

Original Papers

Polish Psychological Bulletin
 2019, vol. 50(3) 275–283
 DOI - 10.24425/ppb.2019.130701

Ewa Sygit-Kowalkowska*
 Robert Poklek**
 Beata Pastwa-Wojciechowska***

Predicting the Role of Personality Traits, Organizational Factors, and Strategies for Coping with Stress in Job Satisfaction in Correctional Services

Abstract: Correctional staff is particularly exposed to occupational stress which in turn can have a negative impact on their job performance. This study attempted to analyse the role of personality, organizational factors, and stress coping strategies in shaping job satisfaction. 163 correctional staff members who were being trained at the Central Training Centre of Correctional Services in Kalisz, Poland, participated in the study. The following tools were used: The Bochum Inventory of Personal Work Features (BIP), the Multiphasic Inventory for Measuring Coping (COPE), and the Satisfaction with Job Scale (SSP).

Staff working directly with inmates scored the lowest in terms of job satisfaction. Social sensibility is a predictor of job satisfaction among each study subgroup and each correctional department and correctional staff as a whole. Correlates of job satisfaction among correctional officers were: Active coping with stressful situations and Seeking social support for emotional and instrumental reasons.

Keywords: job satisfaction, correctional officers, coping with stress, active coping, substance use

Without a doubt, work is an important sphere of human activity. The available psychological literature on the role of work links professional activity with individuals' job satisfaction. Measurable benefits of satisfaction encourage researchers to conduct further studies among various professional groups. Specifically, the occupations in healthcare, law enforcement, and correctional services. Among these is correctional staff.

Certain people working in correctional services find their work overwhelming because they must deal with inmates who are incarcerated against their own will (Lambert, & Paoline, 2010). Studies to date indicate that correctional staff may experience significant deterioration of physical and mental health due to specific working conditions (Johnson, Cooper, Cartwright, Donald, Taylor, & Millet, 2005). In addition, they experience occupational stress and burnout more often than the general population, which consequently impacts their quality of life and job satisfaction (Lambert, Hogan, & Altheimer, 2010). In the

opinion of correctional staff, their occupation is rarely satisfying (Pomiankiewicz, 2010).

Furthermore, correctional staff is exposed to a variety of stressful factors. Among these are factors closely related to work characteristics typical of paramilitary services (e.g., subordinate status, low input into decision-making) and factors experienced while working with inmates (aggression, insufficient skills and abilities to deal with inmates) (Castle, & Martin, 2006; Lambert, Hogan, & Altheimer, 2010; Piotrowski, 2010; Taxman, & Gordon, 2009). The research has shown that correctional officers, who constantly supervise inmates, and correctional rehabilitation staff, who is responsible for the rehabilitation of inmates, are most exposed to stressors. The administration staff who has very little or virtually no contact with inmates (i.e., employees working in human resources, legal assistance, and inmates' employment departments) is the least exposed to stressors (Korczyńska, 2004).

* Kazimierz Wielki University in Bydgoszcz, Institute of Psychology, Division of Organizational and Management Psychology

** Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan, Division of Education Science

*** University of Gdansk, Institute of Psychology, Division of Personality Psychology and Forensic Psychology

Correctional staff role is closely associated with problems of coping with work situations. The available literature indicates that employee reactions to difficult situations depend on their personality response to stress and the ability to respond to changes in the work environment (Bolger, 1990; Beutler, Moos, & Lane, 2003). Connor-Smith and Flachsbart (2007) state that human personality directly and indirectly affects coping. Specifically, it affects coping directly as it constrains or facilitates the use of coping strategies. An individual's personality can affect coping indirectly by impacting the effectiveness of using coping strategies. To date, scientific analyses showed that personality is strongly related to life satisfaction, depression severity, and psychological adaptation to stress (Skomorovsky, 2013).

Analysing job satisfaction among correctional staff in terms of personal characteristics (competence), correctional work environment, and staff's tasks and duties seems to be an important aspect of the research on the functioning of the penitentiary system. Studies to date associate coping with stress with occupational burnout and the amount of experienced job stress; however, they do not link it with job satisfaction (Griffin, Hogan, Lambert, Tucker-Gail, & Baker, 2010; Morgan, Van Haveren, & Pearson, 2002; Schaufeli, & Peeters, 2000). So far, in Poland research has been focused on analysing general life satisfaction among correctional staff, whereas job satisfaction has been measured only regarding certain departments (Piotrowski, 2012; Piotrowski, 2013). The presented research fills this knowledge gap.

Study Aim and Research Questions

This study aimed to explain psychological determinants of job satisfaction in terms of organizational structure. Specifically, among correctional staff working in various correctional departments – correctional officers, the administration, and correctional rehabilitation department. In this study, the impact of personality traits and strategies for coping with stress were also analysed.

Furthermore, the authors attempted to answer the following study questions:

- What is the job satisfaction level in the study subgroups (correctional rehabilitation staff, the administration, correctional officers)?
- Does the job satisfaction level vary among the study subgroups (correctional rehabilitation staff, the administration, correctional officers)?
- Is there a relationship between personality and job satisfaction in the study subgroups (correctional rehabilitation staff, the administration, correctional officers)?
- Is there a relationship between stress coping strategies and job satisfaction in the study subgroups (correctional rehabilitation staff, the administration, correctional officers)?
- Which analysed variables are predictors of job satisfaction level in each study subgroup?

Characteristics of the Study Group

Study participants were correctional staff who took part in officer and noncommissioned officer training at the Central Training Center of Correctional Services in Kalisz, Poland. The research was carried out with the consent of the Central Training Center director and the Bioethics Committee. Participation in the study was voluntary. The topic and aim of the study were explained to each volunteer participant and informed oral consent was obtained.

The study participants worked in the following correctional departments: the administration, the correctional rehabilitation department, and the department of corrections. Employees who work in the administration department are responsible for human resources, legal assistance, and inmates' employment. Correctional officers keep order and discipline in the correctional institution and they ensure the safety of inmates and other correctional officers. Correctional officers' constantly supervise activities of inmates, check cells and other areas of the correctional facility. They also escort inmates within the correctional facility and help to transfer inmates to other locations. Correctional rehabilitation staff is responsible for running educational programs and rehabilitating incarcerated inmates, as such initiatives reduce aggression incidents and suicidal behaviors among inmates. Furthermore, correctional rehabilitation staff also participates in making decisions about granting parole release.

350 officers, at the time undergoing training in the centre in Kalisz, were invited to participate in the study. Of these, 200 joined the study. 37 surveys were rejected from the analysis due to incomplete data. In the group of 163 respondents, 24% were women. 96 correctional officers and 34 correctional rehabilitation staff members work directly with inmates. Whereas, 33 study participants who work in the administration have limited contact with inmates. A total number of 67 study participants were not correctional officers. The mean tenure in correctional services was 6 years and 8 months. Whereas, the shortest tenure was 1 year, and the longest tenure was 20 years. The mean age of study participants was 33 years and 1 month.

Research Tools

The following tools were used in this study:

- 1) The Bochum Inventory of Personal Work Features (BIP). The tool is used to measure certain personality aspects considered important in terms of effective professional functioning (Jaworowska, 2014). The self-report BIP version is a 220-item scale. The respondent assesses to what extent they agree with each statement using a 6-point scale. The tool allows to identify 14 basic personality traits in 4 dimensions. Specifically, these are Professional orientation (Achievement motivation, Power motivation, and Leadership motivation); Professional behaviour (Conscientiousness, Flexibility, and Towards action-orientation); Social

competence (Social sensibility, Openness to relations, Sociability, Towards team-orientation, Assertiveness); Psychological nature (Emotional stability, Work under pressure, and Self-confidence). In the following study the researchers used the Polish BIP version whose structure was analogous to that of the original BIP. The test accuracy was confirmed by the subgroup results. For most scales, internal reliability indices are around .8. Tool standards apply to professionally active adults, aged 20–65 years.

- 2) The Multiphasic Inventory for Measuring Coping (COPE) developed by Ch. C. Carver, M. F. Scheier, J. K. Weintraub, adapted in Polish by Z. Juczyński and N. Ogińska-Bulik (2009). The questionnaire is a self-report tool used to assess ways in which people cope with stress. An individual indicates on a 4-point scale to what extent they agree with each of the 60 statements. The tool allows to assess 15 strategies for coping with stressful situations. According to the factor structure included in manual, these strategies can be divided into the following groups:
 - a) Active coping, which includes: Active coping, Planning, Suppression of competing activities, Positive reinterpretation and growth, and Restraint.
 - b) Avoidance behaviours, which include 6 strategies: Behavioural disengagement, Mental disengagement, Sense of humour, Alcohol-drug disengagement, Acceptance, Denial.
 - c) Use of support and Focus on emotions, which includes 4 scales: Seeking social support for instrumental reasons, Seeking social support for emotional reasons, Turning to Religion, and Focus on and venting of emotions. Standard deviations and means are considered the standards for adults aged 20–65 years.
- 3) The Satisfaction With Job Scale (SSP) designed by A. M. Zalewska, based on The Satisfaction With Life Scale (SWLS) by E. Diener et al. (1985; 2003). The tool demonstrates high internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha above .80). The Satisfaction With Job Scale measures the cognitive aspect of general job satisfaction. The tool consists of 5 statements: *In most ways my work is close to my ideal; My work conditions are excellent; I am satisfied with my work; So far, I have gotten the important things I want at work; If I were to choose my work again, I would choose the same one.* According to the instructions, a respondent is asked to indicate how much they agree with each statement using a 7-point scale, where: 1 – Strongly disagree; 2 – Disagree; 3 – Slightly disagree; 4 – Neither agree nor disagree; 5 – Slightly agree; 6 – Agree; 7 – Strongly agree. All the SSP statements contribute to a one-dimensional structure and indicate high internal reliability in both the heterogeneous group of employees and in each employee subgroup.

In the study, the following demographic data were collected: employee's department, tenure (in years), sex, and age (in years).

Statistical analyses were conducted on the data using the IBM SPSS Statistics 24 package to answer study questions. The software allowed the authors to compute basic descriptive statistics analysis, correlations with Pearson's r coefficient, one-way analysis of variance of independent samples, and stepwise linear regression analyses. The authors defined the statistical significance level of $p < .05$. The article presents results excluding low and weak correlations. This was done due to the large amount of data obtained from the analyses. A scale was used, where (Stanisz, 1998):

- a) $0 < r_{xy} \leq .1$ is a slender correlation,
- b) $.1 \leq r_{xy} \leq .3$ is a weak correlation,
- c) $.3 \leq r_{xy} \leq .5$ is an average correlation,
- d) $.5 \leq r_{xy} \leq .7$ is a high correlation,
- e) $.7 \leq r_{xy} \leq .9$ very high correlation.

The Study Results

Prior to the detailed analysis of the study questions, the authors checked the hypothesis of the normality distribution of the quantitative variables. First, the basic descriptive statistics were analysed and the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test was applied to data obtained for all the study participants. Afterwards, data gathered for each department was evaluated using the Shapiro–Wilk test. The authors found that the test results were statistically significant for numerous variables for all the departments as well as for each of the subgroups. Consequently, the variable distributions differ from the normal distribution. However, the skewness of the variables exceeded the absolute value of 2.0, set by the authors, only in case of tenure in the correctional rehabilitation department. Subsequently, this variable distribution was rather asymmetric when compared to the Gaussian curve. The authors further performed parametric analysis of the other variables.

Job satisfaction among correctional staff

The lowest mean results in job satisfaction, at 20.91 points ($SD = 5.58$; $n = 96$), were recorded for correctional officers. The highest results, at 22.36 points ($SD = 5.49$; $n = 33$), were recorded for the administration. The mean result in job satisfaction among the correctional rehabilitation staff was 22.29 points ($SD = 4.59$; $n = 34$). The general result for the whole study group was 21.65 points ($SD = 5.31$; $n = 163$). Since there are no tool standards available, the authors decided to continue with further analyses.

One-way analysis of variance of independent samples was used to check whether an employee's department has a statistically significant impact on the perceived job satisfaction level. However, the result was deemed statistically insignificant.

Relationship between job satisfaction and personality of employees working in different departments

In the next study phase, the authors verified whether there is a statistically significant relationship between

job satisfaction and personality of employees working as correctional officers, correctional rehabilitation workers, or administrators. In this analysis, findings demonstrate that in the case of correctional officers, the job satisfaction had statistically significant correlations with Leadership motivation ($r = .400$; $p = .002$) and Social sensibility ($r = .355$; $p = .006$). The recorded positive correlations of moderate strength demonstrate that job satisfaction is statistically significantly associated with Social sensibility for both, correctional rehabilitation staff ($r = .405$; $p = .018$) and administrative staff ($r = .396$; $p = .025$). No other statistically significant relationships were found between the analysed variables.

Relationship between job satisfaction and stress coping strategies among employees working in different departments

Next, the authors calculated correlations with Pearson's r to check whether job satisfaction in different departments is linked with stress coping strategies. The findings prove that there are significant positive correlations of moderate strength between job satisfaction and Active coping ($r = .311$; $p = .015$), Use of instrumental social support ($r = .314$; $p = .014$), Use of emotional social support ($r = .313$; $p = .014$), and Restraint ($r = .302$;

$p = .018$) among correctional officers. Therefore, the higher the correctional officers' tendency to actively cope with stress using the above-mentioned strategies, the higher their job satisfaction level.

The predictive model of job satisfaction

In line with the study aims, a stepwise linear regression analysis was performed. The authors assumed that the scales measuring personality traits and stress coping strategies were the predictors, whereas the dependent variable was job satisfaction (Table 1). In the first step, the analysis was performed for correctional officers.

Leadership motivation was the strongest predictor among correctional officers (Table 1). Additionally, Leadership motivation explains the largest percentage of the variance in job satisfaction (16%). However, subsequent steps in the regression analysis showed that Social sensibility, Seeking social support for instrumental reasons, and Power motivation had a statistically significant impact on job satisfaction and led to an increase of 30% in the explained variance. Nevertheless, Leadership motivation remains to be the strongest predictor of job satisfaction among correctional officers.

Two regression models estimated for the correctional rehabilitation staff examine the job satisfaction variability

Table 1. Regression results for 4 models with job satisfaction as the dependent variable among correctional officers

	Non-standardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	R^2	ΔR^2	$F_{Changes}$
	B	SE	Beta			
Model 1				.16		10.84**
(Constant)	5.63	4.69				
Leadership motivation	.30	.09	.40			
Model 2				.22	.08	6.07*
(Constant)	-7.15	6.86				
Leadership motivation	.26	.09	.35			
Social sensibility	.31	.13	.29			
Model 3				.26	.05	4.07*
(Constant)	-9.58	6.79				
Leadership motivation	.24	.09	.31			
Social sensibility	.28	.12	.26			
Use of instrumental social support	1.89	.93	.23			
Model 4				.30	.05	4.39*
(Constant)	-1.88	7.55				
Leadership motivation	.27	.09	.35			
Social sensibility	.29	.12	.27			
Use of instrumental social support	1.92	.91	.24			
Power motivation	-.23	.11	-.24			

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Table 2. Regression results for 2 models with job satisfaction as the dependent variable among correctional rehabilitation staff

	Non-standardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	R^2	ΔR^2	F_{Changes}
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	Beta			
Model 1				.16		6.26*
(Constant)	5.90	6.59				
Social sensibility	.33	.13	.41			
Model 2				.28	.16	7.21*
(Constant)	14.52	6.83				
Social sensibility	.41	.12	.51			
Assertiveness	-.27	.10	-.41			

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

(Table 2). In model 1, Social sensibility was a significant predictor, explaining 16% of the job satisfaction variability. Furthermore, Assertiveness had such an impact on the explained variance, that both predictors explained 28% of the variance.

In the first step, the regression analysis for the administration demonstrated that Social sensibility explains the greatest percentage of the variance of the dependent

variable (Table 3). Moreover, the authors discovered that Social sensibility was the variable most strongly associated with job satisfaction among the administration department. However, subsequent steps in the analysis showed that Openness to relations, Restraint, Acceptance, and Conscientiousness were also statistically significant predictors. These predictors combined explain 47% of the job satisfaction variability.

Table 3. Regression results for 5 models with job satisfaction as the dependent variable among the administration

	Non-standardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	R^2	ΔR^2	F_{Changes}
	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	Beta			
Model 1				.16		5.58*
(Constant)	7.45	6.41				
Social sensibility	.31	.13	.40			
Model 2				.28	.17	7.49*
(Constant)	7.18	5.81				
Social sensibility	.63	.17	.81			
Openness to relations	-.25	.09	-.58			
Model 3				.41	.14	7.27*
(Constant)	12.40	5.61				
Social sensibility	.72	.15	.92			
Openness to relations	-.29	.08	-.67			
Restraint	-3.20	1.19	-.38			
Model 4				.47	4.23	4.23*
(Constant)	6.47	6.05				
Social sensibility	.75	.15	.97			
Openness to relations	-.27	.08	-.64			
Restraint	-3.76	1.16	-.45			
Acceptance	2.11	1.02	.28			

Table 3. Cont.

	Non-standardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	R^2	ΔR^2	F_{Changes}
	B	SE	Beta			
Model 5				.55	.08	5.71*
(Constant)	10.50	5.83				
Social sensibility	.94	.16	1.21			
Openness to relations	-.27	.07	-.63			
Restraint	-4.09	1.08	-.49			
Acceptance	2.27	.95	.31			
Conscientiousness	-.22	.09	-.38			

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Discussion of Findings

Limited studies have focused on job satisfaction among employees in correctional services. According to the available data, job satisfaction among correctional staff translates into overall quality of life satisfaction (Baranauskienė, Dirzytė, & Valaikiene, 2010). Scientific analyses concerning the profession of a correction officer, regardless of the country and the penitentiary system, showed many common features. They perform the same tasks (preventing the escape of inmates, keeping order and discipline within the correctional facility, ensuring security of inmates and personnel, correcting inmates' attitudes) and they encounter similar type of people – demoralized criminals. Officers can encounter the aggression of inmates or contract diseases; hence the rates of injury and illness are the highest of all occupations (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2019). In recent times, the world mass imprisonment policy has also become more acute, increasing the severity of punishment and thus causing overcrowding of prisons in most countries, which affects the work of staff (Garland, 2001).

One of the research objectives was to determine the level of job satisfaction and its dependence on the specifics of the work performed in the penitentiary institution. It turned out that correctional officers, who work directly with inmates, scored the lowest in terms of job satisfaction. This result confirmed other study findings which suggested that correctional staff perceived work strain may vary depending on their department, duties, and degree of contact with inmates (Jung-Wan & Hyun-Jung, 2006; Keinan & Malach-Pines, 2007). Perceived dangerousness induced by frequent contacts with inmates poses a threat to correctional officers and may be associated both with the level of experienced stress and the lack of satisfaction (Cullen, Link, Wolfe, & Frank, 1985; Whiteacre, 2006). Also, it seems highly probable that this type of contact may contribute to burnout, which is analogous to the concept of client-related burnout highlighted in general studies on employees in the social services sector (Borritz, Rugulies, Bjorner, Villadsen, Mikkelsen, & Kristensen, 2006). Direct

contact with prisoners can take different intensity in the work of correctional officers. Literature indicates large disparities between countries in terms of the number of prisoners per one employee. Based on that, we can assume that a different level of professional burdens (including liability and control) accompanies officers from Denmark (.7 inmates per employee), Poland (2.4 inmates) or the US (4 inmates) (Kacprzak, 2017; Zeng, 2018).

In the presented study, it was assumed that officers would assess not only the conditions of their work, but also how close it is to the ideal, and if it was a good life choice. Until now the cognitive aspect of general job satisfaction measured using the SSP tool has been analysed in relation to various professional groups. Comparison of our study results with data obtained by other researchers revealed that correctional officers' scores were lower than those of individuals working in customer service (salespersons, telemarketers, hotel employees, nurses, teachers); whereas the administrative and correctional rehabilitation staff scored higher mean scores than the customer service employees (Lachowska, 2012; Łaguna, 2012; Mróz, 2015).

It should be noted that no differences in overall satisfaction results between different departments were observed in other studies on job satisfaction among correctional staff (Piotrowski, 2013). According to Piotrowski who performed detailed analyses of answers to the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire, if we consider such work aspects as job importance, task difficulty, and input into decision-making, then it turns out that the correctional rehabilitation staff is more satisfied than the correctional officers. The correctional literature often presents perceived autonomy at work as the last factor which significantly affects the correctional rehabilitation staff satisfaction (Lambert, Cluse-Tolar, & Hogan, 2007; Cullen, Latessa, Kopache, Lombardo, & Burton, 1993). The authors believe that the above data indicate that there is a need for more research focusing on correctional services functioning and their rigidly defined structure.

The study also aimed at analysing the personality traits of prison employees in relation to the job satisfaction

declared by them. The study results showed that the Leadership motivation is a predictor and a correlate of job satisfaction among correctional officers. Keeping order and discipline are the essential part of their every-day work. According to the BIP tool manual, Leadership motivation defines an individual's tendency towards putting themselves in the position of authority, leading and influencing others. Leadership position in correctional services gives authority and power, and it allows more control and input into decision-making. It also means that employees can issue and enforce orders and punishments. Additionally, leadership gives more power both among subordinates, as well as inmates. The available literature demonstrates that employees with higher positions reported greater job satisfaction. Higher salaries, tenure-related benefits, and social recognition are among factors which explain this phenomenon (Campos, Schneider, Bonafé, Oliveira, & Maroco, 2016).

Leadership motivation among correctional staff may impact their ability to respond to supervisors' expectations. Consequently, executing supervisors' orders may lead to positive reinforcements (acknowledgment and praise) which in turn will contribute to further organizational commitment. However, correctional staff understands the limited influence they have on their career development. According to the employees, promotion opportunities in correctional institutions depend strongly on supervisors' personal preferences and they are not based on merit (Mosadeghrad & Ferdosi, 2013). There is another dimension to the importance of leadership in the context of job satisfaction.

Studies on correctional staff demonstrate that leadership in the form of social control, i.e., an established system of norms and rules, is of paramount importance in correctional facilities. Correctional staff job satisfaction depends on other factors than just discipline and control over inmates. Other essential factors include the discipline and control that are enforced upon them by their supervisors, and the employees' attitude towards them (Blau, Light, & Chamlin, 1986; Nawój, 2004).

The study results analysis also demonstrated that Social sensibility plays an essential role in shaping job satisfaction among each correctional department and correctional staff as a whole. According to the BIP tool manual, social sensibility is a social competence which allows individuals to notice even the subtlest emotional signals in their environment and use that knowledge to understand the behaviour of others. Also, this trait is essential in professions which involve contact with people. Furthermore, social sensibility affects correctional staff's attitude towards inmates and the way they interact with them. The authors believe that the importance of social skills in delivering a proper correctional service is yet to be examined. Analyses performed in nine countries demonstrated that demanding social contacts with inmates, co-workers, and supervisors are one of the most typical stressors for correctional staff (Schaufeli & Peeters, 2000). This means that it is important to learn about the social skills of correctional staff, as they may have significant

impact on the shaping of professional duties performance and job satisfaction.

Studies to date indicate that the type of correctional orientation (rehabilitation or punishment orientation) may influence job satisfaction among correctional staff (Moon & Maxwell, 2004). It was pointed out that job satisfaction correlates negatively with supportive attitude, which itself is more common in older staff members. However, the study data paint a different picture. It is essential to note, that sensibility is described in relation to other traits, such as empathy, emotionality, and subtlety. Regarding these traits, sensibility determines the quality of interpersonal contacts. According to Błaszczyk (2010), social sensibility towards people and respect towards human dignity, liberty, security, and equality play an essential role in overcoming potential marginalized behaviours. Among the three main components of emotional intelligence (emotional sensitivity, emotional competency, and emotional maturity), it's the emotional sensitivity which was proven to shape job satisfaction among employees (Hamidi & Amiri, 2013; Mahal, 2016).

Studies to date prove the strong relationship between emotional intelligence and job satisfaction among employees in customer service, and the findings also suggest that emotional intelligence can impact effective professional functioning (Hamidi & Amiri, 2013; Gündüz, Günsel, & Ulutaş, 2012; Zalewska, 2003). Furthermore, emotional intelligence is a social skill which allows to accurately read and interpret emotions and understand group dynamics and motivation behind human behaviour (Korcz, 2006). According to the available literature, individuals with greater ability to understand emotions adapt better to the requirements of a work environment (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002).

Job-related stress may have a negative impact on employees' health and it may contribute to burnout syndrome development (Ogińska-Bulik, 2005). In the scientific literature, there is a well-established view that working in prison can be stressful. The analyses to date confirm the importance of studies on the relationship between job satisfaction and stress coping strategies. Meanwhile, employees' attempts to fulfil workplace or self-set demands can ease job-related stress. For this reason, the variable of coping strategies was included in the research model.

The study results showed differences between employees from different departments in terms of the stress coping strategies variable. The following active strategies were correlates of job satisfaction among correctional officers: Active coping, Seeking social support for emotional and instrumental reasons. In general, the correctional literature supports the idea that problem-focused strategies are more effective in reducing stress than strategies which focus on venting emotions, and they have a significant impact on lowering emotional burnout and increasing the sense of personal achievement among correctional staff (Goleman, 1998; Savicki, 2002).

This study provided insights on shaping job satisfaction among correctional officers, yet it has its limitations. The authors believe that a longitudinal study would allow a more precise analysis of factors shaping job

satisfaction. Specifically, such studies would allow the researchers to pinpoint in time the moment of change in relation to tenure, growing experience, knowledge, and professional skills. While the authors analysed different stress coping strategies, it would also be noteworthy to analyse flexible coping skills, such as discontinuing the use of ineffective methods. In the discussion about effectively delivering a proper correctional service, it would be worth analysing suggested solutions which in the opinion of correctional staff can allow more effective and satisfying functioning in such a demanding work environment. Scientific knowledge on prison staff can be effectively developed in international comparative research projects. However, only considering differences and similarities in the conditions of penitentiary work will allow for a thorough analysis of the topic. An interesting aspect to compare to the available Polish data is the approach of Scandinavian countries, where the principle of universalism applies, which means that the working conditions in prison are to be the same in terms of aesthetics as for civil servants or academic teachers (Płatek, 2007).

Conclusions

1. Correctional officers, who work directly with inmates, scored the lowest in terms of job satisfaction. This finding is consistent with current scientific reports on this subject.
2. Social sensibility correlates positively with job satisfaction. As such, Social sensibility is a predictor of job satisfaction among correctional officers, correctional rehabilitation staff and administration.
3. Leadership motivation correlates positively with job satisfaction among correctional officers and as such, it is the strongest predictor of job satisfaction.
4. Other correlates of job satisfaction among correctional officers are active strategies, such as Active coping, Seeking social support for emotional and instrumental reasons.
5. There is a need to further develop knowledge about the work of officers, considering the differences and similarities of the penitentiary systems of the countries in which they serve.

References

- Anshel, M. H. (2000). A conceptual model and implications for coping with stressful events in police work. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 27, 375–400.
- Barauskiene, I., Dirzyte, A., Valaikiene, A. (2010). Relation of Psychosocial Job Factors to Job Satisfaction, Quality of Life, Sense of Harmony among Officers of correctional institutions. *Social Research*, 1(18), 29–39.
- Beutler, L. E., Moos, R. H., & Lane, G. (2003). Coping, treatment planning, and treatment outcome: Discussion. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 59, 1151–1167.
- Biggs, A., Brough, P., & Barbour, J. P. (2014). Exposure to extraorganizational stressors: Impact on mental health and organizational perceptions for police officers. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 21, 255–282.
- Blau, J. R., Light, S. C., & Chamlin, M. (1986). Individual and Contextual Effects on Stress and Job Satisfaction. A Study of Prison Staff. *Work and Occupations*, 13(1), 131–156. [https://doi: 10.1177/07308888486013001009](https://doi.org/10.1177/07308888486013001009).
- Błaszczuk, W. (2010). Wrażliwość jako czynnik wpływu społecznego na zmiany w organizacji [Sensitivity as a factor of social influence on changes in the organization]. *Acta Universitatis Lodzianis Folia Oeconomica*, 234, 93–100.
- Bolger, N. (1990). Coping as a personality process. A prospective study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 525–537.
- Borritz, M., Rugulies, R., Bjorner, J. B., Villadsen, E., Mikkelsen O. A., & Kristensen, T. S. (2006). Burnout among employees in human service work: design and baseline findings of the PUMA study. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 34, 49–58.
- Bourbonnais, R., Malenfant, R., Vézina, M., Jauvin, N., & Brisson, I. (2005). Work characteristics and health of correctional officers. *Revue d'Epidemiologie et de Sante Publique*, 53 (2), 127–142.
- Bureau of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, *Occupational Outlook Handbook, Correctional Officers and Bailiffs*. (n.d.). Retrieved May 1, 2019, from <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/protective-service/correctional-officers.htm>.
- Burke, R., & Deszca, E. (1986). Correlates of psychological burnout phases among police officers. *Human Relations*, 39, 487–501. [https://doi: 10.1177/001872678603900601](https://doi.org/10.1177/001872678603900601).
- Campos, J., Schneider, V., Bonafé, F., Oliveira, R. & Maroco, J. (2016). Burnout Syndrome and alcohol consumption in prison employees. *Revista Brasileira de Epidemiologia*, 19, 205–216. [https://doi: 10.1590/1980-5497201600010018](https://doi.org/10.1590/1980-5497201600010018).
- Carlson, J. R., & Thomas, G. (2006). Burnout among prison caseworkers and correctional officers. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 43, 19–34. [https://doi: 10.1300/J076v43n03_02](https://doi.org/10.1300/J076v43n03_02).
- Castle, T. L., & Martin, J. S. (2006). Occupational hazard: predictors of stress among jail correctional officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 31(1), 65–80. [https://doi: 10.1007/bf02885685](https://doi.org/10.1007/bf02885685).
- Connor-Smith, J. K., & Flachsbart, C. (2007). Relations between Personality and Coping: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(6), 1080–1107.
- Cullen, F. T., Latessa, E. J., Kopache, R., Lombardo, L. X., & Burton, V. S. (1993). Prison wardens' job satisfaction. *The Prison Journal*, 73(2), 141–161. [https://doi: 10.1177/0032855593073002002](https://doi.org/10.1177/0032855593073002002).
- Cullen, F. T., Link, B. G., Wolfe, N. T., Frank, J. (1985). The social dimensions of correctional officer stress. *Justice Quarterly*, 2(4), 505–533. [https://doi: 10.1080/07418828500088711](https://doi.org/10.1080/07418828500088711).
- Frone, M. R. (2015). Relations of Negative and Positive Work Experiences to Employee Alcohol Use: Testing the Intervening Role of Negative and Positive Work Rumination. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 20 (2), 148–160. [https://doi: 10.1037/a0038375](https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038375).
- Garland, D. (2001). *Mass Imprisonment. Social Causes and Consequences*. London: Thousand Oaks.
- Garland, B. (2002). Prison treatment staff burnout: Consequences, cause, and prevention. *Corrections Today*, 64, 116–120.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Naturalne przywództwo: odkrywanie mocy inteligencji emocjonalnej* [Natural leadership: discovering the power of emotional intelligence]. Wrocław, Warszawa: Jacek Santorski- Wydawnictwa Biznesowe.
- Griffin, M. L., Hogan, N. L., Lambert, E. G., Tucker-Gail, K. A., & Baker, D. N. (2010). Job involvement, job stress, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment and the burnout of correctional staff. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 3(2), 239–255.
- Gündüz, H., Günsel, C. A., & Ulutaş, T. (2012). Effects of Emotional Intelligence on Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Study on Call Center Employees. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 58(12), 363–369.
- Hamidi, F., & Amiri, M., (2013). Predicting the Job Satisfaction of Teachers based on Their Emotional Intelligence and Self-Efficacy. *International Journal of Psychology*, 7(2), 73–95.
- Jaworowska, A. (2014). *Bochumski Inwentarz Osobowościowych Wyznaczników Pracy* [The Bochum Inventory of Personal Work Features]. Warszawa: Polskie Towarzystwo Psychologiczne. Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych.
- Johnson, S., Cooper, C., Cartwright, S., Donald, I., Taylor, P. J., & Millet, C. (2005). The experience of work-related stress across occupations. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20(2), 178–187. [https://doi: 10.1108/02683940510579803](https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940510579803).

- Jung-Wan, K., & Hyun-Jung, K. (2006, December). *The factor affecting job stress and psychosocial well-being of prison officers*. Paper presented at International Congress on Occupational Health Services, Utsunomiya, Japan.
- Juczynski, Z., & Ogińska-Bulik, N. (2009). *Narzędzia Pomiaru Stresu i Radzenia Sobie ze Stresem* [Tools for Measuring Stress and Coping with Stress]. Warszawa: Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych Polskiego Towarzystwa Psychologicznego.
- Kacprzak, A. (2017). Współczesne aspekty resocjalizacji przestępców w wybranych krajach europejskich [Contemporary aspects of resocialization of criminals in selected European countries]. *Acta Universitatis Lodzianae Folia Sociologica*, 62, 63–81. <https://doi:10.18778/0208-600X.62.05>.
- Keinan, G., & Malach-Pines, A. (2007). Stress and Burnout Among Prison Personnel Sources, Outcomes, and Intervention Strategies. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(3), 80–398. <https://doi:10.1177/0093854806290007>.
- Korcz, I. (2006). Zespołowa inteligencja emocjonalna – czynnikiem powodzenia w pracy [Team emotional intelligence – a factor of success at work]. *Problemy Profesjologii*, 2, 123–148.
- Korczyńska, J. (2004). Temperamentalny czynnik ryzyka wypalenia zawodowego na przykładzie pracowników służby więziennej [Temperamental risk factor of occupational burnout on the example of employees of the prison service]. In: J. Strelau (Ed.), *Osobowość a ekstremalny stres* (pp. 317–342). Gdańsk: GWP.
- Lachowska, B. (2012). Konflikt i facylitacja między rolami rodzinnymi i zawodowymi a jakość życia pracujących rodziców [Conflict and facilitation between family and professional roles and the quality of life of working parents]. *Psychologia Społeczna*, 74 (23), 353–371.
- Lambert, E., & Paoline, E. A. (2010). Take this job and shove it: An exploratory study of turnover intent among jail staff. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38, 139–148.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Cluse-Tolar, T. (2007). This job is killing me: the impact of job characteristics on correctional staff job stress. *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*, 3(2), 118–142.
- Lambert, E., Hogan, N. L., & Altheimer, I. (2010). The association between work-family conflict and job burnout among correctional staff: A preliminary study. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 35, 37–55. <https://doi:10.1007/s12103-009-9067-1>.
- Lambert, E. G., Hogan, N. L., & Altheimer, I. (2010). An exploratory examination of the consequences of burnout in terms of life satisfaction, turnover intent, and absenteeism among private correctional staff. *The Prison Journal*, 90(1), 94–114. doi: <https://doi:10.1177/0032885509357586>.
- Łaguna, M. (2012). Satysfakcja z życia i satysfakcja z pracy a motywacja do podejmowania szkoleń: Doniesienie z badań [Satisfaction with life and job satisfaction and motivation to undertake training: A report from research]. *Psychologia Jakości Życia*, 11(2), 163–172.
- Makowska, H., & Poprawa, R. (2001). Radzenie sobie ze stresem w procesie budowania zdrowia [Coping with stress in the process of building health]. In G. Dolińska-Zygmunt (Ed.), *Podstawy psychologii zdrowia* (pp. 71–102). Wrocław: Uniwersytet Wrocławski.
- Moon, B., & Maxwell, S. R. (2004). Assessing the Correctional Orientation of Corrections Officers in South Korea. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 48(6), 729–743.
- Morgan, R. D., Van Haveren, R. A., & Pearson, C. A. (2002). Correctional officer burnout: Further analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 29, 144–160.
- Mosadeghrad A. M., & Ferdosi, M. (2013). Leadership, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Healthcare Sector: Proposing and Testing a Model. *Materia Socio Medica*, 25(2), 121–126. <https://doi:10.5455/msm.2013.25.121-126>.
- Mróz, J. (2015). Differentiation of self in job and work engagement as variables determining job satisfaction among social service job. *Journal of Modern Science*, 4(27), 293–308.
- Nawój, J. (2004). Rezerwa kadrowa w zarządzaniu zasobami ludzkimi w służbie więziennej [Personnel reserve in human resources management in the prison service]. In W. Ambrozik, P. Stępiak (Ed.), *Służba więzienna wobec problemów resocjalizacji penitencjarnej* (p. 282). Poznań–Warszawa–Kalisz: Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu, Centralny Zarząd Służby Więziennej, Centralny Ośrodek Szkolenia Służby Więziennej.
- Nelson, K. V., & Smith, A. P. (2016). Occupational stress, coping and mental health in Jamaican police officers. *Occupational Medicine*, 66, 488–491.
- Ogińska-Bulik, N. (2005). Emotional intelligence in the workplace: Exploring its effects on occupational stress and health outcomes in human service workers. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health*, 18(2), 167–175.
- Piotrowski, A. (2012). Jakość życia i satysfakcja funkcjonariuszy Służby Więziennej [Quality of life and satisfaction of Prison Guard officers]. *Przegląd Więziennictwa Polskiego*, 74–75, 107–138.
- Piotrowski, A. (2013). Analiza wymiarów i poziomów zadowolenia z pracy kadry jednostek penitencjarnych [Analysis of the dimensions and levels of satisfaction with the work of the penitentiary units]. In D. Kowalczyk, I. Mudrecka (Eds.), *Funkcjonowanie kadry penitencjarnej w procesie wykonywania kary pozbawienia wolności. Studia i rozprawy z pedagogiki resocjalizacyjnej*, t. 4. (pp.117–130). Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski.
- Piotrowski, A. (2010). *Stres i wypalenie zawodowe funkcjonariuszy służby więziennej [Stress and professional burnout of officers of the prison service]*. Warszawa: Difin.
- Plątek, M. (2007). *Systemy penitencjarne państw skandynawskich [Penitentiary systems of the Scandinavian countries]*. Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski.
- Poklek, R. (2012). *Motywacja do pracy i doskonalenia zawodowego funkcjonariuszy Służby Więziennej w ujęciu dwuczynnikowej koncepcji motywacji-higieny Fredericka I. Herzberga* [Work motivation and professional development of officers of the Prison Service in terms of the two-factor concept of motivation-hygiene Frederick I. Herzberg]. Kalisz: Centralny Ośrodek Szkolenia Służby Więziennej.
- Pomiankiewicz, J. (2010). Stres i wypalenie zawodowe funkcjonariuszy Służby Więziennej – uwarunkowania, przejawy, konsekwencje – zarys problemu [Stress and burnout of officers of the Prison Service – conditions, manifestations, consequences – outline of the problem]. *Przegląd Więziennictwa Polskiego*, 67(68), 47–60.
- Savicki, V. (2002). *Burnout across thirteen cultures: Stress, and coping in child and youth care workers*. Westport: Praeger.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Peeters, M. C. W. (2000). Job Stress and Burnout Among Correctional Officers: A Literature Review. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 7(1), 19–48.
- Singh, D. (2015). *Emotional Intelligence at Work A Professional Guide*. New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
- Skomorovsky, A. (2013). Psychological Well-Being of Canadian Forces Officer Candidates: The Role of Personality and Coping Strategies. *Military Psychology*, 25(1), 3–12.
- Stanisz, A. (1998). *Przystępny kurs statystyki [Statistics course]*. T. 1. Statsoft: Kraków.
- Swatt, M. L., Gibson, C. L., & Piquero, N. L. (2007). Exploring the utility of general strain theory in explaining problematic alcohol consumption by police officers. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 35, 596–611.
- Taxman, F. S., & Gordon, J. A. (2009). Do fairness and equity matter? An examination of organizational justice among correctional officers in adult prisons. *Criminal Justice Behavior*, 36(7), 695–711. <https://doi:10.1177/0093854809335039>.
- Whiteacre, K. (2006). Measuring Job Satisfaction and Stress at Community Corrections Center: An Evidence-Based Study. *Corrections Today*, 70–73.
- Zalewska, A. (2003). *Dwa światy. Emocjonalne i poznawcze oceny jakości życia i ich uwarunkowania u osób o wysokiej i niskiej reaktywności* [Two worlds. Emotional and cognitive assessments of quality of life and their determinants in people with high and low reactivity]. Warszawa: Academica.
- Zalewska, A. M. (2003). Skala Satysfakcji z Pracy – pomiar poznawczego aspektu ogólnego zadowolenia z pracy [The Satisfaction with Job Scale – measurement of the cognitive aspect of overall job satisfaction]. *Acta Universitatis Lodzianae Folia Psychologica*, 7, 49–61.
- Zhen Zeng (2018). *Jail Inmates in 2016*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ji16.pdf>