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Abstract

Previous studies indicate that police work is stressful and that it can lead to job burnout, particularly among those that have lower levels of social support. The aim of the current research was to identify levels of distress and burnout and to explore the relationship between social support, stress and burnout among Icelandic police officers.

The sample consisted of 93 police officers in Iceland, 81.7% male and 18.3% female. Social support from co-workers and family and friends, stress and burnout were assessed with online questionnaires. Results indicated that 26.9% of participants reported high levels of stress and around 30% of participants had symptoms of burnout. Pearson correlational analysis revealed that those with higher levels of social support from co-workers reported both less stress and burnout while social support from family and friends was only associated with lower stress levels. Mediational analyses showed that the relationship between social support from co-workers and burnout was mediated by the impact of social support from co-workers in reducing stress. Future studies should design and test interventions aimed at increasing social support, particularly in the workplace, as that may reduce stress which in turn would reduce the likelihood that burnout symptoms will develop.
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Útdráttur

Fyrri rannsóknir gefa til kynna að lögreglustrafandi sé streituvaldandi og það geti leitt til kulnunar í starfi, sérstaklega á meðal þeirra sem hafa minni félagslegan stuðning. Markmið þessarar rannsóknar var að bera kennsl á umfang streitu og kulnunar og að kanna sambandið á milli félagslegs stuðnings, streitu og kulnunar á meðal íslenskrar lögreglujóna.

Úrtað rannsóknarinnar samanstóð af 93 lögregluþjónum, 81,7% körlum og 18,3% konum. Félagslegur stuðningur frá samstarfsfélagum og fjölskyldu og vinum, streita og kulnun voru metin með rafrænum sjálfsmatssurningalistum. Niðurstöður leiddu í ljós að 26,9% þátttakenda greindu frá mikilli streitu og um 30% þátttakenda voru með einkenni kulnunar.


Lykilord: lögregluþjónar, félagslegur stuðningur, streita, kulnun
Stress, Burnout and Social Support among Icelandic Police Officers

**Police stress**

Police work has been widely recognized as one of the most stressful profession in comparison with other occupations (Johnson et al., 2005). Johnson & colleagues (2005) found that out of 26 professions, police work was one of the six professions that had the highest average scores on three stress-related variables. In addition to being among one of the most stressful professions both physically and psychologically, it further had the lowest levels of job satisfaction. Police work has therefore been a thoroughly analyzed matter for a few decades (Abdollahi, 2002).

Police stress is a complicated equation that is challenging to measure for it cannot be traced to only one cause since it has a multitude of diverse contributing elements (Abdollahi, 2002). Symonds (1970) was amongst the first to determine various origins of police stress and organized them into two categories: the nature of police work is the reason for stress being experienced (for example occupational stressors) and the nature of police organization is the reason for stress being experienced (for example organizational stressors).

Policing is commonly considered intrinsically stressful as a consequence of the imminent danger and traumatic events that are fundamental to police work (Sigler & Wilson, 1988). However, the police stress literature has directed its attention to another perspective of police work that is in some measure as stressful as the distressing circumstances officers encounter (Liberman et al., 2002). Research has implied that officers feel that bureaucratic occurrences instead of occurrences in the line of service to be more troublesome, where stress often is due to the nature of the organization (Band & Manuele, 1987; Brown & Campbell, 1990; Crank & Caldero, 1991; Martelli, Waters, & Martelli, 1989; Storch & Panzarella, 1996). In the past years, research has mainly focused on stressors that exist within organizations as part of occupations, including an impact on health and other intrapersonal
effects (Crank & Caldero, 1991; Martelli et al., 1989; Storch & Panzarella, 1996).

Cooper and colleagues (1982) found out that the most frequent stressors reported by officers were work overload, long shifts, shortage of resources and staff, a greater extent of bureaucratic procedures and management strategies. A study by Brown & Campbell (1990), on the same subject found similar stressors as the most frequently reported.

The prevalence of stress reported by officers may vary between studies. In a study by Collins & Gibbs (2003) 41% police officers had high scores on occupational and personal stressors while in a study by Walvekar, Ambekar, & Devaranavadagi (2015) 38% of police officers were found to be under stress as estimated by the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS), which was higher than the scoring rate in the general population. These routine stressors as well as the trauma experienced as part of the job can have severe adverse effects on the officers physical and mental health. These consequences can range from mild temporary distress to more severe mental illnesses (Alexander & Klein, 2001; Benedek, Fullerton, & Ursano, 2007; D’Andrea, Sharma, Zelechoski, & Spinazzola, 2011). Among the consequences that are experienced are burnout and resigning from the job (Anshel, 2000; Ray & Miller, 1994).

Maslach (1982, p. 3) described burnout as “a syndrome of emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment that can occur among individuals who do ‘people work’ of some kind“.

Studies have indicated that when high levels of stress is experienced, it leads to higher risk of burnout (Russell, 2014; Solana, Extemrema, Pecino, & Fuente, 2013). Since the police force is a critical component of the state, several studies have examined the association between the environment of police work and work-related stress, which are conducted with the goal of mitigating burnout (Patterson, 1992; Violanti & Aron, 1994). It is essential to find a way to prevent burnout among police officers since they have reported higher degree of burnout compared to other professions (Houdmont, 2013).
Social support, stress and burnout

Police work is stressful and can lead to burnout, however, police officers may handle their work well. One influential factor that might minimize the impact their stress on their life is social support (Cobb, 1976; Kaufmann & Beehr, 1989). Social support relates to the resources available within people’s social network, both in terms of supportive individuals and material to help mitigate stress (Cohen, 2004).

Social support has been reported as an important factor to reduce work-related stress and therefore reduce the chances of burnout (Kaufmann & Beehr, 1989; McCarty, Zhao, & Garland, 2007). It has been suggested that lack of support from supervisors is particularly important when it comes to burnout, even more than support from co-workers (Lee & Ashforth, 1996; Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). This does not mean however that support from co-workers is insignificant when it comes to preventing burnout. A study by Schaufeli & Buunk (1996) showed that it has a strong mitigating effect among police officers. McCarty & Skogan (2013) agreed with their findings as well as Lambert and colleagues (2010), who additionally found that support from family and friends had an effect on burnout as well. These studies imply that social support can play an important role in reducing burnout.

Ganster and colleagues (1986) hypothesized that low degree of social support translated to higher stress response than among those with more ample social support. Given the broad definition, there has been a plethora of different approaches and metrics defined to understand how social support impacts stress (Stephens & Long, 2000).

Cohen & Wills (1985) explained a concept of buffering, hypothesizing that social support can dampen the negative experiences that people might otherwise take from stressful situations. According to this theory, seeking social support is a coping strategy and affects how individuals tackle circumstances that have stressors (Schreurs & de Ridder, 1997).
Despite growing research, a significant discrepancy exists among scholars on the buffering effect (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Kaufmann & Beehr, 1986; LaRocco, House, & French, 1980). In short, buffering effect speaks how the strength of a social support affects the ability to overcome job stressors, where the relationship between job stressors and jobholder’s strains is weaker when strong social support is experienced than when weak social support is experienced (Kaufmann & Beehr, 1989).

On one hand, some studies identified a paradoxical “reverse buffering effect”, where police officers simultaneously both had strong social support and significant exposure to stressful events and stress-related outcomes (Kaufmann & Beehr, 1986; Patterson, 2003; Redman & Snape, 2006). On the other hand, other studies found the exposure to stressful events often did not adversely impact well-being because the social support mitigated the negative effects (Thoits, 1995).

Researchers have tried to further explain the factors involved in social support in relation to the buffering effect (LaRocco et al., 1980). They usually divide it into three categories: co-workers, supervisor and the jobholder’s family and friends (Kaufmann & Beehr, 1986; Patterson, 2003). Several studies suggest that co-workers are the central source of support when it comes to coping with stress at work (Graf, 1986; Kaufmann & Beehr, 1989; Marcelissen, Winnubst, Buunk, & de Wolff, 1988; Viswesvaran, Sanchez, & Fisher, 1999) and that supervisor support is more impactful than support from external parties (Kaufmann & Beehr, 1989). In research by Fenlason & Beehr (1994) the strongest relationship was between social support across these three categories and stress at work was supervisor support, followed by co-worker support and then family and friends. Kaufmann & Beehr (1989) discovered that officers who were not in supervisor positions endured greater stress at work than their supervisors, while also receiving less social support than their superiors.
Based on this, police officers may primarily turn to their colleagues to cope with stress since they would feel most understood by that group (LaRocco et al., 1980; Morash, Haarr, & Kwak, 2006). Regardless, it has been suggested that external parties like family and friends can positively influence a person on a variety of physical and psychological measures (Cohen & Wills, 1985). Lord (1996) discovered that the greater the social support from family and friends, the lower stress the officers’ experience as well as reduced chance of quitting their profession. Also, support from co-workers and supervisors reduced the lack of willingness to be involved in their work and support from spouses did help to reduce stress. Furthermore, Jackson (1992) found out that spousal support acted as a buffer on the negative aspects of job stress. It should be emphasized that research have not extensively studied friends and family support, so it is not known whether this type of support may in fact also be the reason for stress among police officers (Ray & Miller, 1994).

The variability among the diverse sources of social support suggests that it is an important factor which should be considered when the psychological well-being of an officer is being assessed (Jackson, 1992). In addition, the number of people within the person’s support circle is another consideration, since larger potential support groups are correlated with a reduced feeling of work stress (Graf, 1986).

In sum, it has been suggested in general, that officers who receive higher co-worker support experience lower amount of stress. Effective social support from co-workers can buffer the amount of stress and buffer job burnout as well (LaRocco et al., 1980; Morash et al., 2006).

In Iceland, relatively few studies have examined the well-being of police officers. As previously mentioned, stress and burnout is something that seems to be a common experience among police officers. Therefore, it is essential to investigate the factors that can help reduce it (Cohen, 2004; Houdmont, 2013; Johnson et al., 2005). The current study on police officers
in Iceland should reveal if the results are in line with previous studies.

The aim of the present study was to examine the prevalence of stress and burnout among Icelandic police officers and to examine the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1) Police officers with higher levels of stress will report higher levels of burnout.

Hypothesis 2) Social support from co-workers and family and friends will be associated with lower levels of burnout and lower levels of stress.

Hypothesis 3) To explore if the relationship between social support from co-workers and burnout is mediated by the impact of social support from co-workers and family and friends in decreasing work stress.

Method

Participants

A total of 93 participants (81.7% male, 18.3% female) completed an online questionnaire. The participants reported their age in age gaps. Participants in the age gap 20-29 years were 7.5%, 30-39 years were 23.7%, 40-49 years were 38.7%, 50-59 years were 21.5% and 60 years or older were 7.5%. One participant did not reveal his age. Participants working 0-4 years as officers were 10.8%, 5-9 years were 12.9%, 10-14 years were 21.5%, 15-19 years were 16.1% and 20 years or longer were 37.6%. One participant did not reveal his length of service. The participation was voluntary. The questionnaire was sent via e-mail to all police officers in Iceland.

Measures

The questionnaire which participants answered was in Icelandic and was constructed in consultation with supervisors (see Appendix A). The questionnaire received approval from The National Bioethics Committee (no. VSNb2017030001/03.01) and was notified to the Icelandic Data Protection Authority. In addition to deploying several standard scales, the participants answered background questions regarding their sex, age, education, working
experience and department. In the background questions regarding age, department and working experience the participants had the option not to respond.

**Stress.** Stress was measured using the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS10) (Cohen, 1988). The scale was found to have a good reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .78$). The scale included questions such as “In the last month, how often have you felt nervous and “stressed”’” and “In the last month, how often have you found that you could not cope with all the things you had to do”. Respondents answered on a five-point Likert scale depending on how well the questions applied to them. In the present study, the scale was found to have high internal consistency (10 item; Cronbach’s $\alpha = .81$). Scores on the Perceived Stress Scale were divided into three groups based on “Perceived Stress Scale” (n.d.). Scores ranging from 0-13 indicated low stress, scores ranging from 14-26 indicated moderate stress and scores ranging from 27-40 indicated high perceived stress.

**Burnout.** Burnout was measured using two-sub dimensions, personal burnout and work-related burnout, of the Copenhagen burnout inventory (CBI) (Kristensen, Borritz, Villadsen, & Christensen, 2005). The scale had high internal reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .85-.87$). The scale included questions like “Does your work frustrate you” and “Do you feel burnt out because of your work”. Participants answered on a five-point Likert scale depending on how well the questions applied to them. Based on Borritz & Kristensen (2004) the response options which ranged from 1-5 were assigned a different number, 1=0, 2=25, 3=50, 4=75 and 5=100. Total burnout was calculated by taking the mean of all the items, therefore the two subscales had a value ranging from 0 to 100. As recommended by Borritz & Kristensen (2004) individuals who scored 50 or higher on the on the subscales were classified as having symptoms suggestive of burnout. The scale in the present study indicated excellent reliability (13 items; Cronbach’s $\alpha = .91$). The means for the two subscales, in the present study, were compared to published means reported for the general population in Denmark which also used
Social support from co-workers. Social support from co-workers was measured by using autonomy component which is a part of the Work-related basic need satisfaction scale (W-BNS) (Van den Broeck, Vansteenkiste, De Witte, Soenens, & Lens, 2010). The scale was found to have a good reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .81$). Participants were presented with a series of statements and asked to rate each of them on a five-point scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. “At work, I feel part of a group,” “I don’t really feel connected with other people at my job” and “At work, I can talk with people about things that really matter to me”. In the present study, Cronbach’s alpha found good reliability (6 items; Cronbach’s $\alpha = .81$).

Social support from family and friends. Social support from family and friends was measured using the Multidimensional scale of perceived social support (MSPSS) (Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley, 1988). The scale was found to have good internal consistency (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .88$). Participants were instructed to rank how the following statements described them using a seven-point scale from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”: “My friends really try to help me,” “I can talk about my problems with my family,” and “There is a special person in my life who cares about my feelings”. The scale in the present study found excellent reliability (12 items; Cronbach’s $\alpha = .97$).

Procedure

The questionnaire was sent via e-mail to all members of the police force in Iceland at the end of April 2017. E-mails were obtained from the psychologist of the police, Sigrún Þóra Sveinsdóttir. The e-mail participants received, included information regarding the research and informed consent was obtained from all participants as a requirement for proceeding to start the questionnaire (see Appendix B). In order to regulate the experimental conditions all participants were assured of confidentiality and that no identifying information would be
collected. The participants were asked to answer the questionnaire honestly and they had right to withdraw their participation at any given time. Participants were offered a single free meeting with a psychologist in case they would feel uncomfortable after participation. Participants did not get any reward for taking part in the research.

**Data analysis**

The IBM SPSS Statistics software was used to conduct statistical and correlation tests. The data was collected in an online survey program hosted by Questionpro. The responses appeared in Microsoft Excel and were transferred to IBM SPSS Statistics software for analysis. Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were used to present the results. Pearson correlation was used to investigate whether stress influenced burnout, and whether social support from co-workers and family and friends affected stress or burnout. The relationship between stress, burnout and social support from co-workers was analyzed using linear regression.

To explore whether the relationship between social support from co-workers (independent variable) and burnout (dependent variable) would be mediated by stress (mediator), an approach by Baron & Kenny (1986) was used. The approach states, that to confirm the existence of a mediation effect, four criteria need to be fulfilled. The first three criteria that must be significant is a correlation between: 1) the independent and the dependent variable; 2) the independent variable and the mediator; and, 3) the mediator and the dependent variable. Finally, the correlation between the independent and the dependent variable should be nonsignificant or significantly lower when both the mediator and the independent variable are in the model.

**Results**

For the demographic variables, there was no difference between gender and perceived stress (p = .368) on burnout (p = .342). Age was not related to burnout (p = .496) but it was
significantly related to stress ($p = .005$), with older officers reporting higher levels of stress. Police officers with some university education reported lower levels of burnout ($p = .0024$) and perceived stress ($p = .0006$).

Stress was investigated using the Perceived Stress Scale (PSS). The scale score in the present study ranged from 11 to 37 and the mean was 22.97 ($SD = 6.10$). As figure 1 illustrates, using the recommended cut-off score of 27 the results show that majority of the participants reported moderate levels of stress. However, 26.9% of the participants reported high levels of stress.

![Figure 1](image)

*Figure 1. Stress divided into three groups, ranging from 0-13 which indicated low stress, scores ranging from 14-26 indicated moderate stress and scores ranging from 27-40 indicated high perceived stress.*

Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI) was used to examine work-related burnout and personal burnout. Figure 2 shows the percentage of participants that were classified as having burnout and for a comparison the percentages of individuals classified with burnout in the general population in Denmark are also presented. By using the cut-off criteria of 50, the results revealed that approximately 30% of participants in the current study reported burnout symptoms on both subscales compared to around 20% for the general population in Denmark.
Correlational relationship

Pearson correlation was computed to determine the relationship between social support from family and friends, social support from co-workers, stress and burnout. Table 1 below illustrates the correlation between the four variables.

As shown in Table 1 higher levels of stress was related to higher levels of burnout ($r = .729, n = 93, p < .001$). Social support from co-workers was associated with lower levels of stress ($r = -.485, n = 93, p < .001$) and burnout ($r = -.397, n = 93, p < .001$) while social support from family and friends was associated with stress ($r = -.415, n = 93, p < .001$) but not with burnout ($r = -.192, n = 93, p = .065$).
Table 1. The association between social support from family and friends, social support from co-workers, stress and burnout.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Burnout</th>
<th>Stress</th>
<th>Social support from co-workers</th>
<th>Social support from family and friends</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burnout</td>
<td></td>
<td>.729**</td>
<td>-.397**</td>
<td>-.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>.729**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.485**</td>
<td>-.415**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support from co-workers</td>
<td>-.397**</td>
<td>-.485**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.458**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support from family and friends</td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>-.415**</td>
<td>.458**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).*

**Mediation Analysis**

Regression analysis was used to investigate whether the relationship between social support and burnout would be mediated by the impact that social support has on stress. The mediational effects of social support from family and friends could not be tested, as the relationship between social support from family and friends was not associated with burnout. As established above (see Table 1), the first three criteria of Baron & Kenny (1986) were met, that is: 1) social support from co-workers was significantly and negatively related to burnout; 2) social support from co-workers was significantly and negatively related to stress; and 3) stress was significantly and positively related to burnout. When both social support from co-workers and stress were entered into the regression model the relationship between social support from co-workers and burnout was no longer significant (b = -.109, p = .491).

For the results of social support from co-workers the overall model accounted for 53% of the variance in burnout ($R^2 = .534$). These findings suggest that the relationship between social support from co-workers and burnout was mediated by the impact of social support in reducing stress.
Figure 3. Stress as a mediator for the relationship between social support from co-workers and burnout. The p-value above the c-line shows the relationship between social support and burnout, when those two variables are in the model. The p-value below the c-line shows the relationship between social support and burnout when the mediator or stress has been added into the model.

Discussion

The aim of the present study was to examine the relationship between social support, stress and burnout. The main results were that higher levels of stress was related to higher levels of burnout. Social support from co-workers was associated with both lower levels of stress and burnout while social support from family and friends was only related to stress. Furthermore, the relationship between social support from co-workers and burnout was mediated by the impact of social support from co-workers in reducing stress.

One goal of the study was to determine the prevalence of stress and burnout among Icelandic police officers. The results indicated that the prevalence of high stress levels was that 26.9% of participants reported high levels of stress, which is slightly lower than the 38% reported by Walvekar et al. (2015). Around 30% of the participants had symptoms of burnout, which was approximately 10% higher than the comparison group from the general population in Denmark (Borritz & Kristensen, 2004). That is also in line with previous studies where
police officers reported higher degree of burnout compared to other professions (Houdmont, 2013). The findings furthermore indicial that older police officers reported higher levels of stress and officers with some university education reported lower levels of both burnout and perceived stress.

The first hypothesis of the study was that higher levels of stress would be related to higher levels of burnout was supported. That is consistent with previous findings which indicate that high levels of stress can lead to higher risk of burnout (Russell, 2014; Solana et al., 2013). The second hypothesis of the study was partly supported, as the results revealed that social support from co-workers was associated with both lower stress and burnout while social support from family and friends was only related to lower stress levels. That is in line with previous studies which indicate that co-worker support has a mitigating influence on stress and burnout among officers (Graf, 1986; Kaufmann & Beehr, 1989; Marcelissen et al., 1988; McCarty & Skogan, 2013; Schaufeli & Buunk, 1996; Viswesvaran et al., 1999). The results also support previous studies which have reported that social support from co-workers appears to be more important than social support from family and friends (Fenlason & Beehr, 1994; Graf, 1986; Kaufmann & Beehr, 1989; Marcelissen et al., 1988; Viswesvaran et al., 1999). Lastly, it was explored if the relationship between social support from co-workers and burnout would be mediated by the impact of social support from co-workers on stress. The results showed that the relationship between social support from co-workers and burnout was due to the impact that social support from co-workers had on reducing stress. More specifically, social support from co-workers was related to lower levels of distress which in turn was related to lower levels of burnout. This finding indicates that interventions aimed at increasing social support in the workplace might be effective in reducing stress and thereby lower the risk of burnout.

The main strength of the study was the investigation of the prevalence of stress and
burnout as well as the relationship between social support, stress and burnout among police officers in Iceland. This is one of the few studies on stress and burnout within the police in Iceland and it is the first study to examine the relationship between social support, stress and burnout. Other strengths of the research were that the questionnaire was anonymous and the reliability, as Cronbach’s alpha indicated, that the reliability of the scales ranged from good to high consistency, which indicates that the constructs were measured accurately.

The current study had several limitations. One limitation was the low participation rate. Due to the deadline of submitting the study on time only responses for the police officers that responded during the first week could be included in the current study. Data collection is still ongoing and the results will be reanalyzed once data collection is completed. Until then all results need to be interpreted with caution. The current study was a cross-sectional study which does not allow for any casual inferences about the relationship between social support, stress and burnout. Another limitation was that it was only possible to compare burnout findings with the Danish population as data does not exist on the Icelandic population.

Since stress seems to be a common experience among police officers it is important for future studies to investigate further how social support, particularly in the workplace, can work as a stress prevention (Cohen, 2004; Johnson et al., 2005). It would be helpful to expand knowledge and understanding of these factors, which in turn could lead to improved treatments for people suffering from stress or experiencing burnout.
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**Appendix A**

**Bakgrunssspurningar**

1. Aldur

☐ 20-29 ára  ☐ 30-39 ára  ☐ 40-49 ára  ☐ 50-59 ára ☐ 60 ára eða eldri

2. Kyn

☐ Karl  ☐ Kona

3. Menntun. Merktu við það sem á við:

☐ Stúdentspróf  ☐ Annað framhaldsnám eftir grunnskóla (þó ekki stúdentspróf) ☐ Grunnám í Háskóla (BA/bS eða B.ed. gráðu) ☐ Framhaldsnám úr háskóla (MA/MS/M.ed. eða P.hd.gráðu)

4. Hvaða stöðu gegnir þú?

☐ Lögreglunemi ☐ Lögreglumaður ☐ Aðstoðarvarðstjóri, varðstjóri/rannisóknarlögreglumaður, aðalvarðstjóri/lögreglufulltrúi ☐ Aðstoðaryfirlögregluþjónn, yfirföðregluþjónn

5. Hvaða stöðu gegnir þú?

☐ Löggreglunemi ☐ Löggreglumaður ☐ Aðstoðarvarðstjóri, varðstjóri/rannisóknarlöggreglumaður, aðalvarðstjóri/löggreglufulltrúi ☐ Aðstoðaryfirlöggregluþjónn, yfirföðregluþjónn

6. Hvert er meginstarfssvið þitt? Merktu við allt sem við á:

☐ Almenn löggæsla ☐ Rannsóknir brota ☐ Stjórnun ☐ Annað

7. Vinnufyrirkomulag. Merkið við allt sem við á:

☐ Dagvinna ☐ Vaktavinna ☐ Bakvaktir

8. Hversu lengi hefur þú starfað í löggreglunni?

☐ 0–4 ár ☐ 5–9 ár ☐ 10–14 ár ☐ 15–19 ár ☐ 20 ár eða meira

9. Hversu marga veikindadaga hefur þú tekið síðustu 2 mánuði?

☐ Engan ☐ 1 dag ☐ 2 daga ☐ 3 daga ☐ 4 daga eða fleiri

10. Hversu oft telur þú þig upplifa streitu í löggreglustrafinu?

☐ Oft ☐ Stundum ☐ Sjaldan ☐ Aldrei
Streitukvarði (Perceived Stress Scale (PSS))
Spurningarnar á þessum kvarða eru um tilfinningar og hugsanir þínar síðastliðinn mánuð. Vinsamlegast merktu í viðeigandi reit eftir því hversu oft þú hugsaðir eða leið á ákveðinn hátt.

1. Hversu oft síðastliðinn mánuð hefur þú farið úr jafnvægi vegna einhvers sem kom óvænt upp á?
☐ Aldrei ☐ Næstum aldrei ☐ Stundum ☐ Nokkuð oft ☐ Mjög oft

2. Hversu oft síðastliðinn mánuð hefur þér fundist sem þú værir ekki fær um að hafa stjórn á mikilvægum þáttum í lífi þínu?
☐ Aldrei ☐ Næstum aldrei ☐ Stundum ☐ Nokkuð oft ☐ Mjög oft

3. Hversu oft síðastliðinn mánuð hefur þér vera taugaóstyrk/ur og stressuð/aður?
☐ Aldrei ☐ Næstum aldrei ☐ Stundum ☐ Nokkuð oft ☐ Mjög oft

4. Hversu oft síðastliðinn mánuð hefur þú verið örugg/ur um getu þína til að fást við eigin vandamál?
☐ Aldrei ☐ Næstum aldrei ☐ Stundum ☐ Nokkuð oft ☐ Mjög oft

5. Hversu oft síðastliðinn mánuð hefur þér fundist hlutirnir ganga þér í hag?
☐ Aldrei ☐ Næstum aldrei ☐ Stundum ☐ Nokkuð oft ☐ Mjög oft

6. Hversu oft síðastliðinn mánuð hefur þér fundist að þú gætir ekki ráðið við allt það sem þú þurftir að gera?
☐ Aldrei ☐ Næstum aldrei ☐ Stundum ☐ Nokkuð oft ☐ Mjög oft

7. Hversu oft síðastliðinn mánuð hefur þú getað haft stjórn á hlutum í lífi þínu sem hafa skapraunað þér?
☐ Aldrei ☐ Næstum aldrei ☐ Stundum ☐ Nokkuð oft ☐ Mjög oft

8. Hversu oft síðastliðinn mánuð hefur þér fundist þú hafa vald á hlutunum?
☐ Aldrei ☐ Næstum aldrei ☐ Stundum ☐ Nokkuð oft ☐ Mjög oft

9. Hversu oft síðastliðinn mánuð hefur þú orðið reið/ur vegna einhvers sem þú gast ekki haft áhrif á?
☐ Aldrei ☐ Næstum aldrei ☐ Stundum ☐ Nokkuð oft ☐ Mjög oft

10. Hversu oft síðastliðinn mánuð hefur þér fundist vandamálin hrannast upp þannig að þú gætir ekki sigrst á þeim?
☐ Aldrei ☐ Næstum aldrei ☐ Stundum ☐ Nokkuð oft ☐ Mjög oft
Kulnun (Copenhagen Burnout Inventory (CBI))

1. Hversu oft finnur þú fyrir þreytu?
☐ Alltaf  ☐ Oft  ☐ Stundum  ☐ Sjaldan  ☐ Næstum aldrei / aldrei

2. Finnur þú fyrir þreytu í lok vinnudags?
☐ Alltaf  ☐ Oft  ☐ Stundum  ☐ Sjaldan  ☐ Næstum aldrei / aldrei

3. Hversu oft finnst þér þú vera líkamlega uppgefin?
☐ Alltaf  ☐ Oft  ☐ Stundum  ☐ Sjaldan  ☐ Næstum aldrei / aldrei

4. Verður þú þreytt/ur við tilhugsunina um annan dag í vinnunni?
☐ Alltaf  ☐ Oft  ☐ Stundum  ☐ Sjaldan  ☐ Næstum aldrei / aldrei

5. Skapraunar vinnan þín þér?
☐ Mjög mikið  ☐ Mikið  ☐ Hvorki né  ☐ Lítið  ☐ Mjög lítið

6. Finnst þér þú vera útbrunnin vegna vinnu þinnar?
☐ Mjög mikið  ☐ Mikið  ☐ Hvorki né  ☐ Lítið  ☐ Mjög lítið

7. Er vinnan þín tilfinningalega erfið?
☐ Mjög mikið  ☐ Mikið  ☐ Hvorki né  ☐ Lítið  ☐ Mjög lítið

8. Hversu oft finnst þér þú vera tilfinningalega uppgefin?
☐ Alltaf  ☐ Oft  ☐ Stundum  ☐ Sjaldan  ☐ Næstum aldrei/Aldrei

9. Hefur þú næga orku til að hitta fjölskyldu og vini fyrir utan vinnutíma?
☐ Alltaf  ☐ Oft  ☐ Stundum  ☐ Sjaldan  ☐ Næstum aldrei/Aldrei

10. Hversu oft hugsar þú „ég get þetta ekki lengur“?
☐ Alltaf  ☐ Oft  ☐ Stundum  ☐ Sjaldan  ☐ Næstum aldrei/Aldrei

11. Finnst þér hver einasta stund í vinnunni þreyta þig?
☐ Alltaf  ☐ Oft  ☐ Stundum  ☐ Sjaldan  ☐ Næstum aldrei/Aldrei

12. Hversu oft finnst þér þú vera úrvinda?
☐ Alltaf  ☐ Oft  ☐ Stundum  ☐ Sjaldan  ☐ Næstum aldrei/Aldrei

13. Hversu oft finnur þú fyrir slappleika?
☐ Alltaf  ☐ Oft  ☐ Stundum  ☐ Sjaldan  ☐ Næstum aldrei/Aldrei

Félagslegur stuðningur í vinnu (Work-related Basic Need Satisfaction Scale)
Hversu oft á síðastiðnum 2 vikum hefur þú upplifað eftirfarandi:
1. Mér finnst ég ekki ná tengslum við samstarfsfélaga mána
☐ Algerlega ósammála  ☐ Frekar ósammála  ☐ Hvorki né  ☐ Frekar sammála  ☐ Algerlega sammála
2. Í vinnunni upplifi ég mig sem hluta af hóp
☐ Algerlega ósammála  ☐ Frekar ósammála  ☐ Hvorki né  ☐Frekar sammála  ☐Algerlega sammála

3. Ég fell ekki í hópinn meðal vinnufélaga (mér fellur í raun ekki við annað fólk í vinnu minni)
☐ Algerlega ósammála  ☐ Frekar ósammála  ☐ Hvorki né  ☐Frekar sammála  ☐Algerlega sammála

4. Ég get talað við vinnufélaga mína um hluti sem eru mér mikilvægir
☐ Algerlega ósammála  ☐ Frekar ósammála  ☐ Hvorki né  ☐Frekar sammála  ☐Algerlega sammála

5. Ég er oft einmanna meðal vinnufélaga minna
☐ Algerlega ósammála  ☐ Frekar ósammála  ☐ Hvorki né  ☐Frekar sammála  ☐Algerlega sammála

6. Ég á mjög nána vini meðal vinnufélaga minna.
☐ Algerlega ósammála  ☐ Frekar ósammála  ☐ Hvorki né  ☐Frekar sammála  ☐Algerlega sammála

Félagslegur stuðningur fjölskyldu, vina og maka (MSPSS)
Stigagjöf.
1 = algjörlega ósammála 2 = mjög ósammála 3 = frekar ósammála 4 = hlutlaus 5 = frekar sammála 6 = mjög sammála 7 = algjörlega sammála
1. Það er viss einstaklingur til staðar fyrir mig þegar ég þarfnast.
☐ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2. Það er viss einstaklingur sem ég get deilt með gleði minni og sorg.
☐ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3. Fjölskyldan mín reynir virkilega að hjálpa mér.
☐ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4. Frá fjölskyldu minni fæ ég þá tilfinningalegu aðstoð og þann stuðning sem ég þarfnast
☐ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5. Ýg get leitað huggunar hjá vissum einstaklingi þegar þörf er á.
☐ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
☐ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7. Ýg get treyst á vini mín þegar illa gengur.
☐ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8. Ýg get talað um vandamál mín við fjölskyldu mín.
☐ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9. Ýg á vini sem ég get deilt með gleði minni og sorg.
☐ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
10. Pað er viss einstaklingur í lífi mínu sem er umhugað um tilfinningar mínar.
☐ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11. Fjölskylda mín er tilbúin til að aðstoða mig við ákvarðanatöku.
☐ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12. Ýg get talað um vandamál mín við vini mín.
☐ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Könnun á líðan lögreglumanna á Íslandi

Upplýsingar til þátttakenda

Kærri viðtakandi.

Vinsamlega hlutargið neðängreindar upplýsingar vandlega áður en þú ákvæðir hvort þú viljir taka þátt í þessari rannsókn.

Tilgangur og markmið: Litið er vitað um langtíma líðan og áfallastreitu meðal lögreglumanna á Íslandi. Erlendur rannsóknir hafa sýnt að um 12% lögreglugu greinast með áfallastreitu sem getur hafið alvarlegar afleiðingar, svo sem auknar liður á líkamlegum og andlegum sjúkdómmum ásamt röskun á almennri velliða. Þessi rannsókn, sem verður hluti af lokafirðurum Stefanið og Róskvufálfræðinum við Háskólann í Reykjavík, er partur af stærri verkefni sem verið er að þróa í samvinnu við önnur Evrópuþríður. Markmiðið er að stofna þekkingarsetur áfalla á Íslandi en eitt af hlutverkum þess verður að kanna langtíma líðan og áfallastreitu hjá viðbragðsaðilum í neyðarfjónustu og þróu úræði sem draga úr vanliðan og bæta vinnumhverfið.

Rannsakendur:

Ábyrgðarmaður rannsóknarinnar og leiðbeinandi er:

Heiliðís B. Valdimarsdóttir, Professor við Háskólann í Reykjavík, s: 6900930, heiddisb@ru.is

Málrannsakendur eru:

Sigurður Björk Dormar, doktor í áfallasálfræði, s: 616 6437, sigur@salfræingarnir.is
Róskva Vigfúsdóttir, BSc-nemi, Háskólinn í Reykjavík, s: 6953102, roskva13@ru.is
Stefania Hildur Ásmundsdóttir, BSc-nemi, Háskólinn í Reykjavík, s: 8230797, stefaniah14@ru.is

Hægt er að hafa samband við rannsakendur ef það vakna spurningar varðandi rannsóknina.
Páttataka í rannsókninni felur í sér að: svara spurningalista, á rafrænu formi, sem tekur um það bil 20 minútur að svara.


Ávinningur og áhætta/óþ þægindi fyrir þátttakendur: Ekki er um heinan ávinning af þátttöku að ræða fyrir einstaka þátttakendur rannsóknarinnar en með því að taka það leggja þátttakendur sitt af mórkum til að auka þekkingu á liðan lögreglufólks á Íslandi. Jafnframt aukast likur á umbótum og úrræðum sem til lengri tíma má telja til ávinnings fyrir allt lögreglufólk. Ef þátttaka í rannsóknunum veikur upp vanlóðan geta þátttakendur haft samband við Brynjólf Björk Magnúsdóttur (s.543–4068) brynjabm@ru.is en íslan getur veitt þátttakendum eitt viðtal þeim að kostnaðarlægum.

Tryggingar í rannsókninni: þátttakendur eru ekki sérstaklega tryggðir í þessari rannsókn.

Greiðslur eða önnur umbun til þátttakenda: Ekki verður um neinar greiðslur né umbun að ræða fyrir þátttöku í rannsókninni.


Um rétt þátttakenda í spurningakönnun: Spurningalistarnir verða auðkenndir með þátttakendunarúmer sem verður ekki hægt að rekja til þátttakenda.

bú getur hætt við þátttöku hvenær sem er án alra útskýringa og ber þér hví engin skylda til að taka þátt í þessari rannsókn. Til þess að taka þátt ferðu inn sliðina sem er meðhjálpt hér aftast í þrjúgvu.

bér er auðvitað frjálst að sleppa því að svara einstaka spurningum á listanum ef þær valda vanlóðan eða ef svar er óvíst. En mikilvægt er fyrir geði rannsóknarinnar að sem flestum spurningum sé svara eins nákvæmlega og unnt er.
Ef þú hefur einhverjar þækki spurningar tengt þarannsökninn þá er þer velkunnð að hafa samband við ábyrgðarmenn eða meðrannsakanda rannsóknarinnar. Ef þátttaka í þarannsökninni vekur upp valdið að geta þátttakandi hafði samband við Brynjólf Björk Magnússon (t: 543-4068; brynjolf@msi.is) en hann getur verið þátttakandi eftir viðal þeim að kostnaðarlausu. Ef þú hefur spurningar um rétt þinn sem þátttakandi í þarannsökninni getur þú snúið þér til Visindasóðarins, Borgartúni 21, 4.hæð, 105 Reykjavík.
Sími: 551-7100, fax: 551-1444, tölufóstaður: vssn@vssn.is

Hverjir hafa samþykkt rannsóknina: Rannsóknin er unnin með samþykki Visindasóðarins og hefur verið tilkynnt Persónuvernd.

Með von um góðar undirtektur,

fyrir hónd rannsóknarhópsins,
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