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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

Stress among direct service workers in juvenile detention institutions is a problem that demands close and immediate attention. These workers face a complex system of exploitative behaviors that arouse anxiety and undermine effectiveness. At such institutions, stress and exploitation appear to exist concommitantly. Staff members are subjected to physical attacks, verbal insults and physical intimidation by inmates. In turn, staff experience demoralization and exhibit an array of reactive behaviors.

Juvenile institution workers experience work-related stress as a result of working with uncooperative inmates. Feld (1977) states, "The extensive use of violence prevented the staff from gaining control over the inmate group." (p. 165) In this view, inmates are seen as uncooperative, with negative perceptions and hostile feelings toward staff.

Staff experiences of stress and their exposure to inmate hostility cause some employees to respond with anger, exaggeratedly business-like behavior or withdrawal. This distancing behavior results in a lack of trust between staff and inmates.

An employee's inexperience with juvenile inmates contributes to an atmosphere of mistrust. Dinitz (1976) describes how middle-class juvenile workers are subjected to exploitation: "... exploitation
may either not be recognized, or its importance may be ignored. Paradoxically, while these middle-class staff may be more likely to leave the boys alone, they are also more likely to be confronted both mentally and physically." (p. 185) Dinitz (1976) further describes how a staff member is mentally and physically confronted:

Contraband (money, food, clothing and radios) may be stolen from them; they may be physically pushed around by aggressive boys, or perhaps even violently assaulted. But, much more frequently, the types of games are such that staff are not aware of being victimized. (p. 184)

The role of juvenile institution workers requires that the employees control others. The role includes maintaining discipline and contributing to a positive atmosphere despite being bombarded with exploitative behaviors while under pressure. At the same time, however, they must maintain control of their own inner feelings.

Personnel may become dissatisfied with their occupational role and become as victims of job stress. Dinitz (1976) states, "Nothing in its structure (juvenile institution) generates job satisfaction, high morale, or loyalty" (p. xii). Employees are part of a system with few rewards. High staff turnover is likely to occur because of physical assaults and other sources of worker dissatisfaction.

**Statement of the Problem**

Juvenile institutions have difficulty hiring and retaining effective direct service workers. This may be due to factors in the work environment. Employees who are exposed to daily verbal abuse, who are threatened or who are actually physically battered, experience varying
levels of job stress. Few studies, however, have focused on this aspect of the juvenile system. Many studies have been concerned with staff exploitation of inmates (Dinitz, 1976; Feld, 1977), and recent studies have been interested in stress and coping among prison guards (Fox, 1982; Veninga and Spradley, 1971).

Some researchers have described a variety of illicit activities which occur between inmates and staff. Earlier studies (Goffman, 1961; Polsky, 1962) pointed to the core values of the inmate code and the nature of the inmate culture. One author (Phelps, 1976) pointed out that staff's non-judgmental attitudes, without emotional involvement, are needed to reduce negative relations between staff and inmates.

On the basis of the little attention heretofore given to the subject and the need for determining whether there is a relationship between job stress and juvenile exploitation, it is suggested here that the relationship be empirically tested.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between the exploitation of staff and the work-related stress experienced by staff. The primary hypothesis is: The more exploited an employee, as perceived by the employee, the higher the employee's stress level.

Based upon a review of the literature concerning juvenile exploitation of staff and work-related stress, specific objectives are formulated to guide this investigation. This study will seek to determine:
1. The stress levels of respondents as measured by the six scales of Maslach's Burnout Inventory.

2. The perceived exploitation level of respondents.

3. The impact of selected demographic variables on perceived exploitation of respondents. The demographic variables in this analysis were age, sex, months employed, degree of preparation, income and years of professional training.

4. Whether a relationship exists between perceived exploitation and the following factors: pressures outside of workplace, work conditions, level of education completed, coping strategies, age of juveniles worked with and absenteeism.

5. Whether differences exist in perceived exploitation among the levels of the following variables: job title, value orientation of respondent employment, shift and personality characteristics.

6. Whether there is a positive relationship between perceived exploitation and job stress as measured by six subscales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory.

7. Whether there are particular forms of perceived exploitation which impact on employee stress levels.

**Significance of the Study**

The results of this study shall have implications for the administration of juvenile detention and treatment institutions. First of all, the results will draw attention to the need among some staff
members for special preparation for employment inside juvenile institutions. This type of information can be particularly valuable to the administrator for the hiring and training of line workers. Current hiring practices may need to be modified.

Secondly, the findings of this study may suggest a need for increased in-service training in identified areas such as stress management and the handling of violent behaviors.

The findings of this study may also be used by social workers in juvenile institutions. Because social workers operate in institutional roles such as training, administration, supervision, discharge and planning, some of them may use the findings to establish orientation and training programs for new employees and staff support groups. By preparing inexperienced youth care workers and social workers about the nature of the institutional environment, the outcome of such a program might decrease the high rate of job turnovers.

The results of this study may also be useful to placement personnel, vocational counselors and others interested in employment placement. The findings of this study can be useful in career planning, advising, effective hiring and the development of new programs.

Limitations of the Study

1. Subjects will be staff members within a juvenile institution. Generalizations of the findings are limited to staff of similar institutions.
2. The sample size may limit the study's generalizability.

3. The exploitation of juvenile inmates by staff will not be considered in the study.

4. Institutional policy regarding rules and regulations of inmate behavior will not be part of the study.

5. Stress between staff members and their peer groups as a function of organizational design will not be examined.
Chapter II

A REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Two theoretical perspectives upon which this dissertation is based are stress theory and role theory. These theories and related research will be discussed in this chapter, as well as work overload as it pertains to job stress.

Stress Theory

Recent years have witnessed a growing body of literature on stress. Webb and Smith (1980) define stress as "the state of an individual reacting to some problematic event or demand, which those factors that produce the state of stress are referred to as 'stressors'" (p. 251). Stress is thought to derive from many aspects of life and is seen as a primary cause of psychological, social and physical problems. Webb and Smith (1980) further suggest, "Regardless of whether stress is non-specific or whether it is more likely associated with psychological than physiological phenomena, virtually every form and type of stress can be said to be environmentally engendered" (p. 252).

Paramount to understanding the concept of stress is the variation of definitions used. These definitions are widely employed and have different meanings for researchers.
Hans Selye (1974), the father of stress research, defines stress as:

... the non-specific, response of the body to any demand made upon it. For general orientation, it suffices to keep in mind that by stress the physician means the common result of exposure to any stimulus. (p. 141).

Other researchers have questioned Selye's definition of stress as a "non-specific response." Research studies are revealing that stress is both physiological and psychological. Edward Gross (1970) points out that "physiological stress is represented by a 'detectable change in the body' ..." (p. 55). He further suggests that psychological stress refers to situations in which "... there are reports of disturbed effects ... in the adequacy of cognitive function" (p. 55).

While Gross' view of stress is broader than Selye's definition, Gross' perception of physiological and psychological stress response has been examined. Webb and Smith (1980) have argued, "Virtually anything can stimulate the stress condition, but whether a particular situation is conducive to stress is dependent on the individual's emotional health, personal vulnerability to stress, as well as other predisposing personality factors." (p. 253)

Stress research can be seen on a broader level, but comprised of divergent definitions including several forms of stress. For example, "physical stress is linked to exercise, mental stress is involved in problem-solving activities and emotional stress is characterized by frustration, nervous anxiety and depression." (Webb and Smith, 1980,
Webb and Smith (1980) note also that "although most researchers emphasized the emotional aspect of stress, behavioral changes may be equally important and can be both positive and negative" (p. 254).

Research has been done on tedium and burnout. Both have been linked to stress. Tedium is the process of wearing down and feeling mentally and physically exhausted. Kafry and Pines (1978) explain tedium as the primary cause of occupational stress in social services.

Another response linked to stress is burnout (Mattingly, 1977). Freudenberger (1980) gives a vivid description of the burnout experience of staff members in free clinics. He describes how burnout includes such symptoms as "cynicism and negativism . . . which often lead to a closed mind about change or innovation" (Freudenberger, 1980, p. 90). Similarly, Maslach (1982) considers burnout a "syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment . . . " (p. 3). For example, a social worker who is burned out and under conditions of high stress may grow cynical and not care about clients. Maslach and Pines (1977) found in a study that "staff members who worked longer hours with children developed negative attitudes toward children" (p. 107).

Burnout

The importance of focusing on burnout and its relationship to the employment setting has been explored (Wasserman, 1970; Freudenberger, 1974; Mahingly, 1977; Maslach and Pines, 1977; Crosby, 1982; Maslach,
1982). As a result of burnout, there is a high turnover rate among correctional staff employees, with some institutions reporting annual rates as high as 50 percent.

The institutional setting and the job task have produced high levels of stress on the behavior of employees. Within this setting, individual differences such as education, training, prior work experience, age, sex and coping strategy seem to account for the varied reactions toward stress. In some cases, there is a strong conflict among direct service employees and the actual personnel training a staff member in how to maintain control over inmates. The outcome is usually burnout. As an outgrowth of burnout, employees are leaving institutions. There is no single factor responsible for all turnovers reported to personnel. Reasons include low pay, inmates, and unfair treatment by supervisors, to name a few.

Despite alarming turnover rates, burnout has been given little attention by correctional administrations. Rather than looking at burnout as a factor associated with the physical and psychological illnesses experienced by staff members, many administrators explain the high number of departing workers as more a problem of employee job dissatisfaction.

Research in the area is gaining acceptance as increasing numbers of employee health problems are attributed to job turnover. Some of the physical effects of burnout are evident in people who experience ulcers, migraine headaches, nervous tension, sleeplessness, loss of appetite, and weight gain. Psychological disorders often include
emotional conflict, low self-esteem, helplessness, and depression. Others, who may have learned to cope with institutional dangers by disguising their true feelings, may show no overt symptoms of burnout, but suffer silently without anyone knowing their emotional or physical stress.

Environmental Sources of Stress

The environment of a juvenile institution may produce stress among workers. There may be a "detachment" which leads to a negative attitude (Maslach and Pines, 1977, p. 100), that is, the emotional strain of working with people can lead workers to psychological withdrawal, intellectualization, exaggeratedly business-like behavior and the use of disparaging language to describe juvenile inmates (e.g., "the little criminals" or "the animals"). Some view them as "my caseload" rather than as people (Maslach and Pines, 1977, p. 103). Wasserman (1970) noted:

The worker is often overwhelmed by the cumulative impact, perhaps the . . . terror, of a large number of cases--by the human suffering, deprivation, disorder, ignorance, hostility and cruelty he must face as part of his everyday work situation (p. 96).

Mattingly (1977) suggests that some workers feel as if they are inside a "pressure cooker" because they were "exposed continuously to the possibility of physical and psychological harm" with juvenile inmates who are insolent (p. 130). King (1976) speaks of an increasing "volume and intensity of juvenile violence" (p. 43). He advocates workers' assertive behavior with recalcitrant youth. As a consequence,

Daley (1979) supports this contention, pointing out that stress is derived from a setting with little rewards and many crises. The workers may need to develop some form of structure to apply to potentially explosive youth. A problem-solving approach is one way of providing such structure in currently unstructured crisis situations.

Mattingly (1977) writes:

The kick in the shins, the spitting, a broken finger, the insult, the cracked glasses and the feelings of self-doubt after a management crisis are, no matter how experienced or psychodynamically sophisticated the workers, all assaults on self-esteem and self-image (p. 130).

King (1976) explains that even more common in a counseling session is a defiant, remorseless, threatening attitude of the client. This attitude provokes another most important responsive emotion in the clinician—the desire to punish (p. 45). The following discussion addresses specific factors related to stress.

Inadequate Preparation

According to Maslach and Pines (1977), professional helpers lack training in coping with their own emotional job-related stress. In support of Maslach and Pines, Spaniol Caputo (cited in Unger, 1980), points to "an inability to make decisions" as a symptom of burnout (p. 33). Daley (1979) found that "reality shock created stress" in workers (p. 446). Others have focused on individual characteristics as possible sources of stress. Such factors as self-esteem and work
(Pattan, 1980); age linked to stress and work (Selye, 1974); sex as a predictor of burnout (cited in Daley, 1979); physical illness and stress (cited in Levine and Scotch, 1970); class and race (cited in Levine and Scotch, 1970); cognitive and personality factors (cited in Levine and Scotch, 1970); and psychophysiological responses to stress (Opton and Lazarus, 1967) have been associated with stress. Other research studies have also focused on individual characteristics as a predictor of job stress.

**Individual Differences**

The following individual characteristics have been found to be associated with stress:

**Age**--Theorell's study of middle-aged construction workers (cited in Beehr and Newman, 1978) found that age had a moderate role in relation to job stress. This premise was based on the assumption that age is a predictor of the extent of stress experienced in employment.

Maslach (1982) suggested a similar conclusion. She found that "burnout is greatest when workers are young and is lower for older workers" (p. 59). In her study, age is part of experience and wisdom acquired on the job. Age is considered an asset to employees because it represents maturity and the ability to handle stress.

**Sex**--Crosby (1982) found that sex was not a significant predictor of burnout among faculty members. In disagreement with this study, Manderscheid et al. (cited in Crosby, 1982) found a higher stress level among females than males. In a sample of college-educated persons,
Indik et al. (cited in Crosby, 1982) found stress among men and women the same. Maslach (1982) suggests that men and women were similar in their experiences of burnout.

In the most general sense, sex-based studies tend to reveal mixed findings. Some researchers believe that sex is a major factor in burnout, while other argue that sex has a small effect.

**Length of Employment**—Stress research in recent years draws a strong correlation between job stress and length of employment. Studies have shown the length of employment is a factor in the extent of stress experienced in employment.

**Personality Characteristics, Values and Personality Types**—While individual differences are of considerable significance in stress, research has shown that a humanistic orientation creates fewer problems (Harris et al., 1983). There is also growing evidence that stress found with the authoritarian person is higher than the humanistically-oriented person (Harris et al., 1983).

Friedman and Rosenman (cited in Selye, 1974) pointed out that individual differences include Type A and Type B behavior. Both reflect values. Type A behavior is considered more direct and aggressive, while Type B is more passive than Type A. However, Reiser (cited in Webb and Smith, 1980) argues that the rigid personality is more apt to successfully cope with stress than the flexible personality.

**Employment Affiliation, Education and Professional Training**—Maslach (1982) found a "high degree of emotional exhaustion for providers with less education" (p. 61). It is suggested that employees
who work directly with juvenile inmates (i.e., child care workers and social work aides) are less educated and subjected to more stress than the professional staff.

The professional staff—social workers, nurses, psychiatrists, etc.—see the juveniles during structured, brief intermittent appointments only. Infrequent contacts reduce some of the strain. The literature is not clear, however, about this relationship. More research needs to be conducted to investigate the relationship between professional and non-professional stress levels within an institutional setting.

Absence—Porter and Steers (cited in Selye, 1974) identified stress as a factor that hinders organizational effectiveness by contributing to employee absenteeism. Other researchers have identified the same (Kafry and Pines, 1980; Maslach, 1982). Absenteeism is a result of employees under continual stress.

Social Class and Degree of Preparation—Webb and Smith (1980) cite that previous work experience affects stress. In another study, Dohrenwend and Dohrenwend (1974) reported that lower class status is associated with stress.

Stress Resulting from Outside Sources—Holmes and Rahe (1967) found that certain life events affect behavior and health. Their study pointed to the notion that life events may affect stress, which can be assessed by measuring the individual's perception of stressful life events.
Coping Strategies

Lazarus (cited in Crosby, 1982) has presented two kinds of coping:

(a) direct action in which the person tries to master the stressful transaction with the environment; and (b) palliation, in which the person attempts to reduce the disturbance when unable to manage the environment or when action is too costly. Direct action is a strategy applied externally to the environmental source of stress and indirect coping or palliation is a strategy applied internally to one's behavior and emotions (p. 56).

Working Conditions

The literature is not clear in specifying how working conditions (i.e., noise, heat, and light) are related to job stress. Hockey (1979) has shown the following set of characteristics that must be considered in noise-induced stress:

a. An increase in rate of work, but with an increase in errors
b. A reduction in primary memory capacity
c. An increase in the selectivity of attention
d. An increase in the selectivity of response
e. A reduction in the use of intermediate categories of confidence (p. 169).

These characteristics point to a qualitative change which occurs in job performance. Noise-induced stress affects the level of performance and the degree of control over the situation. Moreover, loud noise may be perceived as threatening to some employees.
Characteristics of Juveniles

Howard Polsky, who is noted for his work in Cottage Six (Polsky, 1962), pointed out that juvenile subculture influenced the staff's behavior. Within this subculture was a hierarchy of roles in which both older and younger boys were assigned power by position. Older inmate leaders were often manipulated by staff to retain control over the subculture.

Dinitz et al. (1976) noted that black juveniles manipulated smaller white juveniles. There was little indication that, however, age of juveniles was a factor in staff exploitation.

Expectations

While most new professional helpers enter the helping professions for many different reasons, few find satisfaction and rewards. Maslach and Pines (1977) reported that the professional person who gets burnout is:

unable to maintain the caring and the commitment that they initially brought to the job. When this happens, workers tend to use a variety of ways of coping, ranging from impaired performance and absenteeism to various types of personal problems (p. 100).

Interpersonal Relationships

Stress studies have shown that direct "responsibility for the well-being of others" can be stressful (Kahn, 1978, p. 62). When a staff-inmate relationship is comprised of mistrust, psychological stress results. Research indicates that psychological stress is a
primary factor in low morale, absenteeism and high job turnover (Pines and Kafry, 1978).

In a study of the burnout syndrome in day care settings, Maslach and Pines (1979) found that:

a) larger worker/child ratios resulted in emotional overload; b) longer working hours were associated with stress and negative attitudes; c) a less-structured program created greater emotions from staff; and d) staff meetings were helpful in reducing burnout (p. 107).

Responsibility

Direct service workers are given responsibility and authority to make decisions in the lives of juveniles. This responsibility places a tremendous burden on the employee. At times, the worker may be indecisive in case management because the fate of a client rests with him.

For some, this experience can be overwhelming. When the worker is confused or lacks preparation in decision-making, the fear of making the wrong decision may affect the worker's self-esteem. Self-esteem is determined by an individual's own perception of self-worth. An individual evaluates and judges responses and attitudes in a given situation. Individuals who have a strong sense of self and feel positive about themselves have high self-esteem, while those who do not feel positive about themselves have low self-esteem.

Self-esteem is linked with perceptions of job performance. If the individual's assessment of job performance is evaluated as worthy of respect rather than condemnation, then the person's self-esteem may be
a reflection of this assessment. A negative evaluation, however, creates feelings of self-rejection and low self-esteem.

Stress Responses

Responses to stressors are different for every person. Some of the following symptoms can be linked to the degree of stress experienced by an individual:

Affective Symptoms of Stress

a. Depression (Freudenberger, 1974)
b. Cynicism (Freudenberger, 1974)
c. Negative attitude (Maslach and Jackson, 1977)
d. Increased irritability (Freudenberger, 1974)
e. Apathy (Freudenberger, 1977)

Behavioral Symptoms of Stress

a. Absenteeism (Freudenberger, 1974)
b. High turnover (Pines and Kafry, 1978)
c. Low work performance (Pines and Kafry, 1978)
d. Increased involvement in outside work (Freudenberger, 1974)
e. Alcohol consumption (Freudenberger, 1974)

Cognitive Symptoms of Stress

a. Paranoid response (Freudenberger, 1974)
b. Lack of concentration (Pines and Kafry, 1978)
c. Indecisiveness (Pines and Kafry, 1978)
d. Daydreaming (Freudenberger, 1974)

Physical Symptoms of Stress

a. Feelings of exhaustion (Maslach, 1982)
b. Tiredness (Maslach, 1982)
c. Headaches (Freudenbeger, 1974)
d. Tension (Maslach, 1982)
e. High blood pressure (Maslach, 1982)
Work-Related Stress

Focusing on stress and its relationship to job performance has been investigated (Maslach, 1982; Crosby, 1982; Maslach and Pines, 1977; Mahingly, 1977; Freudenberger, 1974; Wasserman, 1970). Maslach (1982) found that burnout is highest among younger workers and lowest among older workers. The importance of work experience, however, is not limited to the characteristics of age. Staff members from different backgrounds experience stress differently within juvenile institutions. Moreover, one's specific coping approach, e.g. reading, running, prayer, hobbies, etc., may strongly influence the impact of stress on work performance.

Other Factors

Within a juvenile institution, other factors such as an intense relationship with a juvenile inmate may cause job stress. Staff members who have unrealistic expectations of juveniles may experience mental exhaustion and unrelieved work pressure. Some authors have suggested that role ambiguity, role conflict and work overload contribute to the problem. Role theory will be explored presently.

Some employee stress factors can be traced to pressures that occur away from the job. As Block (1978) made clear, teachers will experience problems similar to soldiers in combat, i.e., battle fatigue, in addition to family crises, eating disturbances, high blood pressure, and financial difficulties. Other forms of pressure that occur for
some employees and may effect job performance are role ambiguity, role conflict, and work overload.

**Role Theory**

Role behaviors are expected responses perceived to be appropriate to a certain status. A role includes behavior that is incorporated into a pattern. For example, a job description describes how the worker will perform on the job. The job description explains what is to be done and how it should be performed within a particular setting.

A major aspect of role behavior is the notion that a role specifies how one individual is expected to relate to another, or how an individual's position relates to another. Additional aspects of role behavior are discussed below.

**Role Ambiguity**

Role ambiguity refers to confusion about work roles and responsibilities. Pattan (1980) cited a study at the Kennedy Space Flight Center where the researchers found role ambiguity responsible for personnel turnover and impaired worker efficiency. It was further suggested in the study that role ambiguity was related to anxiety, depression, lowered self-esteem, life and job satisfaction, low motivation to work and the desire to leave the job (Pattan, 1980, p. 17).
Role Conflict

Pattan (1980) defined role conflict as "a situation where the information available to the worker causes conflict, as opposed to role ambiguity where not enough information is available to the worker" (p. 17). Roberts (1982) perceived "person-role conflict" as those behaviors required which are not compatible with a person's values, beliefs, or motivation" (p. 27). In other words, a lack of consensus exists among different staff members as to what is expected of them. For example, a supervisor and a newly-hired social worker may define the role of child care worker in different terms. Or, a newly-hired child care worker may develop a special relationship with a juvenile. As a consequence of this special relationship, a runaway juvenile inmate may seek protection outside the institution in a staff member's home. If the child care worker were to allow the youth to enter his home without contacting the institution, the worker could be charged with an illegal act.

Child care workers sometimes find themselves in such conflicting situations. Resolving these conflicting expectations can be a difficult task and may create trouble for inexperienced workers.

Work Overload

Maslach (1982) states, "The emotional strain of working with many people can lead helpers to withdraw psychologically and have minimal contact with them" (p. 79). As might be expected, the quality of
service may be affected. A telephone interview with a juvenile probation officer (1984) revealed the following:

It is not unusual for a probation officer in Houston, Texas, to handle between 126-150 cases per year. Faced with an overwhelming numbers of juvenile clients, the quality of service may deteriorate. "We are not able to keep juvenile probation officers, because they burn out quickly," said a supervisor.

Because of casework overload, some juvenile probation officers develop an impersonal approach for coping. This kind of behavior allows the worker to move quickly through a caseload, providing superficial help.

In summary, institutional staff members cope with stress in different ways. From the employee's viewpoint, employees are under pressure to provide quality services to a large number of juvenile inmates. One aspect of the problem is role ambiguity. When employees are unclear about what is expected of them, burnout may be a pitfall.

Figure 1 presents a framework developed by this researcher which describes employee job stress. This is a general model, adapted for the work environment:

| Stressors | Individual Differences | Perceptions | Coping Strategies | Consequences |

FIGURE 1.
Stressors influence employee behavior and job performance. Some stressors identified by research studies are (Selye, 1974; Maslach and Pines, 1977; Freudenberger, 1974; Pines and Kafry, 1978; and Patton, 1980) are:

---Supervisors
---Size of organization
---Institutional policies
---Role ambiguity
---Role conflict
---Work overload
---Hours of work
---Job security
---Job responsibility
---Low self-esteem
---Relationships
---Lack of positive feedback

Individual differences include any characteristics of a person that influence an individual's perception of stressful events. The following types of individual characteristics have been studied in stress research:

---Age (Selye, 1974)
---Sex (cited in Daley, 1979)
---Education (Maslach, 1982)
---Health condition (Webb and Smith, 1980)
---Coping strategy (Lazarus, 1966)
---Class (Dohrenwend and Dohrenwend, 1974)
---Prior work experience (Maslach and Pines, 1977)
---Marital Status (Holmes and Rahe, 1967)
---Race (Levine and Scotch, 1970)

Perceptions of an individual determine whether or not stress is a threat. What may appear as a threat to one person may be non-threatening to another (Lazarus, 1966).
Coping strategy includes the various approaches used by employees to deal with stress level (Lazarus, 1966). Research shows there are a variety of approaches used in reducing stress:

--Meditation
--Imagery drill
--Psychotherapy
--Physical exercise (e.g., swimming, jogging, walking)
--Medication
--Assertiveness training
--Stress workshops
--Muscle relaxation techniques
--Yoga
--Breathing exercises
--Mental relaxation techniques
--Hypnosis

Consequences of stress have been studied by numerous researchers (Selye, 1974; Maslach and Pines, 1977; Holmes and Rahe, 1967; Freudenberger, 1974; and Block, 1978). Some of the symptoms are as follows:

--High absenteeism
--Sleep disorders
--Negativism toward employment
--Tired, exhausted feelings
--Frequent colds
--Negative language used to describe clients
--Alcohol and drug abuse
--Headaches
--Gastrointestinal disturbances
--Marital and family conflict
--Low self-esteem
--Nervousness
--Excessive smoking
--Impatience
--Loss of interest in sex
--Fatigue
--High blood pressure

Studies on job stress reveal that all people do not perceive stress in the same way, nor do they react with identical responses or
outcomes. Some workers may show high levels of apathy, depression and fatigue, while others may not.

For some individuals, especially those who are employed in juvenile institutions, the nature of the work itself can cause job stress. Workers may feel they are increasingly "putting out fires" as a reaction to crises.

Pines and Maslach (1979) reported that of some "76 staff members in various mental health facilities, findings revealed that the longer staff had worked in the mental health field, the less they liked working with patients, the less successful they felt with them and the less humanistic were their attitudes toward mental illness." (p. 233)

Research on teachers and stress seems to draw similar conclusions. Halpin et al. (1983) hypothesized that an internal locus of control would be related to low teacher stress. They found that the internal teachers accepted responsibility for their actions, while external teachers believed they possessed little control over what happens. Block (1978) pointed out that teachers suffered the same symptoms that soldiers experienced in combat situations. Teachers manifested stress problems such as high blood pressure, peptic ulcer, and sleep disorders.

Nusbaum (1982) found that educators who saw themselves more positively tended to perceive a lesser degree of stress than those who did not, and Brookins (1982) found that "unclear goal, goal ambiguity and work overload" contribute to burnout" (p.141).
In summary, the research on stress and work overload emphasizes that human service workers are victims of stress. Role conflict and role ambiguity part of the problem. High blood pressure, headaches and peptic ulcers are some of the many possible outcomes of job stress. The review of the literature on stress and related areas reveals inconsistencies and gaps. Little research has been done on juvenile institution workers' stress. The literature does not establish how work-related stress is related to juvenile exploitation of staff. Furthermore, the research lacks an empirical investigation of those variables identified as significant.

Juvenile exploitation is defined as a staff member's perception of being verbally and physically exploited in a juvenile institution by inmates. In discussing exploitation among prison guards, Fox (1982) states that "personal safety" seemed to be an issue with many guards and that acts of violence toward staff members was a "safety concern" (p. 154). Fox cited a study by Lombardo that found guards were concerned about "physical danger and mental strain stemming from the social relationship with prisoners" (Fox, 1982).

Smith and Hepburn (1979) studied alienation in prison organizations. The data suggested "both treatment and custody staff have a significantly more punitive attitude toward inmates . . ." (p. 258). Data were obtained from inmates and officers in six adult correctional institutions. Poole and Regoli (1981) studied alienation among prison guards. Data obtained from questionnaires and interview sources
revealed that negative evaluation of work relations result in increased levels of alienation experienced by guards (p. 251).

In view of these studies, it appears that psychological stress is derived from social interaction between the staff members and inmates. Social interaction is related to the demands, constraints and social threats inherent in the environment of juvenile institutions.

Bennett (1974) suggests that "the ability to connive" is important in the institution, referring to the social interaction found among inmates (p. 15). To cope with the institutional environment, some juvenile inmates will devise psychological games or connive to break down the self-esteem of staff members. In a hypothetical case, Johnny wanted to "get even" with a female social worker who spoiled his chances for a home visit. The juvenile would orally insult other inmates whenever the worker was present. His intent was to manipulate the worker into intervening so that he could then insult her for the loss of his home visit.

This is one example of how juveniles use manipulative behavior to fight back against staff members. If the juvenile can get the staff member to feel negatively about a situation, he will succeed in breaking down the worker's self-esteem. Tactics used by inmates to provoke a worker into suffering a loss of self-esteem are: 1) spreading rumors about the worker; 2) encouraging other youth to be resistant to, or to ignore, any given directives; 3) stealing workers' personal items; 4) reporting one worker's behavior to other workers; 5) asking
to be transferred to another worker; and 6) displaying resistant behavior as a form of protest.

Some of these behaviors may be implemented by a juvenile inmate to discredit a worker, and staff members may pay a hefty price when game behavior is taken seriously by administrators. At times, a supervisor may succumb to a juvenile's manipulation by questioning about alleged wrongdoing. The act of questioning the worker can generate stress among the employees. It can upset a worker to realize that the juvenile has created an atmosphere of suspicion.

These potential hazards are present in the juvenile institution. Stress and tension are part of the everyday interaction between staff and inmates. Stress may be a problem to anyone who is bombarded daily with crisis situations and frequent exploitative behavior. Personnel may find themselves involved in struggles for control and dominance, as inmates who seek control over the workers often find they can obtain the power through exploitation.

Giallombardo (1974) expressed concern about the lack of research studies on the institutional worker's interaction with inmates. In order to understand the consequences of staff-inmate interaction, empirical studies will need to emerge that not only confront the control and dominance problem, but also inform us on how to diffuse power struggles when they occur. Furthermore, institutional studies will be needed to increase our knowledge about social characteristics of staff members and burnout.
To explore the relationship of work-related stress in the juvenile institution, this study will look at the effects of exploitative behaviors performed by juvenile inmates on employee stress.
Chapter III

METHOD

This study used an ex post facto design, an approach referred to by Stanley and Campbell (1963) as an "effort to simulate experimentation through a process of attempting in a static group comparison to accomplish a pre-treatment equation by a process of matching on pre-treatment attributes" (p. 70). The primary hypothesis to be tested is: The more exploited an employee is, as perceived by the employee, the higher the employee's stress level.

The independent variable of the study was perceived juvenile exploitation and the dependent variable to be measured was work-related stress experienced by staff. The researcher acknowledges the existence of both internal and external sources of stress. This study, however, only dealt with work-related stress.

The major threat to internal validity with this design was selection. Selection was a problem as some employees may not have responded to the study because of illness at the time of data collection, part-time employment at the institution, or outright refusal to participate.

Other threats which cannot be controlled, in addition to selection and mortality, were maturation and interaction of selection and
maturation. The strategy for controlling extraneous variables was that of testing alternative hypotheses.

Subject Selection

A systematic random sample of 100 full-time employees of the two juvenile institutions were asked to participate in this study. To get the sample, every third person was selected from a personnel listing of employees. Of the 100 employees who were approached, 41 subjects (24 from Scioto Village and 17 from the Training Institution of Central Ohio) agreed to participate in the study. The eligibility criteria for participation in the study were full-time status, employed more than six months, and staff workers who made direct contact with juveniles. Of these, 21 were males and 20 were females. Questionnaires were distributed in person at each institution but were left in the mailboxes of employees who were on sick leave (four employees). Employees were read the Oral Presentation for Protocol (see Appendix) or were given a copy of it to read. Employees were asked to place their completed questionnaire in a large yellow envelope during the week. The envelope was sealed and returned to the researcher in one week.

An intensified effort to obtain responses from the sample was made by additional telephone contacts and personal contacts with staff supervisors. Also, a 20% random sample of non-respondents (20% of 59) was drawn 1 1/2 months later. These 12 surveys were representative of the non-respondent group.
Data were collected to explain and predict which staff members were most likely to experience work-related stress. Those individuals who were employed less than six months, who declined to participate, who dropped out, or who did not participate in all parts of the study, were excluded. In terms of uncompleted instruments and/or obvious response sets of unanswered items, decisions were made at the time the questions arose.

**Outcome Measures**

**Instruments**

Two of the instruments used in this study were developed by the researcher. The Juvenile Worker Interactive Instrument measured the extent of employees' perceived exploitation. The staff were given a likert scale to rank order, with weight assigned to each value, their perceptions of being exploited by juvenile inmates. An example is:

To what extent do you believe juveniles take advantage of you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were twenty items of exploitative behaviors and supportive behaviors. Participants were to determine to what extent they had or had not experienced the effects of specific interactions from incarcerated youths.
The researcher provided clear definitions of terms used in the Juvenile Worker Interactive Instrument in the instructions so that employees did not misinterpret them. Employees rated their perceptions of being exploited over the last six-month period. The instrument was pilot-tested on a sample of 10 non-participating staff members with over five years of institutional experience. A panel of four nationally known researchers from The Ohio State University representing social work, sociology and criminology and a psychologist were selected to critique for general improvement of the organization, clarity of working and validity, the Juvenile Worker Interactive Instrument and the Critical Incident Survey. (These instruments will be described later.) Face validity was determined by how well the instrument appeared to measure what it purports to measure. Some items were negatively worded in order to reduce response bias. The internal consistency of the Juvenile Worker Interactive Instrument as measured by Cronbach's alpha was .63.

Another instrument used here was the Critical Incident Survey. This was designed by the researcher to examine experiences of juvenile exploitation of staff qualitatively. The data for the survey were self reports collected from staff employees. The Critical Incident Survey was comprised of seven major questions that probed about experiences individuals had while working with juveniles that made a significant impression on them. The questions were divided into subquestions which described specific events. Also, participants were asked to make additional comments about experiences not included in the survey.
The pretesting of the Critical Incident Survey occurred together with the Juvenile Worker Interactive Instrument. The field testing allowed the researcher to modify items on the survey.

The third instrument, the Maslach Burnout Inventory (MBI), was used to measure the dependent variable work-related stress experienced by employees. The instrument was developed by Christina Maslach and Susan E. Jackson (1981). This inventory was designed to measure burnout among members of helping professions. The MBI is comprised of twenty-two items rated on the dimensions of frequency and intensity. The inventory measures three aspects of burnout with three separate subscales: 1) emotional exhaustion; 2) depersonalization; and 3) personal accomplishment. Scores for each subscale are not combined into a single score. Frequency and Intensity are separate scores. Therefore, six scores are tabulated for each respondent: Emotional Exhaustion-Frequency, Emotional Exhaustion-Intensity, Depersonalization-Frequency, Depersonalization-Intensity, Personal Accomplishment-Frequency and Personal Accomplishment-Intensity.

Maslach's preliminary research on the MBI was on a 650 person sample. Later, she used a new sample of 420 people. Reliability coefficients reported for the subscales were the following: 1) .90 (frequency) and .87 (intensity) for Emotional Exhaustion; 2) .79 (frequency) and .76 (intensity) for Depersonalization; and 3) .71 (frequency) and .73 (intensity) for Personal Accomplishment (Maslach and Jackson, 1981).
Convergent validity was determined first by a person's MBI scores which were correlated with behavioral ratings made independently by someone who knew the person well (Maslach and Jackson, 1981). Next, MBI scores were correlated with the presence of certain job characteristics (Maslach and Jackson, 1981). Third, MBI scores were correlated with measures of various outcomes that had been hypothesized to be related to burnout (Maslach and Jackson, 1981).

In addition to the three instruments described above, a Background Information and Attitudes Toward Your Work questionnaire was also designed by the researcher. This was a 20-item questionnaire of employee self reports on demographic variables and attitudes. This questionnaire also was included in the field testing which allowed the researcher to improve the organization.

Copies of the Maslach Burnout Inventory, the Juvenile Worker Interactive Instrument, the Critical Incident Survey and the Background Information and Attitudes Toward Your Work questionnaires are located in the Appendix.

Procedure

Because of the sensitive nature of the study, it was possible that subjects would bias their answers or fail to respond. Several steps were taken to help guard against these threats.

First, the researcher made a personal visit to each institution to introduce this study to the subjects. The study's purpose, date and time were discussed individually with subjects. In this process,
subjects were assured of confidentiality. They were told that only summary statistics would be released, and no information would be released to their employer or anyone else that could be linked to individual staff members.

Information regarding age, sex, length of employment, employment affiliation with juvenile institution, professional training, years of education, socio-economic class, absenteeism, employment shift, age range of juveniles they serve and their degree of preparation for juvenile and institutional work was solicited from the employees either directly or from personnel files with signed releases from the employees.

Staff members were given an oral presentation of the purpose of the study during the beginning of their shift. The researcher administered the instruments and questionnaires and returned later to pick up materials. In some cases, instruments, questionnaires and a copy of the oral presentation were either placed in employees' mailboxes by their supervisor or administered to a group of staff members in a private room.

Subjects were administered the Maslach Burnout Inventory on a Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday and were provided the Juvenile Worker Interactive Instrument, A Background Information and Attitudes Toward Your Work questionnaire, and the Critical Incident Survey the same day. These periods were chosen because they are considered as typical days in the juvenile institution. The time allocated for completion of the Maslach Burnout Inventory, the Juvenile Worker Interactive Instrument,
the Background Informational and Attitudes Toward Your Work and the Critical Incident Survey questionnaires was thirty minutes.

**Data Analysis**

The data collected for this study were analyzed with the use of a Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSSX) computer program. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize data on employees who completed the Background Information and Attitudes Toward Your Work questionnaire. A demographic data sheet will supply additional information about participants. The variables were enumerated by tallying the number and computing the percent of respondents. The variables to be used in this research are as follows:

- **Age** was defined as "years since birth" as of last birthday.
- **Sex** was defined as male and female, or as indicated by respondent on questionnaire.
- **Length of Employment** was defined as number of months of employment, taken from personnel files, as of a given date. Length of employment was operationalized as: less than one year; 1-5 years; 6-10 years; 11-15 years; 16 or more.
- **Personality characteristics** was defined as the employee's perception of his internal locus as compared to externally-oriented control as reported to researcher:
  --I take charge of a situation
  --Fate and luck play a significant role in my work environment
  --Both
Employment affiliation with juvenile institution was defined as reported to researcher:

--Administration
--Social worker
--Teacher
--Psychologist
--Psychiatrist
--Nurse
--Ward Personnel
--Dispensary Personnel
--Recreation Staff
--Youth leader

Value orientation of staff members was defined as reported to researcher.

Conservatism refers to the employee's position on rebellious ideas, question 10 on Background Information and Attitudes Toward Your Work, ("Juvenile inmates are rebellious, but they will grow up and adjust to society") as reported to researcher.

Liberalism refers to the employee's position on rebellious ideas, question 11 on Background Information and Attitudes Toward Your Work, ("Juvenile inmates are rebellious because society has victimized youth") as reported to researcher.
Professional training was defined as number of years of experience in working with juvenile delinquents as reported to researcher:

1. 0-1 year
2. 1-3 years
3. 4-5 years
4. 6-8 years
5. 9-12 years
6. 12+ years

Years of education completed was operationally defined categorically as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-12 grade</td>
<td>First year college</td>
<td>First year graduate school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second year college</td>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Socio-economic class was defined as income range as reported to researcher. Income range was operationally defined categorically as:

5,000-9,999; 10,000-14,999; 15,000-19,999; 20,000-24,999; 25,000+.

Absenteeism was defined as the number of days missing from work over the last six-month period, as taken from personnel file. Absences of respondents was operationally defined categorically as: 3 days or less; 4-10 days; 11-20 days; 23 days or more.

Juvenile exploitation refers to two defined exploitation subscales. (See items of the Exploitation—Intimidation and Interpersonal Relationship subscales in Tables 13 and 14.)
Work conditions refer to physical working conditions such as heat, noise and light, which affect employment in institutional work as reported to researcher.

Pressures outside of workplace were defined as stress experienced by employees as coming outside of work, as reported to researcher.

Work-related stress was defined operationally as the scores obtained on the six subscales (EE-F, EE-I, DP-F, DP-I, PA-F and PA-I) of the Maslach Burnout Inventory.

Employment shift was defined as the shift work (1, 2, or 3) as reported to researcher. Day shift was represented by 1; night shift was represented by 2; and midnight shift was represented by 3.

Age of juvenile was defined as "years since birth" as of last birthday. Age range of juveniles was operationally defined categorically as: 10-13 years; 14-16 years; 17-18 years; 19+.

Degree of preparation for juvenile institutional work was defined as years or months of previous employment in institutional work as reported to researcher.

Coping strategies of employees refers to ongoing coping approaches utilized (e.g., repression and mental relaxation techniques) in stressful situations to reduce anxiety or fear as reported to researcher.

The following statistical analyses were performed:

1. Multiple regression analysis was used with demographics of respondents as independent variables on each of the exploitation scales.
2. Pearson correlation coefficient was used with coping strategies on each of the exploitation scales. An alpha of .05 was set to test for significance.

3. Analysis of variance was used to make a comparison between levels of job titles.

4. Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationships of the respondents' value orientation to respondents' perceived exploitation. An alpha of .05 was set to test for significance.

5. Analysis of variance also was applied to shiftwork on each of the exploitation scales.

6. A t-test was used on each of the exploitation scales with personality characteristics.

7. Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine a relationship between perceived exploitation and job stress as measured by the six burnout subscales. An alpha of .05 was set to test for significance.

8. Factor analysis was used to determine if more than one construct was being measured in the Juvenile Worker Interactive Instrument.

9. A content analysis was conducted on the Critical Incident Survey. Participants' responses were placed on 3x5 index cards. Responses were categorized by developing categories based on responses to questions of the Critical Incident Survey. Similar responses were grouped together. Information was analyzed and reported by this researcher.
Chapter IV
FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the findings of the demographic characteristics and work attitudes of the respondents, to present findings related to the research objectives and to present findings of the Critical Incident Survey. First the descriptive findings will be given.

Descriptive Findings

The following section data on employees' ages, length of employment, absences, income, gender, job titles, and other demographic information will be presented. In addition, descriptive findings on such topics as coping strategies, perception of working conditions, and attitudes toward juveniles are provided.

Respondents' ages ranged from 21 to 64 years with a mean of 41.1 years. The age group with the largest frequency was that of 46 to 55 years (10 or 24.4%). Data regarding the age of respondents are presented in Table 1.
Table 1

Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 or less</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 55</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 or more</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean age = 41.1 (S.D. = 12.6). The mean age of the respondents could be calculated since raw data were collected.

Respondents were asked to indicate their length of time employed on their present job. The responses ranged from less than one year to 25 years. The average length of time employed was 8.35 years (S.D. = 7.1). These data were put into categories for ease of interpretation and are presented in Table 2. This summary reveals that the largest group of respondents (15 or 41.7%) had been employed between one and five years.
Table 2
Respondents' Length of Time Employed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Time Employed</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than 1 year</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean length of time employed = 8.35 years (S.D. = 7.1). The mean of the respondents could be calculated since raw data were collected.

Data regarding the number of days absent from work during the past six months revealed a range of from zero to 155 days absent. The summary of these data by response categories is presented in Table 3. Examination of this table reveals that five (13.9%) of the respondents had missed an excess of 20 days (approximately one work month) in the last six months. However, 18 (50%) had missed three days or less, and 31 (86.1%) had missed 10 days or less (approximately 2 work weeks).
### Table 3
Absences of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absences</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 days or less</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 10 days</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 20 days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean absence = 12 (S.D. = 27.9). The mean absence of the respondents could be calculated since raw data was collected.

Respondents' reported income levels are presented in Table 4. Examination of data in this table reveals that the majority of respondents (31 or 77.5%) fell into the salary range of $15,000 to $19,000. No respondents reported an income level below $10,000 and only one respondent reported more than $20,000 as an income.
Table 4

Income of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 14,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 - 19,999</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 - 24,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were asked to indicate their highest level of education completed. Over one-fourth (11 or 26.8%) reported high school as their completed education. Seven (17.1%) indicated having taken some college work while six (14.6%) reported the completion of a baccalaureate degree. In addition, 17 (41.5%) respondents had taken graduate work with nine (22.0%) of these 17 having completed a graduate degree.

Data regarding sex of employees revealed the largest group was that of females (21 or 52.1%), while males made up 48.8% (20) of the respondent group.

Employees were asked to indicate their job title. Three (7.3%) reported social worker as their job title. Twenty (48.8%) indicated teacher, while two (4.9%) reported ward personnel. Sixteen (39.0%) indicated youth leader.
Respondents were asked to indicate their preparation for employment. Ten (25.6%) reported a similar job experience in another institution. Twenty (51.3%) reported some previous job experience while five (12.8%) reported no previous job experience. Four (10.3%) indicated other.

Respondents were asked to indicate their years of professional training. Six (15.4%) reported less than one year. Four (10.3%) indicated one to three years. The largest number of respondents were in the four to five years category (11 or 28.2%). Eight (20.5%) respondents indicated six to eight years of professional training. In addition, two (5.1%) respondents reported nine to twelve years and eight indicated more than 12 years.

Data regarding the distribution on the characteristic of shiftwork revealed that the majority were on the first shift (29 or 74.4%). Six (15.4%) indicated second shift while four (10.3%) reported third shift.

Employees were presented with a list of 12 coping strategies and asked to indicate for each one whether or not they employed it in dealing with stress. The strategy reported as being utilized by most respondents was that of "talking to someone." Twenty six (63.4%) indicated that they used this coping strategy. A majority of respondents (21 or 51.2%) also indicated that they used the strategy "confront source of stress." Nineteen (46.3%) responded affirmatively to both of the strategies "adopt a positive attitude" and "get involved in other activity." Other coping strategies reported by smaller numbers of respondents are included in Table 5.
Table 5  
Use of Coping Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coping Strategy</th>
<th>Yes (used)</th>
<th>No (not used)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to Someone</td>
<td>26 (63.4%)</td>
<td>15 (36.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confront Source of Stress</td>
<td>21 (51.2%)</td>
<td>20 (48.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt Positive Attitude</td>
<td>19 (46.3%)</td>
<td>22 (53.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Involved in Another Activity</td>
<td>19 (46.3%)</td>
<td>22 (53.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meditation</td>
<td>10 (24.4%)</td>
<td>31 (75.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jogging</td>
<td>7 (17.1%)</td>
<td>34 (82.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignore Source of Stress</td>
<td>7 (17.1%)</td>
<td>34 (82.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Food Intake</td>
<td>7 (17.1%)</td>
<td>34 (82.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Source of Stress</td>
<td>7 (17.1%)</td>
<td>34 (82.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave Source of Stress</td>
<td>6 (14.6%)</td>
<td>35 (85.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication</td>
<td>6 (14.6%)</td>
<td>35 (85.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Drugs</td>
<td>5 (12.2%)</td>
<td>36 (87.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4 (9.8%)</td>
<td>37 (90.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages do not total 100 since respondents marked more than one strategy.
Respondents were asked to indicate how they react to a crisis situation. The majority of the respondents (24 or 58.5%) indicated that they take charge of a crisis situation when it occurs while some respondents reported (two or 4.9%) fate and luck as their locus of control. Fifteen (36.6%) indicated a reliance on a combination of both.

Respondents were asked to indicate their reaction to juvenile inmates that are rebellious, but they grow up and adjust to society. The majority of the respondents (16 or 43.2%) indicated that they were undecided. Eleven (29.7%) indicated juveniles did grow up and adjust to society (true) while 10 (27.0%) reported that they did not adjust to society (false).

Respondents were asked to indicate their reaction to society being at fault in creating juvenile delinquency. The majority (23 or 60.5%) reported that they did not feel that society was at fault. Six (15.8%) said they did feel that society was at fault. Six (15.8%) said they did feel that society was at fault, and three (23.7%) were undecided.

Respondents were asked to indicate working conditions which adversely affect their job performance. The working condition reported by most respondents was noise. Twenty-eight (70.0%) indicated that noise affected their job performance. Twenty-two (55.0%) indicated heat while five (12.5%) indicated lighting.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether arbitration is going on in the workplace. Over one-half (25 or 65.8%) indicated no, and 13
(34.2%) responded yes. When asked about pressures outside of the workplace, twenty (51.3%) reported this as a problem.

Regarding in-service training in stress reduction, 10 (25%) respondents indicated that they had participated in such training and 30 (75%) had not had stress reduction training. When asked about their interest in this type of inservice training, however, more than three-fourths (31 or 77.5%) reported that they were interested.

Findings related to the objectives of this study are found in the next section.

Findings Related to Research Objectives

Objective #1

To determine the stress levels of respondents as measured by the six scales of Maslach's Burnout Inventory.

The scales of Maslach's Burnout Inventory were used as measures of employee stress. The respondents' scores on each of the six subscales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory are presented in this section. To aid in the interpretation of these scores, the available normative data for these six scales is presented in Table 6 (Maslach and Jackson, 1981). These data provide the reader with an indication of the respondents' level on each subscale as either high, moderate, or low.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maslach Burnout Inventory Subscale</th>
<th>Range of Experienced Burnout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low (Lower Third)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Exhaustion</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depersonalization</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intensity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Accomplishment</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intensity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Occupations represented in the Maslach Burnout Inventory normative sample presented in Table 6 consisted of the following: 845 Social Security Administration public contact employees, 142 police officers, 231 nurses, 125 agency administrators, 222 teachers, 97 counselors, 91 social workers, 68 probation officers, 63 mental health workers, 86 physicians, 40 psychologists and psychiatrists, 31 attorneys, and 77 others.
On the Emotional Exhaustion--Frequency (EEF) Scale, the scores ranged from one to 47 with a mean EEF score of 22.86. This mean value is classified in the moderate category in regards to the normative data. Further examination of the data revealed that of the 36 responses, the largest group (14 or 38.9%) were in the moderate category. Data regarding the EEF scores are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 or less</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 - 29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 or more</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Emotional Exhaustion--Intensity scores ranged from one to 50 with a mean value of 27.29. This mean value is also considered moderate based on the normative categories. A comparison of the distribution of scores to the normative data categories shows that 15 (42.9%) were in both the low and moderate groups. Data regarding the EEI score distribution are presented in Table 8.
Table 8

Distribution of EEI Scores by Normative Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low 25 or less</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate 26 - 39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High 40 or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents' mean score on the Depersonalization--Frequency scale fell into the moderate category with a mean value of 9.56. These scores ranged from zero to 24 and were generally evenly distributed among the three normative categories. Data regarding DPF scores are presented in Table 9.

Table 9

Distribution of DPF Scores by Normative Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low 5 or less</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate 6 - 11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High 12 or more</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Depersonalization—Intensity Scores range from zero to 34 with a mean value of 13.1. This mean value is also considered moderate based on the normative categories. A comparison of the distribution of scores to the normative data categories showed that the largest group was that of high burnout with 14 or 41.2% of the respondents classified in this category. Data regarding DPI scores are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

Distribution of DPI Scores by Normative Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low 6 or less</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate 7 - 14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High 15 or more</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the Personal Accomplishment—Frequency scale (see Table 11) the scores ranged from 17 to 50 with a mean value of 35.8. This mean value is also considered moderate based on the normative categories. The respondents' distribution of scores to the normative data categories showed that 17 (48.6%) were in the low group; seven (20%) were in the moderate group; and 11 (31.4%) were in the high group.
Table 11
Distribution of PAF Scores by Normative Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low 40 or more</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate 39 - 34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High 33 or less</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents' mean score on the Personal Accomplishment--Intensity scale (see Table 12) fell into the moderate category with a mean value of 37.97. These scores ranged from 21 to 52 and were distributed among the three normative categories. The respondent distribution of scores to the normative data category showed 11 (31.4%) were in the low group; 10 (28.6%) were in the moderate group, and 14 (40%) were in the high group.
### Table 12  
**Distribution of PAI Scores by Normative Categories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low 44 or more</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate 43 - 37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High 36 or less</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objective #2**

To determine the perceived exploitation level of respondents.

The Juvenile Worker Interactive Instrument was developed with the intent to measure employees' perceived exploitation by incarcerated juveniles. The Cronbach's Alpha was calculated and found to be $A = .63$. This may indicate that the Exploitation scale score measured more than one primary construct. Consequently, the items in the scale were subjected to a factor analysis to determine if more than one construct was being measured in the scale. Factor loadings indicated that two major constructs were being measured.

When reliabilities were calculated on each of the two defined subscales, reliabilities indicated a higher level of internal consistency. The exploitation items identified in factor 1 showed a reliability of .79. On the interpersonal relationship items identified in factor 2, the reliability was .76. The factors identified by the
factor analysis and their respective items are presented in Tables 13 and 14. Examination of the items in these factors led the researcher to label factor 1 as intimidation and factor 2 as interpersonal relationships.

Table 13

Exploitation Items Present in Factor 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intimidation</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V088 Youth made you angry</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V090 Youth swear at you</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V082 Juvenile show you any disrespect</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V092 Threatened by a youth</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V083 Express strong disagreement</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V096 Have you been physically attacked</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V094 Use non-verbal behavior</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V084 Left unguarded</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V097 What age range were the juveniles</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V080 Feel you are strict</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14
Interpersonal Items Present in Factor 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Relationship</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V091 Juveniles express trust in you</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V085 Juveniles accept your discipline</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V098 Juveniles get along with you</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V089 Juveniles show respect for authority</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V081 Juvenile politeness</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V087 Share personal problems</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V093 Juveniles obey you</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V095 Juveniles follow through with suggestions</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V079 Positive compliments</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V086 Anything taken from your vehicle</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V078 Believe juveniles take advantage of you</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the Exploitation—Intimidation (factor 1) the potential range of scores was from a minimum score of 10 to a maximum possible score of 70. The average intimidation score of the respondents was 33.2 with a standard deviation of 9.2. The scores ranged from a low of 14 to a high of 55.

The Interpersonal Relationship factor (factor 2) showed a potential range of scores from a minimum score of 11 to a maximum possible score of 77. The average interpersonal score of the respondents was
27.8 with a standard deviation of 7.1. The scores range from a low of 15 to a high of 46.

**Objective #3**

To determine the impact of selected demographic variables on perceived exploitation of respondents. Demographics included in this analysis were age, sex, months employed, degree of preparation, income and years of professional training.

Multiple regression analysis was utilized with demographics of respondents as independent variables, and each of the exploitation scales used as dependent variables. With the Exploitation—Intimidation subscale, there were no demographics found to have significant explanatory power. In terms of the Interpersonal Relationship subscale one demographic factor, sex (male) was found to be significant at the .05 level. This factor accounted for 22% of the variance with males tending to have the highest in relation to the Interpersonal Relationship subscale. Data regarding sex are shown in Table 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationship of Demographics on Perceived Exploitation—Interpersonal Relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05
Objective #4

To determine whether a relationship exists between perceived exploitation and the following factors: pressures outside of the workplace, work conditions, level of education completed, coping strategies, age of juvenile working with and absenteeism.

A Pearson correlation coefficient was used with coping strategies and the Exploitation and Interpersonal Relationship scales. With the Exploitation—Intimidation subscale, there were no significant relationships found. With the Interpersonal Relationship subscale, there were three coping strategies factors found to be significant at the .05 level and one work condition. These strategies were alcohol and drugs, medication, and adopt positive attitude. Data regarding alcohol and drugs \( r = -0.31 \) indicated a negative relationship. Meditation \( r = -0.37 \) also indicated a negative relationship. Data regarding "adopt a positive attitude" \( r = +0.33 \) indicated a positive relationship. Heat \( r = +0.36 \) indicated a positive relationship. Pressures outside of the workplace, work conditions, level of education completed, age of juveniles dealing with and absenteeism had no significant relationship. Data are present in Tables 16, 17, 18 and 19.
Table 16

Relationship Between Exploitation—Intimidation and Coping Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Pearson Product Moment (r)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jogging</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and Drugs</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meditation</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confront Source of Stress</td>
<td>+.22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt Positive Attitude</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignore the Source of Stress</td>
<td>+.03</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase My Food Intake</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave Source of Stress</td>
<td>+.18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the Source of Stress</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to Someone</td>
<td>+.08</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Involved in Other Activity</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17

Relationship Between Exploitation—Intimidation and Work Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Pearson Product Moment (r)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heat</td>
<td>+.10</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressures Outside of Workplace</td>
<td>+.21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration</td>
<td>+.17</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice Training</td>
<td>+.02</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in This Kind of Training</td>
<td>+.20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Completed</td>
<td>+.07</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Juvenile</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>+.26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 18

Relationship Between Interpersonal and Coping Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Pearson Product Moment (r)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jogging</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication</td>
<td>+.02</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol and Drugs</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meditation</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confront Source of Stress</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt Positive Attitude</td>
<td>+.33*</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignore the Source of Stress</td>
<td>+.02</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase My Food Intake</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave Source of Stress</td>
<td>+.10</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change the Source of Stress</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk to Someone</td>
<td>+.17</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get Involved in Other Activity</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>+.06</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05

Note: Variables were coded 1 = yes, 2 = no
Table 19

Relationship Between Interpersonal and Work Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Pearson Product Moment (r)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heat</td>
<td>+.36*</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>+.13</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressures Outside of Workplace</td>
<td>+.02</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration</td>
<td>+.03</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice Training</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested in This Kind of Training</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Completed</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Juvenile</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absenteeism</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05

Note: Variables were coded 1 = yes, 2 = no
Objective #5

To determine whether differences exist in perceived exploitation among the levels of the following variables: job title, value orientation of respondent, employment shift and personality characteristics.

ANOVA was used to make the comparison between levels of job titles. No significant difference was found. Refer to Tables 20 and 21 for mean scores and analysis of variance in relation to Exploitation—Intimidation and Tables 22 and 23 in relation to Interpersonal Relationship.

Table 20

Exploitation—Intimidation Scores Broken Down by Job Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>34.15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Leader</td>
<td>32.45</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For analysis purposes, ward personnel were combined with youth leader.
Table 21

Analysis of Variance of Perceived Exploitation—
Intimidation by Job Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35.911</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89.801</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>84.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22

Interpersonal Relationship Scores Broken Down by Job Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Worker</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>29.85</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Leader</td>
<td>25.10</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For purposes of analysis, ward personnel were combined with youth leader.
Table 23
Analysis of Variance of Perceived Interpersonal Relationship by Job Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>77.805</td>
<td>1.840</td>
<td>.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42.291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46.096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson Product Moment Correlation was calculated to determine the relationship of the respondents value orientation to respondents perceived exploitation. Examination of the items reveal no significant correlations were found. Items are presented in Tables 24 and 25.

Table 24
Comparison of Exploitation—Intimidation by Value Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Orientation</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjust to Society</td>
<td>+.01</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society is at Fault</td>
<td>+.03</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25
Comparison of Interpersonal Relationship by Value Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Orientation</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjust to Society</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society is at Fault</td>
<td>+.24</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of variance was utilized with shiftwork of respondents in each of the exploitation scales. Scores on the Exploitation—Intimidation and Interpersonal Relationship subscales were compared by shifts worked. The perceived Exploitation Intimidation means and ANOVA are presented in Tables 26 and 27. The perceived Interpersonal Relationship means and ANOVA are presented in Tables 28 and 29. The ANOVA revealed no significant differences.

Table 26
Exploitation—Intimidation by Shiftwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shift</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift 1</td>
<td>30.95</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift 2</td>
<td>39.17</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift 3</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27
Analysis of Variance of Perceived Exploitation—Intimidation by Shiftwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiftwork</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>193.486</td>
<td>2.559</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>75.607</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>84.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28

Interpersonal Relationship by Shift

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift 1</td>
<td>29.05</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift 2</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift 3</td>
<td>28.50</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29

Analysis of Variance of Perceived Interpersonal Relationship by Shiftwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Effects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiftwork</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44.952</td>
<td>.0973</td>
<td>.391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>46.189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46.096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A t-test was utilized for each of the Exploitation--Intimidation and Interpersonal Relationship subscales with personality characteristics. Because the response group was small in the "both" category, this group was combined with the fate and luck group for analysis. With the Exploitation scale, there was no significant difference found. See Tables 30 and 31.
Table 30
Personality Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploitation--Intimidation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>2-Tail Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take Charge of the Situation</td>
<td>30.87</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fate and Luck</td>
<td>35.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31
Personality Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interpersonal Relationship</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>T Value</th>
<th>2-Tail Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take Charge of the Situation</td>
<td>27.42</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fate and Luck</td>
<td>28.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective #6
To determine whether there is a positive relationship between perceived exploitation and job stress as measured by the six subscales of Maslach's Burnout Inventory.

The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used to determine whether a relationship existed between perceived exploitation and job stress as measured by six burnout subscales: Emotional Exhaustion--Frequency, Emotional Exhaustion--Intensity, Personal Accomplishment--Frequency and Personal Accomplishment--Intensity.
The Exploitation--Intimidation subscale was correlated with the six scales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory and found to be significantly related to three of the scales. The strongest association was with the DPI scale ($r = .45$). The other significant relationship was with the EEF and DPF scales ($r = .38$ and .37 respectively). See Table 32 for these data.

Table 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship Between Maslach's Burnout Inventory Categories and Exploitation--Intimidation Scale Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05

The Interpersonal Relationship subscale was also correlated with the six scales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory and found to be significantly related to three of the scales. The strongest association was with the PAI Scale ($r = -.57$). The other significant relationship was with the PAF scale ($r = -.53$). See Table 33 for these data.
Objective #7

To determine whether there are particular forms of perceived juvenile exploitation which impact on employee stress levels. A multiple regression analysis was used to determine whether particular forms of perceived exploitation by juveniles created higher stress levels. The Maslach Burnout Subscales were used as dependent variables, and the items of the Exploitation scales were used as independent variables in the regression equation. Perceived exploitation variables were entered into the multiple regression equation to determine if a model could be identified to explain variance in Maslach's subscales.
When the EEF scale was analyzed using the regression equation, one form of exploitation was found to have a significant amount of explanatory power with regard to the EEF scale. This factor was "youth made you angry" and accounted for 21% of the variance in the dependent variable. The EEI scale was analyzed using the regression equation and the items "to what extent are juveniles polite" and "youth made you angry" were found to have a significant amount of explanatory power with regard to the EEI scale. These factors cumulatively accounted for 42% of the variability in the dependent variable. Data is presented in Tables 34 and 35.

Table 34
Regression of Forms of Exploitation on EEF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Factor</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth made you angry</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.466</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>7.245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05

Table 35
Regression of Forms of Exploitation on EEI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Factor</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Made You Angry</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To What Extent Are Juveniles Polite</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>9.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05
When the DPF scale was analyzed using the regression equation, one form of exploitation was found to have a significant amount of explanatory power with regard to the DPF scale. This factor was "youth made you angry" and accounted for 31% of the variability in the dependent variable. The DPI scale was analyzed using the regression equation and "youth made you angry" was found to be significant with regard to the DPI scale. This factor accounted for 43% of the variance in the dependent variable. Data is presented in Tables 36 and 37.

Table 36

Regression of Forms of Exploitation on DPF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Factor</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Made You Angry</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.559</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>11.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05

Table 37

Regression of Forms of Exploitation on DPI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Factor</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Made You Angry</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>19.083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05

The PAF scale was analyzed using the regression equation. The variables found to be significant were "shared personal problems" and "youth swear at you" with regard to the PAF scale. These factors
cumulatively accounted for 36% of the variance in the dependent variable. The PAI scale was analyzed using the "share personal problems," "positive complaints," "youth swear at you," and "take advantage of you" were found to be significant with regard to the PAI scale. These factors cumulatively accounted for 64% of the variance in the dependent variable. Data is presented in Tables 38 and 39.

Table 38
Regression of Forms of Exploitation on PAF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Factor</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth Swear at You</td>
<td>-.466</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Personal Problems</td>
<td>-.382</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>6.988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05

Table 39
Regression of Forms of Exploitation on PAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stress Factor</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Multiple R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share Personal Problems</td>
<td>-.331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Compliments</td>
<td>-.547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Swear at You</td>
<td>-.445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Take Advantage of You</td>
<td>-.324</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>10.2274*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05
Non-Respondents

The respondents and non-respondents were compared by the t-test. No significant differences in stress of Exploitation—Intimidation and Interpersonal Relationship scores by group (respondent versus non-respondent) was found.

Results of Critical Incident Survey

The Critical Incident Survey was designed to examine a juvenile worker's subjective response to being exploited by juvenile inmates. To determine to what degree this was done, respondents were asked to describe specific events and provide the most recent example.

Part of the researcher's concern in this study was to investigate juvenile exploitation inside two different institutions and to find if there was relatedness present in the data. After close inspection of the data and using content analysis, there were more similarities on responses than dissimilarities among respondents. Therefore, data were combined and presented in a summary.

Scioto Village

Scioto Village is a girl's institution. There were 24 subjects who participated in the study. For a total response, there were 600 responses (25 items per survey form x 24 subjects) typed on 3x5 index cards.
Training Institution of Central Ohio

The Training Institution of Central Ohio (TICO) is a boy's institution. There were 17 subjects at TICO who participated in the study. For a total response, there were 400 responses.

The Critical Incident Survey provided the framework for the categorization of responses. Each category was grouped into similar experiences. However, one question was not included on the survey, but was asked of each respondent. The following are participants' composite responses.

What kind of professional training in the helping profession have you received?

When asked this question, there were a high number of respondents who did not respond. However, some respondents reported they received their training in college. College courses taken were counseling, education, psychology, sociology, special education and social work. Other subjects had received youth leader training (N = 10) and some reported prior work experience (7) and workshops as training.

Tell me about an experience you had that made you feel taken advantage of by a juvenile.

Subjects tended to feel juveniles emphasized con games, lied and stole staff's personal items. When asked to describe the juvenile involved that made you feel taken advantage of, the following descriptors were used:
The most bothersome experience reported was a loss of trust in the youth. Subjects expressed personal experiences of humiliation and being set up by youth. Consequently, these experiences made them "look bad" in front of juveniles and co-workers.

Tell me about an experience you had working with a juvenile that made you feel tense or anxious.

Concern for physical assault and physical intimidation seemed to make employees feel tense. Subjects also attributed anxious feelings to having no control over explosive juveniles.

Workers in juvenile institutions sometimes get into arguments with juveniles.

Most of the respondents described problems centered around disobeying institutional rules, a disrespectful attitude toward staff members and disagreement about staff's write-ups.

Some subjects claimed they never argued with juveniles. They were able to avoid confrontation because of the nature of their position.
Usually the roles of youth leader, social worker and supervisor protected them from physical and verbal attacks.

The behavior that caused arguments between worker and juvenile inmates were reported as: (1) refusal to do assignment; (2) refusal to follow instructions; (3) verbal insults (4) lack of self discipline; (5) early bedtime; and (6) dislike of staff member.

In terms of how arguments were resolved, the following were used: (1) talking with the juvenile; (2) send youth to the bedroom; (3) send youth to the office; (4) write-ups; (5) send youth to isolation; and (6) calm self down and proceed to discuss problem.

Respondents reported also they were affected as a result of arguments by low self-esteem, feeling guilty about losing temper and depression.

Tell me about the most recent or the worst incident at work in which one of your possessions or property was damaged (or in danger of being damaged).

Subjects reported personal items such as scissors, camera and money stolen. In some incidents, respondents reported torn clothing as a result of physical confrontations with inmates.

Staff members expressed that they learned quickly not to bring valuables to work. They learned also not to wear anything that may not be replaceable.
Tell me about an incident at work in which you became concerned about your physical safety.

Concerns were expressed about crisis situations. It appears that during a crisis staff members were more likely to be injured. This was due to staff shortage.

Tell me about an experience you had with a juvenile that made you feel good about working with juveniles.

Subjects reported they had played some part in helping the youth become a member of society. Because they were a significant person in the youth's life, this made them feel good.

How do you cope with the pressures of the job?

Respondents reported that they used withdrawal coping strategies, such as running, reading, prayer, medication or restraining negative thoughts about employment, while some used socializing coping strategies, such as talking with family and friends, getting involved with outside functions, and going to parties.

When asked how effective were your coping strategies, the majority of subjects reported a positive response in the method they used.

Comments

For additional comments, workers expressed that frequent policy changes made their job frustrating. In addition, some viewed their supervisors as lacking sensitivity to the needs of staff and juveniles.
Chapter V
DISCUSSION

The findings of this study support the major hypothesis; that is, there is a relationship between perceived exploitation and stress. To investigate the perceived exploitation level, a factor analysis of items from the Juvenile Worker Interactive Instrument identified two constructs: Exploitation—Intimidation and Interpersonal Relationship. When the Exploitation—Intimidation subscale was correlated with the six scales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory, three out of six came out significantly. The DPI scale (r = .45) had the highest association. The other significant relationships were with the EEF (r = .38) and DPF (r = .37) scale. The Interpersonal Relationship subscale was also correlated with the six subscales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory. The strongest association here was with the PAI scale (r = -.57). The other significant relationship was with the PAF scale (r = -.53).

The findings regarding stress levels of respondents as measured by the six scales of Maslach's Burnout Inventory revealed that for the most part, a moderate level of burnout was experienced by respondents.

The analysis of the perceived exploitation level of respondents revealed the average intimidation score of the respondents was 33.2 with a standard deviation of 9.2. The average interpersonal score of the respondents was 27.8 with a standard deviation of 7.1. Both scales
indicated respondents were experiencing exploitation in the institutional setting.

Multiple regression analysis of selected demographic variables on the Exploitation—Intimidation subscale revealed that no demographics explained a significant portion of the $R^2$ in the dependent variable. This indicates that the demographics variables investigated have little or no impact on subjects' perceived exploitation and that other variables that were not part of the regression equation (e.g., personality factors) might be relevant. With respect to the interpersonal subscale, one demographic factor, sex (male) was found to be significant. In other words, being a male is significantly related to a positive interpersonal relationship. This finding is consistent with studies that recognize sex as a predictor of burnout (Maslach and Crosby, 1982). Sex-based studies tend to reveal mixed findings. Some researchers believe that sex is a major factor in burnout, while others argue that sex has a small effect. Findings in the current study indicate sex is a significant factor which accounted for 22% of the variance.

The findings on the relationship between perceived exploitation and pressures outside of the workplace, work conditions, level of education completed, coping strategies, age of juvenile, working with and absenteeism, with the Exploitation—Intimidation subscale revealed no significant relationship. There, perceived exploitation has little to do with the above variables. The Interpersonal Relationship
subscale was found to be significantly related to three coping strategies. Alcohol and drugs \((r = -0.31)\) and meditation \((r = -0.37)\) were negatively related. Data regarding "adopt a positive attitude" \((r = +0.33)\) indicated a positive relationship. The work condition "heat" \((r = +0.36)\) indicated a positive relationship. This means that the use of drugs and alcohol as a coping strategy is inconsistent with positive interpersonal relationships. This makes sense as substance abuse is considered a maladaptive means of coping. The negative relationship between meditation and interpersonal relationship was surprising. Perhaps people who have positive relationships don't need to meditate. The relationship between positive relationships and adopt a positive attitude and the working condition of (enough) heat make common sense. Such findings are consistent with burnout studies (Freudenberger, 1974). Maslach and Pines (1977) have pointed to the lack of training in coping with emotional job-related stress. Similarly, in support of Maslach and Pines, the current study points to "adopt a positive attitude" as a method of handling emotional stress.

The findings on perceived exploitation and job title, value orientation of respondent, employment shift and personality characteristics revealed no significant relationship. These predictors of perceived exploitation were not consistent with research studies. There is growing evidence around personality characteristics, values and personality types that point to the authoritarian person's stress as higher than the humanistically-oriented person (Harris et al., 1983). According to Maslach (1982) employees who also work directly with
juvenile inmates and are less educated are subjected to more stress than professional staff. It may be that an individual's perception of exploitation is not influenced by the above variables.

A regression analysis was used to determine significant items in the form of perceived juvenile exploitation which impact on employee stress levels. The results were anger, politeness and "juvenile takes advantage of you." Anger was an important variable because employees who continually become emotionally upset in their interactions with juveniles quickly burn out. Similarly, numerous researchers (Maslach and Pines, 1977; Freudenberger, 1974; Phelps, 1976) have indicated negativism as a factor in employee burnout. The emotional turmoil leaves them physically and mentally drained from daily confrontations. A juvenile showing an employee consistent politeness may be conning or manipulating the juvenile worker. Such workers often become powerless and are victimized by juvenile inmates. Eventually, these individuals are targeted for exploitative behaviors. The variable "juvenile takes advantage of you" reveals that juvenile workers who are exploited are under stress. Overall display of emotion or defensive behavior on the part of juveniles seem to contribute to employee burnout. This may lead to feelings of powerlessness and low worker self-esteem. When juvenile workers do not feel good about themselves regarding their job, they may view their work as boring and meaningless.

The Critical Incident Survey and the quantitative findings in the current study reported similar findings. Each reported a large number of respondents pursuing higher education. This may reflect that
juvenile correctional administrators are seeking employees with college education. Findings on the Critical Incident Survey revealed humiliation and looking bad in front of juveniles and co-workers as a demeaning experience. Respondents attributed the variables "anger" and "taken advantage of" as significant variables. Most social workers and psychologists would agree that juvenile workers who become emotionally upset during the crisis situations with juveniles do not have control of a crisis. Arguments and the fear of physical attack were important experiences reported. Again, anger is a contributing factor that may influence whether or not an employee becomes physically attacked. Probably more stress reduction workshops and training on how to handle your own emotions in a crisis situation would be helpful to juvenile workers who daily confront disruptive behaviors. Respondents reported they used withdrawal coping strategies while some used socializing coping strategies. This is consistent with subjects reporting elsewhere that drugs and alcohol, meditation and adopting a positive attitude are significant variables. In this setting alcohol and drugs, and medications that were used, may be seen as a possible way of handling job stress. Adopting a positive attitude may be seen as a method of survival. For some employees, a positive attitude may be the only way they can get through a day on the job. This attitude provides them with a sense of environmental control. A limitation to the study was a small sample size.

Dissatisfaction with the job may have been responsible for the widespread resistance of workers who were asked to participate in this
research. Although encouraging subjects' participation is an obstacle encountered in almost every survey research project, factors may have prevailed in this instance that went beyond what might normally be expected.

For one thing, a small number of juvenile inmates escaped from the Training Institute of Central Ohio just a few weeks prior to performing the research. The media gave generous coverage to the incident, pointing to TICO's administration and staff shortages as part of the problem. This attention made some of the workers suspicious of the motivation for this research. As a result, they refused to participate. They feared that involvement in the study would be a negative mark against them.

Resentment toward the administration among staff was another factor that may have interfered with the study. Although individual findings of the study are confidential, some workers declined to participate because the research was supported by the administration.

Other workers seemed to want to be left alone. They may have perceived the researcher as representing change, and change was viewed as threatening. Some may have feared that the results of the research project might be used to alter the staff by trained specialists, which was essentially disturbing to those who had many years invested in the organization and preferred that everything remain the same.

Moreover, some workers saw the study as irrelevant to the problems of their institution. They made several statements such as "Why are you studying burnout? You should be studying the administration and
the politics, not "burnout" and "people burn out from policies." When staff workers viewed the study as irrelevant, many did not complete the instruments and questionnaires.

In an ideal world, administration would be supportive of the workers, providing recognition, encouragement and rewards for effective job performance. The juveniles, discouraged from exploitative behavior, would respond to therapeutic interaction with benevolent role models.

These goals are worth striving for. Steps such as those recommended later in the chapter can be taken toward reaching the objectives.

Meanwhile, this analysis of juvenile exploitation and job-related stress addresses many questions about the prevention of staff workers' burnout. The moderate degree of burnout and its associated symptoms, such as staff turnover, affects juvenile care in a negative way. Unless training and prevention programs are implemented, burned out employees will function ineffectively. Those who suffer the most may be our juveniles.

Role theory defines roles as expected behaviors. Roles specify how people are expected to relate to each other. Accordingly, roles determine how staff workers inside an institution relate to peers and inmates. It also explains how an individual's position influences how he relates to others. All juvenile workers have responsibilities tied to a role. The role of juvenile worker is that of being in charge of juveniles. Implied in the role is that individuals are able to handle
all crisis situations, maintain control of their emotions, and never become emotionally upset during a crisis.

Institution employees are aware that negative reports by a supervisor regarding job performance can prevent them from getting a raise or job promotion. Therefore, some employees learn to cope with stress by insulating their emotions. This form of behavior is closely associated with studies of alienation by Hepburn and Smith (1970) and by Poole and Regoli (1981).

Another form of alienation is employees' attitudes of cynicism and negativism that develop from negative transactions. Phelps (1976) pointed out that non-judgmental attitudes are needed to reduce negative relations between workers and inmates. Maslach and Pines (1977) found that longer hours spent working with children contributed toward staff workers' negative attitudes. Freudenberger (1980) provided a description of burnout that included employee attitudes of cynicism and negativism.

Closely linked to role theory and alienation is stress theory, which points out that people respond differently to stressors. Daley (1974) supported this contention, describing stress as a result of many crises. Nusbaum (1982) found educators who viewed themselves more positively, perceived a lesser degree of stress. In agreement with this view, the current study found a positive attitude to a coping strategy for stress reduction.

King (1976) advocated assertive behavior in dealing with youth. An assertive worker is less likely to internalize negative feelings toward
juvenile inmates. This in turn, helps staff workers to cope better in stress environment.

Many studies have identified a variety of stress reduction strategies such as better nutrition and physical exercise to name only a few. Many of these were employed by juvenile workers in this study.

Lazarus (1966) found stress reduction strategies helpful for people learning to cope with stress. Halpin et al. (1983) described how internal locus of control helps individuals combat stress. Few studies, however, have researched the effectiveness of intervention in reducing the problem of job stress among workers in juvenile correctional institutions.

Some suggestion for future research are as follows:

1. Studies should be implemented to determine the substance abuse problems of juvenile correctional workers.
2. Studies are needed to determine effective methods of crisis intervention with staff members.
3. Studies are needed to determine different stress reduction approaches for men and women.
4. Efforts should be made to measure the stress levels of staff members.
5. Studies should look into the relative merits of stress reduction techniques used with juvenile correlational workers.
6. Studies are needed to identify sources of institutional workers' self-esteem.
7. Studies are needed to identify the motivators of exploitative behaviors by juveniles inside correctional institutions.

Clearly, there are many area of inquiry about stress that await further research. But a major problem remains: How do we get higher compliance among staff workers for future research in juvenile correctional institutions? Some suggestions that may be helpful for achieving higher compliance are as follows:

1. Select institutions that are seeking solutions to their problems.

2. Use larger target population. Staff members tend to drop out or refuse to participate in institutional research because of fear.

3. Go to larger juvenile correctional institutions for larger samples.

4. Advise correctional administrators to encourage employees' participation. Give rewards, monetary compensation or time off to employees who participate.

5. Show a film on how research studies can benefit employees and their organization. This approach may encourage participation.

6. Keep instruments and surveys short. Staff members tend to leave blank spaces when instruments and surveys are too long. Instruments and surveys might be sent to the subjects' home.
Practice

The findings of this study should be of importance to any effort to implement new social programs. Based on the current research, some questions that need answers in order to minimize the possibility of job stress are as follows: How can we improve the efficiency and effectiveness of similar institutional settings? How can we implement methods that will prevent healthy workers from burnout? How can we reduce job stress? How can social workers intervene to prevent exploitation—and how should they deal with it when it does occur.

Based on the findings of this research, the following recommendations are given as a tool for minimizing the possibility of work-related stress and juvenile exploitation. The social work practitioner who is in a leadership role in a juvenile institution can be helpful by:

1. Holding weekly or biweekly staff meetings where the workers can discuss their grievances, frustrations and problems in relation to juveniles. Workers can benefit from their supervisors' knowledge and experience while, at the same time, administrators can learn first-hand about problems within the institution.

2. Providing guided group discussion on behavior of juveniles related to stress can lead to coordinated strategies among staff workers for dealing with especially manipulative juveniles.
3. Administering periodic burnout tests, such as the Maslach Burnout Inventory, to determine whether they are experiencing a sudden increase in stress. When a sudden increase occurs, appropriate remedial measures can be taken.

4. Providing questionnaires to workers regarding the relationship between absences and job stress.

5. Recommending systems of rewards such as a recognition dinner for staff members can help to increase role security, self-esteem and the sense of doing an important job.

6. Initiating systematic training sessions to help define roles; developing role plays in which constructive reactions to juveniles' anger and politeness, as well as techniques in dealing with employees' personal conflict with juvenile exploitative behavior, are illustrated.

7. Requesting annual evaluations by independent researchers to assess problem areas, strengths and improvements of institutional processes.

8. Recommending that treatment of juvenile inmates include socialization to discourage the incidence of harmful and exploitative behavior.


10. Referring employees to employee assistance programs of counseling and referral to help employees deal with stress.
Purpose and Objectives of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between juvenile exploitation and the work-related stress experienced by staff. The hypothesis was: the more exploited an employee, as perceived by the employee, the higher the stress level.

The objectives of this study were:

1. To determine the stress levels of respondents as measured by the six scales of Maslach's Burnout Inventory.
2. To determine the perceived exploitation level of respondents.
3. To determine the impact of selected demographic variables on perceived exploitation of respondents. The demographic variables in this analysis were age, sex, months employed, degree of preparation, income, and years of professional training.
4. To determine whether a relationship exists between perceived exploitation and the following factors: pressures outside of workplace, work conditions, level of education completed, coping strategies, age of juveniles worked with and absenteeism.
5. To determine whether differences exist in perceived exploitation among the levels of the following variables: job title, value orientation of respondent employment, shift and personality characteristics.

6. To determine whether there is a positive relationship between perceived exploitation and job stress as measured by six subscales of the Maslach Burnout Inventory.

7. To determine whether there are particular forms of perceived exploitation which impact on employee stress levels.

**Research Methodology**

This study was an ex post facto research which examined juvenile exploitation and work-related stress over a six month period. There were 41 respondents from Scioto Village (N = 16) and Training Institution of Central Ohio (n = 25).

Data were collected by the following four instruments: (1) A Background Information and Attitudes Toward Your Work questionnaire, (2) The Maslach Burnout Inventory, (3) The Juvenile Worker Interactive Instrument and (4) the Critical Incident Survey. The first instrument collected information on demographic variables and work attitudes, the second measured burnout, the third measured juvenile exploitation and the fourth probed for juvenile exploitative behaviors.
Summary of Findings

The stress levels of the respondents measured by the six scales of Maslach's Burnout Inventory were the following: The respondents' mean score on the Emotional Exhaustion--Frequency Scale was 22.86 which falls within the moderate range according to the normative data given on page 9.

The respondents' mean score on the Emotional Exhaustion--Intensity Scale was 27.29, which falls within the moderate range according to the normative data.

The respondents' mean score on the Depersonalization--Frequency Scale fell into the moderate category with a mean value of 9.56.

The Depersonalization--Intensity scores showed a mean value of 13.1. This mean value is considered moderate based on the normative categories.

The Personal Accomplishment--Frequency scale showed a mean value of 35.8. This mean value is considered moderate based on the normative data.

Respondents' mean score on the Personal Accomplishment--Intensity scale fell into the low category with a mean value of 37.97.

Two subscales were developed to measure employees' perceived exploitation by incarcerated juveniles. On the Exploitation--Intimidation subscale, the mean response value was 33.2 (S.D. = 9.2). The Interpersonal Relationship Subscale mean response value was 27.8 (S.D. = 7.08).
Multiple regression analysis was used with demographics of respondents as independent variables on each of the exploitation scales which were used as dependent variables. No demographic factor was found to have significant explanatory power with the Exploitation—Intimidation Subscale. With the Interpersonal subscale, however, there was one demographic factor found to be significant; the respondent's sex.

A Pearson correlation coefficient was used with coping strategies on the Exploitation—Intimidation and Interpersonal Relationship scales. With the Exploitation—Intimidation subscale, no significant relationship was found. Four factors were found to be significantly related to the Interpersonal Relationship subscale which were alcohol and drugs, medication, adopt positive attitude which are coping strategies and the work condition heat. No significant relationships were found on the variables pressures outside of workplace, level of education completed, age of juvenile worked with or absenteeism.

ANOVA was used to make a comparison between levels of job titles. No significant difference was found. A Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the relationship of the respondents' value orientation to respondents' perceived exploitation. No significant level was found. Analysis of variance also was applied to shiftwork on the Exploitation—Intimidation and Interpersonal Relationship scales. No differences were found. A t-test was utilized on each of the exploitation scales with personality characteristics. There were no significant differences found.
A Pearson correlation coefficient was used to determine whether a relationship existed between perceived exploitation and job stress as measured by the six burnout subscales. With the Emotional Exhaustion--Frequency scale, there was a significant relationship found on the Exploitation--Intimidation subscale. On the Depersonalization--Frequency and Depersonalization--Intensity subscale, there was a significant relationship found on the Exploitation--Intimidation scale. In terms of Personal Accomplishment--Frequency and Personal Accomplishment--Intensity subscales, both were found to be significantly related to the Interpersonal Relationship subscale.

Multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to identify the most prominent forms of exploitation and determine the percent of variance. "Anger" accounted for 21% of the variance in Emotional Exhaustion--Frequency, "to what extent are juveniles polite" and "youth made you angry," accounted for 42% of the variance in Emotional Exhaustion--Intensity, "anger" accounted for 31% of the variance in Depersonalization--Frequency scale, anger accounted for 43% of the variability in Depersonalization--Intensity, "share personal problems" and "youth swear at you" accounted for 36% for the variance in Personal Accomplishment--Frequency, and "share personal problems," "positive compliments," "youth swear at you," and "juveniles take advantage of you" accounted for 64% of the variance in Personal Accomplishment--Intensity.

A content analysis was conducted on the Critical Incident Survey in order to examine a juvenile worker's subjective response to being
exploited by the juvenile inmates at Scioto Village and the Training Institution for Central Ohio. It was found that many of the staff had received prior training or had attended college courses. Respondents reported they had felt humiliated and victimized by juveniles. Many reported concerns about the danger of physical intimidation and assault presented by their closeness to violent juveniles.

Respondents described problems that centered around the disobeying of institutional rules, disrespectful attitudes toward staff members and disagreement about staff's write-ups. As a result of this, respondents reported feelings of low self-esteem, anger and depression.

Respondents reported that their personal items such as scissors, cameras and money had been stolen. They also expressed concerns about their vulnerability to injury during crisis situations.

On a positive note, respondents reported they had played some role in helping young people to become members of society. This suggests that, despite its hardships, careers involving young delinquents do provide opportunities for people to feel good about their work.

Many respondents reported using helpful coping strategies. These included running, reading, prayer, talking with friends and going to parties.

Juvenile workers also expressed their dislike of frequent policy changes, which made their jobs frustrating. In addition, some viewed their supervisors as lacking sensitivity. Others reported that administrators were concerned about the rights of juvenile offenders but unconcerned about the rights of employees.
BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND ATTITUDES TOWARD YOUR WORK

1. What is your age? _______ Years

2. What is your sex? _______ Female _______ Male

3. How many months have you been employed at your present job? ______

4. What is your job title? (Check only one.)
   ______ (1) Administration
   ______ (2) Social Worker
   ______ (3) Teacher
   ______ (4) Psychologist
   ______ (5) Psychiatrist
   ______ (6) Nurse
   ______ (7) Ward Personnel
   ______ (8) Dispensary Personnel
   ______ (9) Recreational Staff
   ______ (10) Other

5. What is your degree of preparation for this kind of employment? (Check only one answer.)
   ______ (1) I had a similar job in another institution.
   ______ (2) I had some previous job experience, but not in a job like this.
   ______ (3) I had no previous job experience.
   ______ (4) Other

6. How many days have you been absent from work over the past six months? _______ days.

7. What employment shift do you usually work?
   ______ (1) Shift 1
   ______ (2) Shift 2
   ______ (3) Shift 3
   ______ (4) Rotation

8. How do you cope with stressful events? (Please check as many as you wish.)
   ______ (1) Jogging
   ______ (2) Meditation
   ______ (3) Alcohol/drugs
   ______ (4) Medication
   ______ (5) Confront the source of stress
   ______ (6) Adopt a positive attitude
   ______ (7) Ignore the source of stress
Background Information

____ (8) Increase my intake of food
____ (9) Leave the source of stress
____ (10) Change the source of stress
____ (11) Talk to someone about what is bothering me.
____ (12) Get involved in other activity
____ (13) Other: Please specify

9. How do you perceive your job environment in a crisis situation? (Please check one item)
   _____ ( ) I take charge of a situation.
   _____ ( ) Fate and luck plan a significant role in my work environment.
   _____ ( ) Both

10. What is your income range for this job only?
    _____ (1) $ 5,000 - $ 9,999
    _____ (2) $10,000 - $14,999
    _____ (3) $15,000 - $19,999
    _____ (4) $21,000 - $24,999
    _____ (5) $25,000+

11. How many years of professional training have you had?
    _____ (1) 0 - 1 year
    _____ (2) 1 - 3 years
    _____ (3) 4 - 5 years
    _____ (4) 6 - 8 years
    _____ (5) 9 - 12 years
    _____ (6) 12+ years

12. Juvenile inmates are rebellious, but they will grow up and adjust to society.
    _____ True  _____ False  _____ Undecided

13. Juvenile inmates are rebellious because society is at fault.
    _____ True  _____ False  _____ Undecided

14. What working conditions adversely affect your job performance?
    _____ (1) Heat
    _____ (2) Noise
    _____ (3) Lighting

15. Do you have pressures outside of the workplace?
    _____ no  _____ yes

16. Is arbitration going on in the workplace?
    _____ no  _____ yes
Background Information

17. Have you had in-service training in stress reduction?
   _____ no   _____ yes

18. Would you be interested in this kind of training?
   _____ no   _____ yes

19. What kind of professional training in the helping profession have you received? What kind? Briefly describe.

20. How many years of education have you completed? Please specify.

   High School  College  Graduate Degree
   10  11  12  1  2  3  4  Some  Completed
   Degree
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JUVENILE WORKER INTERACTIVE INSTRUMENT

The purpose of this instrument is to assess a juvenile worker's interactive behavior among incarcerated youths.

When filling out the instrument, please think of juveniles within this human service setting and your relationship with them.

There are twenty (20) items of exploitative behaviors and supportive behaviors. Read each item and decide which has happened to you. If the incident has never occurred, circle #1, "Hardly ever," in the column. If the incident has happened most of the time, circle #7, "Most of the time," in the column. If you have sometimes experienced this incident, circle #4, "Sometimes," in the column.

1. To what extent do you believe juveniles take advantage of you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The juvenile has given positive compliments in regard to my conduct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. To what extent do juveniles feel you are strict?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. To what extent are juveniles polite?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardly</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ever</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JUVENILE WORKER INTERACTIVE INSTRUMENT

5. To what extent do juveniles show you any disrespect (e.g., swearing, pushing, and theft)?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Hardly Ever Sometimes Most of the time

6. To what extent do juveniles express strong disagreement with your directives?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Hardly Ever Sometimes Most of the time

7. To what extent has anything which you have left unguarded within the past six months been stolen?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Hardly Ever Sometimes Most of the time

8. To what extent do juveniles accept your discipline?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Hardly Ever Sometimes Most of the time

9. To what extent have you had anything taken from your vehicle in the past six months at the job?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7
Hardly Ever Sometimes Most of the time
JUVENILE WORKER INTERACTIVE INSTRUMENT

10. To what extent has a juvenile shared personal problems with you?

Hardly Ever Sometimes Most of the time

11. To what extent has a youth made you angry in the past six months?

Hardly Ever Sometimes Most of the time

12. To what extent have juveniles shown respect for your authority?

Hardly Ever Sometimes Most of the time

13. To what extent have you had a youth swear at you?

Hardly Ever Sometimes Most of the time

14. To what extent do juveniles express trust in you?

Hardly Ever Sometimes Most of the time

15. To what extent have you been threatened by a youth?

Hardly Ever Sometimes Most of the time
JUVENILE WORKER INTERACTIVE INSTRUMENT

16. To what extent do juveniles obey you?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardly Ever</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. To what extent do juveniles use non-verbal behavior to express hostile feelings toward you (e.g., giving a finger, facial frown, or waving a fist)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardly Ever</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. To what extent do juveniles follow through with your suggestions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardly Ever</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. To what extent have you been physically attacked?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardly Ever</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you were physically attacked, what age range were the juvenile(s) involved in the incident?

- (1) 10-13 years
- (2) 14-16 years
- (3) 17-18 years
- (4) +19 years
- (5) Does not apply

20. To what extent do juveniles get along with you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardly Ever</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CRITICAL INCIDENT SURVEY

These questions are about experiences you may have had working with juveniles here that made a significant impression on you or affected the way you feel. Please describe specific events that have occurred that affected you personally. If you think of more than one incident under each category, describe the most recent one.

1. Tell me about an experience you had that made you feel taken advantage of by a juvenile.
   a. Describe the experience:

   b. Describe the juvenile involved:

   c. What about this experience bothered you the most?

2. Tell me about an experience you had working with a juvenile that made you feel tense or anxious.
   a. Describe the experience:

   b. Describe the juvenile involved:

   c. What about this experience made you feel anxious?
Critical Incident Survey

3. Workers in juvenile institutions sometimes get into **arguments** with juveniles.
   
a. Describe the most recent or the worst incident in which you got into an argument with a juvenile:
   
b. What was the argument about?
   
c. Describe the juvenile's temperament.
   
d. How was the argument resolved?
   
e. How did this event affect you personally?

4. Tell me about the most recent or the worst incident at work in which one of your possessions or property was damaged (or in danger of being damaged).
   
a. Describe the incident:
   
b. Describe the people involved.
Critical Incident Survey

c. What possessions or property were in danger

d. What about this experience made an impression on you.

5. Tell me about an incident at work in which you became concerned about your physical safety.
   a. Describe the incident:

   b. Describe the people involved:

   c. What about this experience made an impression on you?

6. Tell me about an experience you had with a juvenile that made you feel good about working with juveniles.
   a. Describe the experience

   b. Describe the juvenile
Critical Incident Survey

c. What about this experience made you feel good?

7. How do you cope with the pressures on the job?
   a. Describe what you do:

   b. How effective are your means of coping?
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"An Ex Post Facto Research Study on the Relationship Between Juvenile Exploitation and Work-Related Stress Experienced by Staff Members"

You have been randomly selected to be asked to participate in a doctoral dissertation research study supervised by Dr. Milton S. Rosner of The Ohio State University. The purpose of this study will be to investigate the effects on you of experiences you may have had while working with juveniles here in which they have been abusive or exploitative of you.

Each participant will be given a packet which consists of Background Information and Attitudes Toward Your Work Sheet. This form requests information pertaining to the participant's background and his or her attitudes toward work. The Maslach Burnout Inventory is designed to measure your experience of burnout on the job. The intent of the Juvenile Worker Interactive Instrument assesses a juvenile worker's interactive behavior among incarcerated juveniles. In other words, we are trying to assess whether or not you have been exploited by a juvenile. The Critical Incident Survey is used to probe for abusive experiences you may have had while working with juveniles.

If you decide to participate, it will take about an hour of your time to complete the instruments.

Participation in this study is strictly voluntary, and you have the right to withdraw at any time. Involvement in this study will not affect your employment status. Your personnel files will be accessed only to get two types of information: months employed at present job, and the number of days you have been absent from work over the past six months. If you possess this information however, there will be no need to use personnel files.

The purpose of this information will be used to provide background data on each participant. Only summary statistics will be released. No information that can be linked to individual participants will be released. This means that your name will not be allowed on any of the instruments. You can be assured of confidentiality and anonymity.

I would appreciate it very much if you would volunteer to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

James A. Farmer
Doctoral Candidate
College of Social Work
The Ohio State University
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