in-depth look at the collected data as it relates to the research questions I posed in the study. I will conclude the chapter with a summation of the findings.

Setting

This was a qualitative phenomenological research study using a 15-item open-ended questionnaire. The participants are correctional custody staff (correctional officers, sergeants, lieutenants, and captains) working in a sworn position in any California correctional institution. Participants were given a link to the study via the Survey Monkey Website using a Snowball sampling technique.

Obtaining Participants

Approval to begin data collection was granted by Walden University's Institutional Review Board on February 2nd, 2017 (IRB approval # 07-27-16-0222346). After approval to begin data collection was granted, I contacted individuals who I became aware of through the community, interactions on a professional level, or family friends who were employed as correctional custody staff members of varying ranks and at different institutions within the state of California. I spoke to and sent these individuals an email explaining the details of study that I was conducting, as well as an attached consent form and a link to the website containing the online survey. The potential participants for the survey were then contacted through a purposeful sampling strategy referred to as the snowball sampling method (Creswell, 2007). Snowball sampling provides for individuals to connect with other potential participants who meet the data

collection criteria, thus allowing for a more expansive participant pool. Specifically, as it related to my study, these initial points of contact were asked to forward the email and attachments to any potential participants they had contact with that fit the following criteria: (a) they worked as correctional custody staff members currently employed at any correctional facility located in the state of California; (b) they held any rank, could be of any gender or ethnicity, and could have any amount of time on the job; and (c), they worked any yard level present in their institution (yard level refers to the classification of inmate present on a yard. Yard levels in California range from 1-4, as well as having sensitive needs yards, and secured housing units). I requested, via the informative email, that the potential participants only be contacted via personal email and not be contacted at any employment email address. The informative email also explained that the survey link would only be available from February 5th - February 28th, 2017.

As I stated in Chapter 3, my intention was to gather responses from 20-30 participants. At the end of the data collection timeframe, I had received a total of 23 responses from participants meeting the criteria. Due to the nature of the sampling method, and that the survey responses were completely anonymous, I only know that the respondents met my initial criteria to receive the invitation survey. That is, the data collected were from 23 correctional custody staff members from varying correctional institutions throughout the state of California.

Demographics

At the close of the data collection phase, I had received a total of 23 responses to the online survey. All the participants were anonymous and asked to not include any

identifying information on the survey responses. All 23 participants are correctional custody staff working at correctional institutions somewhere within the state of California. As such, I assumed that all participants were over the age of 18, that they had been vetted through a background and psychological screening process, and that their training and job duties are consistent with all correctional custody staff working at institutions in the State of California. No further identifying criteria are available for the participant group.

Data Collection

I began the data collection process by contacting individuals who work at a correctional institution in the State of California. The initial potential participants were individuals I either had personal knowledge of, or whom I was put in contact with by a mutual acquaintance or contact. I contacted these individuals either by phone or email, and in each case followed up with an email containing the explanation of the study and the consent form. The introduction email explained the study and gave the link to the 15-item survey published through SurveyMonkey. The survey contained open-ended questions relating to the study's research questions. The initial participants were asked to participate in the survey if they chose, and to pass on the email with the introduction to the survey, the consent form, and the survey link to any individuals they had access to who met the study criteria. I have no knowledge of which, if any, of the initially contacted participants chose to complete the survey or how many of them opted to pass the informative email forward.

Each of these individuals completed the entire 15-item questionnaire and returned the survey via the SurveyMonkey link. Each of the 23 returned surveys contained answers to each question as well as in depth statements of explanation from the participants.

Data Analysis

To begin the process of analyzing data, I read through all the survey responses. When reading through each participant's survey response, I used NVivo software to make separate nodes for each respondent. I coded each respondent as Participant 1, Participant 2, Participant 3, and so forth through Participant 23. As I placed each of the participant's responses in a node, I took note of the responses given for each question. To get a clearer picture of the responses for each question, I made additional nodes. These nodes were labeled Question 1, Question 2, Question 3, and so on through Question 15. Once the participants and individual questions were coded into nodes, I could start to see patterns and themes within the responses. Once specific themes started to appear, I ran the auto-code analysis on NVivo to verify the themes I was seeing were consistent with the themes NVivo was picking up.

In addition to using NVivo, once I had determined the themes occurring in each survey question answer, I used the SurveyMonkey Website to further organize and code my data. SurveyMonkey was used to design the study questionnaire and provided the website that respondents accessed to complete the survey. Further, SurveyMonkey also provides several data analysis tools for qualitative data. Using the data analysis tool in SurveyMonkey, I could take the themes I discovered in NVivo and further code them.

Specifically, I could take each question and assign a title and color code to the words or general theme I was seeing. I was then able to go through all 23 responses to each question and group them based on the words or phrases I had assigned them. For example, in Question 1, I noticed that a significant number of responses included the word "anxiety." I then used the "categorize as" tab and entered the words "anxiety, worried, or scared". After doing this, I assigned a color code to this category and then went through the responses and added any response for Question 1 that had these words or general theme to the category I created. I continued this process for Question 1 until all 23 responses had been assigned a category and color. The following is a list of the categories created for each survey question:

Question 1: When you arrive on the institution grounds, what is the first emotion you are aware of feeling?

Category 1: Green – anxious, worried, uneasy.

Category 2: Blue – indifference, no emotion.

Category 3: Turquoise – sad, depressed.

Question 2: During your shift, when you interact with an inmate, what emotion are you aware of feeling?

Category 1: Red – annoyed, angry, frustrated.

Category 2: Green – anxious, hypervigilant.

Category 3: Orange – distrust, apprehension.

Category 4: Blue – indifference, all business.

Question 3: When there is a violent incident that you are involved in, or witness to, what emotion are you aware of feeling?

Category 1: Green – anxious, excited, adrenalin rush.

Category 2: Blue – indifference.

Category 3: Purple – pity or sadness.

Question 4: When you interact with staff at the management level, do you have any specific emotions?

Category 1: Maroon – annoyance, anger.

Category 2: Blue – indifference.

Category 3: Green – respect.

Category 4: Grey – unsure, uneasy, distrust.

Question 5: Overall, when you are inside the institution interacting with coworkers, inmates, and management, what are the most consistent emotions you are experiencing?

Category 1: Green – anger, anxious, annoyed.

Category 2: Maroon – brotherhood, comradery.

Category 3: Blue – indifference.

Question 6: Are there certain incidents where you feel one emotion, yet express another?

Category 1: Purple – no.

Category 2: Red – yes.

Question 7: If you express an emotion different than the one you are feeling, why do you think you might do that?

Category 1: Turquoise – can't show weakness.

Category 2: Orange – the emotion is not appropriate.

Category 3: Grey – unsure.

Question 8: In the event of a violent incident in which an inmate may be seriously injured or killed, what emotions do you feel?

Category 1: Green – anxiety.

Category 2: Purple – empathy.

Category 3: Maroon – feel nothing.

Category 4: Orange – thinking about paperwork and documentation.

Question 9: Do you discuss emotions regarding the job with coworkers while on the job?

Category 1: Turquoise – no only express sarcasm and cynism.

Category 2: red – yes.

Question 10: Do you feel that the emotions you express (externally) while on the job are consistent with what you are feeling (internally), or do you alter what you exhibit/show coworkers?

Category 1: Turquoise – alter feelings.

Category 2: Red – do not alter feelings.

Question 11: When you leave the institution, how do you process the day's events?

Category 1: Red – no coping method.

Category 2: Green – some sort of activity.

Category 3: Purple – talk with someone.

Question 12: Do you discuss the emotions you feel during the day with family or friends?

Category 1: Red – no.

Category 2: Turquoise – yes.

Question 13: Explain what emotions you feel when faced with a tense situation at home.

Category 1: Orange – calm.

Category 2: Green – cop mode, strict, mad.

Category 3: Grey – unsure.

Question 14: Do you express the emotions you feel in personal situations or do you feel one emotion but exhibit another?

Category 1: Orange – no, change or stifle.

Category 2: Green – yes, more open.

Question 15: Do you think that the emotions you exhibit in your personal life are appropriate for the situation?

Category 1: Turquoise – no.

Category 2: Green – yes.

Once this process had been completed for each of the 15 survey questions, I could them click on the “My Categories” tab for each question and view a bar graph of the

coded data, and could get a percentage showing the breakdown of how each participant's response aligned with certain categories. At the completion of the coding process I was then able to interpret the data as it related to my research questions.

Evidence of Trustworthiness

Credibility

Creswell suggests using forms of validation to assist in assuring the data collected is trustworthy (2013). Prior to a participant entering the study, he or she was given an introductory email with sample questions and the ability to view the survey by clicking on the survey link. The introductory email gave detailed explanation as to the reason for the study, as well as what was being asked of each potential participant. Contact information was provided in the event that a potential participant had a question or concern regarding the survey or the information being requested. I was not contacted by any participant during the data collection phase. All the individuals who participated gave implied consent prior to submitting their answers via SurveyMonkey. In addition, I utilized the member checking method (Creswell, 2013). In this method, I reached out to the initial potential participants and asked them to review the coding and categorizing terms and phrases I had implemented after all the survey results were submitted. These individuals did not see each participant's responses, but were asked to look at the overall coding and themes I had developed based on all the responses. It was not possible to use the member checking method on all my participants as I had no way of identifying who took part in the study.

Transferability

Transferability refers to the extent that the results of the study can be applied to the overall population being researched (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2008). The participant pool for this study was any correctional custody staff working in a prison facility within the state of California. The participants could be any ethnicity, gender, or age. No exclusions were made, allowing for the most comprehensive participant pool. Thus, the overall population for this study would be all correctional custody staff.

This study is a qualitative phenomenological study. Thus, my intent with this research was to determine if there were themes or patterns that surfaced based on the responses to the research questions I posed. Duplication of this study would be possible with access to correctional custody staff using the 15-item questionnaire, and a snowball sampling format.

Dependability

Dependability, or reliability, refers to the extent that the data collection device measures what it is designed to measure (Frankfort-Nachmias & Nachmias, 2008). As stated in the methodology section, I used negative case analysis when coding the data to secure for dependability. During the coding process, all occurring themes were coded and included in data analysis. I did not eliminate any responses that may have been contrary to already identified themes. All responses were included in data analysis to ensure a clear and reliable picture of the participant responses.

Confirmability

Reflexivity in qualitative research is a consciousness of the researcher to address their biases, values, and experiences that relate to the study they have proposed (Creswell, 2007). To address confirmability or reflexivity in this study, I followed a very clearly defined protocol for accessing the participant pool. In addition, I made sure that I had no knowledge of who participated in the study, (aside from the initial individuals I contacted to begin the snowball sample). Even with the initial potential participants, I have no confirmation of whether they completed a questionnaire and no way to determine which questionnaire was theirs if they submitted one. I verified no identifying information was present in the participant's responses. As explained in Chapter 3, though I have interactions with correctional custody staff in my personal and professional life, I did not discuss the research with any of these individuals, as it is possible any of them may have participated in the study.

Results

A total of 23 individuals employed as correctional custody staff responded to the 15-item open ended questionnaire that was designed specifically for this study. After carefully reviewing the responses and inputting all the responses into NVivo software as well as Survey Monkeys data analysis programs, common themes emerged. In the context of this study "themes "or "categories" referred to common phrases, words or ideas that consistently presented in the responses given by each participant. Each question of the 15-item questionnaire relates to 1 or more of the research questions posed.

The following is an in-depth description of the data obtained and the themes presented as they relate to each research question.

Research Question 1

RQ1, Qualitative: What emotions does a correctional officer experience throughout a shift within a prison?

This research question was designed to address what an officer feels during a shift within the institution. The research question is purposely broad to address all aspects of the officer's shift, as well as all aspects of the emotions the officer experiences while in the institution. Specific questions on the questionnaire were designed to directly address research question 1. The five survey questions directly relating to research question 1 are:

1) When you arrive on the institution grounds what is the first emotion you are aware of feeling?
2) During your shift, when you interact with an inmate, what emotion are you aware of feeling?
3) When there is a violent incident that you are involved in, or witness to, what emotion are you aware of feeling?
4) When you interact with staff at the management level, do you have any specific emotions?
5) Overall, when you are inside the institution interacting with coworkers, inmates, and management, what are the most consistent emotions you are experiencing?

Each of the survey questions was answered by all 23 participants. Analysis of responses provided by each participant of each individual questions yielded specific themes or categories and phrases.

Question 1 Analysis

When you arrive on the institution grounds what is the first emotion you are aware of feeling?

Question 1 was designed to address the specific emotions that an officer feels upon arriving at their institution. All participants answered this question and many provided detailed responses as to their experienced emotions. After reviewing the responses for question 1, I could place all the responses into three categories. The categories I used were, “anxious, worry, uneasy”, “indifference or no emotion”, and “sad or depressed”. Each of the 23 responses was then placed into one of the three categories mentioned. I decided what category to place the response in based on the written answer to the question given by the participant. If a participant expressed any emotion falling into the “anxious, worry, or uneasy” category their answer to question 1 was placed in that category. An example of a response that would be placed in the “anxious, worry or uneasy category was from Participant 1, who stated “Worried. I worry what the day might become, and what situations might arise”. A second example comes from Participant 2, who stated “Anxious. Just because there is so much unknown about what is to come on the shift”. Participant 19 wrote, “A feeling of anxiety and self-preservation”. Several of the participants simply responded with the word “anxious” or “anxiety”. Participant 20 gave a response that was coded in the “sad or depressed” category; “Most

times it's despair, you say to yourself, you can do this". Other participants whose answers fell into the "sad or depressed category" gave answers stating "sad" or "depressed". There were a few participants who gave responses that fell into the indifference or no emotion category. Participant 8 stated "indifferent" and Participant 9 stated "not aware of any emotion". The following Table shows a percentage breakdown of all 23 responses for Question 1. It is clear when looking at the data that most participants (69,57%) responded that upon arriving on institution grounds, the first emotion they are aware of feeling, fall into the category of "anxious, worry, uneasy"

Table 2

Research Question 1: Survey Question 1

Category	Number of participants with answers in this category	Percentage of Participants who answered in this category
Anxious, worry, uneasy	16	69.57%
Sad or depressed	4	17.39%
Indifference or no emotion	3	13.04

Question 2 Analysis

Question 2 was designed to illicit responses regarding how an officer feels when they have direct interaction with inmates. All 23 participants answered this question. I could place their responses into four categories. The themes or words used to categorize

each response were “annoyed, angry, frustrated”, “anxious, hyper vigilant”, “distrust, apprehension”, and “indifference, just business”.

In the category of “annoyed, angry, frustrated Participant 2 wrote in response to the question, “Irritable. Having to talk to inmates has become very irritating to me. Most of the time they want to manipulate the situation and don't want to hear what you are telling them unless it is what they want to hear.” Participant 22 responded, “Frustration, I know that he is trying or going to try some form of manipulation”. Participant 15 stated, “It depends on what type of interaction. I get very irritated with the know-it-all inmates and usually will become somewhat aggressive with my body language and tone of voice.”

The category labeled “anxious or hyper vigilant” participants gave more detail in their responses. Participant 21 wrote in response to the question “Awareness and doubt. I become hyper aware and I doubt everything the inmate is saying until I’m able to piece together the truth or the misdirection that the inmate is attempting to relay.” Participant 5 explained “Anxiety at times. Depending on the interaction, positive or negative. What is the inmates thought process, what are his intentions, how is he going to react to the interaction?” Several other participants responded with “high alertness”, “on guard”, “on edge”, “anxious”, and “defensive”.

The next category used to code Question 2 was “distrust and apprehension”. Participant 1 explained in response to the question, “Skepticism. I am never sure whether I am being told the truth or if the inmate is working a manipulation tactic on me.” In another response, Participant 17 stated, “Apprehension, unsure of how the inmate will

react but I need to have command presence". Other responses included words like "distrust" and "skepticism".

The final category used for question 2 was "indifference, just business". This category was needed because one response did not fit into any of the other categories. Participant 6 stated "Its business. Talk to them like you would talk to anyone else, but they know they are an inmate".

The most coded category for question 2 was the category "anxious, hyper vigilant." The category was responsible for 65.22% of responses. The table below illustrates a percentage breakdown of the answers to question 2.

Table 3

Research Question 1: Survey Question 2

Category	Number of participants with answers in this category	Percentage of Participants who answered in this category
Annoyed, angry, frustrated	4	17.39%
Anxious, hyper vigilant	15	65.22%
Distrust, apprehension	3	13.04
Indifference, business	1	4.35%

Question 3 Analysis

When there is a violent incident that you are involved in, or witness to, what emotion are you aware of feeling?

Question 3 was designed to have the participant explore and report what emotions they experience when they are faced with a violent altercation or witness to violence within the institution. Three main categories emerged when I analyzed the participant's responses to this question. The categories for question 3 are "anxious, excited, rush", "indifference", and "pity, sadness". All the participants responded to this question.

Many responses fell into the category of "anxious, excited, rush". Participants seemed willing to elaborate or give more lengthy responses to this question. Participant 7 responded to the question with "Excitement, finding out the severity of the incident is always exciting. High adrenaline". Participant 19 stated,

> Emotion goes away and is replaced with hyper vigilance, normal feelings that a normal person would experience simply vanish. It's all business at that point. You either run or charge ahead. You see your partners and try to protect them at all costs. You feel responsible for your partner's lives. Nothing else matters but that. There is no room for fear. You become a robot.

Participant 22 explained

> Usually a rush, there is so much waiting and sitting around try to keep yourself busy when there is a fight I get to expel some energy but there is also anxiety about images of co.'s stabbed in the neck as I run into a building that causes anger

and I know I have to show restraint with the inmate if he is laying on the ground with his hands behind is back yelling "I give up".

The second category used in question 3 is “indifference”. Participant 18 explained in response to the question “At this point of my career it no longer bothers me I don't see them as human beings”. Participant 15 responded “Either no emotion or a ‘he had that coming’ mindset if the incident just involved inmates. If it was a staff assault, then I get very angry and want to retaliate against inmates.”

The final category for question 3 is “pity, sadness”. Participant 3 stated “Pity for the victim.” Other responses included sadness if staff were involved in an assault. The category responsible for the most responses was “anxious, excited, and rushed” with 73.91 of the responses fitting in this category. The table below illustrates a percentage breakdown of the responses to question 3.

Table 4

Research Question 1: Survey Question 3

Category	Number of participants with answers in this category	Percentage of Participants who answered in this category
Anxious, excited, rush	17	73.91%
Indifference	4	17.39%
Pity, sadness	2	8.70%

Question 4 Analysis

When you interact with staff at the management level, do you have any specific emotions?

I designed question 4 to allow participants the opportunity to explain the emotions they have when they must interact with management level staff. Four categories emerged after I analyzed the responses from all 23 participants. The four categories used for coding question 4 are “annoyance and anger”, “indifference”, “respect”, and “unsure, uneasy, distrust”. Numerous participants gave lengthy or more in-depth answers then in previous or subsequent questions.

The first category coded for Question 4 was “annoyance and anger”. In response to question 4, Participant 14 explained, “I despise dealing with management. As an officer, you are looked down upon and spoken down to in a subtle, passive-aggressive manner often. It seems as though some management staff have a ‘holier than thou’ attitude and most rules do not apply to them”. Participant 8 stated “Disgusted usually, most think and act like they are better than everyone else.” Other responses in this category include “disgust”, “dislike”, and “frustration”.

In the category of “indifference” Participant 4 responded, “The emotion that comes to mind when talking to management is detachment. They detach themselves from line staff.” Participant 9 stated “normally talk with management is non-job related and when it is job related has to deal with policies and procedure that they have little to no control over therefore little to no emotion involved”.

The category “respect” had only one response. Participant 1 stated, “Respect. While I might not always agree with the decisions they make, I respect their authority and position.”

The final category in question 4 “unsure, uneasy, distrust” was coded the most frequently. In response to question 4, Participant 23 stated, “Cautious, not sure who you can trust”. Participant 19 explained,

The current atmosphere has created relations with management teams that is not any greater that the relationship officers have with inmates. Not in all instances, but it seems to be the trend. Basically, staff have become the teeth on the gears the runs the machine called prison. A diminished sense of self-worth sets in when u work hard and are not taken care of or looked after by the management team. All of this causes depression, a negative work environment that becomes toxic. This often carries over to your personal life. Basically, there is a huge sense of distrust, animosity and loneliness at work.

Participant 17 responded, “Unsure of the sincerity of their comments. If they actually care how line staff is doing and if we are protected in our jobs”. Participant 5 stated, “Stress at times. "Am I under any sort of frivolous investigation that they know about and I haven't been informed of." Other words and phrases used when participants answered question 4 included “uneasy”, “no trust”, “disappointment”, and “overwhelmed”. The category with the most responses for question 4 was “unsure, uneasy, and distrust with 65.22% of the responses. The table below illustrates the percentage of responses that were coded into each category.

Table 5

Research Question 1: Survey Question 4

Category	Number of participants with answers in this category	Percentage of Participants who answered in this category
Annoyance, anger	4	17.39%
Indifference	3	13.4%
respect	1	4.35%
Unsure, uneasy, distrust	15	65.22%

Question 5 Analysis

Overall, when you are inside the institution interacting with coworkers, inmates, and management, what are the most consistent emotions you are experiencing?

I designed question 5 to elicit the emotions that officers feel about their whole experience during a shift inside their institution. This question combined what I addressed in each previous question, but asked the participant to explain the overwhelming or predominant emotion.

Three main categories became apparent when coding question 5. This was the first question in which there was often overlap or where participant's responses fell into more than one category. The categories used in question 5 are "anger, anxious, annoyed", "brotherhood, comradery", and "indifference."

The first category coded in question 5 was “anger, anxious, annoyed”. In response to question 5, Participant 15 stated, “I mostly feel anxiety throughout the day. I worry about my partner’s safety and I worry if I will have a job at the end of the day for my actions that I need to do while working.” Participant 19 explained, “How stupid this place is, the inmate has no accountability and takes no responsibility for their actions. Meanwhile I have to maintain accountability for him.” Participant 18 responded, “hypervigilance. Every sound, every move, creates a twitch like effect where it feels like you can't relax. Eyes can't focus on one area for any length of time due to the feeling that something might be missed.” Participant 17 stated, “Scared of losing my job because of a small procedure like taking too long in the bathroom. I do not feel protected by my department”.

Some responses were coded into two categories. When this occurred, the categories involved were “anger, anxious, and annoyed” and “brotherhood, comradery”. Participant 15 responded, “Anxiety, depression, happiness, togetherness, trust, distrust, fear, confusion, loneliness, team work, anger, sorrow... you get everything, that's why it's so confusing.” Participant 4 stated, “With partners/coworkers it is a feeling of duty, love, encouragement, and responsibility. With inmates, it is anger and irritability. With management, it is indifference.” Participant 7 explained, “It's great interacting with partners. They are like family and friends. Dealing with inmates is like approaching a stray dog, you don't know their intentions but know that they can snap at you (not that I would approach a stray).”

The category of “brotherhood, comradery” was coded next for question 5. Participant 5 responded, “Majority of the time, interaction with coworkers is positive. A sense of family and brotherhood, giving that feeling of happiness and security regardless of what's going on.” Participant 10 stated, “a bond of brothers with your partners and the trust of your safety is in their hands and vice versa.”

The final category for question 5 is “indifference”. Participant 6 stated, “Mostly indifferent. Just there to do my job and go home”. Participant 7 explained, “No emotion just doing a job and getting everyone home safe at the end of the shift.”

“Anger, anxious, annoyed” was seen in the most responses with 69.57% of responses fitting into that category. The table below indicates the percentage of responses that were coded in each category.

Table 6

Research Question 1: Survey Question 5

Category	Number of participants with answers in this category	Percentage of Participants who answered in this category
Anger, anxious, annoyed	16	69.57%
Brotherhood, comradery	7	30.43%
Indifference	4	17.39%

Research Question 1 (Question 1-5) Analysis

Survey questions 1-5 were designed to directly relate to Research Question 1. After an individual analysis was done on questions 1-5, I looked at the categories as a collective group to determine what phrases, words, and overall themes had presented in most of the responses. In four out of five questions (1,2,3,5), the category containing the theme "anxious, anxiety, worry, uneasy, and hyper vigilant" was used the most. Overall, in questions 1-5 the category including the "anxiety" theme made up over 65% of the responses for each question. In the one question that the category "anxiety" did not emerge the overwhelming coded response was "unsure, uneasy, distrust". This category was responsible for 65.22% of the coded responses for question 4.

Questions 1-5 addressed the officers perceived emotions regarding their experience in the institution, with coworkers, with management, and with inmate interaction. The consistent theme presenting in the responses of each of the first 5 questions was that anxiety or anxiousness was the most prevalent emotions experienced. The other emotions that were consistently reported were anger, distrust, and unease.

Research Question 2

Research Question 2– Qualitative: What emotions does the correction officer allow himself/herself to show while at work?

This research question was designed to elicit responses regarding the officer's internal emotional awareness and if the internal emotion is what they express outwardly. Five questions on the survey were designed to relate directly to Research question 2.

These questions give the officers an opportunity to explain the emotions they feel versus the emotions they express. The 5 survey questions relating to Research Question 2 are:

6. Are there certain incidents where you feel one emotion, yet express another?

7. If you express an emotion different than the one you are feeling, why do you think you might do that?

8. In the event of a violent incident in which an inmate may be seriously injured or killed, what emotions do you feel?

9. Do you discuss emotions regarding the job with coworkers while on the job?

10. Do you feel that the emotions you express (externally) while on the job are consistent with what you are feeling (internally), or do you alter what you exhibit/show coworkers?

Question 6 Analysis

Are there certain incidents where you feel one emotion, yet express another?

Question 6 was designed to introduce the idea to the participant that it is possible that they may feel one emotion, yet express another. The question directly asks the participant if they feel one emotion yet express another. The question allows for the participant to answer in an open-ended fashion and address the phenomenon anyway they would like. This question was coded and produced two categories. Respondents either answered “yes” and gave an explanation, or answered “no”, and gave an explanation. 82.61% of participants responded “yes”, that they did feel one emotion, yet express another. Participant 1 explained, “When a staff member is battered by an inmate I feel anger but express a professional demeanor. I never want to see a fellow partner get injured

yet my job will not allow me to react in any other way other than professional." Participant 23 stated "For the most part you feel scared it's just an instinct when you are in surrounded by people you can't trust both staff and inmates. you don't show that your scared though because that is perceived as weakness." Participant 17 responded "Yes. I will feel scared for my safety but have to show confidence and command presence" Participant 15 said, "Yes. A few years back an inmate hung himself in his cell. He had bound his hands tightly behind his back and stuffed a sock down his throat. I remember the look on his face to this day. Seeing him bothered me, yet my coworkers and I were literally laughing and telling jokes about the incident". Some participants reported that they do not change what they feel internally versus what they express externally. Participant 21 stated, "Overall I think after a while, especially at more violent prisons, you're able to become an unnatural calm during incidents of pure terror or frustration. "The following table illustrates how many responses fell into each category.

Table 7

Research Question 2: Survey Question 6

Category	Number of participants with answers in this category	Percentage of Participants who answered in this category
yes	19	82.61%
no	4	17.39%

Question 7 Analysis

If you express an emotion different than the one you are feeling, why do you think you might do that?

I designed this question to allow the participant the opportunity to express the reason, or their understanding of why one emotion may be felt, but another expressed. Question 7 was coded using three categories, “can’t show weakness”, “the emotion expressed is not appropriate”, “unsure”. This question yielded the most evenly split responses of any of the questions in this section. However, most of the responses fell into the “can’t show weakness” category. Participant 3 stated, “Empathy shows weakness”. Participant 15 explained, “It's a defense mechanism. You have to put up this strong facade in front of your coworkers even if an incident really bothers you. You never want to show weakness in that type of environment”. Participant 23 responded, “I do it because it's just the way it is. If you show any signs of weakness or vulnerability, it’s like blood in the water and the inmates and or staff will exploit that and verbally and or physically hurt you. Sometimes in good fun and sometimes to truly try and hurt you.”

> In the category “the emotion is not appropriate for the situation”, Participant 2 explained, it’s often because the emotion we are feeling is not appropriate for the situation. A good example would be my supervisor telling me something that needs to be done because he feels it's the right way to handle the situation all while knowing it's not going to have the results he wants. Then having to relay the information he has passed on to other staff members why all argue the way it's to

be done. All while agreeing with the staff on the inside having to express that it's in their best interests.

The third category for question 7 was “unsure”. Five participants or 21.74% of participants explained they were unsure of why they did not express the emotion they felt. The table below represents the percentage breakdown of the participant’s responses.

Table 8

Research Question 2: Survey Question 7

Category	Number of participants with answers in this category	Percentage of Participants who answered in this category
Can’t show weakness	10	43.48%
Emotion not appropriate	8	34.78%
Unsure	5	21.74%

Question 8 Analysis

In the event of a violent incident in which an inmate may be seriously injured or killed, what emotions do you feel?

Question 8 is like Question 3 in that they both discuss feelings regarding violence. However, they do pose slightly different scenarios. Question 8 specifies what emotion is felt when an inmate is violently hurt or killed. Question 8 yielded four different

categories after coding. The four categories are, “anxiety”, “empathy”, “feel nothing”, “paperwork, documentation”.

The category with the most responses coded to it is “feel nothing”. Participant 19 stated, “None a normal person on the streets would. I don't care, I check my ‘feelings’ at the gate when. I walk in. If they do something to harm staff they deserve to die. If they fall victim to. Inmate politics, well, that's their problem. Inmates get treated better than staff by the management teams and are considered more by the people who run the department. It's all about surviving your shift, going home safe and not getting in trouble.”. Participant 23 explained, “I used to feel scared anxious nervous curios but now I don't really feel anything.; Participant 16 said, “Nothing. It's part of the environment and culture.”

The category called “paperwork or documentation” was tied with empathy for the second most responses. Participant 2 stated,

> Mostly thinking of all the paperwork and who is going to do what and hope that it's all completed perfect and in a timely manner. We are scrutinized for our paperwork and not how well we handled the situation. Management doesn't see all that went into the violent incident all they see is that we are late turning in a form. Or that the form is not filled out to their expectation.

Participant 10 stated, “Scared that management might blame custody for not saving the inmates life and being fired for not saving the innate.” Some participants responded in the “empathy” category. Participant 3 explained, “Excitement then empathy for their family.” Participant 9 stated,

there are mixed emotions glad that staff are going home to their family's safe however, the realization that the person was someone's family member, son, and possibly husband is saddening and fear in the fact that staff may face (emotional legal and family challenges for doing their job.

The category of "anxiety" had the least number of responses. The participants stated they felt anxiety and gave no additional explanation. The table below depicts the categories the responses were coded to.

Table 9

Research Question 2: Survey Question 8

Category	Number of participants with answers in this category	Percentage of Participants who answered in this category
anxiety	3	13.04%
Empathy	4	17.39%
Feel nothing	14	60.87%
Paperwork, documentation	4	17.39%

Question 9 Analysis

Do you discuss emotions regarding the job with coworkers while on the job?

Question 9 addresses the issue of whether the participants feel they discuss emotions regarding their job with coworkers. The question requests that they explain their response. After coding, it was apparent that the responses fell into two categories.

The participants either stated “yes”, they did discuss emotions with coworkers, or, they stated “no” but explained that they used sarcasm and cynicism as tools for communicating. The majority of participants (78.26%) were coded in the “no” category. Participant 19 stated, “Conversations that normally would involve feelings or emotions are usually substituted with cruel, crass and vulgar statements or jokes about serous issues. It's the only way we know how to cope.” Participant 20 explained, “No, never! To do so is weakness and people will ridicule you for that! Being weak is like being a coward people make fun of the weak people everyone act hard it's the nature of the beast to show emotion is weakness in the prison setting.” Participant 21 said, “No, in general regardless of how hard they try to say otherwise, anything other than ‘bravery, fearlessness etc.’ is frowned upon. Some of the participants that responded with “yes” explained that they felt close enough to some coworkers to discuss their emotions at work. The table below illustrates the breakdown of the participant’s responses.

Table 10

Research Question 2: Survey Question 9

Category	Number of participants with answers in this category	Percentage of Participants who answered in this category
yes	5	21.74%
no	18	78.26%

Question 10 Analysis

Do you feel that the emotions you express (externally) while on the job are consistent with what you are feeling (internally), or do you alter what you exhibit/show coworkers?

Question 10 is the last question pertaining directly to Research Question 2. This question was asked to get an overall response of how the participant views their experienced versus expressed emotions while at work. Two categories emerged after the coding process. Participants responses could be categorized as “alter feelings” or “do not alter feelings”. Most participants (15) responded in the “alter feelings” category. Participant 12 stated, I never show what I actually feel. My job as a manager is to keep everyone on the departmental direction.” Participant 16 explained, “I alter. You can't show any signs of weakness. Inmates prey on weakness, and staff make fun of your weakness. If I find an inmate made alcohol inside a cell, I couldn’t care less and would just throw it away. But if I get called out by staff, I am forced to write up a disciplinary. Additionally, if I throw it away, and the next time I wrote up the inmate, the inmate will complain and call me soft because I didn't do what I did the time before.” Participant 23 responded,

> No for the most part they can totally opposite but like I already said it's best not to show any true emotion. I saw my first inmate die due to wounds sustained in an incident and inside I was sad scared nervous anxious to get away from the area yet I stood there stone cold face with the rest of the responding staff and acted like it was just another day. No big deal.

The remaining participants (8) responded that they "do not alter" their emotions at work or with coworkers. These participants responded that they had little emotion to express or that their emotions were consistent with their expression. The table below indicates the percentage breakdown in each coded category.

Table 11

Research Question 2: Survey Question 10

Category	Number of participants with answers in this category	Percentage of Participants who answered in this category
Alter feelings	15	65.22%
Do not alter feelings	8	34.78%

Research Question 2 (Questions 6-10) Analysis

What emotions does the correction officer allow himself/herself to show while at work?

Questions 6-10 were designed to address the overall question of whether participants allow their experienced emotions to be shown while at work. Each question asked the participants to examine that phenomenon and explain their thoughts and feelings surrounding it. After coding and analyzing the data, clear themes began to take shape in this cluster of questions. Question 6, 9, and 10 all ask the participant about experienced versus expressed emotions. In each of these questions more than 65% of the

participants reported that they do not express what they feel, that they "alter" their feelings or emotions, and that they do not feel comfortable confiding in or discussing emotions with coworkers. In Questions 7, participants were asked to address why they might alter their emotions while at work. 10 participants (43.48%) explained they did not show what they were experiencing because "you cannot show weakness at work". Question 8 asked the participant to explain their emotion in a violent incident. Fourteen, or (60.87%) explained they had no feelings at all when witnessing violence at work. The data indicate that correctional custody staff do not allow themselves to show many emotions, if any at all. Responses routinely indicated a disconnect between the participants experienced emotion versus their expressed emotion. In addition, words like cynic, and sarcasm were used to describe the communication tools used within the institution. There was a consistent theme present throughout numerous answers that participants did not feel it was acceptable to show any form of weakness while at work. That theme carried through on questions regarding handling inmates and violence to interacting with coworkers.

Research Question 3

What negative symptoms in their private lives does the officer attribute to the emotions they experience on the job?

This research question was designed to address the potential overlap of regarding how a participant experiences emotions at work and how they experience emotions in their home or private lives. The remaining five survey questions were designed to address

the overall question being asked in Research Question 3. The five survey questions used to elicit his data from participants are:

11. When you leave the institution, how do you process the day's events?
12. Do you discuss the emotions you feel during the day with family or friends?
13. Explain what emotions you feel when faced with a tense situation at home.
14. Do you express the emotions you feel in personal situations or do you feel one emotion but exhibit another?

Do you think that the emotions you exhibit in your personal life are appropriate for the situation?

Question 11 Analysis

When you leave the institution how do you process the day's events?

I included this question to gain insight as to the participant's habits regarding processing the emotions they experience on a shift. I asked the participant to explain their response. After analyzing the data and coding the responses certain themes or categories emerged. For Question 11, the responses could be placed into three categories. These categories are "no coping method", "some activity", and "talk to someone".

The category fit most of the responses was "no coping method". Participant 2 explained,

most of the time I just store them away. Prison is a nasty place and I don't want to bring that negativity to my beautiful home. On a daily basis, we deal with the worst stuff the public turns a blind eye to because it's a nasty world behind the walls. So, I do my very best to not bring it home to a place of peace and love.

Participant 22 stated, “A waste of time nothing is accomplished the same mess will be waiting for me tomorrow”. Participant 22, “try to forget the day, try to leave the stress behind. Problem is, the job has already changed you as a person by the time you realize things to the degree you are able to type answers to these questions.” Participant 14, “I don't. I keep it bottled up inside.”

In the category of “some activity”, Participant 23 stated,

> I try and just forget about all of it but I can't. I distract myself by being with my family and trying to enjoy the time we spend together doing thing we love like watching the kids play sports. And I usually have cold beer that helps. You will never forget the shit you see in prison.

Participant 12 stated, “I go to the gym and I express my true feelings to.my wife.” Participant 13 explained, “Slow drive home. Sometimes quiet alone time at the end of the day before bed.” Participant 17 said, “Try to relax on my long drive home”.

The final category for Question 11 is “talk with someone”. Participant 1, responded, “I will usually feel relieved the day is over and discuss situations with my spouse to make sure I always get things off my chest of what I have to deal with daily.” Participant 19 explained, “You don't, you just go home unless you have a good wife or significant other that will allow you to vent. My wife was an officer so she gets it I'm one of the lucky few!”

The following table illustrates the categories assigned to Question 11 and the percentages of responses in each category.

Table 12

Research Question 3: Survey Question 11

Category	Number of participants with answers in this category	Percentage of Participants who answered in this category
No coping method	11	47.83%
Some activity	9	39.13%
Talk to someone	3	13.04%

Question 12 Analysis

Do you discuss the emotions you feel during the day with family or friends?

Question 12 asks the participants to explain if they express any emotions regarding their job with family or friends. This question was coded into two categories. All responses were either "yes" or "no". Some participants gave further explanation.

Participant 19 answered, "No. Not that often, the chaos of the job becomes normal as if you are going to desk job in an office building full of white collar workers. You can try to leave it behind at the gate, but it's too late, since you already have changed as a person." Participant 14 explained, "No they do not understand what I deal with on a daily basis. And if I tell them how I feel it usually ends up in an argument." Participant 11 said, "no. emotions stay bottled up."

Participant 2 explained, "Yes. Mostly my friends only cause they all work in the same field. And mostly we discuss our anger or frustration. We discuss how things

played out and how to do them differently or even better." Participant 5 said, "Yes. To an extent yes. I don't go into detail too deep as I feel that it is hard for the average person to understand how we can be so guarded". Participant 7 stated, "Sometimes I discuss things when I'm stressed about certain situations, such as getting held or possibly losing my position."

Table 13

Research Question 3: Survey Question 12

Category	Number of participants with answers in this category	Percentage of Participants who answered in this category
yes	8	34.78%
no	15	65.22%

Question 13 Analysis

Explain what emotions you feel when faced with a tense situation at home.

Question 13 allows the participant the opportunity to address what emotion they feel when faced with a tense situation in their home or private life. Three categories emerged when analyzing and coding the responses. The categories for Question 13 are "calm", "cop mode, strict, mad", and "unsure".

Participant 1 stated, "I am able to think logically and calmly do to most home situations are less life threatening and easier to deal with." Participant 21 explained,

“Calm. I remain calm and try to find a solution to the problem the quickest way possible.” Participant 15 said, “I feel like not dealing with the situation at all. Just ignore it and it will go away type mentality”

Participant 23 explained,

> Again, fear and sadness anger which generally causes me to go into my show no fear don't back down mode. I feel fear for the things that could result from the tense situation such as my spouse not talking to me or even worse divorce. The kids being upset or their feelings hurt. Sadness for the fact that I wish there didn't have to be those tense situations at home. I want my home to be a safe stress free environment but we all know that isn't practical.

Participant 17 responded, “I turn into a correctional officer sometimes”. Participant 8 explained, “I anger easily at home.” Participant 4 stated, “You go into "cop" mode and detach emotion all together sometimes. If you are having an argument or something emergent you explain in facts and details so that emotions don't have a play into it.”

Two Participants responded under the category of “unsure”. Their explanation indicated they were unclear what the question was asking for. The table below depicts the breakdown of the number of participants responding in each category.

Table 14

Research Question 3: Survey Question 13

Category	Number of participants with answers in this category	Percentage of Participants who answered in this category
calm	7	30.43%
Cop mode, strict, mad	14	60.87%
unsure	2	8.7%

Question 14 Analysis

Do you express the emotions you feel in personal situations or do you feel one emotion but exhibit another?

Question 14 is very similar in content to Question 10. Question 10 was designed to coincide with Research Question 2, and it addresses the congruency of felt versus expressed emotions of the participant on the job. Question 14 is designed to align with Research Question 3, and speaks to the congruency of felt versus expressed emotions in regards to the participant's personal life.

After analyzing and coding the responses by the participants for Question 14, two main categories emerged. The categories are, "no, change, or stifle", and "yes, more open." The outcome of Question 14 was directly opposite of the outcome in Question 10. Question 14 responses indicated that 14 or 60.87% of participants felt that they were consistent with their emotions at home or in their personal lives. Question 10 indicated

that 15 respondents or 65.22% of participants indicated they altered their emotions while at work. These findings illustrate that participants do not feel they can consistently experience and express the same emotion while on the job, but are able to in their personal lives.

Participant 15 explained, “In personal situations I exhibit the emotions I'm feeling. I'm not trying to put up the same facade like I do at work.” Participant 6 stated, “I am pretty much an open book. I wear my emotions on my sleeve.” Participant 8 said, “Away from work I express the emotion I'm feeling at the time.”

Participant 11 explained, “no, I keep with the persona of keeping it bottled up inside because of habit.” Participant 17 said, “no, I won't cry. It's weakness. I've only cried once in the past 10 years.” Participant 21 responded. “I remain calm and collected at all times even if I may be anxious or nervous on the inside.”

The table below illustrates the percentages of the responses in each category.

Table 15

Research Question 3: Survey Question 14

Category	Number of participants with answers in this category	Percentage of Participants who answered in this category
No, change, stifle	9	39.13%
yes	14	60.87%

Question 15 Analysis

Do you think the emotions you exhibit in your personal life are appropriate for the situation?

This is the last question participants were asked to answer on the 15-item questionnaire. It relates directly to Research Question 3, and it asks the participant to address if the emotions they express in their personal life are appropriate. This question yielded two categories after coding and analysis was complete. The two categories are "yes", and "no". The percentage of responses assigned to each category was very near equal. 11 participants or 47.83% responded "no", that their expressed emotions are not appropriate for the situation. In contrast, 12 participants or 52.17% responded with a "yes", that they believed their expressed emotions were appropriate.

Participant 2 stated, "no, sometimes yes, for instance if you tell your kids or significant other to know where exits are in a movie theater so you have a plan if something happens that is a good emotional response because you are trying to protect them. On the other hand, if you continue to replay the day over in your head and come home wound up you could easily say or do something harmful to your loved ones because your mind is not where it needs to be. Participant 4 said, "Probably not. This career tends to breed twisted emotions." Participant 19 explained, "No, prison people are generally a "changed" group of people. We are the elephant in the room and usually don't mix well with others because we see things so different. So no, outer emotions are

usually not appropriate, but they certainly will assist us in staying alive more than normal people." participant 21 responded,

> "I've been told by my wife that I remind her of a machine that is programmed to solve a problem when something happens. My 2-year-old daughter was choking once, and turning blue. I was in my office and my wife was freaking out downstairs. My wife said when I came into the room, my face showed no emotion and I grabbed my daughter, turned her upside down on my forearm and began infant / toddler back thrusts to dislodge the food she was choking on. It worked, I set her back down and asked if she was ok. Afterwards, my wife asked me if I was ok, I had a strange look on my face like I almost didn't care. Which obviously was the exact opposite of what I was actually feeling. I think overall this job either breaks people mentally, or causes them to fortify their minds to the point of survival at all costs and pushes 'normal' emotions out of the way to make way for others that are 'more important'. I don't know the best way to explain what I mean, but hopefully this comes across at least semi understandable.

Participant 3 said, "Yes. When arguing with my wife I express anger. When something sad is discussed then sadness is displayed. Participant 9 explained, "yes, I think as a parent and a husband one must keep a level head and be willing to discuss and not throw a fit in anger or argue when in anger it is best resolved to look at both sides and compromise to the best of one's personal beliefs and ability." Participant 15 responded, "Yes. To me work and my personal life are two separate worlds if that makes sense. I will say that working in the prison setting for 10 years has made me callous as far as

emotion goes. I tend to not get upset by much at work or at home. I have a "this too shall pass" outlook the vast majority of the time."

The table below depicts the percentage of responses in each of the two categories coded for Question 15.

Table 16

Research Question 3: Survey Question 15

Category	Number of participants with answers in this category	Percentage of Participants who answered in this category
no	11	47.83%
yes	12	52.17%

Research Question 3 (Questions 11-15) Analysis

What negative symptoms in their private lives does the officer attribute to the emotions they experience on the job?

Research Question 3 was designed to determine if the emotions experienced on the job spill over into the private lives of the participants. Five questions on the 15-item questionnaire were designed to address the potential phenomenon discussed in Research Question 3. These five questions allowed the participant the opportunity to explain how their felt and expressed emotions are handled outside of work, and, to determine if the

participant was aware of any discrepancies in their felt or expressed emotions stemming from their occupation.

After coding and analyzing the responses to Questions 11-15 on the 15-item questionnaire, certain, specific themes or phenomenon were apparent. Questions 11 and 12 discussed whether the participant had a tool they used to process the day's events, and Question 12 followed up on that concept by directly asking if the participant discussed or processed the day's events with a close family member or friend. Both these questions yielded consistent similar results. 47.83% of participants in question 11 explained they had no coping mechanism and 65.22% of participants explained they did not talk through the day's events with family or close friends. A total of 39.13% of participants said they engaged in some sort of "activity" to process the work days' events.

Question 13 continued to build on the themes presented in questions 11 and 12. Question 13 asked the participant to explain the emotions they felt when faced with a tense situation in their private lives. This question indicated that it is plausible that some negative behaviors experienced in the participant's private life could be attributed to their emotions or experiences within the institution. The majority of the participant's responses (60.87%) could be coded into the category of "cop mode, strict, and mad. Several participants explained how they often had a difficult time not responding to a situation at home in the same way they would at work.

Question 14 asked again about felt emotions versus expressed emotions as they relate to personal situations. 60.87% of participants explained that, yes, they were

consistent with expressing their felt emotions in a personal setting. This in contrast to how participants felt about expressing their felt emotions while at work.

Question 15 asked the participants if they felt that they expressed their emotions appropriately. Participants were almost evenly split in their responses with 12 participants saying “yes” and 11 participants saying “no”. In many of the “no” explanations the theme of being easily angered, hyper vigilant, having dead or muted affect, always being on guard, cynical, and feeling like their emotions were now somehow different than those not working within a prison.

Summary

The 15- item questionnaire designed to gather data and explore the phenomenon of correctional officers’ perceived emotions on the job yielded a considerable amount of information pertaining to the research questions posed. Overall, the questionnaire yielded results that support the phenomenon indicating Correctional Custody Staff feel one emotion while on the job, but tend to express another. This phenomenon appears to be more prevalent in their professional life. In addition, the participants in this study indicated that they experience high levels of stress and anxiety during their shifts and, it is plausible based on the survey results, that high levels of stress and anxiety do have negative effects on the personal life of the participants. In Chapter 5, I will interpret the findings of the study, make recommendations regarding the study, discuss potential implications, and address the limitations of the study.

Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore the emotions experienced by correctional officers while at work in a prison setting. The study was designed to allow correctional officers the opportunity to express what emotions they experience while on shift, and to identify if their felt emotions were consistent with their expressed emotions. The study also addressed how correctional custody officers handled emotions in their private lives, versus how they handled emotions while at work.

Though much has been written regarding correctional officer stress, I designed this study (a) to address the emotional component of working in a prison, (b) to allow the participants the opportunity to address the various emotions felt throughout a shift, and (c) to offer participants the opportunity to discuss if they feel that they can express the felt emotions while at work. The study showed that correctional officers experience a high amount of anxiousness when arriving for their shifts and throughout their daily interactions with inmates and management-level staff. Further, my findings indicated that correctional officers are not comfortable expressing or discussing their felt emotions throughout their shift at work, but rather consistently feel one emotion and express another. Finally, correctional custody staff expressed that they often take their work persona home with them and either show no emotion in their private life, or show emotion not consistent with the situation they are experiencing. Participants did report that they felt more able to express their emotions in their home or private life setting, but that their emotions were often not appropriate for the situation.

Interpretation of Findings

The findings of this study confirm that correctional custody staff experience high levels of stress and anxiety in their occupation. These finding are consistent with both the Shwartz and Lavitas, (2012) study that shows correctional custody staff experience stress at higher levels than most other occupations, the Griffin et al.'s (2010) study explaining the high levels of burnout in correctional officers. Griffin et al. noted that high levels of stress in correctional custody staff can be due to inconsistency in work expectations and feeling loyalty or dedication to the institution, while nonetheless feeling disenfranchised when the loyalty is not reciprocated by the institution the officer works for. Griffin et al. stated that officers who felt a high level of satisfaction with their occupation were less likely to experience burnout (2010). The results of my study indicated that most participants did not feel a high level of satisfaction with their occupation. In contrast, many of the answers given by the participants indicated a feeling of frustration and cynicism regarding corrections. Thus, it is plausible that these negative feelings could contribute to the negative symptoms experienced in correction custody staff.

Like the findings in the Griffin et al. (2010) study, Lambert et al. (2014) discussed the types of organizational commitment to the institution in relation to the level of home/work conflict. The findings of my study coincide with those of Lambert et al. in that participants who indicated high levels of anxiety and frustration at work also indicated higher levels of difficulty in not bringing work home with them. These participants were often the ones who expressed taking work home with them and having a harder time turning off their work persona. The participants in my study consistently

discussed having conflicting emotions while at work and how those conflicting emotions caused them difficulty in expressing appropriate emotions in their private lives. Similar findings were noted in the Lambert et al. study, thus indicating further consistency between my findings and those reported in previous literature on the subject.

Both Crawley (2002) and Farkas (2002) have both touched on the highly suspicious, paranoid nature that correctional custody staff members exhibit. Participants in my study often expressed a feeling of distrust and worry regarding their occupation and how they interacted with individuals both while at work and in their private lives. Crawley (2002) looked extensively at the effects correctional occupations had on the family of the correctional officer, and reported statements made by correctional officers' spouses indicating that their spouse had changed, was "rigid," had "loss of affect," and was "hardened" by the occupation (2002). Participants in my study used these same descriptive terms to describe themselves. The participants in my study often used words like "hyper vigilant," "angry," "no emotion," "loss of empathy," and "numb" to explain how they may feel at work and at home. This marks a consistency in the findings of previous literature and the results of my research.

Though my research was focused on the emotions felt by correctional custody staff, themes identified in previous literature were evident in the findings of my study. Farkas (2000) and Tait (2011) both discussed the typology of correctional officers in their research. The results of my research do not specifically address a typology of officers, but findings in the Farkas (2000) and Tait (2011) studies seem to be consistent with some of the results of my research. For example, Tait (2011) and Farkas (2000) both concluded

that the personality types most often seen in correctional custody staff were those who liked to adhere to structure and a rigid routine, were strict, and had a strong sense of loyalty to each other and the institution. They expected continuity in their job and support and leadership from management. These themes were present in the responses from the participants of my study. Though the responses indicated a frustration and anger with management, it was often in response to not feeling supported or not feeling like they had consistent directives. Participants in my study often explained a "brotherhood" or comradery with their coworkers and a need to keep each other safe and take care of one another. Further they expressed anger or anxiousness when discussing interactions with inmates and the uncertainty surrounding what an inmate might do at any time. Responses from the participants in my research illustrated a need for order and a need to have control over their surroundings in both their work and personal lives.

Miller et al. (2007) and Tracy (2004) have addressed the issue of emotional labor used by correctional custody staff. Both researchers found that correctional officers use emotional labor while at work and often change the emotion they express to be more acceptable in the situation than the emotion they feel. This concept was consistently discussed in the responses given by the participants in my research study. Overall, the responses to the questionnaire used in my research indicated that the participants did not feel comfortable expressing the emotions they felt. They explained a consistent need to alter the expression of their emotions regarding everything from reactions to violence in the institution to reactions when interacting with management. Participants explained that they did this for several reasons, but often stated that their felt emotions would not be

acceptable because of the need to show a command presence, stay in control, and show no weakness.

Overall, the data collected during this study is consistent with the findings of the research previously done regarding correctional officer stress and related topics.

Theoretical Framework

The two theories I used to frame this study were Glasser's choice or control theory and Schacter's theory of emotion. These two theories help to explain why an individual might experience a specific emotion and why he or she would potentially choose to exhibit another.

Many of the participants in the study indicated that they were aware of feeling a specific emotion while at work. For example, one participant gave the example of feeling fear when coming upon a violent incident with inmates. The participant explained that he was aware of the feeling of fear, however, decided to only show confidence and a command presence while handling the incident. This illustrates how Glasser's theory of choice or control works. The individual experiences an emotion, but can choose what they express. The participant who detailed this experience explained that the reason he chose to exhibit a different emotion than the one felt was because he felt that showing any fear or weakness inside a prison was dangerous to himself and his partners. In this situation, which is consistent with Glasser's theory, the desired outcome for the individual was to maintain a persona of control; thus, expressing his internal emotion would not yield the desired outcome, so he made a choice to control what he expressed.

Schacter's theory of emotion helped me understand how the participant might experience negative symptoms when choosing to express an emotion not consistent with what he is feeling (see Reisenzein, 1983). Several participants expressed a feeling of anxiety when driving onto the grounds of the institution. Schacter explains that emotion is a two-phased occurrence in that the individual has a physiological response, followed by a choice to assign a feeling that is occurring after he experiences the physiological response (Reisenzein, 1983). The results of the study indicate that the participants are all experiencing physiological responses when entering the prison and are often assigning the feelings anxiety, frustration, hyper vigilance, fear, and anger to the physiological response they are having. However, as Schacter explained, the individual may not choose to exhibit what he is feeling (Reisenzein, 1983). This is evidenced by the participant's responses detailing his choice not to show the emotion he felt, but rather to express an emotion believed to be more appropriate on the job. This further explains the conflicting dialogue that correctional custody staff experience numerous times throughout their shifts, as well as when they transition back to their home lives.

Limitations of the Study

This study was a phenomenological study conducted in the State of California using participants working for a correctional institution within the state. Though there are many similarities from state to state regarding how correctional officers are trained and how each correctional department is run, there are differences as well. It is plausible that if this study were conducted in another state the data produced might yield different outcomes.

The study was phenomenological and I was looking for emerging themes regarding the emotions felt by correctional custody staff. Thus, the participant pool was kept within the recommended range for a qualitative study of this nature to accommodate for the coding process (Creswell, 2012).

Snowball sampling was used to reach and secure participants. While this allowed for anonymity, I have no way of knowing what institutions participants were from, or the breakdown of gender, ethnicity, age, and rank of the participants. It is possible that with a different sampling method the demographics of the participant pool could be more controlled.

Recommendations

The results of this study illustrate that correctional custody staff do not feel comfortable expressing their felt emotions, that they have high levels of anxiety going into their shifts, and that there is an overall attitude of distrust and uncertainty while on the job. Further, the data illustrate that the participants in this study do have difficulty transitioning between work and home personas, and that they feel the occupation has a negative effect on their emotions. Expanding the participant pool of this research to include other states correctional staff would help to determine if this phenomenon was present in all correctional settings or is specific to California institutions. Further, research designed to address the individual components of the overall research that was conducted could be helpful in narrowing down what specific issues cause the officer anxiety. For example, research specific to interactions with management, research

specific to interactions with inmates and research specific to coping mechanisms would allow for more in-depth analysis and could result in clear and detailed data.

Implications

Research regarding correctional occupations is not new; however, much of what has been done in the past has not allowed for correctional custody staff to express in their own words, what they feel while on the job. This study, though small, and focusing on only one state, allowed officers the opportunity to address their emotions and the issues surrounding them. The potential for changes in training and interactions between management level staff are significant. The results of this study should serve as a starting point and a means for dialog between policy makers and front-line staff. It is plausible that significant change can be effected regarding the high levels of suicide, divorce, substance abuse, and domestic violence seen in correctional custody employees by addressing the results of this study and using the data to implement new methods of training.

Much can be accomplished in correctional training academies regarding understanding the potential emotions that an officer will incur and ways to resolve the disconnect between what is felt and what is expressed. Corrections departments spend a significant amount of time and money training their officers to be effective at their jobs. However, the results of this study indicate that to be an effective officer, the individual must often suppress the emotions felt. If that is the case, education and training could be implemented to assist the officer in understanding the phenomenon that is occurring, why it occurs, and how to effectively process the emotions experienced to avoid negative

symptoms. The results of this study offer a starting point for departments to open dialogue with their staff and begin a process of change.

Conclusions

"What happens when good people are put into an evil place? Do they triumph, or does the situation dominate their past history and morality?" (Zimbardo, 2003).

Correctional custody staff work in an environment not typical of other occupations. They are, for all intents and purposes, incarcerated alongside some of our society's most dangerous criminals for the entirety of their shift. Correctional custody staff spend their shifts maintaining law and order amongst those who disrupt law and order at every turn. They work in a dangerous, negative, and cynical environment with little ability to effect any positive change. This study addressed what these officers feel while working in these institutions, and, if they felt comfortable expressing their felt emotions. The participants of this study allowed us a glimpse of what it is like to work in a correctional institution and gave us insight as to the emotional process they encounter when faced with situations they experience throughout their shifts.

The results of the study detail the large amounts of anxiety and stress felt by officers as they start a shift, the disconnect between what they feel and what they express throughout a shift, and the consistent theme of distrust and paranoia felt by officers in both their work and home life. It is evident from the results of this study that correctional custody staff are affected emotionally by their occupation, that they feel the occupation somehow changes them, and that they struggle with the ability to "turn off" their work persona when they leave the institution. The results of this study and those that

have come before it illustrates some of the reasons that the occupation of corrections has higher than average mortality, suicide, domestic violence, divorce, and substance abuse rates. It would be to the benefit of all correctional custody staff if correctional departments addressed these issues and implemented further training and educational procedures to assist in offsetting the negative symptoms that occur as a product of working in a correctional facility.

References

Allen, R., Hogan, N., & Lambert, E. (2006). Correlates of correctional officer job stress: The impact of organizational structure. *American Journal of Criminal Justice, 30*(2), 227-248. doi:10.1177/2158244013489695

Altheimer, I., Hogan, N., & Lambert, E. (2010). Exploring the relationship between social support and job burnout among correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 37*(11), 1217-1236. doi:10.1177/0093854810379552

Brimeyer, L., Delprino, R., & Hepner, W. (2005). Consequences of the job on the health and well-being of corrections officers. *Hearing Three: Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prisons.* Retrieved from http://www.prisoncommission.org /transcripts/public_hearing_3_day_1_consequences.pdf

Bureau of Labor Statistics (2015). *Occupational outlook handbook.* Correctional officers. Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/ooh/Protective-Service/Correctional-officers .htm

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (2015). Career Opportunities. Retrieved from http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Career_Opportunities/

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. (2015). Facility Locator. California Correctional Center. Retrieved from http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/Facilities _Locator/CCC.html

Ciccarelli, S. & Noland, J. (2012). *Psychology* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Crawley, E. (2002). Bringing it all back home? The impact of Prison officers' work on

their families. *Probation Journal*, 49, 277-286.doi/10.1177/026455050204900403

Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design, choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Farkas, M. (2000). A typology of correctional officers. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 44*(4), 441-449. doi:10.1177 /0306624X0044400

Frankfort-Nachmias, C. & Nachmias, D. (2008). *Research methods in the social sciences* (7th ed). New York, NY: Worth Publishers.

Grawitch, M., Barber, L., & Kruger, M. (2010). Role identification, community socio-economic status demands, and stress outcomes in police officers. *Anxiety, Stress, and Coping, 23*(2), 165-180. doi:101080/10615800902935542

Griffin, M., Hogan, N., Lambert, E., Tucker-Gail, K., & Baker, D. (2010). Job involvement, job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment and the burnout of correctional officer staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*. 37, 239-255. doi:10.1177/0093854809351682

Mesmer-Magnus, J., DeChurch, L., & Wax, A. (2012). Moving emotional labor beyond surface and deep acting: A discordance-congruence perspective. *Organizational Psychology Review, 2*(1), 6-53. doi:10.1177/20411386611417746

Noblet, A. Rodwell, J. & Allisey, A. (2009). Job stress in the law enforcement sector: Comparing the linear, non-linear and interaction effects of working conditions. *Stress & Health, 25*(1), 111-120. doi:10.1002/smi.1227

Reisenzein, R. (1983). The Schachter theory of emotion: Two decades later.

Psychological Bulletin. 94(2), 239-264. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.94.2.239

Shwartz, S. & Lavitiz, L. (2012). A new vision for correctional officers. *Tikkun*. 27(1), 37-40. doi:10.1215/08879982-2012-1017

Steele, D. (2001*). Stress management for the professional corrections officer*. Mansfield, MA: Steele Publishing and Consulting Co.

Tracy, S. (2003). Correctional contradictions: A structural approach to addressing officer burnout. *Corrections Today, 65*(2), 90-94. Google Scholar

Tracy, S. (2004). The construction of correctional officers: Layers of emotionality behind bars. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *10*(4), 509-533. doi:10.1177/1077800403259716

Tracy, S. (2005). Locking up emotion: moving beyond dissonance for understanding emotion labor discomfort. *Communication Monographs, 73*(3), 261-283. doi:10 .1080/03637750500206474

Appendix: Correctional Officer's Perceived Emotions on the Job 15-item Questionnaire

The following questionnaire consists of questions regarding the emotions you experience while at work and at home. Please answer the questions as detailed and honestly as possible. Remember this study is anonymous. Please do not put your name on this questionnaire.

1. When you arrive on the institution grounds, what is the first emotion you are aware of feeling?

2. During your shift when you interact with an inmate what emotion are you aware of experiencing? It may be a variety of emotions. Please explain

3. When there is a violent incident that you are involved in, or witness to, what emotion are you aware of feeling? Please explain.

4. When you interact with staff at the management level do you have any specific emotions? Please elaborate.

5. Overall, when you are inside the institution, interacting with coworkers, inmates and management what are the most consistent emotions you experience? Please explain in detail.

6. Are there certain incidents where you feel one emotion yet express another? Please explain.
7. If you express an emotion different then the emotion you are feeling, why do you think you might do that? Please explain and give detailed examples.

8. In the event of a violent incident in which an inmate may be seriously injured or killed what emotions do you feel? Please elaborate.

9. Do you discuss emotions regarding the job with coworkers while on the job? Please give an example.

10. Do you feel that the emotions you express while on the job are consistent with what you are feeling or do you alter what you exhibit to coworkers? Please give an example.

11. When you leave the institution how do you process the day's events? Please explain.

12. Do you discuss the emotions you feel during the day with family or friends? Please explain.

13. Explain what emotions you experience when faced with a tense situation at home. Please detail and explain your feelings.

14. Do you express the emotion you feel in personal situations or do you feel one emotion, but exhibit another? Please elaborate.

15. Do you feel the emotions you exhibit in your personal life are appropriate for the situation? Please explain and give examples.