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Abstract

In the outdoor behavioral healthcare industry, the largest group of employees is undeniably the field instructors that operate on a daily basis with the clients. These individuals spend extended periods of time in remote wilderness areas, sometimes up to 21 days, often making on the spot decisions to assure the safety and well-being of adolescents struggling with behavioral and/or emotional issues. Previous research has raised some questions concerning burnout (Kirby, 2006) and job demands (Marchand, Russell & Cross, 2009) with possible relations to retention of field instructors. The rapid turnover of these individuals may be linked to unrealistic expectations and inadequate training concerning the job demands of this type of work. A mixed-method design was utilized to evaluate expected levels of job demand stressors, current job satisfaction, psychological well-being, and elements of the initial field instructor training, job choice and organizational choice.

Eight North American wilderness therapy programs distributed a questionnaire to all their field instructors yielding 129 participants. A retrospective pre-test was used to evaluate expectation levels of job demand stressors, while job satisfaction and psychological well-being were measured with the Job Satisfaction Survey and the PGWB-S. Qualitative questions also inquired about the most important elements of field instructor initial training, as well as reasons for job choice and organizational choice in wilderness therapy.

A MANOVA indicated an interaction between job demand stressors and job
satisfaction, where field instructors who had underestimated their job demand stressors had lower job satisfaction, mainly in the areas of pay, promotion, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, coworkers and communication. Findings also revealed that field instructors either underestimated or overestimated over half of the job demand stressors they had retrospectively evaluated. MANOVA was also used to evaluate the interaction between job satisfaction and tenure. Results indicated that as tenure length increased job satisfaction lowered, mainly in the areas of promotion, contingent rewards, operating conditions and communication.

When asked about working in wilderness therapy, field instructors reported altruistic reasons as the most important reason for doing this type of work. Specific program characteristics were most often reported as the reason why they chose their specific organization. Information concerning the initial training indicated that over 75% of field instructors had participated in training with an average of 7 days. Field instructors thought that therapeutic and behavioral management skills were the most important element of their initial training.

Evidences from this study lead to believe that field instructors could benefit from having a better understanding of the job demands of wilderness therapy. While job satisfaction of field instructor was high and psychological well-being was generally positive, field instructor showed a decline in job satisfaction when they had mostly underestimated their job demands and has they increased days of field experience.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Background of the Study

Careers in outdoor adventure programming, such as outdoor educators, ropes course facilitators, or therapeutic field instructors, are now taken more seriously as the demand for outdoor programs is growing in various communities (Jensen & Guthrie, 2005). Changes in the values and beliefs of our society have helped outdoor programs become more widely recognized and utilized for a variety of purposes. For example, outdoor adventure programs serve as therapeutic tools for teenagers (therapeutic programming), corporate development tools for the growing multinational business (developmental programming), recreational retreats for the thrill seeking individuals (recreational programming), or tools to help college students get ready for their first year of college (educational programming). Together, these four types of programs are known as outdoor adventure programs (Priest & Gass, 2005).

While the idea of having a career in outdoor programming is becoming more acceptable, certain stigma are still associated to these professions. The image of the summer camp counselor is sometime the idea that some people have of these job opportunities. While being a summer camp counselor has shown to have positive effects on self-concepts (Henderson & Bialeschki, 1982) and leadership development (Garst & Johnson, 2005) among others, the seasonal work aspect and small paycheck make it a difficult career choice for others. Further, working in outdoor programming can also be
perceived as a way to escape reality and may not always be as valued as other professions (Gass, 1993). For those that decide to continue pass these stigmas, careers in outdoor programming can be difficult to sustain because of the nature of the job demands. Some of these job demands include seasonal work or periods of 24 hour of work for several days in the field, remote wilderness areas and limited access the usual amenities that parts of our society have come to depend on.

Because of these and other factors specific to each type of job, the idea that someone could thrive all year long and develop meaningful professional experiences in outdoor programming can be unimaginable by many. However, the diversification of the types of outdoor adventure programs has created new avenues for professional career options (Priest & Gass, 2005; Russell, Gillis & Lewis, 2008). These include working for recreational, therapeutic, educational and developmental outdoor programs that require specific professional workers to fulfill the individual goals of each type of program (Priest & Gass, 2005). Further, the amount of programs looking for full-time employees who are willing to be paid for living and working in the backcountry is consistently growing as the popularity of these programs increases and outdoor education is seen as a valid educational avenue for learning (Hattie et al., 1997; Ungrin, 2001). Additionally, to cater to the industry and educate well-rounded professionals, a growing number of higher education institutions are offering majors in programs related to outdoor education, adventure therapy and experiential education (Taylor et al., 2002).

While there may be more options for those interested in outdoor programming careers, it appears pertinent to examine how sustainable these careers are. Depending on
the characteristics of such jobs, future members of the outdoor profession and programs can benefit from being adequately prepared for the job skills requirements and equipped with tools that will contribute to retain staff facing the job demand stressors of their work.

Currently, the training and educational emphasis have mostly been directed towards teaching technical and relationship skills to be used with participants (Priest & Gass, 2005), while potentially omitting the tools necessary to deal with job demand stressors. Specific job demands in outdoor programming careers include the types of clients with which people work, the unconventional schedule, remoteness of the work area and daily activity implementation require unique job skills and preparedness. This also requires support from organizations to sustain and help develop the individuals working in this area and may require special attention that work in similar human service professions also demand. By assuring that programs and their trainings equip their employees with the specific tools necessary to deal with the unique job demand stressors, programs will be better able to fulfill their mission and goals of providing quality educational and therapeutic services to clients. Specific to this study is the careful examination of wilderness therapy as we investigate the job demands of field instructors in this work environment

**Wilderness Therapy**

While all outdoor professionals should be accurately informed of the job characteristics in their specific field, careers in outdoor behavioral healthcare programs (OBH) may require more preparation due to the demanding nature of the jobs.
programs provide wilderness therapy for adolescent clients and their families, and seem to be further perceived as a possible treatment option (Russell, Gillis, & Lewis, 2008). The treatment model of wilderness therapy utilizes the challenges of living in a wilderness environment in small group settings with an intentional climate of change that is punctuated by challenging social and physical situations to improve adolescent problem behaviors (Crisp, 1998; Davis-Berman & Berman, 1994; Gass, 1993; Russell, 2001). Wilderness therapy programs generally work with troubled adolescent (Davis-Berman & Berman, 1993; Miles, 1987) and have gained recognition as an alternative treatment to more conventional therapeutic methods, including studies that have shown positive outcomes (Fletcher & Hinkle, 2002; Russell, 2005; Russell, 2006).

For several wilderness therapy programs, recruiting field instructors is an ongoing task. Two possible reasons for this are: 1) a reasoned increase in the number of clients seeking treatment (Russell, Gillis, & Lewis, 2008), and 2) stressors related to the job which are believed to result in higher voluntary turnover of staff (Marchand, Russell and Cross, 2009). Examining the types and reasoned effects of job demand stressors of field instructors, including field skills, organizational structure and work-life balance, are the primary concern of this study. These include job demands such as: 1) unconventional schedules, including several overnights and days in remote wilderness areas, 2) limited access to outside communication, 3) constant vigilance to keep adolescent clients safe, physical and mental tiredness from repeated trips, and 4) lack of time to maintain or create intimate relationships (Bunce, 1998; Thompson, 1984; Marchand, Russell, & Cross, 2009). While average job tenure in wilderness therapy programs is still uncertain
and mostly anecdotal, two recent studies have reported data supporting a turnover rate of field instructors that is less than 12 months (Kirby, 2006; Marchand et al. 2009). There is little empirical research concerning the job characteristics of field instructors and the psychological, emotional and physical consequences have on the well-being of field instructors. Moreover, little is known about the consequences of these job demand stressors on program effectiveness and client outcomes. One area in human resource management and organizational health psychology that has received considerable attention which may shed light on this issue is research on newcomers’ expectations.

**Newcomers’ Expectations**

Research on newcomer’s expectations will help inform the role that stressors play on job satisfaction and well-being of field instructors. Research in related areas of employment has shown that realistic job previews have positive effects on employees and improves the authenticity of job expectations (Avner, Guastello, & Aderman, 1982; Dean & Wanous, 1984; Buckley et al., 1998; Buckley et al., 2002) while also improving job satisfaction (Buckley et al., 1998). Another study found that individuals underestimating the potential job demand stressors reported more distress symptoms once employed for an organization (Nelson & Sutton, 1991). While newcomers’ expectations have been studied in more conventional career fields, the same attention has not been given to professionals of adventure programming. Since several wilderness therapy programs deliver initial trainings to their potential field instructors with the goal of providing a more realistic picture of the work, there is research support that unmet expectations,
especially underestimation of expectations, may be partly responsible for voluntary turnover (Hom et al., 1979; Mobley et al., 1979; Porter, Crampon, & Smith, 1976). More importantly, newcomer’s expectations have been linked to levels of job satisfaction and psychological distress associated with job demand stressors (Beehr, 1976; Henne & Locke, 1985; Kornhauser, 1965; Locke, 1976). Further understanding of these theories requires some understanding of stress. Stress occurs for an individual when the fit between the job and the organization does not match his or her abilities or preferences for the work (Kristof, 1996). In return, strain develops since there is a discrepancy between the perception and motivation of the worker and the job environment, and/or the job demands, and/or the abilities of an individual to perform the job (Caplan et al., 1975). This strain may manifest itself in psycho-social effects such as psychological well-being (Wright & Cropanzano, 2000) and job satisfaction (Locke, 1976). Different types of job demand stressors create different types of strain for different individuals (Cartwright & Cooper, 1997), depending on how they appraise these stressors and what kind of coping mechanism they may have developed previous to the exposure or from the exposure to these stressors (Lazarus, 1966). Further, Anderson (1977) found that it is not stress alone that causes these problems, but rather the inability to cope with them.

**Statement of the Problem**

This study seeks to examine the notion that by better preparing newcomers to anticipate the stressful job characteristics of working in wilderness therapy, program administrations may increase job satisfaction, increase positive well-being and help
develop resiliency to the job demand stressors. There is a growing body of research that reports a potential for burnout and high attrition among the field instructor work force (Kirby, 2006; Marchand et al., 2009). Several researchers have reported high turnover rates and illustrated the potential costs of constantly hiring and training new field instructors (Marchand et al., 2009) including the likely disruption of the therapeutic alliance that field instructors form with clients (Russell, 2003; 2005; 2006).

Because of these issues, this study proposes an in-depth empirical examination of job demand stressors and how field instructors are trained and educated to deal with these stressors. It is unknown how programs are training their field instructors to deal with the demanding job characteristics and the compromises that may need to be made to work in the field.

Field instructors work in remote wilderness area and interact with a more challenging adolescent populations. Marchand et al. (2009) reported that personal issues work-life balance resulting from job demand stressors, were more significant for field instructors than issues inside the work setting, such as field skills and organizational structure. Because of these findings, this study seeks to further examine the job characteristics and their effect on job satisfaction and psychological well-being of instructors. This information could help understand to what extent the job demand stressors are affecting field instructors. Therefore, this research will provide information that will help programs recruit and train more prepared and qualified field instructors.
The purpose statement

The purpose of this concurrent mixed-methods study was to examine expectations of job demand stressors of newcomer field instructors working in wilderness therapy programs and the relationship between these job demand stressors, job satisfaction and psychological well-being. To explore the role that training plays in, this study examined specific elements of the initial training such as content, satisfaction and effectiveness. This focus on preparing the initial training of field instructors in OBH programs was meant to increase the understanding of this often overlooked aspect, and review potential information that may give more insights into expectations of job demand stressors. Finally, information concerning job choice and organizational choice was collected to explore the decision process of the individuals who choose this work.

To conduct this study, two strategies were employed. First, a quantitative survey was administered to a large sample of field instructors working in wilderness therapy programs at the time of the study. The quantitative survey collected information about current job demand stressors, as well as anticipated job demand stressors prior to the initial training. This survey utilized a retrospective pretest design to measure fulfilled and unfulfilled job demand stressors. The survey also measured current job satisfaction and psychological well-being of participating field instructors. The survey also collected information about initial training effectiveness. Second, qualitative information was collected using the same survey to identify the most important aspects of the job and organizational choice of field instructors. Information was also collected about the most important aspects of current field instructors initial training and elements these
individuals would like to see more. All instructors employed in one of the Outdoor Behavioral Healthcare Industry Council (OBHIC) program in Fall 2008 were selected for this survey.

Research Objectives

The following research objectives guided this study:

1. To identify the main expectations of job demand stressors that field instructors in wilderness therapy programs have pre-initial training.

2. To identify the most important expectations of job demand stressors that field instructors in wilderness therapy programs have before starting their job.

3. To identify the most important expectations of job demand stressors that field instructors in wilderness therapy programs underestimated, overestimated or fulfilled, as well as any additional job demand stressors.

4. To examine job satisfaction of field instructors working in wilderness therapy programs.

5. To examine the level of psychological well-being of field instructors working in wilderness therapy programs.
6. To examine the relationship between underestimated, overestimated or fulfilled job demand stressors with psychological well-being and job satisfaction.

7. To examine elements of the initial field instructor training including: a) level of satisfaction with preparation, b) specific elements that were effective in the training and c) the level of realistic job preview perceived by instructors.

8. To obtain information about job choice and organizational choice of field instructors in wilderness therapy.

Research questions

This study was driven by the following research questions. Reasoned to be best addressed by using a mixed-methods design:

1. What are newcomer’s perception levels of expectations of job demand stressors prior to the initial training?
2. What are current perception levels of job demand stressors?
3. Do newcomer’s pre-work expectations of job demand stressors correspond to their current job demand stressors?
4. Are field instructors satisfied with their job?
5. What are field instructors most and least satisfying aspects of their job?
6. Do field instructors have a positive psychological well-being?
7. Is there a relationship between underestimation, overestimation or fulfilled expectations of job demand stressors and job satisfaction?

8. Is there a relationship between underestimation, overestimation or fulfilled expectations of job demand stressors and psychological well-being?

9. How satisfied are field instructors with their initial training in regards to work preparation?

10. Is training satisfaction related to their current perception of job demand stressors?

**Limitations**

This study had the following limitations: 1) selection of the programs, 2) differences between programs, 3) differences between training methods, 4) selection of the field instructors, 5) memory distortion, and 6) interpretation of the results by the researcher.

Programs recruited to participate in this study were different from each other given that each program is owned or managed by different individuals. Each program operated in a different wilderness area, and some programs had different schedule models for their field instructors. The location of a program has been linked to higher satisfaction in outdoor leadership, and may affect perception of job demand stressors (Marchand, Unpublished).

At the time of this study, every program offered an in-house initial training for field instructors, which could have affected their perception of job demand stressors. Further, in line with the concept of Realistic Job Preview (Buckley et al., 1998; Buckley et al.,
2002), this study argues that the dissemination of information concerning job demand stressors is potentially affected by the initial training content of each program, and the information given to newcomers prior to the initial training and the start of employment.

Further, field instructors participating in this study interacted with different types of clients and staff prior to completing the survey, which may have affected their perception of their job demand stressors. Also, some field instructors participating in this study have previously worked in wilderness therapy or other types of outdoor programs, which may have affected their initial expectations.

It is also important to take into account field instructors’ interactions with members of the treatment team, which includes therapists and medical supervisors, as these may have affected newcomers’ perceptions of job demand stressors. Finally, instructors who had been with their program for over six months at the time of this study may have been affected by memory distortion, as suggested by proponents of retrospectives pretests (Babcock, 1998). Statistical analysis took into account this potential distortion by delimiting instructors into previous relevant experience and tenure.

Finally, while the researcher used several methods of reliability and validated its findings with several sources, interpretation of the results may have been influenced by the researcher’s personal experience as a field instructor. The researcher was careful in reviewing the results to avoid any biases while interpreting the results.
Delimitations

Delimitations of this study included the selection of programs and field instructors for the quantitative and qualitative section of this study. Programs selected to participate in this study were all members of OBHIC in the Fall of 2008 and operating in North America. Each program utilized wilderness therapy as a treatment intervention and conducted initial trainings of their field instructors. Programs were approached for participating in this study through OBHIC, and each program asked their own field instructors for volunteered participation in the quantitative survey.

Definition of Terms

Adventure programming: *The deliberate use of adventure to achieve specific purposes and benefits.* (Priest & Gass, 2005)

Wilderness therapy: *Wilderness therapy is one type of therapeutic treatment intervention utilized by outdoor behavioral healthcare programs, which includes a) fostering emotional growth, self-awareness, and communication skills, b) increasing self-esteem, and c) correcting behavior problems in troubled adolescents* (Davis-Berman & Berman, 1994; Russell, 2001). *It is also often characterized by remote wilderness settings, takes place within small groups, for multiple days, and includes 24 hours interventions.* (Gass, 1993)
**Psychological well-being:** A self-perception of happiness or potential psychological distress in someone’s health-related quality of life (Dupuy, 1984).

**Field instructor:** Individual working directly with clients in a wilderness setting. Primary responsibility includes safety of the group and implementation of therapeutic treatment prescribed by the field therapist (Russell & Hendee, 2000).

**Job satisfaction:** Evaluation of feelings about a job (Spector, 1997)

**Outdoor Behavioral Healthcare:** A treatment intervention that utilizes wilderness therapy to address behavioral and emotional problems and provide growth for adolescent clients (Russell & Hendee, 2001)

**Job demand stressors:** Characteristics of the workload that may create stress for some individuals (Karasek, 1979). Job demands may create positive or negative responses, depending on several factors connected to individual perception of the demand (Lazarus et al., 1985; Jex, 1998).
Chapter 2

*Literature Review*

This chapter will attempt to situate the knowledge about newcomer’s expectations of job demand stressors in association to the job characteristics of field instructors in wilderness therapy. It will first situate the field of wilderness therapy inside the concept of adventure programming and outdoor behavioral healthcare. It will then look at the knowledge concerning wilderness therapy and adventure programming, specifically job demand stressors, as well as the factors impacting human service workers and other unconventional professions. A link is made to direct caregivers in residential treatment centers and the effects of youth at risks on workers. Finally, it will look at the theories and concepts surrounding job expectations, psychological well-being, job satisfaction and resiliency.

*Outdoor Education*

Human beings have reported for centuries the virtues of nature on the human self and countless individuals have sought its qualities. Saint Bernard of Clairvaux (1090 - 1153AD) wrote: “You will find something far greater in the woods than you will find in books. Stones and trees will teach you that which you will never learn from masters.” While many have sought the merits of the wilderness over the past centuries, the deliberate decision of utilizing nature as an educational or healing tool does not appear in
the literature until much later.

There are several organized outdoor programs that have shaped the history of outdoor education (i.e. Outward Bound, Gunnery Camps, Camp Amhek) and it is unclear which organization would be considered the first outdoor program with deliberate educational intentions. This historical question is beyond the point of this review. It is most important to recognize how organized outdoor programming have come a long way since the creation of deliberate wilderness education. In utilizing John Dewey’s (1938) educational philosophies about experiential education, the combined usage of wilderness environments and recreational activities can create specific. Experiential education is defined as a philosophy and methodology. Learning takes place between the student and the teacher as action oriented experiences to increase the development and knowledge of the subject (Itin, 1999). In the context of outdoor education, learning outcomes may be as diverse as wilderness living skills such as backpacking or backcountry cooking, or as complex as leadership development and increased self-confidence. With this in mind, outdoor education is here defined as an experiential method that takes place in the “out-of-doors” (Priest, 1986) and intentionally works at developing all aspects of a person (Neill, 2002).

The usage of outdoor education can be described through the concept of adventure programming. When adventure is used to achieve specific outcomes, it is called adventure programming (Gass & Priest, 1997). It is important to mention that this definition those not include the usage of the outdoors, but is often considered inherently part of it as the outdoors offer many adventures. The term adventure programming,
coined by Priest and Gass (1997), is represented in these different applications: recreation, education, development and therapy. While recreation programming is aimed at giving participants a leisurely activity through learning new skills and experiencing adventure, education and development are more in tune with the philosophy behind experiential education. In education programming, participants are encouraged to enrich themselves and grow externally and internally. Developmental programs have similar outcomes with the specific goal of being applied in a particular setting. That is why it is most often used in pre-organized groups with specific developmental needs such as improving employee communication or teacher-student trust (Priest & Gass, 2005).

**Therapeutic Adventure Programming**

The therapeutic application of adventure programming is the environment of interest in this study. While the participation of recreational activities in a natural environment is often inherently seen as therapeutic in nature (Davis-Berman & Berman, 1994), organized therapeutic outdoor programming is a more recent concept. Therapeutic adventure programs are aimed at changing dysfunctional behaviors and rehabilitating the participants by developing healthier life coping strategies. Adventure therapy (AT) is the term commonly used to describe this application. Alvarez and Stauffer (2001) define AT as: “any intentional, facilitated use of adventure tools and techniques to guide personal change toward desired therapeutic goals” (p.87). Techniques commonly used include activity-based psychotherapy, wilderness therapy and long-term residential camping (Gass, 1993). More specifically, activities such as ropes course, teambuilding and
wilderness expeditions are utilized to create changes through risk, facilitation and learning transfer (Gillis & Thomsen, 1996).

Learning transfer

To better understand the goals of wilderness therapy, learning transfer will first be explained. Learning transfer in experiential education, including therapeutic adventure programming, is often described as the most important treatment intervention outcome. This can be explained by the fact that learning transfer is the action of transferring the learning from the experience to future settings (Gass, 1985). Gass (1985) explains learning transfers as being either specific, non specific or metaphoric. In specific learning transfer, the learning from one activity is utilized directly in another activity. An example of this would be a student learning how to bake on a campfire after having learned fire building the previous day. An example of non-specific transfer could be the communication skills that a participant acquires during a ropes course activity, which is later applied in her family setting. Finally, metaphoric transfer can be explained through this example: The importance of working as a cohesive team when canoeing, later applied to the team work skills necessary to the growth of an intimate relationship.

Outdoor Behavioral Healthcare

Transferring skills learned during wilderness therapy treatment is the ultimate goal of clients participating in an outdoor behavioral healthcare program. This study is also specifically interested in the professional aspects of wilderness therapy. The
wilderness expedition model, called wilderness therapy (WT), is most often associated with AT (Bandoroff & Newes, 2004). Russell (2003) describes one way to differentiate this treatment modality from other adventure therapy applications. That is to ground wilderness therapy inside outdoor behavioral healthcare programming (Russell, 2003). Outdoor behavioral healthcare specifically utilized the outdoor settings to achieve therapeutic goals through clinical supervision, therapeutic activities and educational programming (Russell & Hendee, 2000). Outdoor behavioral healthcare is also a type of treatment program rather than a set of techniques or tools (Russell, 2003). Therefore, outdoor behavioral healthcare utilizes elements of wilderness therapy as a treatment method.

Several characteristics of wilderness therapy (WT) make the practice and delivery of this method unique compared to other adventure-therapy programs. WT involves extended periods of time in remote wilderness areas, group and individual therapy sessions, and educational and therapeutic curriculum (Russell & Phillips-Miller, 2002). In a nationwide survey of programs, Russell and Hendee (2000) identified unique characteristics that distinguish outdoor behavioral healthcare from other adventure therapy applications. A look at these characteristics is necessary to understand the differences between programs. First, two types of programs are identified: private placement, where primary care givers place clients in treatment, and adjudicated placement, where judicial authorities have the authority to do so. Inside each type of programs, four models separate their practices. The first two models utilized contained or continuous flow expeditions, where clients remain in the wilderness for the duration of
their treatment. Staff rotating in and out of the field distinguishes continuous flow expeditions, and clients starting and completing the program as assessed by their therapist and caregivers. For rotating field instructors (Marchand, 2006), also referred to as field staff (Kirby, 2006) and leaders (Russell & Hendee, 2000), common schedules are 8 days on and six days off, or 15 days on and 13 days off. The last two models, base camp expedition and residential expedition, are more traditionally linked to residential treatment centers, were clients are either stationed at a base camp or a residential school or treatment center, and participate in wilderness expeditions during their stay. Field instructors in these programs have varied work schedule depending on the length of the expedition and the needs of the program.

In support of wilderness therapy, several studies have measured the outcomes of treatment in outdoor behavioral healthcare programs. Research has focused on general treatment outcomes (Russell, 2001; Clark, Marmol, Cooley & Gathercoal, 2004; Doucette, 2004), substance use frequency, depressive symptoms, youth well being (Russell, 2001, 2005, 2006), family functioning and maintenance change (Harper, Russell, Cooley & Cuples, 2007). The findings are promising and showing positive changes in the lives of clients (Russell, 2007).

Despite promising results, there is also evidence that wilderness therapy does not work for everyone (Russell, 2007) and there is still a lot of work to be done to understand which specific client benefits most from WT. A continuous problem is the media image associating WT to boot camps (Russell, 2001). The reporting of unfortunate events (Kutz & O’Connell, 2007), such as the death of Aaron Bacon in an outdoor behavioral
healthcare program (Krakauer, 1995), has overshadowed the positive changes in hundreds of youth in WT programs. The diffusion of the research undertaken by the Outdoor Behavioral Healthcare Research Cooperative (OBHRC, University of Minnesota) is one way to provide evidence of the benefits of WT (Russell, 2007). Recent studies from the OBHRC include substance use frequency and depression outcomes following outdoor behavioral healthcare (Russell, 2007) and family involvement (Harper, 2007). Outside the OBHRC, discussions on the benefits and consequences of the use of force and restraints in WT and other inpatient treatment have also contributed to best practices from outdoor behavioral healthcare programs (Conner, 2000; LeBel & Goldstein, 2005). Another subject of best practices in WT and adventure therapy is the need for professional and licensed members in the treatment team (Davis-Berman & Berman, 1993; Gillis & Thomsen, 1996) as well as program licensure (Burg, 2001; Russell, 2001). This last one is particularly of interest in getting insurance organizations to pay for WT treatment as a legitimate form of therapeutic treatment.

*Treatment team*

The strains of dealing with adolescent with psychological issues are often considered greater than those with adolescent in non-therapeutic programs (Davis-Berman, Berman & Capone, 1994, Thompson, 1984). The treatment team assures in each program a continuum of care for the clients in treatment. Russell and Hendee (2000) explain the treatment team through four professionals: clinical supervisor, medical supervisor, field therapist and field staff. The first two supervisors mainly have roles in
the clinical supervision of therapist and regular medical health check of clients, but are not regularly involved with clients. Field therapists and field instructors are in direct contact with the students on a regular basis. The field therapist, depending on the program, has weekly or daily visits with the clients and field instructors. On the other hand, the field instructor is responsible 24 hours a day for the clients and has contact with the field therapist daily or weekly. The primary duties of field instructors include safety of the clients and delivery of the treatment plan. They also have the responsibility of managing the daily aspects of the wilderness expedition and reporting to the field therapist progress, changes and unusual behaviors of clients.

Field Instructors

Since field instructors are in contact with clients 24 hours and are managing most aspects of a wilderness expedition while encouraging clients to follow treatment plans, their position inside a program is unique. Until recently, research in wilderness therapy had mainly focused on clients. Two recent studies have brought issues specifically concerning field instructors to the table. In one study, Marchand (2006) explored the difficulties experienced by field instructors working in wilderness therapy, while in another study; Kirby (2006) investigated the antecedents of turnover for field instructors. Both of these studies follow the common assumption that field instructors have an unusually high demanding job, with stressful work characteristics, which often results in high turnover. In support of this, Marchand (2006) and Kirby (2006) both reported average length of time working as a field instructor in their current program being less
than 10 months.

While these may be the first two studies directly linked to field instructors, Bunce (1998) published the results of a workshop on experiences, challenges and impacts of working in wilderness therapy, conducted with therapists and instructors alike. The results of this workshop reported that participants were concerned with balancing their life between work and non-work. Job characteristics, including working with troubled clients, and the effects of working in remote wilderness areas for extended periods of time, also played important roles in their general well-being. Similarly, a 1984 article “How to Reduce Stress on Staff in Outdoor Programs” (Thompson, 1984), had already reported that high staff voluntary turnover in Outward Bound adapted programs was problematic due to job demand stressors associated with working with troubled youth in wilderness adventure programs. Other factors not related to the job characteristics may contribute to the excessive turnover rate, such as age and socio-cultural background, but are still misunderstood at this moment (Kirby, 2006). Interestingly, Thompson described the typical Outward Bound field instructor has being young, transient, predominantly from the middle class and possessing an intellectual background. Both Marchand (2006) and Kirby (2006) found field instructors to generally be under 30 years old and possess at least a bachelor’s degree, being overwhelming Caucasian (over 90%) and unattached (single or divorced).
Outdoor Leaders

This portrait of the typical field instructor in wilderness therapy is an extension of outdoor leaders working in other applications of adventure programming such as outdoor education (Priest & Gass, 2005). Wilderness therapy job characteristics relating to working with youth, in remote wilderness settings, on extended expeditions, can also be seen in other areas of adventure programming. For example, long hours, time away from home and difficulties maintaining relationships were reportedly common problems in a study of Australian outdoor education professionals (Thomas, 2001). Another study reported that adventure-based educators felt emotional exhaustion from their involvement with students and that their work demanded too much time away from their personal life (Wells, 1978).

These characteristics have lead to the assumption that many outdoor leaders become burned-out by the high work demands of this type of job. This term is often used widely without much understanding of the true meaning. The most utilized definition of burnout in human services is Maslach’s definition, which includes emotional exhaustion, depersonalization (cynicism) and feelings of reduced accomplishment (inefficacy) (Maslach, 1976). This is how each variable is defined: emotional exhaustion, which relates to feeling depleted of energy and emotional resources, depersonalization, where there is a tendency to see people as objects, and lack of personal accomplishment (Maslach, 2003; Maslach & Jackson, 1981). In Kirby’s study of field instructors in wilderness therapy, burnout was shown to be a significant predictor of intent to turnover (2006). More specifically, Kirby reported higher feelings of inefficacy in comparison to
service workers and mental health workers. Cynicism and exhaustion levels were also higher for field instructors than previous findings of mental health workers. According to Burke and Richardson (1993), the focus on burnout related to job stressors has mainly focused on role demands.

Dawson (1979) speculated at the causes of burnout in outdoor programs. Common elements believed to enhance burnout across programs were alleged to be high degrees of risk, high workload, limited possibilities for advancement, work interference with personal life, lack of influence and authority with managers, anxiety in front of performance and evaluation, unmotivated students, income insecurity, disruption from frequent staff turnover and low status within the organization. While some of these elements may not be true any more as the field of outdoor programming has evolved, certain aspects most certainly remain such as long hours and poor pay (Barnes, 1999). Further, the issue of work-life balance seems to be a recurring theme in the literature, both with field instructors and outdoor leaders (Allin, 2004; Kirby, 2006; Marchand, 2006). Allin (2004) explored women outdoor educators and family combination, and found participants of her study to be commonly single has an unintentional consequence of the lifestyle investment demanded by their work. She also reported that the desire to have a family is often contradictory with following the path to an outdoor career.

This may be in part because of the disparity between family demands and outdoor career demands. While outdoor careers demand long hours, days, sometimes weeks away from home, family investment requires the total opposite. This particular characteristics of working as an outdoor leaders/ field instructor can be conceptualized in routine
separation. The effect of routine separations has been extensively studied in various fields, such as military families (Van Breda, 1999), flight attendant (MacDonald, Deddens, Gradjewski, Whelan & Hurrell, 2003), commercial fisherman and long-haul truckers (Zvonkovic, Solomon, Humble & Manoogian, 2005). Some outcomes of these studies may be relevant to working in wilderness settings, but do not integrate all the characteristics specific to working in adventure programming, specifically outdoor behavioral healthcare programs.

Some of these characteristics can be explained in the theory of post-expedition, which is more connected to the job characteristics of outdoor behavioral healthcare. Post-expedition adjustment, a term coined by Allison (2000), refers to the time it takes for participants of wilderness expeditions to adjust back to everyday life. In his research, Allison found that participants had to go through four aspects of post-expedition adjustment: self-self, self-other, self-natural environment, and self-education/career. Self-self is explained as a reflection and personal tuning in regard to consumption and cultural values of the self, such as the amount of material objects in a participant’s life that were not necessary during a wilderness expedition. Self-other reflects the sense of loss felt by participants in regards to the other members of the wilderness expedition. During wilderness expeditions, participants and instructors alike create bonds that are unique to circumstances of the expedition. These may be difficult to find or explain to other people that did not take part in the expedition. In both of these aspects, self-self and self-other, individuals can either try to adjust themselves or adjust the environment to which they returned. Part of this adjustment can be seen in the concept of transference of new
learning explains early in this chapter (Gass, 1985). “It represents the integration of learning from the adventure program into the participant’s real life.” (Priest & Gass, 2005, p. 175). This concept can also be applied to participants and instructors alike. Finally, self-natural environment relates to the grieving of the wilderness and its uniqueness, while self-education/career, is explained has the adjustment back to home life, which includes going to school or having to work in the case of most participants. Self-education/career might not be as applicable to careers in the outdoors and a specific theory of expedition adjustment for field instructors may be necessary to explain this aspect.

**Human Service Workers**

An intuitive connection to the job characteristics affecting field instructors in wilderness therapy can be made to the job characteristics of human service professions. As mentioned earlier, several authors have demonstrated the prevalence of burnout in human service workers. Maslach extensively developed the concept of burnout in the late 1970’s specifically in relation to human service workers. Among some, stress and burnout has been linked to child welfare workers (Jayaratne, Chess & Kunkel, 1986), child care workers (Manlove, 1993), social workers (Acker, 1999; Egan, 1993; Um & Harrison, 1998; Lloyd et al., 2002), therapist (Bermak, 1977; Farber & Heifetz, 1982), nurses (Eastburg, Williamson, Gorsuch & Ridley, 1994) and psychiatrists (Kumar, Hatcher, Bhagat, Fische & Robinson, 2007). Working with therapeutic clients can be complex and create difficult situations that may be demanding for most person.
Conflicting role, status, tasks and context were found as main sources of stress (Dillon, 1990). A variety of factors have been linked to predict burnout, such as low possibility for advancement, unpredictability, lack of role clarity, (Borritz et al., 2005), high role conflicts (Reid et al., 1999; Borritz et al., 2005), professional isolation, demand for constant empathy, ambiguous success (Bermak, 1977), lack of therapeutic success, un-gratifying clients (Farber & Heifetz, 1982), organizational structure and climate (Lloyd et al., 2002) and autonomy over clients (Dillon, 1990). These are only a sample of the extensive literature on the subject. These factors and other aspects may offer the possibility of making meaningful connections between well-studied trends among human service workers and less studied characteristics around the professional field instructors.

Another issue affecting some human service workers and possibly affecting some field instructors is vicarious trauma or secondary traumatic stress. Secondary traumatic stress also referred to as compassion fatigue is “the natural consequent behaviors and emotions resulting from knowing about a traumatizing event experienced by a significant other-the stress resulting from helping or wanting to help the traumatized or suffering person.” (Figley, 1995, p.7). Vicarious trauma, a term developed by McCann and Pearlman (1990), is particular to therapist and other workers who try to help victims. Psychological effects of hearing about traumatic events are disruptive and complex to most human being. The effects can last for years after working with a traumatized person (McCann & Pearlman, 1990). Vicarious trauma and secondary traumatic stress are different than burnout since they are specifically related to exposure of client’s traumatic accounts and have not been related to the workplace, the way that burnout has been
(Schauben & Frazier, 1995; Jenkins & Baird, 2002). The prevalence of secondary traumatic stress has been reported in social workers (Bride, 2007) and clinicians working with victims of physical and sexual abuse as well as other crimes (Van der Kolk, McFarlane & Weisbeth, 1996). More recently, the return of thousands of military personnel from the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan has brought back to the forefront the issue of vicarious trauma as a problem for several individual treating veterans returning from combat zone (Conant, 2007).

Introduction to Organizational Psychology

While not too long ago, people were more concern about making enough money to feed their families or their image associated with their employment status, more modern ideas such as “work engagement” (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004) and the well-being of workers as holistic individuals (Dugdill, 2000) have taken prominence in the organizational literature. Historically, the first studies in organizational psychology were more concern with the performance of employees and their productivity (Taylor, 1911). While performance is still a common research subject, organizational psychology and other connected disciplines have approached more contemporary subjects such as job stress, work-family spillover, quality of life, vocational choice, job strain or motivation. There is a common understanding among the modern workforce that employees who enjoy their work will give back time and energy, and hopefully be healthier individuals in their communities (Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, & Schwartz, 1997). Therefore, the concepts of “satisfied” and “engaged” employees, and the variables surrounding these
concepts are of current concern in organizational science. As explained through transfer learning, it is one of the most important tasks of field instructors to support clients in learning the skills to transfer the knowledge gained during their stay in a wilderness therapy program back into their home environment. As role models, it should be expected that field instructors would be healthy individuals as well, not just while at work. Some concerns about field instructors releasing work tension through binge drinking, has been one concerned raised in the past (Ferguson, 1999).

In the context of recreation and leisure professions, the research on organizational psychology is sparse. The emphasis has been on the creation and delivery of programs, as well as client’s satisfaction and outcomes from the services provided, and diversity of clients in recreation programming (e.g. Allen & Tucker, 2008; Keller & Hodges, 2003; Witt, Crompton, & Baker, 1995). As recreation professionals provide services that are intended to be of leisurely nature, and opposite to work, one may ask why these professionals have received so little attention in the field of organizational psychology.

*Stress, Eustress, Stressors, Distress and Strain*

Before we go any further into details of organizational psychology, we need to define some key concepts to better situate the theories and models utilized in this discussion. First of all, stress and stressors should be differentiated so stress is seen as a process and stressors are the events or characteristics of an event that are experienced by individuals (Cooper, Dewe & O’Driscoll, 2001). The concept of stress itself is a complex mechanism that involves several psychological, physiological and environmental factors.
It is an ambiguous term used in our everyday vocabulary with several meanings and little approved scientific definition (Quick et al., 1997). The product of stress is also a complex phenomenon that is linked to people’s adjustment to their environment, performance at work and personal health. When unmanaged or too high, the process of stress may lead to several complications in physiological, behavioral and psychological domains (Quick et al., 1997).

Jex (1998) explains stressors as the “…job or organizational conditions that may require adaptive responses from employees…” (p.2). Often, the terms stressors and demands are used interchangeably, as physical or psychological stimulus require an individual’s response (Quick et al., 1997). However, using the two terms interchangeably may be erroneous since demands do not automatically bring on a stress response. Demands may create positive or negative reactions, depending on several factors connected to individual perception of the demand (Jex, 1998). One way to explain this is with Lazarus’ (1966) model of cognitive appraisal and coping. Research has shown that individuals see demand stressors differently, either as a threat or a challenge, and that individual perceptions of the stressors can not be separated from this interaction (Lazarus, DeLongis, Folkman, & Gruen, 1985). Since stressors are one of the main concepts researched here, we will later return to it in more details.

When stress causes negative outcomes it is referred to as distress (Quick et al., 1997). A negative response to the stressors is considered a strain (Jex, 1998). Distress and strain are used interchangeably in reference to the negative or unhealthy outcomes that make an individual deviate from healthy functioning (Quick et al., 1997). The
expression of strain is seen in psychological, physiological or behavioral functions (Quick et al., 1997), and the range of strains may go from a simple headache or lowered performance at work, to cardiovascular diseases and turnover of employees (Jex, 1998). While the strain is a consequence for the individual employee, it also becomes a problem for organizations in reason of absenteeism that may results from too much stressors or lowered productivity, which often depends on the culture of the work place (Quick et al., 1997). Cooper, Dewe, and O’Driscoll (2001) divide strain into three major categories including job-specific sources, organizational sources and individual sources. The proposed study is mainly concerned with the job specific and organizational sources of strain rather than individual differences, such as Type A behaviors.

Critical Theories

While this study evaluates the hypothesis that newcomer’s expectations of job demand stressors ultimately affects their current level of job demand stressors, and their job satisfaction, this study does not adhere to one theory. However, there is several theories in organizational psychology that are ultimately giving the foundations to the subject of this research. While it would be impossible to discuss every single theory in this paper, some concepts are more frequently discussed in organizational psychology, and may be of importance in understanding how field instructors make decisions and cope with the demands of their job.
Person-environment fit

The first theory covered is one concerned with individual’s interactions in their organizations based on their “fit” with their work environment. The Person-environment fit theory derived from the social psychologist Kurt Lewin (1951), who raised the idea that people’s behaviors were a function of their interaction with certain situations (Jex, 1998). Stress occurs for an individual when the fit between the job and the organization does not match his or her abilities or preferences for the work (Kristof, 1996). In return, strain develops since there are discrepancies between the motivation of the worker and the job environment, and/ or the job demands, and/ or the abilities of an individual to perform the job (Caplan et al., 1975). In the major study that gave support to this model, researchers found that work overload, misfit between the job’s demands, overtime and underutilization of abilities were the most important stressors associated with the misfit of the person-environment (Caplan et al., 1975). The lack of P-E fit has also been associated to home-work interference and a source of conflict (Edwards & Rothbard, 2005).

Yerkes-Dodson Law

As discussed previously, when stress is considered “good”, it is referred to as eustress (Selye, 1976). Positive outcomes of stress, such as performance, have been associated with optimum performance in a theory called the Yerkes-Dodson Law (Yerkes & Dodson, 1908). This model is best explained by thinking of a graph with an inverted U. In this graph, when stress increases up to a certain level, performance
increases as well. However, when stress becomes too high, the level of performance decreases (Jex, 1998). Further research has shown that as the complexity of the task increases, the maximum level of performance that an individual can reach may come sooner than the original model implied (Broadbent, 1971; Easterbrook, 1959). There is little study that test for nonlinear effects, and the Yerkes-Dodson Law may be underutilized in the study of organizational psychology (Jex, 1998). In the field of human services, one study showed an inverted U-shaped relation between job complexity and mental health outcomes (Xie & Johns, 1995).

Role Theory

The connection between someone’s role in an organization has been linked directly to different types of stressors with strain as a likely result (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). Role conflict and role ambiguity have prominently been studied in the literature of the last 50 years (see Kahn et al., 1964) as an indicator of dysfunctional outcomes for individuals and organizations (Rizzo et al., 1970). It explains the negative outcomes (e.g. dissatisfaction) that individuals may develop from role conflicts and role ambiguity (Kahn et al., 1964). The study of role theory, specifically role conflict and role ambiguity is attributed to Kahn et al. (1964) whom from early on looked at the link between these two variables as a source of anxiety. Role conflict may manifest itself when an employee feels caught in the middle such as between a supervisor and the supervisees (Roethlisberger, 1965) or when given conflicting directions about a task (Ditz, 1959). The consequences of role conflict may lead to difficulty making decisions
(Seeman, 1953), viewing problems unrealistically (Gullahorn, 1956) and job
dissatisfaction (Gross, Ward, & Alexander, 1958). Further, role conflict was early on
associated with the experience of stress and anxiety (Charters, 1952), making it a prime
concept for the study of stressors and strain in the workplace. Further, burnout has been
increasingly linked to role conflict, especially in the development of emotional
exhaustion (Cooper, Dewe, & O’Driscoll, 2001).

Kahn et al. (1964) associated role ambiguity with different issues inside an
organization, including complexity of the organizational structure, rapid growth or
reorganizations, frequent change in technology, frequent change in colleagues and
changes in the environment of the organization. Role ambiguity has been linked to
increase anxiety (Cohen, 1959; Kahn et al., 1964) and reduce performance (Cohen, 1959;
Mandell, 1956). This happens as role ambiguity creates uncertainty within an individual,
leading to stress of the unpredictable (Schuler, 1984). While role ambiguity may be more
common among newer employees, even veterans are at risk of it, such as in the event of a
re-organization inside the workplace (Ross & Altmaier, 1994).

*Transactional Theory of Stress (Cognitive Appraisal Model)*

Stress is often argued to be a relation between a person and the environment
(Lazarus & Launier, 1978). The cognitive appraisal model is essential in the study of
stressors (Cooper et al., 2001) and our understanding of the stress coping process (Dewe,
Cox, & Ferguson, 1993). There is also evidence that the way an individual appraises
stressors in the work environment is more important to levels of psychological well-being
than the stress factors themselves (Oliver & Brough, 2002). According to research by Lazarus (1991), cognitive appraisal happens when an individual determines if an event is stressful or not.

In this model, two types of appraisal take place in the transaction between the environment and the person. First, primary appraisal gives meaning to an event, where it may be seen as a challenge, threat or harm. More specifically, the primary appraisal may result in little significance (irrelevant encounter), beneficial or positive relevance (benign-positive encounter) or a stressful encounter (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Secondary appraisal will follow and evaluates the resources available to deal with the threat, challenge or harm assessed in the primary appraisal (Lazarus, 1966).

This model clearly emphasizes the responses to job demands and the idea that not every demand becomes a stressor (Jex, 1998). Basically, it is the transaction between the environment and the individual that creates the stress, and that stress is not a “property” but it arises from an individual response to an event or a person (Lazarus, 1991). This model is also quite important in the study of stress, as the emphasis is given on the process, how individual adjust, cope or perceive stress and consequently their adaptation to stress (Cooper et al., 2001).

**Job Demand-Control (Support) Model**

One of the most studied models from the last 20 years is the job demand-control model by Karasek (Cooper et al., 2001; Karasek, 1979). In his study, Karasek (1979) looked at two elements of the work environment: the job demand and the job control,
referring to the amount of discretionary decision an employee as on the demands of his/her work. The control applies to the skills used to perform work (skill discretion) as well as the power to make decisions (decision authority). The model stipulates that strain occurs when job demand and job control are combined, and that the level of strain varies as the amount of demand and control fluctuates. As seen earlier, job demands do not automatically lead to stressors, but Karasek (1979) used these terms interchangeably in relation to the demands made in the work environment. Later on, three types of job demands were conceptualized in the model, including time demands, monitoring demands and problem-solving demands (Karasek & Theorell, 1990). Fox, Dwyer and Gangster (1993) explained the logic behind high demands of work as a conclusion to the resulting stress that leads to anxiety about performance or time frames at work.

The amount of strain obtained from this model is equal to the excess of demands over control. Specifically, the model produces four levels of strain: 1) Low demand and low control, referred to as “passive job”, 2) low demand and high control as “low strain job”, 3) high demand and low control considered a “high strain job” and 4) high demand and high control or “active job”. One interesting aspect of this model is that Karasek (1979) hypothesized that each level of strain would also produce changes outside the work environment. The first attempt at testing this model was made with data from the United-States and Sweden, consisting of only males, since women’s status were “…often complicated by the additional demand of housework.” (Karasek, 1979, p. 289). The data was collected from three variables: control, demand and strain. Job control was measured by an “intellectual discretion” scale, where workers with repetitive, low-skill level jobs
were at the lowest level of the scale and has training/education increased, levels rose higher. Job control was also measured through “decision authority” based on four levels of authority. Job demand was concerned with measuring the psychological demands in a self-report questionnaire. The subjective report of perceived job demand (Lazarus, 1966) was raised as a potential problem in the underestimation of job content and mental strain. Strain was measured using the Mental Strain Index (Gurin, Veroff & Feld (1960) and the Langner scale (1962). Analysis of the model supported the hypothesis that high demand and high control job (active jobs) would have the highest satisfaction among the respondents. Life dissatisfaction was also strongly correlated to the job characteristics. Karasek (1979) argued that implications of his model included improvement of job-related mental health by increasing the amount of decision-making an individual was given. It was later found that the amount of support workers received from their supervisor and colleagues acted as a mediator between demand and control, therefore extending the current model (Johnson & Hall, 1988).

Research regarding job control and the reduction of job stressors and strain is not always consistent (Kahn & Byosiere, 1990; Parkes, Mendham, & von Rabenau, 1994). The relationship between job demand and job control has also been inconsistent in later studies (Cox, 1993; Schreurs & Taris, 1998) and several studies report weak or no support for the model (Parkes, 1991; Van Der Doef & Maes, 1999; Beehr et al., 2001). Further, Beehr et al. (2001) argued that most researcher will “…not test for interactions or to accept main effects of job demands plus main effects of control as sufficient evidence for the theory” (p.116) and go on to state that without controlling for the
interaction between demand and control, there is simply no theory. In this case, main effects are not sufficient to imply a theory and demand and control are therefore simply stressors. In this regard, the lack of control or uncomfortable levels of autonomy as being simply specific stressors has been demonstrated as such (Jackson, 1983; Jackson, 1984). Beehr et al. (2001) concurred with this and found no evidence that demand and control should be regarded as dependent variables, but rather as two independent stressors. Even when support was added to the model, review of “high quality” studies found little support for the demand-control-support model (de Lange, Taris, Houtman & Bongers, 2003).

One major complaint with the usage of the demand-control model is that a large amount of studies supporting the theory use demands that are not in-line with theory or outcomes that are not specifically related to psychological strain (Beehr et al., 2001). Examples of this can be seen in Fox et al. (1991) study of bluecollar workers and Sargent and Terry’s (1998) application of the model to university employees. Further, the measure of job control in this era may not be in-line with Karasek’s constructs which were much broader, and future studies would ultimately benefit from specifying the control variables (Cooper et al., 2001; Wall, Jackson, Mularkey, & Parker, 1996).

**Job Demand Stressors**

A more thorough discussion of job demand stressors is incorporated into the literature review at this point, to make a connection between the theories discussed above, job satisfaction and psychological well-being. Several links between job demand
stressors, the process of stress and psychological well-being have been demonstrated in past studies (e.g. Oliver & Brough, 2002) and linked to some of the models discussed above. Job demand as a construct is potentially one of the most researched subject in organizational psychology (Cooper, Dewe, & O’Driscoll, 2001). This is perhaps because some well known and well studied theories such as the job demand-control model (Karasek, 1979) or appraisal of stressors in reason of a person’s capacities or resources (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) have been prominently displayed in organizational psychology literature (Sauter & Murphy, 1995). These models and other theories are important to understand the job demands that may result in distress for some individuals in their workplace (Cooper, Dewe & O’Driscoll, 2001). As mentioned earlier, not all demands causes distress, but in the case of this paper we will mostly focus on the demands that are indeed stressors, and have the potential for causing unhealthy outcomes.

Cartwright and Cooper (1997) delimit six different types of work related stressors: 1) factors intrinsic to the job itself, 2) roles in the organization, 3) relationships at work, 4) career development issues, 5) organizational factors, and 6) home-work interface. Excluding the last type, all work stressors are directly related to the workplace, while “home-work interface” deals with notions of work-family conflict, where roles between the family and work are mutually incompatible in some ways (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Cooper et al. (2001) agree that most of the research done inside of the work place about job demand stressors has mostly been done in organizational environments where the factors have been linked to negative impact on the employees. As organizations changed over the last century, researcher started focusing less on the
physical factors known as stressors and more on other forms of stressors. The disappearance of lifetime careers and the balance of job demands and family have also directed more studies on stressors (Cooper et al., 2001).

Since Cartwright and Cooper (1997) cover several important aspects of the workplace, and give directions to the stressors surveyed in the proposed study of field instructors, a closer look at each type is necessary. *Intrinsic job characteristics* linked to stressors are related to the content of the tasks (Kahn & Byosiere, 1990), as well as the work environment and scheduling. The amount of demand or control that an individual has on the job is also associated to this type. Earlier studies done in industrial settings showed that employees with fast-pace jobs or unpleasant working conditions were showing poorer mental health (Kornhauser, 1965). Intrinsic job characteristics such as noise, temperature of the work environment or vibrations from the machinery represented some of the earliest forms of stressors, followed by work hours and different hazards on the job (Cooper et al., 2001). For outdoor education professionals, long hours have been shown as the most important stressor in one study of Australian practitioners (Thomas, 2001). While respondents did not consider their work as being “often” stressful, several job characteristics (e.g. long hours, physical demands) were identified as stress contributor.

As seen in the Yerkes-Dodson Law, the amount of work (workload) demanded from an employee produces a certain amount of stress that may either result in heighten or lowered performance at work. The workload that is optimal per person is different for each individual and deviating from this range may lead to strain (Cooper et al., 2001). It
is also important to make a distinction between the quality and the quantity of the workload, especially in the context of the proposed study. Quantity of the workload simply refers to the amount of hours and the time frame to complete these. Relationships between work hours and overall health has been negatively associated to longer hours on the job (Sparks, Cooper, Fried, & Shirom, 1997). However, the quality of the workload, or “qualitative” workload, are directly associated to psychological strain and the affective reactions of an individual. It is suggested that qualitative workload are more often associated with consequences such as depression or job dissatisfaction (Udris, 1981, cited in International Labour Office, 1986), and linked to burnout in some respects (Leitner & Maslach, 1988).

The perception of workload is what gives life to the stress-coping mechanism, which may result in strain or diminish performance (Cooper et al., 2001, Lazarus et al., 1985). This is why job characteristics may not automatically be perceived as stressors by all individuals, and understanding which job characteristics create the most negative reactions from employees in the workplace, can lead to a better understanding of the factors contributing to distress in a particular environment (Cooper et al., 2001, Melamed et al., 1995).

These studies of job characteristics are also in line with the theory of P-E fit, where a person will ultimately have less chance of developing distress if the match between the organization and the worker is appropriate and meets the person’s ability, needs and skills (Edwards & Rothbard, 2005). This may apply particularly to individuals who work in high risk environment, such as soldiers or correctional facility personnel.
Cooper, Dewe, & O’Driscoll (2001) suggest conducting assessment of the workplace to determine a profile of the stressors, and more research needs to be done to understand the combination of hazardous stressors on individuals.

Risky or hazardous stressors have definitely been under researched over the years, as researchers have mainly focus on chronic stressors. Chronic stressors can be explained as the elements that are generally part of someone’s job, such as supervisor, colleagues and organizational structure (Beehr & Newman, 1978). One reason for the lack on interest in “traumatic job stressors” may be that chronic job stressors are easier to assess, since they generalize themselves to more workplace (Jex, 1998). However, chronic stressors may not be the most problematic for certain occupations, including employment in emergency services, correctional facilities and even teaching jobs (Jex, 1998). A wide range of stressors can be considered traumatic, in comparison to the normal range of job stressors that most workers has to deal with (Hillenberg & Wolf, 1988). The research about human healthcare professionals has been more prominent on the subjects, especially in reason of concepts such as burnout (Cooper et al., 2001), or more recently studied: vicarious trauma (Conant, 2007). It has been reported that the unusual situations that human service professionals deal with, such as death and suffering, may have profound effects on them (Payne & Firth-Cozens, 1987). The lack of research on this subject raises some concerns since the strain associated to these stressors may differ from chronic stressors, and there is a lack of understanding for professionals working in more traumatic fields of employment (Allen & Jex, 1995; Jex, 1998).
The importance of organizational roles in job stressors surrounds the behaviors on demands placed on an individual in reason of the tasks asked from his or her job. Role ambiguity and role conflict were first associated to this stressor (Kahn et al., 1964), which has direct relationships to psychological strain (O’Driscoll & Beehr, 1994; Schaubroeck, Cotton, & Jennings, 1989). This is also heightened in the case of role ambiguity (Jackson & Schueler, 1985). Role ambiguity refers to the lack of clarity in the role, especially the consequences associated to the unpredictability of one’s performance and the lack of information (Cooper, Dewe & O’Driscoll, 2001). In the case of role conflicts, four different kinds of conflicts were found, which includes intrasender (one person communicating different expectations), intersender (two or more people communicate different expectations), person-role (differences between values and expectations for the worker) and inter-role (conflict between two roles that one person occupies) (Quick & Quick, 1984).

A third variable can be directly associated to this last type of role ambiguity-conflict type. It is the role overload or the amount of roles a person is expected to perform. In position of role overload, an individual may doubt his or abilities to perform adequately the demands, creating uncertainty for the employee, which has been connected to psychological and physiological well-being (Cooper, 1987). An important finding in the case of role ambiguity came from O’Driscoll and Beehr’s (1994) study, which found that role ambiguity was significantly related to job satisfaction (reduced) and psychological well-being (reduced).
Finally, organizational role as a type of stressor looks at responsibilities of a worker, including the amount or quality of the responsibility. For example, individuals in charge of other people’s life may well have to deal with higher psychological strain. Cooper et al. (2001) raised interesting questions that still need to be answered on this subject, including the level of importance for things (equipment) versus people (manager) responsibility, and the differences in perceived and actual levels of responsibility.

*Work relationships*, including the role of support related to job strain have been studied and argued among researcher for quite some time now. While the exact role of work relationship may not be completely mapped out, negative relationships in the workplace may result in negative outcomes for several individuals (e.g. Motowildo, Packard, & Manning, 1986) and social support may bring relief from job strain (Beehr & McGrath, 1992). Social support may take the form of group cohesion, interpersonal trust or liking from a supervisor (McLean, 1979), creating some interesting dynamic when studying individual differences, especially in terms of amount of supervision (O’Driscoll & Beehr, 1994). Difficulties in work relationships may also be exacerbated by the presence of “abrasive personality” in the workplace, a term coined by Levinson (1978) to define individuals that are generally harder to function with, due to some personality traits such as perfectionist, high-driven and condescending. These may even be harder to deal with when the leadership style of a supervisor resembles the abrasive personality type. The autocratic and authoritarian style of leadership has been linked to inducing strain in workers (e.g. Ashour, 1982). When a supervisor puts more importance on the
task at the expense of relationships, the potential for strain becomes even higher (O’Driscoll & Beehr, 1994).

Job insecurity, feeling under-promoted or over-promoted and a general sense of lack of goal achievement are categorized as career development stressors (Cooper et al., 2001). Feelings of low achievement inside an organization or in someone’s personal career path may become a stressor for some people (Rabinowitz, Falkenbach, Travers, Valentine, & Weener, 1983). This may be even greater for minority group and women, who are still the subject of employment discrimination in the workplace (Cooper et al., 2001). As our world changes, especially in light of the recent economic downfall of the American society, such as the recent “credit crunch”, job insecurity is more present than ever. Mergers and downsizing between and inside organizations may lead to organizational conflicts (e.g. interpersonal conflict, resistance to change), and individual strain (Cameron, Freeman, & Mishra, 1993). Finally, the lack of promotional opportunities is often cited has a source of stressor for many employees (Jewell, 1998).

The inside culture of an organization may be received differently by each individual, and mismatched or unhealthy organizational culture may result as stressors. Organizational factors can be linked, but not limited to the amount of participation people have in an organization’s decision process, the structure of the managerial team or the organizational politics (Cooper et al., 2001). The job demand-control model supports the idea that a lack of decision making in an organization may lead to higher strain (Karasek, 1979). These stressors take many aspects, such as feeling that one is unable to make changes in their organization (Kelly & Cooper, 1981), negative communication
between employees (O’Driscoll & Cooper, 1996) or lack of participation in the creation of office politics (Cooper et al., 2001).

Finally, the *home-work interface* deals with the management between job roles and other life domains (Cooper et al., 2001). This issue has received more attention in the last decade or so (Cooper & Lewis, 1998), as changes in our world modify the structure of the workplace. For example, cell phones and home computers have allowed individuals to work from home, potentially blurring the line between their work and home roles (Hill, Miller, Weiner, & Colihan, 1998). In return, psychological strain has been increasing as our access to technology increases (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1992; O’Driscoll, Ilgen, & Hildreth, 1992).

One type of role conflict described by Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) is the possibility of strain because of emotional interference between domains of life to another domain, such as work to family. Job conditions, including workload or job insecurity can spillover in daily interactions with the family as a result of emotional consequences, such as feelings of uncertainty at work (Menaghan, 1991). Further, gender differences have been found in job stressors, especially in the home-work interface type of stressor (Cooper, Dewe & O’Driscoll, 2001), which may be a reason for more research on the subject.

*Work-Life Balance*

Before we approach the concepts of job satisfaction, job demands and psychological well-being, one more area needs to be discussed in more details. That is
work-life balance, also called work-home interface. While different constructs related to
work stress have been studied in the industrial and organizational literature (e.g. job
performance, burnout, role conflict, person-fit), research has especially paid attention to
job satisfaction in relation to work-family conflict (Bruck et al., 2002). The meaning and
satisfaction that an individual has for his or her work is undoubtedly linked to the quality
of life that this individual has outside of work, creating a more holistic vision of work and
non-work life (Dugdill, 2000). If one is dissatisfied with the work to perform, there is a
strong possibility that this dissatisfaction will affect other domain of his or her life
(Landy, 1992; Schlenker & Gutek, 1987). This is explained by the fact that life outside of
work may affect life inside of work and the reverse is also true, making this a
bidirectional relation (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). This concept is most often referred to
as spillover, one facet of the work-life interference (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

The term work-life balance has taken many directions since Kahn et al. first
studied work-family conflicts in 1964. At the time, the term “life” in work-life balance,
referred to a more traditional family idea, with women staying at home with the children
and the men has the traditional breadwinner (Hayghe, 1990). While the theory of work-
home interference is still very applicable to the workforce of the 21st century, it also
continues to evolve to meet the needs of the present workforce (Bruck, Allen, & Spector,
2002). These include a more balance presence of women in the workforce (Hayghe,
1997), single-income parents, dual-income family (Casy & Pitt-Catsouphes, 1994) and
single individuals without children and/or spouse. This last one may be most in-line with
field instructors working in wilderness therapy.
In a previous study of field instructors, findings have shown a majority of single workers, with fairly equal male to female ratio (Marchand et al., 2009). To establish a connection between this current knowledge of field instructors and the current work-life balance literature can be a challenge, especially in reference to the single status of a majority of instructors. The literature specifically concerning single individuals and work-life balance is scarce. Further, when adding the job characteristics of work in wilderness therapy programs, which includes non-typical working hours, risky situations and remote wilderness environment, the balance between work and life of single individuals seems to be underrepresented in the literature. However, the single status of several instructors should not imply that these individuals are not affected in their non-work life by the challenges of their job and that we should not strive at understanding their work-life conflicts. Further, there may be more individuals who are married and/or with children who may be interested by this type of work, but do not know how to manage both life and work. Some authors have raised the possibility that there may be more difficulties for individuals caring for children (Ford, Heinen, and Langkamer (2007). However, this hypothesis does not take into consideration the need for single individuals to create relationships, form intimate bonds, and pursue other interests. Erikson’s life stage theory (1959) supports the need for intimacy in the average age of field instructors, as found in previous studies (Kirby, 2006; Marchand et al., 2009).

The home-work interference job demand stressors, relates directly to the conflicts that may arise from having to juggle roles at work and outside of work (Cooper et al., 2001). With the advancement of technology, which has lead to more people working
from home and being in constant contact with their work environment, the chances of inter-role conflicts are greatly enhanced (Hill et al., 1998). This inter-role conflict has been linked to an increase in psychological strain as well (Frone et al., 1992), making it a subject of interest in the home-work interference literature.

Work-family conflict is one type of inter-role conflict, where demands from the work roles are incompatible or clash with the non-work roles (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985; Kahn et al., 1964). Greenhaus and Beutell (1985) have identified three types of conflicts. **Time-based conflicts** relate to the amount of time and energy one activity may take over the responsibilities of another. **Behavior-based conflicts** happen when the expectations of one role are not compatible with the expectations of another role. An example of this would be when a field instructor treats a spouse the same way one would with clients in the field. Finally, **strain-based conflicts** happen when the emotions from one role interfere into another role, such as in the role of a spouse or parent. This may happen from the work to life perspective (Menaghan, 1991) as well as being carried over from life to work domains (Higgins & Duxbury, 1992).

**Spillover**

Through research about spillover, three potential hypotheses exist about the work and family conflict (Rice, Near, & Hunt, 1980). The first one states that job and family are positively related. The second states that job and family are negatively related. Finally the third one states that job and family are unrelated. The first two hypotheses are generally more accepted and studied in the research literature. The last hypothesis may be
more in-line wit earlier research that disregarded the presence of home roles when measuring job performance or job satisfaction in employees (Kanter, 1977). The bidirectional nature of inter-role conflicts supposes that work-family conflicts may spillover from work to family and family to work (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

However, the term spillover is used loosely here, since it is used differently in the literature to discuss different aspects of work-home interference. One definition explains spillover has a moderator between experiences from one life domain to another life domain and psychological distress (Barnett & Marshall, 1992; Kirchmeyer, 1992). This definition also makes a distinction to “contagion”, which refers to a person’s subjective experiences of emotions in one life domain, which may affect or transfer those emotions into another life domain, affecting another area of life (Bolger, DeLongis, Kessler, & Wethington, 1989). An example of this may include someone who feels resentment towards a supervisor’s decision, and acts out his or her frustrations in the presence of a spouse.

Spillover has also been studied in the context of role stress theory, where the pressure from one role is incompatible with the pressure from another role (Kahn et al., 1964; Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Role enhancement theory has also served as a framework for the study of spillover, following the positive hypothesis of spillover. In this case, the role from one domain brings reward or positive outcome into another domain such has improved social relationships, self-esteem and accomplishment (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). Spillover, in the case of role stress theory and role enhancement theory, may originate from any of the life domain (i.e. work and non-work life) and may have
positive or negative outcomes on the role demands. From these theories, four different possibilities of spillover have evolved from the study of work-life interference. These include negative work→home spillover, negative home→work spillover, positive work→home spillover and positive family→work spillover. While the proposed research of field instructors is mainly interested in the relationship evolving from job demand stressors, more specifically negative work→home spillover, understanding all four types of spillover is important in relation to the outcomes from different types of spillover (Frone et al., 1992). Frone (2003) advocates to this regard that work-family conflict will cause the outcomes to take place in the family domain and family-work conflict outcomes will reside in the work domain. This would mean that in the case of a negative spillover from work to family, examples of outcomes could be marital dissatisfaction or poor family role performance. While in the case of family to work spillover, the conflict would create negative outcomes at work, such as job dissatisfaction, or lowered work performance (Kinnunen, Feldt, Geurts, & Pulkkinen, 2006). However, the studies are inconsistent on this subject, since work-family spillover has been linked highest in the work domain in a recent meta-analysis where job burnout was highly correlated (0.42) with work-family conflict (Allen, Herst, Bruck, & Sutton, 2000). Another study also showed that work-family conflict predicted negative job satisfaction and psychological symptoms (Kinnunen, Geurts, & Mauno, 2004).

No matter if spillover is negative or positive, it may involve skills, behavior patterns, strain, emotions, beliefs and attitudes (Geurts & Demerouti, 2003). Research has also shown that “both dimensions of work-family conflict are related to mental health,
physical health, and health-related behavior of employees” (Kinnunen et al., 2006, p. 150), supporting the connection between job demands and psychological well-being. This is also very much in line with the connection of job demand stressors and work-home interference as fitting into cognitive, emotional or physical well-being (Peeters, de Jonge, Janssen, & van der Linden, 2004).

Among the four types of spillover, the most often studied effect relates to the negative spillover from work to family (Kinnunen, Feldt, Geurts, & Pulkkinen, 2006). This type of conflict has also been shown to occur more often and more severely than any other type of spillover (Frone, 2003; Geurts & Demerouti, 2003). One study found that work-to-family conflict was three times more severe in participants with a spouse and/or children (Frone et al., 1992). This may sound contradictory to the proposed study and the belief that single and living alone individuals have similar levels of work-home interference as individuals in relationships or in the role of parents. However, the distinction here is in the different types of conflicts, more specifically the stressors associated to the job characteristics rather than the level of stress for each conflict (Karasek, 1979). This concept is challenging to compare since the importance that an individual puts on a conflict is very much subjective (Diener, Lucas, & Oishi, 2005) and it is understandable that some individuals may perceive their job stressors as much more demanding than someone else’s job stressors.

In the study of home work balance, a possible explanation for the more frequent occurrence of spillover from work to family, as mentioned above, resides in the fact that our society regards “good” employees has those individuals that do not think about
family when at work. Therefore, study participants may be less incline to mention family to work spillover. However, a “good” employee will think about work at home and potentially let it interfere with life outside of work (Gutek, Searle, & Klepa, 1991). This is even more severe with the place that new technologies seem to have in our present society, intensifying the permeability between life and work domains (Valcour & Hunter, 2005).

**Person-Environment Fit Theory**

While *Person-Environment Fit Theory* was explained earlier, further connection to work-life balance is warranted. As mentioned earlier, role stress theory and role enhancement theory have both been used to explain the negative and positive spillover associated to work-home interference. Edwards and Rothbard (2005) suggest that the P-E fit theory may be used to study stress in various situations, including home-work interference. Further, the usage of this theory may also reflect a broader understanding of the term families, incorporating individuals with biological ties and social custom, such as non-married individuals (Edwards & Rothbard, 2000; Piotrkowski, Rapoport, & Rapoport, 1987). Also, several constructs conceptualizing the P-E fit theory: objective and subjective demands and abilities, needs and supplies, coping and defense, and strain and illness, can be explain in terms of work family, where family is explain as a broader context (Edwards & Rothbard, 2005).

Job demands can incorporate several facets of work such as tasks requirements or supervisory role. Family demands also incorporate several roles such as parenting,
household chores or other family expectations. The abilities for demands at work and at home can be seen as equivalent, either in qualitative or quantitative workload, and the fit between the demands and abilities can be seen across work-family (Edwards & Rothbard, 2005). For example, the demand of taking care of clients on an extended therapeutic expedition can be frame at the same level than taking care of an aging parent may be.

Needs in the family context (e.g. companionship, the desire to have children) and needs in a work context (e.g. job characteristics, relationships with colleagues), are equivalent to the supplies required to fit the needs. This comparison between needs and supplies can be conceptualized the same way the demands abilities are conceived in the context of the P-E fit theory. In terms of strain and illness, behavioral, psychological or physiological strain can be observed in the work or family context, and outcomes are not specific to one domain of life. Example of outcomes may include absenteeism or anxiety at work or at home. As well, high blood pressure or cardiovascular disease “…refer to the whole person and cannot be differentiated into work and family counterparts” (Edwards & Rothbard, 2005, p. 228). The same misfit or fit between coping and defense is also related to work and home domains in the P-E fit theory. To explain this in response to an increase in job demand, someone may increase the skills necessary to meet this job demand. In the family context, a caretaker for an aging parent may hire a nurse to cope with the amount of time necessary to take care of the aging parent.
Specific Variables

Studies have shown several differences in the study of work and home balance, including differences through gender (e.g. Geurts & Demerouti, 2003; Grzywacz & Marks, 2000), marital status (e.g. Bolger et al., 1989; Barnett, Marshall, & Pleck, 1992) and life cycles (e.g. Higgins, Duxbury, & Lee, 1994). While more recent studies have shown less differences in gender as a moderator (Ford et al., 2007; Frone et al., 1992), earlier studies were reporting differences between women and men, where family roles for women were more likely to spillover into work and work was more likely to spillover into family for men (Pleck, 1977). There is evidence that women and men perceive their work differently, where men may attach more importance to their work role (Cinamon & Rich, 2002). The gender variable will be tested in the proposed study for differences in perceived levels of job demand stressors and in relation to the constructs of job satisfaction and psychological well-being. The association to work-home balance may not be imply generality from this study, but may lead to some interesting findings that could be further explored.

In regards to the age of participants, individuals targeted for the study of wilderness therapy field instructors, are expected to be averaging late 20’s in age (Marchand et al., 2009). Life-cycle stages have been linked to difficulties between work and home demands in several studies (e.g. Higgins et al., 1994; Keith & Schafer, 1991; Schnittger & Bird, 1990). The life-cycle theory has been studied to look at transition in adulthood (Aldous, 1978; Levinson, 1978), which was argued to have been absent from previous developmental theories (i.e. Freud and Piaget) that assumed that most
development was completed by adolescence (Levinson, 1978). However, life-cycle stages are also conceptualize differently in various study, where for example, one study measured life cycles in terms of the age of children at home and not the age of the respondents (Higgins et al., 1994). Differences in age, unrelated to the marital or parenting status of the sample, seems to be an area in need of more research, in reason of the difficulty in conducting this current review of home and work interface literature.

**Hours at Work**

The work demands in wilderness therapy include long rotations that may range from a couple days to a couple weeks on duty, followed by a smaller amount of days off. On a daily basis, field instructors are on duty 24 hours a day, sharing the safety and management of clients in wilderness therapy programs with a small group of field instructors (Marchand et al., 2009). The amount of hours spent at work has been linked to an increase in recovery time needed outside of work, where the longer the hours spent at work, the longer the recovery time is needed (Geurts & Demerouti, 2003). Depue and Monroe (1986) argued that the amount of time an individual needs to unwind from work may be a better predictor of the perceive levels of job demand stressors, than the strain associated to those stressors. The need for recovery was also linked to age and gender in another study, where the older the individuals, the more recovery time was needed, and men demanded more recovery time than women (Jansen, Kant, & van der Brandt, 2002). Further, the more strenuous one perceives their work, the higher the recovery time needed for employees. On the long run, individuals who are unable to recover from the
long work hours risk lowering their psychological well-being. In the case of field instructors, we might speculate that the intensive long working days that these individuals perform will increase the recovery time necessary to be mentally healthy, therefore lowering their psychological well-being. In the eight day on/six days off model of work schedule known from some wilderness therapy programs (Marchand et al., 2009), the necessary amount of time required to unwind from a course may impede on the total amount of time that these individuals have to meet the needs of their non-work roles. The proposed study is planning to collect data on the work schedule of participating field instructors, which in return can be compared to the level of perception of job demand stressors, as well as psychological well-being and job satisfaction. A possibility would be to include a question in the survey concerning the perceive amount of time that individual believe they need to unwind from their work as field instructors. This would be in line with Dupue and Monroe’s (1986) theory, as cited above.

Some interesting reasons have been giving for people to choose to work long working hours. One of them is that these people are potentially choosing to be away from their home environment to avoid dealing with the stress associated with it (Hochschild, 1997). This is an interesting theory that might be more related to individual personality, a construct that will not be studied in the proposed study. Other theories include the need to support home monetarily, where people get accustomed to a certain amount of income and changing the habits that may result from a pay cut might be difficult to do (Reynolds, 2003; Brett & Stroh, 2003). Another possibility is the rush that people get from working, possibly linked to feeling further needed at work than at home (Brett & Stroh, 2003;
Reich, 2001). This is an interesting theory in reason of the work performed in human services such as wilderness therapy. It has been suggested that individuals who choose this line of work may do so to fulfill personal need for psychotherapy (Rushton, 1987). The need to be helpful with clients can lead to unhealthy levels of involvement, contributing to stress (Acker, 1999; Borland, 1981), which is further linked to home life balance.

Job Satisfaction

Having to deal with burnout, vicarious trauma, secondary traumatic stress or simply the un-satisfaction of one’s work environment or excessive job demand stressors can be draining personally and for others surrounding us (www.conference-board.org). A study published in 2007 showed that less than half of American workers were satisfied with their work. Among these, less than 39% of employees under 25 years old were satisfied with their work situation. While several variables may be responsible for this number, this statistic is worth considering, especially in relation to the average age of field instructors (Kirby, 2006; Marchand, 2006).

This area of study became quite prominent in the 60’s, when Vroom (1964) introduced the expectancy theory, sometimes referred to as the theory of job satisfaction (Latham & Budworth, 2007). Best known for its motivational implications, the theory implies two factors: 1) an individual’s perception that he or she will achieve a particular outcome and 2) how attractive that outcome is for that individual. The more likely a
person is to connect to those outcomes, the more likely that person will put the required efforts to make it happen.

Locke (1976) defines job satisfaction has the “results from the perception that one’s job fulfills or allows the fulfillment of one’s important job values” (p.1307). Job satisfaction has been considerably explored in relation to organizational and personal factors. Early research findings by Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959) reported that job satisfaction was predicted by two factors: motivational (e.g. achievement, personal satisfaction, learning new skills) and hygiene (e.g. work conditions, management, commuting time). Another theory, “performance causes satisfaction” (Porter & Lawler, 1968), was later contested has more plausible (Cherrington et al., 1971), despite the fact that an individual’s high performance does not always mean is or her satisfaction for the job (Locke, 1985). A more recent study, found that the relationship between job satisfaction and performance was also moderated by psychological well-being (Wright, Cropanzano & Bonnett, 2007). This could justify further exploration to “the age-old quest to better understand the happy/productive worker” (Wright, Cropanzano & Bonnett, 2007, p.93). While the above research was in relation to psychological well-being and performance, recent research has also studied job satisfaction in relation to family (Bruck et al., 2002; Judge & Ilies, 2004), work and cultural values (Brown, 2002), organizational commitment and turnover (Swagar, 1997; Lawrence, Glidden & Jobe, 2006), health (Faragher, Cass & Cooper, 2005) and social role and gender (Eichinger, 2000).
One major question on the subject is how important is job satisfaction to the psychological well-being of an individual (Brief & Atieh, 1987). Desirable work conditions may include mental challenge, appropriate level of physical work, fair promotions or rewards, facilitate work goals, leads to self-esteem and feeling supported in the work place (Locke, 1976). While, similarly to psychological well-being, the perception of meaningful work is very much a cultural value (Kasl, 1978), it is also essential to the definition of people’s lives in the United-States (Landy, 1992). The satisfaction of one’s work goes beyond the earlier research on productivity and performance (Landy, 1992), and studies have shown that less than meaningful jobs may reduce well-being in individuals (e.g. Schlenker & Gutek, 1987). In the study of psychological well-being and job satisfaction, one must be cautious in measuring this construct without knowledge of how important is job satisfaction to the psychological well-being of an individual (Cooper et al., 2001). This implies that the study of such concepts may have to be tailored to individual and interpretation of the results must be done with reserve (Cooper et al., 2001).

Numerous studies have shown a link between work-family conflicts and different constructs of satisfaction and well-being (see Allen et al., 2000; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998 for reviews). For some researchers, work-home interference should not be seen as a causal relationship, but there is reason to believe that these constructs are related (Kinnunen et al., 2004). For example, the congruence hypothesis about job satisfaction and family satisfaction, positively links the two because each variables share a common cause or causes (Morf, 1989). In another case, work-home interference partially mediates
the relationship between job stressors and mental health of employees (i.e. exhaustion), confirming the link between job stressors and strain (Peeters et al., 2004; Schaufeli & Enzmann, 1998).

Several models of work-family interface propose that job satisfaction and family satisfaction are caused by a unique set of common antecedents and in return, indicate psychological well-being (Frone, Russell, & Cooper, 1994). However, several studies have also shown that job satisfaction was negatively related to work-family conflict (Netemeyer, Boles, & McMurrian, 1996; Rice, Frone, & McFarlin, 1992). In this case, studies have mainly looked at job satisfaction globally, that is without concern for different aspects of work, such as pay, promotion or supervision (Kinnunen et al., 1996). One study that did look at nine different facets of job satisfaction, found that specific composites of job satisfaction were more related to work-family conflict than simply assessing the global satisfaction of the work (Bruck et al., 2002). The same study also reported a stronger correlation between job satisfaction and work-family conflict. Further, behavior-based conflicts were more related to job satisfaction than time and strain based-conflicts (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985), possibly suggesting that workers who’s behaviors were effective at work but not so much at home, were less satisfied with their job (Bruck et al., 2002). This finding may be of some significance for field instructors and other human service workers alike who adopt very distinct behaviors while working with clients in a therapeutic intent. These behaviors may not function in home settings, potentially leading individual to feeling dissatisfied with their job as the above theory suggests.
In a study of job satisfaction of counselors in a summer camp for disabled children and adults, stress/exhaustion and problems with management were most frequently cited as reasons for not returning to camp, while enjoyment working with campers and relationships with co-workers were ranked highest as reasons to return (Lawrence et al., 2006). In another study of camp counselors, individuals between 22 and 27 years old ranked job experience and stimulation as the most important factors influencing their job satisfaction (Magnuson, 1992). The factors affecting job satisfaction in camp counselors are a direct link to field instructors who have comparable job characteristics. In this regard, Lawrence et al (2006) raised an important point in their study concerning the age of respondents. “All participants were in the 15-25 years age range, a time when rapid life changes are typical.” (p.77). There is an important distinction to make between the seasonal nature of camp work and the typically non-seasonal schedule of wilderness therapy instructors. Yet, because of similarity in age range of camp counselors and field instructors, job satisfaction may be confounded by age in wilderness therapy, as it has been shown to do in camp counselors (Magnuson, 1992; Paisley & Powell, 2007). In other similar areas such as recreation, two studies concerning program administrators were found in relation to job satisfaction (Zhang, DeMichele, & Connaughton, 2004; Smucker & Kent, 2004). Smucker and Kent (2004) found that recreation administrators were less satisfied than sports administrators in regards to promotions, co-workers and their overall job. They also concluded that the recreation work environment may lead to lower job satisfaction and that further investigations needed to be done. The connections between summer camps, recreation
programming and other connected areas of wilderness therapy, may be helpful in understanding how the work environment affect the job satisfaction of field instructors.

Job Expectations

It has been demonstrated that emphasizing the positive aspects of a job and minimizing the negative characteristics may lead employees to job dissatisfaction, absenteeism, turnover and lack of organizational commitment (Kottler, 1986; Lee, Ashford, Walsh & Mowday, 1992; Schein, 1978). There is also evidence that the reduction of job expectations will allow newcomer to better handle the job demand stressors associated with their work (Buckley, Fedor, Veres, Wiese and Carraher, 1998). The implementation of realistic job preview (RJP) and expectation-lowering procedures (ELP) has shown positive results in a variety of studies. The idea behind the combination of an RJP and ELP is that in lowering expectations about an organization and the work to perform, newcomers are better prepared for the reality of the job (Buckley, Fedor, Veres, Wiese & Carraher, 1998). In two experimental studies, newly hired applicants who had been randomly assigned to RJP and/ or ELP, showed lower expectations and higher tenure following the treatment (Buckley, Fedor, Veres, Wiese & Carraher, 1998; Buckley et al., 2002). While one study did not show differences in organizational commitment, RJP and ELP treatments did affect job satisfaction in a positive direction. While some fear exists that by exposing the reality of a job to newly hire, these individuals may decide to decline a job offer, studies have shown that fear not to be true (Wanous, 1973; Meglino, Denisi & Ravlin, 1993). RJP and ELP have yet to be tested in wilderness
therapy settings. In consideration of the high voluntary turnover rates of field instructors, this may be a suitable avenue to prevent burnout and deception in staff.

When newcomers experience unfulfilled expectations and deception, it is referred to as “reality shock” (Hughes, 1958). This happens when a newcomer forms expectations about his or her work prior to being employed and these expectations are significantly different after working for that organization (Dean et al., 1985). Dean also recommends that organization screen applicants with unrealistic expectations and hire those that best match the reality of the job demands (Dean et al., 1985). While this may be one solution to reducing unfulfilled expectations and consequently, premature voluntary turnover, the usage of an RJP or/and ELP might be more appropriate (Premack & Wanous, 1985).

The role of realistic expectations in newcomers has also been linked to positive adjustment inside an organization. In return, positive adjustment has indicated low distress among newcomers, high job involvement and high job satisfaction (Nelson et al., 1988). While the role of realistic job preview has mostly been to educate future employees about the actual work to perform and policies of an organization, there is some evidence that preparing newcomer for the job demand stressors will actually reduce distress, increase job satisfaction and increase job involvement (Nelson & Sutton, 1991). Particularly, it is the underestimation of job demand stressors rather than simply misestimating the actual stressors that causes the most problems for newcomers (Nelson & Sutton, 1991).
Psychological Well-Being

In the scope of this study, underestimation of job stressors concerning work-home conflicts, time pressure and job scope has been linked to higher levels of distress (Nelson & Sutton, 1991).

In the light of these findings concerning distress and newcomer expectations of job demand stressors (Nelson & Sutton, 1991), literature concerning occupational health psychology has started to pay attention to the psychological well-being of workers (Wright & Cropanzano, 2000). According to Cooper et al. (2001), one of the most common measure of psychological well-being related to work is job satisfaction. A recent meta-analysis on job satisfaction and health showed that mental or psychosocial problems were increasingly associated with job satisfaction than physical complaints (Faragher, Cass & Cooper, 2005). The same study also found that employees with low job satisfaction were more likely to experience burnout and mild levels of depression and/or anxiety. Most researchers have studied well-being in termed of subjective well-being, where “the individual alone … determines the standards and criteria by which to evaluate her or his life.” (Christopher, 1999, p.143) The two components of subjective well-being are satisfaction with life and affective balance. The first component is largely based on cultural values and varies greatly across societies (Bond, 1986; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). The same thing is true for affective balance, where differences in the way that people think of themselves vary greatly from Western to Non-Western cultures (Christopher, 1999).

The measure of psychological well-being has been the subject of countless studies.
in the last 50 years (Dupuy, 1984; de Jonge et al., 2001; Grossi et al., 2006; Ryff, 1989; Ryff, 1995; Wright & Bonett, 2007; Wright & Cropanzano, 2000; Wright et al., 2007).

Ryff (1989) introduced this alternative approach, which includes six subscales as measures of psychological well-being: autonomy, environmental mastery, positive relations with others, purpose of life, personal growth and self-acceptance. These were later criticized by Christopher (1999) has being embedded in western culture and unrepresentative of a diversifying population. Christopher (1999) also points out that well-being is a subjective notion and there may never be one universal measure available that will stand for all different cultures.

One of the most common measure of psychological well-being related to work is job satisfaction (Cooper et al., 2001). One major question on the subject is how important is job satisfaction to the psychological well-being of an individual (Brief & Atieh, 1987). Desirable work conditions may include feelings of mental challenge, appropriate level of physical work, fair promotions or rewards, facilitative work goals, increase in self-esteem and supportive individuals in the work place (Locke, 1976). While, similarly to psychological well-being, the perception of meaningful work is very much a cultural value (Kasl, 1978), and it is also essential to the definition of many people’s lives in the United-States (Landy, 1992). The satisfaction of one’s work goes beyond the earlier research on productivity and performance (Landy, 1992), and studies have shown that less than meaningful jobs may reduce well-being of individuals (e.g. Schlenker & Gutek, 1987). In the study of psychological well-being and job satisfaction, one must be cautious in measuring this construct without knowledge of how important is
job satisfaction to the psychological well-being of an individual (Cooper et al., 2001). This implies that the study of psychological well-being and job satisfaction may have to be tailored individually for the findings to be significant, and interpretation of the results must be done with reserve in light of this knowledge (Cooper et al., 2001).

Summary of the Literature Review

While research has shown positive results concerning outcomes in wilderness therapy (Clark et al., 2004; Doucette, 2004; Russell, 2001; Russell, 2007), the situation of field instructors is still largely un-documented. In light of the amount of time that field instructors spend in the remote wilderness areas, working with troubled adolescent, understanding the affect of the job demand stressors on their well-being is warranted in the interest of wilderness therapy organizations and employees alike. Human service professionals such as social workers, therapist and child welfare workers have all been linked to challenging job demand stressors in result of their work characteristics. Human service workers have been extensively studied in reason of the prevalence to burnout as a consequence of the nature of their work (Maslach, 1976). Stressful work environments, including a high demand for compassion with low gratification, have made human service professions more likely to be subject of psychological stressors (Bermak, 1977; Farber & Heifetz, 1982).

While field instructors are not responsible for the therapeutic assessment of the clients, they are spending their daily work time in the same condition has their clients (Russell & Hendee, 2000). It is also likely that the time spent in the field with students is
generally more extensive for field instructors than the time therapists spend with clients. Another insight to the problem at hand comes from the theory of post-expedition adjustment (Allison, 2000), a potential explanation to some of the weekly job demand stressors that may result from work-home conflicts and distress at work (Nelson & Sutton, 1991). While the theory was constructed around students, one might think that the reasoning can be applicable to leaders as well. Preliminary research has demonstrated that difficulties outside the work setting resulting from job demand stressors were more prevalent among field instructors than were difficulties inside the work setting (Marchand, 2006). To solidify this argument, previous research on outdoor leaders and human service worker is a source of information connecting field instructors. Thomas (2001) found that the difficulty of holding relationship was an important issue for outdoor educator. The difficulty of balancing life and work was also suggested several researcher (Allin, 2004; Kirby, 2006; Marchand, 2006).

The current research gives strong argument concerning the job demand stressors of working in human service professions as well as outdoor programming professions. We can only assume that wilderness therapy instructors have to juggle several job demand stressors related these different work environment. What is less understood is the effect that these job demand stressors have on job satisfaction and psychological well-being of instructors. Previous studies concerning newcomer expectations of job demand stressors (Nelson & Sutton, 1991), job satisfaction and psychological well-being (Wright & Bonett, 2007), as well as behavioral plasticity theory (Brockner, 1983, 1988; Lerner, 1984) will guide this research.
Chapter 3

Methods

Summary of Design

This mixed-method study consisted of a non-experimental quantitative and qualitative data collection of field instructors utilizing a retrospective pre-test/post test (see Figure 1). This study was primarily designed to explore newcomer field instructors’ expectations of job demand stressors, and their current job satisfaction and current psychological well-being. The study also collected qualitative information about initial training, job choice and organizational choice. Quantitative and qualitative assessments of these variables were conducted in August 2008 for field instructors who were working in an outdoor behavioral healthcare program delivering a wilderness therapy model.

The quantitative measurement of field instructors’ expectations of job demand stressors (independent variables), have been shown in previous studies to have a relation to their job satisfaction and psychological well-being (dependent variables) (Beehr, 1976; Henne & Locke, 1985; Kornhauser, 1965; Locke, 1976). Measurement for all variables was conducted once with participants who were working as a field instructor at an OBH program participating in this study.
Figure 1. Summary of Mixed-Methods Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey - Fall 2008 Administered Once</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 1: Quantitative measurements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job demand stressors (retrospective pre-test)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training preparedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 2: Qualitative measurement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training effectiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rationale*

A mixed-methods design was chosen to bring more depth to this study to achieve the research objectives. It is also argued that our knowledge of this area is still in its infancy level in the field of wilderness therapy and qualitative data collection lays the foundations in regards to initial training, job choice and organizational choice. The study seeks to add to a growing body of research in outdoor behavioral healthcare by integrating well-established theories in organizational psychology and human resources. In examining the relationship between job demand stressors, and the dependent variables job satisfaction and psychological well-being, the researcher utilized well documented instruments and a post + retrospective pretest design to measure job demand stressors as an effort to prevent response shift bias (Babcock, 1998; Howard, Ralph, et al., 1979). Since initial field instructor trainings generally prepares less than a dozen field instructors at a time, it would have been hard to obtain a large enough sample of instructors to
adequately test the relationships propose in the study in a reasonable time period. The initial trainings are also conducted irregularly throughout the year by each program as need arises, which also would have made it difficult for the researcher to develop a sufficient sample of field instructors during the time allocated for this study.

In 2006, Marchand looked at field instructors using a questionnaire to obtain descriptive data about field instructors and measure their perception of the difficulties they had with specific job demand previously linked to the professions of wilderness therapy (i.e. Bunce, 1998). While Marchand (2006) increased knowledge about field instructors working in wilderness therapy, the proposed mixed-methods seeks to bring more depth to her previous study, and rationale to the adjustment and responses of field instructors in reason of their expectations and current job demand stressors. This mixed-method study took a deductive approach to answer research questions and test hypotheses relating to newcomer’s expectations of the job demand stressors, which in return were believed to be related to job satisfaction and psychological well-being.

To complement the main research objectives of this study, the survey also collected qualitative information about the reasons that lead current field instructors to work in OBH, the reasons that lead them to work for their current program, and elements of satisfaction with their initial field instructor training. It was anticipated that the information collected from instructors about their training would complement the research objectives and expand knowledge of realistic and/or expectations of job demand stressors, as well as other variables relating to occupational health and organizational management of field instructors working in OBH programs. These exploratory variables
are related to the theory of job choice and organizational attraction, as well as workplace training satisfaction. This qualitative information collected in the survey was used descriptively to enhance the information generated from this study.

Section One: Quantitative Measurements

Section one consisted of a quantitative assessment utilizing a questionnaire that was administered at one point in time to all field instructors participating in this study during the Fall of 2008. A total of four constructs were measured during this section of the study: 1) expectations of job demand stressors, 2) current job demand stressors (independent variables), 3) job satisfaction, and 4) psychological well-being (dependent variables). A post + retrospective pretest approach was used to measure expectations and current job demand stressors and identify the direction of change in mean difference. This type of approach has been shown to reduce response-shift bias, which can occur when participant overestimate or underestimate their response because they do not have a good understanding of the knowledge or skills necessary to perform their work or to understand a concept (Bray, Maxwell & Howard, 1984; Sprangers & Hoogstraten, 1989).

Section Two: Qualitative Assessment

Open-ended questions were used to explore the reasons that lead current field instructors to work in OBH and the reasons that lead them to choose their current program. Information was based on collecting the three most important reasons that lead them to choose this field or work, as well as the three most important that lead them to
choose their specific program. To explore satisfaction with the initial training, field
instructors were asked to report the three most important elements of their initial training.
This information was reasoned to be complementary to the idea of realistic job preview,
including the importance of realistic expectations. Instructors were also asked to report
any elements they wish their training had included. The survey available in Appendix A
includes these questions as well.

**Null Hypotheses**

Null hypotheses for this study were:

Ho1: Current field instructors will not perceive their individual pre-employment
expectations of job demands as stressors.

Ho2: Current field instructors will not perceive their individual current job demands as
stressors.

Ho3: Current field instructors will not perceive their overall pre-employment
expectations of job demands as stressors.

Ho4: Current field instructors will not perceive their overall current job demands as
stressors.
Ho5: There will be no difference between the pre-initial training expectations of job demand stressors and the current job demand stressors of field instructors.

Ho6: Field instructors will be satisfied with their job.

Ho7: Field instructor’s psychological well-being will be positive.

Ho8: Field instructors’ expectations of job demand stressors will not be related to their job satisfaction.

Ho9: Field instructors’ expectations of job demand stressors will not be related to their psychological well-being.

Ho10: Field instructors’ current job demand stressors will not be related to their job satisfaction.

Ho11: Field instructors’ current job demand stressors will not be related to their psychological well-being.

Participants

All individuals contacted for participation in this study were employed as field instructors in eight participating OBHIC programs. The Outdoor Behavioral Healthcare
Industry Council (OBHIC) is an organization that was founded in 1997 to promote excellence in standards for wilderness treatment. Programs who are members of this council commit themselves to high standards such as being appropriately licensed, fair hiring practices of professional staff and fully disclosing the services and risks associated with this type of treatment. Among the programs that participated in this study, some have been in operation for over 20 years. All programs chosen for this study utilized wilderness therapy in their treatment approach. Finally, the programs operated under the expedition-based models as described by Russell and Hendee (2000). A total of 13 programs were contacted for this study and a total of eight programs agreed to participate in this study. Two programs declined participation based on very low numbers of field instructors available for survey completion at the time of the study and the remaining programs never responded to phone calls and emails. In August 2008, the programs that agreed to participate were sent an electronic template of the survey as well as generic survey administration procedures. Each electronic template of the survey was previously randomized in the section concerning current job demand stressor section. The usage of this particular purposive sampling method made it difficult to assess the total response rate, since each program employed a different total number of field instructors at the time of the study and did not supply the researcher with the number of individuals that declined to respond to the survey or were not present when the survey was administered. In relation to the total number of programs who agreed to participate in this study, the participation rate was estimated to be 62% of the programs, since eight out of 13 programs agreed to participate. Individual field instructor participation rate is estimated
to be above 90% for each individual program based on total number of field instructors estimated to be working for each program and the total number of surveys returned.

Table 1 reports a list of the programs participating in the study as well as the number of field instructors per program who participated. Field instructors were asked by a member of their respective program administration to volunteer for this study and a total of 186 individuals agreed to complete the survey. Participants consisted of both males (62%) and females (38%) and were between the ages of 19 and 59 years old with an average age of 27 years old. About 85% of participants were 30 years old or younger. A convenient sampling method was used and is justified by the small number of wilderness therapy programs available in North America, as well as the small number of field instructors working for these programs. While a random sample of field instructors would have been more appropriate for inferential statistics, the nature of this study and the participants did not allow for this.

Table 1. Programs who participated in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Programs</th>
<th>Number of participating field instructors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspen Academy</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cliff Accents</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three Rivers Montana</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUWS</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Sky</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Home Youth Ranch</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendigo</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instruments

Expectations of Job Demand Stressors

The use of a post + retrospective pretest design served in the creation of this instrument. To measure underestimation, overestimation and fulfilled expectations of job demand stressors, the measure of change was obtained from the post + retrospective pretest mean differences. This method has been shown to be a more accurate measure of change than regular prettest + posttest design (Howard & Dailey, 1979; Hoogenstraten, 1982). The instrument was based on the current Field Instructor Survey utilized in Marchand et al. study (2009) and was revised to include new items based on recommendations from the same study’s participants as well as expert opinion from OBH professionals. Items were also revised to improve wording and were randomly mixed in the instrument to include both positive and negative statements. The survey was reviewed by administration personal from the members of OBHIC, by current and past wilderness therapy field instructors and faculty members at the University of Minnesota. While reliable instruments already exist to measure job demand stressors in other professional areas, notably in the mental health care profession, the uniqueness of the skills and characteristics inherent to field instructing in the outdoors made it difficult to find one instrument that could be used or even modified for this purpose. In the end, 30 job demand stressors were chosen because they best represented wilderness therapy profession as explained above. Field instructors were asked to assess their agreement or disagreement of these job demand statements. While all items of the survey could be perceived has stressors, it is the assessment of each item by an individual that makes a
job demand a stressor or not a stressor. In the context of wilderness therapy work, the job demand is meeting the treatment goals of a client. Within this example, being able to meet the treatment goals may be perceived as more stressful by some individuals than others, ultimately leading in a job demand stressor for those individuals.

The creation of the proposed survey to measure expectations of job demand stressors in relation to job satisfaction and psychological well-being borrows some constructs from the theory of person-environment (P-E) fit (Lewin, 1951). The theory is concerned with individual interactions in organizations based on the “fit” with the work environment (Edwards & Rothbard, 1999). This notion derives from the social psychologist Kurt Lewin (1951), who raised the idea that people’s behaviors were a function of their interaction with certain situations (Jex, 1998). Stress occurs for an individual when the fit between the job and the organization does not match his or her abilities or preferences for the work (Kristof, 1996). In return, strain develops since there is a discrepancy between the perception and motivation of the worker and the job environment, and/ or the job demands, and/ or the abilities of an individual to perform the job (Caplan et al., 1975). This strain may manifest itself in psycho-social effects such as psychological well-being (Wright & Cropanzano, 2000) and job satisfaction (Locke, 1976). Different types of job demand stressors create different types of strain for different individuals (Cartwright & Cooper, 1997), depending on how they appraise these stressors and what kind of coping mechanism they may have developed previous to the exposure or from the exposure to these stressors (Lazarus, 1966).
The instrument developed, tested in Marchand et al. (2009) and refined for this study, served to answer these questions: 1) What were field instructor’s expectations of job demand stressors before the initial training and to what degree were they anticipating those stressors? and 2) What are the actual job demand stressors of field instructors and to what degree are these perceived as stressful? To answer these questions, the same instrument was used for the post and retrospective pretest, by changing the wording of the question from the present to the past.

The post survey asked field instructors: “Please circle the one number for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion about it.” Job demand stressors will be rated on a Likert type scale ranging from: 1 = Disagree very much, 2 = Disagree moderately, 3 = Disagree slightly, 4 = Agree slightly, 5 = Agree moderately and 6 = Agree very much. The same 6-point Likert scale was used for each instrument to produce comparable results. The use of the 6-point scale was chosen to match the scale used in the job satisfaction survey and reduce the burden for field instructors who participated in the study. It was also justified by having comparable scales for data analysis. The retrospective pretest followed and provided the same items but asked this question: “Before you started working as a wilderness therapy field instructor and before your initial training, how did you anticipate the following aspects of your job as a field instructor with your current program? Please circle the one number for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion about it” throughout the same Likert scale was used for the retrospective pretest (Goedhart & Hoogstraten, 1992).
Before administering this survey, copies of the survey were given to OBHIC for revision and feedback. The negative tone of some factors was brought up to attention by a variety of individuals involved in OBHIC. Concerns were raised that the negative wording of too many items would be discouraging to field instructors and lead to more negative results. Following this feedback from reviewers, the items were worded to include approximately equal number of positive and negative items for job demand stressors. The survey was also sent to a dozen previous field instructors who had worked for an OBH program. No significant feedback was given from these instructors, which resulted in no additional changes to the survey. The survey can be found in Appendix A.

*Job Choice and Organizational Choice*

In an attempt to further expand the knowledge concerning field instructors working in OBH programs, qualitative questions were included in the survey to explore their current job choice and organizational attraction. Participants were first asked to give in order the three most important reasons that lead them to work in OBH, and to work for their current program.

*Training Effectiveness*

In an attempt to better understand the role that the initial field instructor training had on lay variables in the study, the survey also looked at training occurrence and perception of specific training elements. Participants were asked to identify whether if they had participated and the length of initial training at their program. Elements of
effectiveness were explored by asking participants what they believed were the three most important elements of their training. Participants were also asked in an open-ended question what items they wish their training had included or elements that could have been further expended. Finally, participants were asked this: “To what degree do you think your training sufficiently prepared you for your job?” This questions was rated using a 5-point Likert Scale which included 5 = very good preparation for my job, 4 = good preparation for my job, 3 = sufficient preparation for my job, 2 = poor preparation for my job and 1 = very poor preparation for my job. The usage of questions concerning the training was utilized as a possible reason to support the findings concerning expectations of job demand stressors.

*Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS)*

The JSS is a 36-items instrument developed specifically to measure job satisfaction of human service worker (Spector, 1985). This instrument was chosen because of its relevance ot human service workers and the reliability of the instrument for this type of population. Each item is rated using a five-point Likert type scale ranging from 1 (disagree very much) to 6 (agree very much). It comprises nine subscales that measure pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work and communication. Each subscale includes four items that are dispersed throughout the questionnaire, and items are written bi-directionally either positive or negative. The JSS has strong internal consistency reliability with a coefficient alpha of .91 for the overall job satisfaction scale (Spector, 1985). Each subscale has a
coefficient alpha between .61 (coworkers) and .80 (supervision). The coworkers scale is somewhat lower than the accepted minimum of .70 for internal consistency in research (Nunnally & Bernstein 1994). However, the internal consistency coefficient is fixed by the level of decision-making that results from the interpretation of the data. The questionnaire was embedded inside the job demand stressor instrument for convenience.

Psychological General Well-Being Index (PGWB-S)

The PGWB-S is a health-related Quality of Life (HRQoL) questionnaire, was used to measure participant’s personal perception of psychological well-being. The PGWB-S is the short version of the original 22-item PGWB (Dupuy, 1984). The original PGWB was developed in the United-States and has also shown validity and consistency in many other countries. The shorter version was tested on three samples in Italy and had a Cronbach’s Alpha value range of .80 to .92 (Grossi et al., 2006), similar to the PGWB (.94). The shorter version seems more appropriate with field instructors, since it was created to reduce administration time and achieve higher acceptability by respondents. A copy of the questionnaire is found in Appendix B. This instrument is a 6-item self-administered questionnaire utilizing a six-points Likert scale (e.g., 0=None of the time, 1=A little of the time, 2=Some of the time, 3=A good bit of the time, 4=Most of the time and 5=All of the time). Dimensions measured were Anxiety: 1) Have you been bothered by nervousness or your “nerves” during the past month?; Vitality: 2) How much energy, pep, or vitality did you have or fell during the past month?, and 3) I felt tired, worn out, used up, or exhausted during the past month; Depressed mood: 4) I felt downhearted and
blue during the past month; Self-control: 5) I was emotionally stable and sure of myself during the past month; and Positive well-being: 6) I felt cheerful, lighthearted during the past month.

Demographics

Demographic variables were also incorporated in the survey including work schedule (days on/ days off), employment duration at current program and total employment duration in OBH, age, gender, marital status, level of education, ethnic identity and if they had a spouse or partner working in a similar profession. Participants were also asked about their previous experience in related fields. Participants were given choices of profession related to OBH work and asked to identify all the related fields of work they had previously been employed in.

Procedures

The Internal Review Board at the University of Minnesota approved this study in spring 2008. Programs were first contacted in spring 2008 by e-mail, informing them of the upcoming study and requesting permission to survey their field instructors in August 2008. Eight programs agreed to participate in this study. Two other programs ultimately agreed to participate in the study but retracted their participation due to budgetary constraints and a reduce number of field instructors. Another two program did not return our email communications. The programs that agreed to participate were sent a copy of the survey by e-mail and were asked to make enough copies for their field instructors.
This method of survey distribution was chosen to reduce the financial burden of the researcher. Programs were also asked to provide individual envelopes to each participant to insure anonymity and confidentiality. Each program was provided with a survey that included randomized items in the section concerning current job demand stressors and job satisfaction. Grouping the item numbers and mixing the orders of these groups manually randomized the items. This method was reasoned to increase reliability of the survey since each program received a survey with items differently situated in the instrument. Randomizing the items helped in insuring that participants were not affected by the order of the items on the instrument. The size of each program does not allow for the analysis of result differences between programs, but should be strongly considered in future research.

Volunteer field instructors from programs who participated in this study were contacted during Fall 2008 through their program’s administration and were briefed on the study during an internal all-staff meeting. The briefing included the nature of the research and why they were being asked to participate in this study. The survey was administered during fall 2008 by the program’s administration. On the day of the administration, participants were given a detailed overview of the study and participants were informed of the confidentiality protocol, their right to withdraw from the study at any time, the right to obtain a copy of their personal data and the right to obtain a copy of the study once completed. Implied consent was obtained through study participation. All participants were informed of the volunteer nature of this survey once by their programs, and again on the introduction page of the survey. Instructors were also given the
opportunity to include their contact information at the end of the survey to be sent the results once the study would be completed.

During an all field instructor meeting a member of the program administration administered the questionnaires before a field work rotation. Administering the survey before a work rotation was deemed best because field instructors may have been vulnerable to the job demand stressors following a work rotation, and the researcher wanted to avoid inflation of perceived job demand stressors. Participants were given the option of signing the back of their individual envelope to increase confidentiality. Once completed, each program returned all surveys in separate envelopes to the researcher. All surveys were administered between August 2008 and October 2008, and were received before November 15th, 2008.

*Data Analysis Procedures: Quantitative Measurements*

Raw data was entered into SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) for statistical analysis. From the total of 186 participants, 33 individuals were eliminated because they did not meet the criteria of having participated in an initial field instructor training. Another two surveys were eliminated for missing over a dozen answers in the job demand stressor section of the survey. This cutoff was chosen because the researcher was worried that these participants had completed their survey without the consideration needed. A total of 151 surveys were maintained for final analysis. The remaining raw data was organized into 124 variables including a category for each program to be
numbered from one to eight. Each individual survey was also assigned a number for easy data retrieval if necessary.

Job demands

Three variables were computed to analyze job demand stressors including item scores and overall mean scores of: a) post-training (current), b) pre-training (expectations), and c) the change in mean for individual items of job demand stressors from post-training (current) to pre-training (expectations). All negatively worded items were recoded to normalize scores. To measure change in mean for scores for job demand stressors, paired-sample t-tests were performed between each post and pretest item and between the current and expected grand means. The reliability of each scale (pretest and posttest) was calculated using a Cronbach’s Alpha. The retrospective pretest and the posttest had internal consistencies (Cronbach’s Alpha) of .77 and .80 respectively. In line with social science cut-off, these results are better than the accepted .70 or higher (Miller, 1995).

Job Satisfaction Survey

The sum of responses for each participant was first computed to obtain individual job satisfaction scores. All items negatively worded were reversed scored. Descriptive statistics were then computed to obtain the grand means of all individual responses. The nine subscales were computed using the sum of responses to the four items comprising the subscale (Pay = 1, 10, 19, 28; Promotion = 2, 11, 20, 33; Supervision, 3, 12, 21, 30;
Fringe benefits = 4, 13, 22, 29; Contingent rewards = 5, 14, 23, 32; Operating conditions = 6, 15, 24, 31; Coworkers = 7, 16, 25, 34; Nature of work = 8, 17, 27, 35). All grand mean and subscale scores were compared to the norm sample scores, which assumes that the higher the score on each scale the more satisfied someone is with their job (Spector, 1994).

**Psychological Well-Being – Short Version**

The five sub-scales comprising the PGWB-S were summed across each sub-scales and averages were computed. The total score for each individual was multiplied by 3.66, which created a score that corresponds to the original version of the PGWB. The total score was computed based on directions given by the author of the PGWB-S who was reached by email in December 2008 (Grossi Enzo, 2008). To be able to compare the final scores of each subscale with the PWGB-S, items 2, 3 and 6 were reversed coded.

**Demographics**

Descriptive statistics for each demographic item were also computed for work experience in adventure programming, work schedule, initial training participation, perception of training effectiveness, age, gender, marital status, partner or spouse working in a similar field and length of employment in OBH and at current program.
**Days of Field Experience**

The creation of a variable called “days of field experience” was created to reflect the number of days that field instructors had worked in the field, based on their total length of work for their program and their schedule pattern. To obtain a number of days of field experience for each participant, the number of monthly workdays for each type of schedule was calculated and was then multiplied by the length of time (in months) that each field instructors had indicated they had worked for their program. Since there was no established research guiding the creation of this variable, the categories were based on the evaluation of the normal distribution of the days of field experience for all participants. The distribution was clearly distributed from a larger amount of respondents having worked lesser days to a smaller amount of respondents having worked more days. Previous studies (Kirby, 2006; Marchand et al., 2009) have estimated the average retention rate of field instructors to be 10 months. Two extreme outliers with over 1000 days of experience were eliminated, leading to four categories of days of field experience based on equal quartiles of the frequency distribution. These categories were: 1) 0 to 52 days, 2) 53 to 118 days, 3) 119 to 261 days and 4) 262 and 662 days.

**Change in Mean Difference – Job Demands**

Another categorical variable was also created to isolate individuals who had underestimated, overestimated or had no difference in their job demand stressors. Since there was no previous research to guide the process of deciding what would indicate any of these three categories based on the instrument used, an evaluation of the normal
distribution of change in means scores was performed. The overall mean difference score was $M = 0.03$, which is very close to zero. A stem-and-leaf plot also showed a generally symmetric shape and a box-plot showed a visually centered median with equal quartile and interquartile ranges. One outlier was detected in the box-plot with a mean difference of -1.53, and was eliminated. Using the frequency distribution and the standard deviations, three categories were developed: 1) underestimation $.21$ and lower, 2) overestimation $.20$ and more, and 3) fulfilled $.20$ to $.20$.

A series of linear regressions were performed using the independent variables of: a) expectations of job demand stressors, b) current levels of job demand stressors and c) change in mean difference for job demands. Each set was regressed to the dependent variables of job satisfaction and psychological well-being. These regression were utilized to go beyond the correlation use and evaluate any possibilities for predictability capabilities.

**Multivariate Analysis**

Three multivariate analyses were performed using the dependent variables: total job satisfaction, the nine subscales of job satisfaction and psychological well-being. One multivariate was performed using the categorical variable change in mean and another multivariate analysis was performed for days of field experience. These were performed to examine underestimation, overestimation and fulfilled expectations, as well as days of field experience as contributors to the scores for job satisfaction and psychological well-being. The usage of the nine subscales also evaluated more details of the dependent
variable job satisfaction. Post-hoc analysis using a Tukey HSD test was also performed to obtain specific information about group differences within each factor for each dependent variable. The usage of the Tukey HSD post hoc test was reasoned by the fact that sample sizes for categorical groups were similar in sizes. Multivariate assumptions for outliers were verified using the Mahalanobis distance method.

**Data Analysis Procedures: Qualitative Measurements**

The qualitative data was analyzed using an emergent coding technique (Neuendorf, 2002). The emerging approach is recommended when no coding scheme exists and supported by the fact that no research has examined job choice, organizational choice and initial training of field instructors and how these were contributing to a variety of variables related to their job situation.

The data collected qualitatively in the survey was entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet and separated into four broader categories. All open-ended questions were analyzed using a content analysis to extract common themes. The content analysis started during the data transcription and continued by reading over the material several times in search of recurring themes (Creswell, 2003; Tesch, 1990). Themes were created based on relationships and patterns to fit similar categories. A large number of themes were first created and later funneled into a smaller number. As themes emerged, they were color coded on a spreadsheet for ease of visual reference. Answers for open-ended questions concerning job choice and organizational choice were concurrently analyzed since several of the answers as well as recurring themes were seen in both job choice and
organizational choice questions. The same method of content analysis was utilized for all questions. However, the open-ended questions concerning the training were analyzed separately.

To increase the reliability of this content analysis, a second coder was asked to review the data for themes to provide basic validation of the researcher’s findings and insure that the themes are not limited to one individual’s judgment (Neuendorf, 2002; Elo & Kyngas, 2007). Any discrepancy was discussed and either rejected or modified by both coders to reach a common conclusion and create a set of final themes. Once the final themes were created, descriptive and frequencies were conducted for each theme to obtain means for job choice items, organizational choice item and initial training elements.
Chapter 4

Results

This chapter is divided in two sections, which present the quantitative and qualitative results of the study. The first section includes results from the quantitative section concerning perceived expectations of job demand stressors, perceived current job demand stressors, levels of job satisfaction and levels of psychological well-being. The second section includes the results from the qualitative section, which includes information concerning the job choice and organizational choice of field instructors. This section also includes responses to questions concerning satisfaction with the initial field instructor training.

As introduced in chapter one, this study addressed the following research questions:

1. What are newcomer’s perception levels of expectations of job demand stressors prior to the initial training?

2. What are field instructor’s current perception levels of job demand stressors?

3. Do newcomer’s pre-work expectations of job demand stressors correspond to their actual job demand stressors?

4. Are field instructors satisfied with their job?

5. What are field instructor most and least satisfying aspects of their job?

6. Do field instructors have a positive psychological well-being?

7. Is there a relationship between underestimation, overestimation or fulfilled
8. Is there a relationship between underestimation, overestimation or fulfilled expectations of job demand stressors and psychological well-being?

9. How satisfied are field instructors with their initial training in regards to work preparation?

10. Is training satisfaction related to their current perception of job demand stressors?

Section One: Quantitative analysis

Demographic Information

A total usable sample of 151 surveys was kept for analysis. The sample showed that 60% (N= 91) were male field instructor compared to 39% (N = 60) female instructors. The racial or ethnic background of the participants was composed of 86% white (non-Hispanic), 4% Hispanic and 3% American Indian or Alaskan Native. A total of 3% was Black or African American (non-Hispanic), Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, other ethnic background. The remaining 4% declined to answer the question.

All instructors had at least completed their high school degrees and over 60% had previously earned a Bachelor’s degree. All participants had graduated high school. A majority of the instructors (61.7%) were single at the time of this study, while 26.6% were in a relationship and 11.7% were married. Individuals married or in a relationships were also asked if their partner worked in a related profession. For people currently married or in a relationship, 15.6% had a spouse or partner working in a related
profession. The age of instructors ranged from 19 to 59 years old, and over 80% of instructors were under 29 years old, with a mode of 24 years old (see Table 2).

Table 2.

Sample of the Demographic Information Concerning Field Instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>P (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education level (n=150)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college but no degree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Marital status (n=128)**     |    |       |
| Single (never married and divorced) | 79 | 61.7  |
| Now in a relationship           | 34 | 26.6  |
| Now married                     | 15 | 11.7  |

| **Age (n=149)**                |    |       |
| 19 to 21 years old             | 9  | 6     |
| 22 to 29 years old             | 113| 75.8  |
| 30 to 39 years old             | 22 | 14.8  |
| 40 years old and above         | 5  | 3.4   |
Other information collected included previous employment in related areas of work, length of time working for current OBH program, cumulative length of time previously working in other OBH programs and current work schedule pattern. The question considering previous employment showed that about 40% of instructors had previous experience working as a camp counselor and 34% had worked as an outdoor instructor or leader in a non-therapeutic program (see Table 2). Only 13% of field instructors had previously worked as a field instructor in a program providing wilderness therapy and 2% had worked in a correctional facility.

Table 3.

Information Concerning Previous Employment by Field Instructors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>P (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(n = 151)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp counselor</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor instructor/leader (non-therapeutic)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ropes course facilitator</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher in public or private school</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field instructor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional facility employee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Multiple answer question. Total n will not equal 151 and total % will not equal 100%.
Length of employment for current programs varied between less than one month to 60 months (see Table 3). Over half of respondents (62.9%) had worked for their current program for 12 months or less. In addition, 42.4% of field instructors were employed by their current program for 6 months or less. Another 24.5% of respondents had worked for their program between 1 to 3 months. 11.9% had worked for their program for over two years. Information collected about length of time that field instructors had worked for any other OBH programs indicated that 21.3% of respondents had worked for another program. These individuals had between one to 80 months (6.6 years) of experience in other wilderness therapy programs prior to their current program. Among these individuals, 11.6% had one year of experience or less, 4.2% had two years of experience, 3.5% had 3 years of experience and 2.8% had between 4 to 6.6 years of experience working for another program (see Table 4).

The information collected about current work schedule showed three types of schedule patterns. The first type was identified as a rotating schedule of 8 days on and 6 days off. The second type was a rotating schedule of either 14, 15 or 16 days on followed by 12, 13 or 14 days off. For the purpose of this study, we called this type of schedule two weeks on followed by two weeks off. The last type of rotating schedule was identified as variable with different numbers of days on followed by different numbers of days off. Most field instructors (80.7%) reported the first type of schedule, 8 days on/ 6 days off. The second type of schedule, two weeks on followed by two weeks off,
accounted for 8% of field instructors and the third type of schedule, the varied schedule, accounted for 11.3% of field instructors.

Table 4.

Length in Months Working as a Field Instructor for a Current or Previous Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>P (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of time at current program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=151)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30 days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 months</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 6 months</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 12 months</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 24 months</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+ months</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time at other programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=151)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No time</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 months or less</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 to 12 months</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 to 24 months</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 36 months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 to 80 months</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perception of Job Demand Stressors

The first three questions from this study were: 1) What are newcomer’s perception
levels of expectations of job demand stressors prior to the initial training? 2) What are current perception levels of job demand stressors? and 3) Do newcomer’s pre-work expectations of job demand stressors corresponds to their actual job demand stressors? These questions sought to assess current perceptions of job demand stressors and compare those to perceived expectations in an effort to assess change and potentially realistic or unrealistic expectations of their jobs.

*Individual Job Demand Stressor Items – Expectations and Current*

A one sample t-test was used to evaluate the means for expected and current levels of job demand stressors from the midpoint of the Likert scale used for this survey. The one sample t-test value was set at 3.5. Items that scored below 3.5 were considered job demand stressors and items that scored above 3.5 were not considered job demand stressors (see Figure 2). This was reversed for negatively worded items. Out of the 30 items included in the instrument to identify the job demands that were assessed as stressors by field instructors, a total of 24 items concerning current job demands were significantly different from 3.5 (p-value < 0.05) and 26 items concerning expectations of job demands were significantly different from 3.5 (p-value < 0.05). In looking at the means for the retrospective pretest and the posttest, a total of five items were above 3.5 and considered expected job demand stressors. Ho1 which stated that current field instructors will not perceive each individual statement of pre-employment expectations of job demands as stressors was therefore rejected for these individuals items. These items are:

- Missing out on time with friends and family when on course/ in the field (M=4.26).
Physically exhausted after a course \((M=4.09)\)

Difficulties leaving my partner/ spouse/ boyfriend/ girlfriend when on course \((M=4.11)\)

Emotionally and mentally drained after a course \((M=4.01)\)

Comfortable with the turnover rate of field instructors in program \((M=3.83)\)

Four items were below 3.5 and considered as current job demand stressors. Based on the results from individual items for the posttest of current job demand stressors, Ho2 which stated that current field instructors will not perceive each individual statement of current job demands as stressors was rejected for four individual items. These items are:

- Comfortable with the turnover rate of field instructors in program \((M=3.39)\)
- Sufficient privacy in the field \((M=3.81)\)
- Missing out on time with friends and family when on course/ in the field \((M=4.25)\)
- Being paid a fair amount \((M=3.49)\)

To help understand these results, three major categories of items were created: field skills, organizational structure and work-life balance. Among the results, the items that had a significant mean relating to expectations and current job demand stressors by field instructors were all within organizational structure or work-life balance.

To clarify the results, graphics were created to report the results of these one sample t-tests. The following figures report one sample t-test results for current job demand stressors. Current and expected job demands for field skills are reported in figure 2. For
this category, all results for the one sample t-test were significant were p-value < .001, except for restraining clients, which was not significant.

Figure 2. One Sample t-test\textsuperscript{a} Results for Current and Expected Job Demand Stressor

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure2}
\caption{One Sample t-test\textsuperscript{a} Results for Current and Expected Job Demand Stressor}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{a} Test value is 3.5

Figure 3 illustrates the results of the one sample t-test for the items in the organizational structure category. Most items were significant at the p-value <.001, for both expected and current job demands. The item concerning fair pay was not significant for current job demand. The item concerning therapist's expectations was significant at p-value < .01 for current but not significant for expected job demand. The item concerning privacy was significant at p-value < .05 for current, and finally, the item concerning turnover was significant at p-value < .01 for expected.
Finally, figure 4 reports the results of the one sample t-test for work-life balance items. Again, most item that were expected or current job demands were significant at the p-value <.001. In current job demands, physical exhaustion, feeling emotionally drained, time to unwind after a course and work affecting relationship were not significant. The item concerning difficulty leaving a partner was significant at the p-value <.01. For expected job demand items, time to unwind and work affecting relationship were not significant, as well as having enough time to pursue relationships.
Field instructors were asked to assess their expectations of pre-employment job demand stressors through a retrospective pretest. The overall grand mean indicated that respondents rated the survey items not as expected job demand stressors ($GM=4.22, SD= .45$). The Ho3 stated that current field instructors will not perceive their overall pre-employment expectations of job demands as stressors, was therefore not rejected. Field instructors were also asked to assess their current job demand stressors. Again, the grand mean indicated that current job demands were overall assessed not as stressors ($GM=4.25, SD=.49$). The Ho4, which stated that current field instructors will not perceive their overall job demands as stressors, was not rejected.
Differences Between Expectations and Current Job Demand Stressors

Table 4, 5 and 6 were created from all the items of the original survey for easier understanding. Table 4 includes the results from job demand statements that are directly related to the field skills generally necessary to perform this type of work. For example, statements relating to therapeutic skills, wilderness skills and work tasks were included in this table. Table 5 includes the job demand statements that represent elements of organizational structure. Examples of these would be schedule, pay and communication. Table 6 reports the results of the statements that are connected to job demands related to work-life balance.

The third research question wanted to know if expectations of job demand stressors correspond to field instructor’s current job demand stressors or if their expectations were realistic. To answer this question, the difference between the grand mean of the current job demand stressors and the grand mean of the expected job demand stressors were compared using a paired sample $t$-test. The grand means difference of -.03 was found not to be significant ($t (-.770) = 150, p = .442$ (two-tailed)) between expectation and current job demand stressors, which indicates that the overall difference between assessment of expectations of job demand stressors and assessment of current job demand stressors is not significant. Each paired items, which included items from expected and current job demand stressors were also compared to assess for individual item differences. A paired $t$-test was used to compare differences between each pairs of individual items, which totaled 30 pairs. The difference between 18 of these pairs was determined to be significant. Based on this results, Ho5, which stated that there will be no
difference between the pre-initial training expectations of job demand stressors and the current job demand stressors of field instructors, was rejected for 18 of the 30 job demand stressors.

**Figure 5. Paired t-test Results Between Expectations and Current Job Demand Stressor**

![Paired t-test Results Between Expectations and Current Job Demand Stressor](image)

**p-value <.01, ***p-value <.001

To clarify the reports of these results, this section was also divided within the same three categories: field skills, organizational structure and work-life balance. The results of the paired t-test can be found in figure 5 for field skills, figure 6 for organizational structure and figure 7 for work-life balance, as well as in table 4 (field skills), 5 (organizational structure) and 6 (work-life balance). Among all the items that were
significant, the three largest differences that were found significant between expectation and current job demand stressors were:

- I am physically exhausted after a course \( (t = -5.672 = 150, p = .000) \)
- I am comfortable having to confront clients on their treatment issues \( (t = 7.281 = 149, p = .000) \)
- I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do \( (t = -7.731 = 149, p = .000) \).

**Figure 6. Paired t-test Results Between Expectations and Current Job Demand Stressors**

![Bar chart showing differences between expectations and current job demand stressors.]

* p-value <.05, ** p-value <.01, ***p-value <.001

For each significant pair of job demand stressor, the direction of the difference from expectation to current was rated as underestimated (expected less stress) or overestimated (expected more stress) based on the direction of the difference. The
interpretation of the direction of the difference was reversed for statements using negative wording. Table 4, 5 and 6 reflect the recoding of the mean difference, where a negative difference with a significant p-value indicated that participants, on average, underestimated the amount of stress they would have from this job demand in comparison to their current job demand level. A positive difference with a significant p-value indicated that participants, on average, overestimated the amount of stress they would have from this job demand in comparison to their current job demand level. Underestimation of expectation versus current job demand stressor was found for seven out of the 30 pairs of items.

Examples of items that were underestimated included:

♦ I enjoy my current work schedule
♦ I find it easy to balance my life at work with my life outside of work
♦ I am comfortable with the turnover rate of field instructors in my program

Overestimation was found to be significant in 11 of the 30 pairs of items. Examples of items that were overestimated included:

♦ I am confident about my counseling skills
♦ I am comfortable working with opposite gender groups of clients
♦ I feel confident with my wilderness living skills
**Figure 7. Paired t-test Results Between Expectations and Current Job Demand Stressor**

* p-value ≤ .05, ** p-value < .01, *** p-value < .001
Table 5.

Paired t-test Between Expectations and Current Job Demands Stressors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job demands stressors</th>
<th>Posttest mean (Current)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Pretest mean (Expectation)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean difference*</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig (2-tail)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am confident about my counseling skills.</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>4.872</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel emotionally safe while at work.</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.861</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am able to detach myself from the clients at the end of a course.</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.165</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>4.456</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am confident that I can meet the treatment goals of the clients I work with.</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>.745</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am comfortable working with opposite gender groups of clients</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.111</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.350</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>4.715</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel physically safe while at work.</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>5.039</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am comfortable having to confront clients on their treatment issues.</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>.925</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.166</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am comfortable and feel I have the necessary training to restrain a client.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.192</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel confident with my wilderness living skills</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>.664</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.016</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>5.535</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am comfortable living in a remote wilderness location.</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>3.135</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The criterion for statistical significance is P < .01

*** The criterion for statistical significance is P < .001

*Negative mean differences reflect underestimation
Table 6.

Results for Paired t-test Between Expectations and Current Job Demands Stressors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job demands stressors Organizational Structure</th>
<th>Posttest mean (Current)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Prettest mean (Expectation)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean difference(^a)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig (2-tail)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel pressured to meet the expectations of my group’s therapist.</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>1.307</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-2.280</td>
<td>.024*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am comfortable with the diet and the food I eat in the field.</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.455</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-1.136</td>
<td>.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I enjoy my current work schedule rotation</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.120</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.943</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-3.436</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I get frustrated with the lack of personal communication available to me while I am working in the field</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.495</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.472</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-1.654</td>
<td>.100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am comfortable about the turnover rate of field instructors in my program.</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.324</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-3.672</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I have sufficient personal privacy in the field.</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.422</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-2.143</td>
<td>.034*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.418</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>-7.731</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I have too much paperwork.</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.241</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.163</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>1.911</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Negative mean differences reflect underestimation

***The criterion for statistical significance is P < .05
** The criterion for statistical significance is P < .01
*The criterion for statistical significance is P < .001

*Negative mean differences reflect underestimation
Table 7.

**Paired t-test Between Expectations and Current Job Demand Stressors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job demands stressors</th>
<th>Posttest mean (Current)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Prettest mean (Expectation)</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean difference&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig (2-tail)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have enough time off as a field instructor.</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.104</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.035</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-1.191</td>
<td>2.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I am physically exhausted after a course.</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.384</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.288</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>-5.672</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is difficult to leave my partner/spouse/ boyfriend/girlfriend when I go on course.</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.735</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.592</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-1.265</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am emotionally and mentally drained after a course.</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>1.309</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.331</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>-2.673</td>
<td>.008**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. It takes me several days to unwind from a course or rotation.</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.553</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I get irritated by the amount of traveling I have to do to get to work.</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.567</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.424</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I find it easy to balance my life at work with my life outside of work</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.363</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.155</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-1.979</td>
<td>.050*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I get worried about my work affecting my relationship with my spouse/partner/girlfriend/boyfriend.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.626</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.461</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-.459</td>
<td>.647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am satisfied with the amount of time I have to pursue personal interests outside of work.</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>1.118</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-3.413</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My spouse/partner/boyfriend/girlfriend supports my work</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>2.367</td>
<td>.020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. It is difficult to pursue meaningful intimate relationship outside of work.</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>1.592</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.518</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>3.173</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I miss out on time with friends and family when I am on course/in the field.</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.303</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The criterion for statistical significance is P< .05
**The criterion for statistical significance is P< .01
***The criterion for statistical significance is P≤ .001

<sup>a</sup> Negative mean differences reflect underestimation
Since 7 items were underestimated and 11 items were overestimated, these results indicated that field instructors more often overestimated the amount of stress they would perceive from their current job demands. These results could also reason that expectations of job demand stressors of field instructors do not correspond to their current job demand stressors. It is worth noting that some questions were left unanswered by respondents. For example, questions concerning intimate relationships and partner were left unanswered by those that were not in a relationship at the time of the study.

**Job Satisfaction**

The JSS has three ranges of scores related to job satisfaction. These are scores of 36 to 108 for dissatisfied, 108 to 144 for ambivalent and 144 to 216 for satisfied. This scoring is based on the author of the survey and each range overlaps according to the author (Spector, 1985). Each of these categories is also used in evaluating the nine subscales. The hypothesis that guided this portion of the study stated that field instructors would be satisfied with their job.

The results for overall job satisfaction showed that field instructors had a job satisfaction range of scores between 124 and 201, and were overall satisfied with their job ($M = 154.70$, $SD = 20.60$) according to the JSS scale which states that individuals with scores higher than 144 would be satisfied. Ho6 was not rejected. The results relating to the nine subscales for job satisfaction indicated that “nature of work” had the highest level of satisfaction (see Table 8), which was also similar to the JSS scale ($M = 20.87$, $SD = 2.98$). Fringe benefits indicated the lowest level of satisfaction compared to all other
subscales, also equivalent to “ambivalent” rating on the JSS scale ($M = 13.43, SD = 3.19$). Table 8 reports these results from the highest mean to the lowest mean.

Table 8.

Results of the Mean Values for the Job Satisfaction Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction subscales(^a)</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>20.87*</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>20.85*</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>19.64*</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>17.44*</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent rewards</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>16.89*</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating conditions</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>16.52*</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>14.93**</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>14.13**</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>13.43**</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)JSS scale: *16-24 = Satisfied, ** 12-16 = ambivalent, ***4-12 = dissatisfied

Psychological Well-Being

Field instructor’s psychological well-being was assessed using the short version of a well tested instrument (PWBG-S). Categories used to interpret the scores of this scale included severe distress (< 60), moderate distress (60-72), no distress (73 – 95) and positive well-being (> 95). Field instructors participating in this study scored $M = 79.33,$
$SD = 4.08$ (see Table 9). The range of scores for the PWBG-S was from 32.94 to 109.80. Ho7 which stated that field instructor’s psychological well-being would be positive was rejected based on these results.

Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>P (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive well-being</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No distress</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>62.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate distress</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe distress</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each item of the PGWB-S also represented a specific dimension: 1) anxiety, 2) vitality, 3) depressed mood, 4) self-control, 5) positive well-being and 6) vitality. The highest possible total score for each dimension is 18.26, which represents the highest achievable level of well-being for a certain dimension. The lowest score was found for the vitality dimension ($M = 12.11, SD = 3.97$), while the highest score was found for anxiety dimension ($M = 13.84, SD = 3.73$). The average score for the general population is as follow: 1) anxiety = 12.81, 2) depressed mood = 12.70, 3) positive well-being = 13.14, 4) self-control = 10.94, 5) positive well-being = 10.43 and 6) vitality = 12.45. Table 10 details the computed scores for each dimension.


Table 10.

Results for the Mean Values for the Subscales of the PGWB-S

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>M (N=151)</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1 - Anxiety</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2 - Vitality</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3 – Depressed mood</td>
<td>13.01</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4 – Self-control</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5 – Positive well-being</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6 - Vitality</td>
<td>12.11</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regression analysis

Job satisfaction

This study hypothesized that neither expectations of job demand stressors, nor current job demand stressors would be related to job satisfaction of field instructors. To verify these hypotheses, standard regressions were performed between the grand mean of expectations and current job demand stressors as independent variables and the total score for job satisfaction as dependent variable. Regression is also a better indication of the strength of the relationship, if present. In evaluating the assumptions for regression analysis, five outliers from the independent variable job satisfaction and one outlier from the dependent variable expectations of job demand stressors were eliminated. A final sample of 143 was kept for the analysis.
The regression indicated that expectations of job demand stressors significantly predicted total job satisfaction score, $\beta = .18$, $t (141) = 2.177$, $p < .05$ (see Table 11). This regression also supports the findings that higher expectations of job demand stressors predict lower job satisfaction score. Expectations of job demand stressors also explained a significant proportion of variance in total job satisfaction, $R^2 = .032$, $F (1, 141) = 4.741$, $p < .05$. These results lead to reject Ho8, that expectations of job demand stressors will not be related to job satisfaction. The regression indicated that current job demand stressors significantly predicted total job satisfaction score, $\beta = .613$, $t (141) = 9.257$, $p < .001$ (see Table 11). Current job demand stressors also explained a significant proportion of variance in total job satisfaction, $R^2 = .38$, $F (1, 141) = 85.687$, $p < .001$. These results lead to reject Ho9, that current job demand stressors will not be related to job satisfaction. Table 13 reports the correlation coefficient for both job satisfaction and psychological well-being.

Table 11.

Summary of Simultaneous Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of job demand stressors</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current job demand stressors</td>
<td>26.29</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>.613***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*p < .05, ***p < .001


*Table 12.*

*Summary of Simultaneous Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Psychological Well-Being*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE_B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of job demand stressors</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.455</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current job demand stressors</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Psychological well-being*

This study also hypothesized that expectations and current job demand stressors will not be related to psychological well-being of field instructors. Regressions were performed to test these hypotheses and obtain a better indication of the strength of the relationship, if present. Seven outliers were also removed from the variable psychological well-being, for a total sample of 140.

The regression indicated that expectations of job demand stressors did not significantly predict psychological well-being score, $\beta = 0.072$, $t(140) = 0.856$, $p > 0.05$ (see Table 12). The regression also indicated that current job demand stressors did not significantly predict psychological well-being score, $\beta = 0.020$, $t(140) = 0.240$, $p > 0.05$ (see Table 12). Based on these analyses, we accepted Ho10 that expectations of job demand
stressors did not predict psychological well-being, as well as Ho11 that current job demand stressors did not predict psychological well-being.

Table 13.

*Correlation Matrix for Job Demands, Job Satisfaction Survey and Psychological Well-Being.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expectations of Job Demand Stressors</th>
<th>Current Job Demand Stressors</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction Total</th>
<th>Psychological Well-Being Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of Job Demand Stressors</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.482*</td>
<td>.274*</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Job Demand Stressors</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.647*</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Well-Being Total</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Multivariate Analysis

Change in Mean Difference

This study wanted to know if underestimation, overestimation or fulfilled expectations of job demand stressors had any relation to job satisfaction or/and psychological well-being of field instructors. To this, a variable was created to represent the direction of change in perception of job demand stressors. This variable was based on the normal distribution, standard deviation and effect size of the mean difference for each individual grand mean of expectations and current job demand stressors. This categorical variable named change in mean difference was set at: 1) underestimation - .21 and lower, 2) overestimation .20 and more, and 3) fulfilled -.20 to .20.

A 3 x 2 between-subjects multivariate analysis of variance was used to examine the dependent variables: job satisfaction subscales and psychological well-being. The independent variable used for this analysis was change in mean difference. A MANOVA was performed after verifying for outliers and evaluating assumptions of normality, including linearity and homogeneity of variance, which were all satisfactory. Using Wilk’s criterion, the combined dependent variables were significantly affected by change in mean difference $F (2, 290) = 4.948, p < .001$. The results reflected a modest association between change in mean difference and the dependent variables with a partial $\eta^2 = .06$.

The test of between-subjects effects was significant (using $\alpha = 0.05$ as the criterion) for the dependent variable job satisfaction $F (2, 146) = 10.157, p < .001$ when using the independent variable change in mean. However, the test of between-subjects
effects was not significant (using $\alpha = 0.05$ as the criterion) for the dependent variable psychological well-being $F(2, 146) = .132, p = .877$. In considering change in mean difference, post hoc analyses using Tukey HSD (using $\alpha = 0.05$ as the criterion) indicated that job satisfaction was significantly lower for underestimation ($M = 144.098, SD = 23.24$) than overestimation ($M = 162.321, SD = 18.40$) and fulfilled expectations ($M = 155.618, SD = 17.40$).

To obtain a more detailed evaluation of the relationship for change in mean and job satisfaction, another MANOVA was performed using the nine job satisfaction subscales as the dependent variable. Using Wilk’s criterion, the combined dependent variables were significantly affected by change in mean difference $F(18, 276) = 2.892, p < .001$. The results reflected a moderate association between change in mean difference and the dependent variables with a partial $\eta^2 = .16$.

The test of between-subjects effects was significant (using $\alpha = 0.05$ as the criterion) for the seven out of the nine subscales of job satisfaction when using the independent variable change in mean. The dependent variables that were significant were pay $F(2, 146) = 12.553, p < .001$, promotion $F(2, 146) = 10.472, p < .001$, fringe benefits $F(2, 146) = 3.737, p < .05$, contingent reward $F(2, 146) = 9.439, p < .001$, coworkers $F(2, 146) = 4.086, p < .05$, nature of work $F(2, 146) = 3.493, p < .05$ and communication $F(2, 146) = 5.054, p < .01$. In considering change in mean difference, post hoc analyses using the Tukey HSD post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the subscale pay was significantly lower for underestimation ($M = 11.585, SD = 4.24$) than for overestimation ($M = 15.754, SD = 4.07$) and fulfilled expectations ($M = 14.527, SD = 3.91$).
The subscale promotion was significantly lower for underestimation ($M = 12.439$, $SD = 4.79$) than for overestimation ($M = 16.113$, $SD = 4.20$) and fulfilled expectations ($M = 15.654$, $SD = 3.48$). Fringe benefits average score was significantly lower for underestimation ($M = 12.415$, $SD = 3.51$) than for fulfilled expectations ($M = 14.182$, $SD = 2.93$). Contingent reward average score was significantly lower for underestimation ($M = 15.146$, $SD = 4.16$) than for overestimation ($M = 18.490$, $SD = 3.42$). Contingent reward average score was also significantly lower for fulfilled expectations ($M = 16.582$, $SD = 3.74$) than for overestimation ($M = 18.490$, $SD = 3.42$). The subscale coworkers average score was significantly lower for underestimation ($M = 18.585$, $SD = 3.99$) than for overestimation ($M = 20.471$, $SD = 2.74$). The subscale nature of work average score was also significantly lower for underestimation ($M = 20.146$, $SD = 3.37$) than for overestimation ($M = 21.698$, $SD = 2.37$). Finally, the subscale communication average score was significantly lower for underestimation ($M = 16.317$, $SD = 4.48$) than for overestimation ($M = 18.567$, $SD = 2.83$). In summary, the subscales pay, promotion, fringe benefits, contingent reward, coworkers, nature of work and communication subscales all scored lower for individuals who underestimated their job demands. Contingent reward was also lower for individuals who fulfilled their expectations.
Table 14.

**MANOVA for Job Satisfaction Subscales**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction category</th>
<th>Total sample M</th>
<th>Underestimation</th>
<th>Overestimation</th>
<th>Fulfilled</th>
<th>$F$ statistic</th>
<th>$p$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total score</td>
<td>154.83</td>
<td>144.09</td>
<td>162.32</td>
<td>155.61</td>
<td>10.157</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20.67)</td>
<td>(23.24)</td>
<td>(18.40)</td>
<td>(17.39)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>14.15</td>
<td>11.56</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>12.553</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.36)</td>
<td>(4.25)</td>
<td>(4.07)</td>
<td>(3.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>14.93</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>16.65</td>
<td>10.472</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.38)</td>
<td>(4.79)</td>
<td>(4.20)</td>
<td>(3.48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>20.82</td>
<td>20.95</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.90)</td>
<td>(2.87)</td>
<td>(3.06)</td>
<td>(2.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>3.737</td>
<td>.026*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.20)</td>
<td>(3.51)</td>
<td>(3.05)</td>
<td>(2.93)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent reward</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>18.49</td>
<td>16.58</td>
<td>9.439</td>
<td>.000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.96)</td>
<td>(4.16)</td>
<td>(3.42)</td>
<td>(3.74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating conditions</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td>16.51</td>
<td>16.68</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.43)</td>
<td>(3.62)</td>
<td>(3.42)</td>
<td>(3.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>19.76</td>
<td>18.59</td>
<td>20.47</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>4.086</td>
<td>.019*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.28)</td>
<td>(3.99)</td>
<td>(2.74)</td>
<td>(2.99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td>20.88</td>
<td>20.15</td>
<td>21.70</td>
<td>20.65</td>
<td>3.493</td>
<td>.033*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.99)</td>
<td>(3.37)</td>
<td>(2.37)</td>
<td>(3.09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>17.46</td>
<td>16.32</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>17.24</td>
<td>5.054</td>
<td>.008**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.56)</td>
<td>(4.48)</td>
<td>(2.83)</td>
<td>(3.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values represent how satisfied respondents are with their work; 16-24 = Satisfied, 12-16 = ambivalent, 4-12 = dissatisfied

* p-value <.05, **p-value<.01, ***p-value <.001
Days of Field Experience

The total mean for days of field experience was 186 days, compared to 365 days (12 months) for total length of time working at current program. From the total days of field experience, a variable with four categories was created: 1) 0 to 52 days, 2) 53 to 118 days, 3) 119 to 261 days and 4) 262 and 662 days.

A 4 x 2 between-subjects multivariate analysis of variance explored the relationship between job satisfaction and psychological well-being (dependent) and days of field experience (independent). Another multivariate analysis was also performed for each nine job satisfaction subscales. Using Wilk’s criterion, the combined dependent variables were significantly affected by days of field experience \( (F(6, 270) = 2.561, p = .020) \). The results reflected a modest association between days in field experience and the dependent variables with a partial \( \eta^2 = .05 \).

The test of between-subjects effects was significant for the dependent variable job satisfaction \( (F(3, 136) = 4.441, p < .01) \) when using the independent variable days of field experience. However, the test of between-subjects effects was not significant for the dependent variable psychological well-being \( (F(3, 136) = .733, p = .534) \). In considering days of field experience, post hoc analyses using Tukey HSD indicated that job satisfaction was significantly lower for 119 to 261 days \( (M = 151.139, SD = 21.85) \) and for 262 and 662 days \( (M = 148.432, SD = 19.72) \), than for 0 to 52 days \( (M = 163.470, SD = 17.26) \).
Table 15.

Analysis of Variance for Job Satisfaction Subscales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job satisfaction category</th>
<th>Total sample M</th>
<th>Days of field experience</th>
<th>1) 0 to 52 days</th>
<th>2) 53 to 118 days</th>
<th>3) 119 to 261 days</th>
<th>4) 262 to 662 days</th>
<th>F statistic</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total score</td>
<td>155.36 (20.44)</td>
<td>163.47 (17.26)</td>
<td>159.36 (19.67)</td>
<td>151.14 (21.85)</td>
<td>148.43 (19.71)</td>
<td>4.441</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay</td>
<td>14.27 (4.27)</td>
<td>15.03 (3.87)</td>
<td>14.63 (4.16)</td>
<td>14.14 (4.34)</td>
<td>13.38 (4.63)</td>
<td>.989</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>15.15 (4.27)</td>
<td>16.00 (3.28)</td>
<td>16.39 (3.93)</td>
<td>15.58 (4.38)</td>
<td>12.84 (4.54)</td>
<td>5.621</td>
<td>.001**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>20.72 (2.93)</td>
<td>21.35 (2.25)</td>
<td>20.93 (2.65)</td>
<td>20.00 (3.69)</td>
<td>21.65 (2.86)</td>
<td>1.329</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td>13.54 (3.08)</td>
<td>13.12 (2.78)</td>
<td>14.00 (2.55)</td>
<td>13.42 (3.36)</td>
<td>13.62 (3.51)</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent reward</td>
<td>16.87 (4.00)</td>
<td>18.35 (3.76)</td>
<td>17.39 (2.90)</td>
<td>16.19 (4.49)</td>
<td>15.70 (4.20)</td>
<td>3.282</td>
<td>.023*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating conditions</td>
<td>16.49 (3.46)</td>
<td>18.15 (2.76)</td>
<td>17.24 (3.74)</td>
<td>15.53 (3.38)</td>
<td>15.24 (3.16)</td>
<td>6.308</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coworkers</td>
<td>19.89 (3.20)</td>
<td>21.00 (2.52)</td>
<td>19.97 (3.12)</td>
<td>19.08 (3.64)</td>
<td>19.59 (3.22)</td>
<td>2.297</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of work</td>
<td>20.96 (2.83)</td>
<td>21.68 (2.73)</td>
<td>20.85 (2.80)</td>
<td>20.25 (3.16)</td>
<td>21.08 (2.54)</td>
<td>1.538</td>
<td>.207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>17.46 (3.56)</td>
<td>18.79 (3.23)</td>
<td>17.94 (2.99)</td>
<td>16.94 (3.78)</td>
<td>16.32 (3.73)</td>
<td>3.480</td>
<td>.018*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values represent how satisfied respondents are with their work; 16-24 = Satisfied, 12-16 = ambivalent, 4-12 = dissatisfied

* p-value <.05, **p-value<.01, ***p-value <.001
To obtain a more detailed evaluation of the relationship between days of field experience and job satisfaction, another MANOVA was performed using the nine job satisfaction subscales as the dependent variable. Using Wilk’s criterion, the combined dependent variables were significantly affected by days of field experience \((F (27, 374) = 1.690, p < .05)\). The results reflected a moderate association between days of field experience and the dependent variables with a partial \(\eta^2 = .10\).

The test of between-subjects effects was significant for four out of the nine subscales of job satisfaction when using the independent variable days of field experience. The dependent variables that were significant were promotion \((F (3, 136) = 5.621, p < .01)\), contingent reward \((F (3, 136) = 3.282, p < .05)\), operating conditions \((F (3, 136) = 6.308, p < .001)\) and communication \((F (3, 136) = 3.480, p < .05)\) were significant for the independent variable days of field experience.

In considering days of field experience, post hoc analyses using the Tukey HSD post hoc criterion for significance indicated that the subscale *promotion* was significantly lower for 262 and 662 days \((M = 12.838, SD = 4.54)\) than for 0 to 52 days \((M = 16.00, SD = 3.28)\), 53 to 118 days \((M = 16.39, SD = 3.93)\) and 119 to 261 days \((M = 15.58, SD = 4.38)\). *Contingent reward* average score was significantly lower for 262 and 662 days \((M = 15.70, SD = 4.20)\) than for 0 to 52 days \((M = 18.35, SD = 3.76)\). The subscale *operating conditions* average score was significantly lower for 119 to 261 days \((M = 15.53, SD = 3.38)\) and 262 and 662 days \((M = 15.24, SD = 3.16)\) than for 0 to 52 days \((M = 18.15, SD = 2.76)\). The subscale *communication* average score was also significantly lower for 262 and 662 days \((M = 16.32, SD = 3.73)\) than for 0 to 52 days \((M = 18.79, SD = 3.23)\).
summary, the subscales promotion, contingent reward, operating conditions and communication subscales all scored lower for individuals who had worked over 262 days compared to individuals who had less than 52 days of field experience.

*Training preparedness*

Frequency and descriptive were conducted to evaluate perception of training effectiveness. Field instructors rated their initial training in regards to the level of preparation for their work and over 45% of instructors rated their training as good preparation for their work (e.g. Table 16). A linear regression was performed to evaluate the relation between training satisfaction and current job demand stressors. This was reasoned by the potential that a realistic job preview might reduce job demand stressors.

*Table 16.*

*Initial Training Perceived Levels of Preparation for Work by Field Instructors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n*</th>
<th>P (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N= 148*
The regression indicated that satisfaction with training preparedness significantly predicted current job demand stressors, $\beta = -.499$, $t(144) = -6.866$, $p > .001$. Satisfaction with training preparedness also explained a significant proportion of variance in total current job demand stressors, $R^2 = .25$, $F(1, 143) = 47.147$, $p < .001$.

Section Two: Qualitative Analysis

Job Choice and Organizational Choice

The first section of the survey asked participants to give, in order, the three most important reasons that led them to work in wilderness therapy, and the three most important reasons that led them to work for their current program. While field instructors who had not participated in an initial field instructor training were rejected for the analysis of the quantitative section, all participants who had answered this question were kept for analysis since this information was used separately and for a different purpose than the rest of the data. This choice was also justified to obtain a larger sample that could ultimately lead to gaining further understanding of job choice and organizational choice specific to field instructors working in wilderness therapy.

Primarily, the first coding was solely computed by the primary researcher and resulted in 32 detailed codes as shown in Table 17. Following this, a second coder was retained and looked over the answers separately without looking at what the primary researcher had done. This coder was chosen because of his extensive experience as a field instructor and his work as a licensed counselor and the knowledge surrounding study. After the second coder analyzed the results, both coders agreed to distill the results to a
final set of 10 pattern codes as shown in Table 17. Table 17 gives details on the coding of each theme by specifying the primary codes that lead to the final set of pattern codes, consequently referred to as themes.

Table 17.
Detailed Coding for Job Choice and Organizational Choice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern codes</th>
<th>Primary Codes</th>
<th>Examples of quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outdoor Environment Characteristics</strong></td>
<td>Love of the outdoors/ wanting to be outdoors</td>
<td>“Get back to nature”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wanting to work outdoors</td>
<td>“Being outside”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Love for a specific outdoor activity</td>
<td>“Full time job in the wilderness”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Convenient (home, friends, family)</td>
<td>“Like outdoor activities”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal of a specific geographic area</td>
<td>“I love camping”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of Program</strong></td>
<td>Program is close to home town”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Altruistic Characteristics</strong></td>
<td>Wanting to working with youth or specifically youth at risk</td>
<td>“Interest in living/ working in Colorado”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Want to help others</td>
<td>“I like the desert”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoy the therapeutic work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meaningful work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wanting to give back (i.e. was a youth at risks, was a wilderness therapy student)</td>
<td>“Helping others”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“To help make even a small difference in someone's life”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I like being part of the therapeutic change process”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Fulfillment”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“My own struggle with substance abuse when I was younger”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Growth and Career Development</strong></td>
<td>Wanting personal growth</td>
<td>“Wanted to get out of my box”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Related to current degree or future educational goals</td>
<td>“Pursuing a career in Social work”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New personal experience</td>
<td>“Looking for a challenge on a personal/professional level”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reputation, Referral, Recommendation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program reputation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Referred to work area or specific program by friend or family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community, support system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specific schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Former student at specific program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific Program Characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program philosophy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Community, support system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Program curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specific schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Former student at specific program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compensation, benefits, rewards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Salary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possibilities for advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment, training, convenience or hiring</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Former student at specific program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training was successful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hiring process was easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBH specific characteristics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Combination of wilderness and therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Natural consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nature of relationships with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fun, adventure, curiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- “I thought this program was the best”
- “Referred by sibling increased my interest”
- “Specific company values”
- “I liked the bosses”
- “My philosophies matched theirs best”
- “Great schedule”
- “I was a student here”
- “Increasing pay scale corresponding to longevity”
- “Experience to become senior field instructor in future”
- “Staff housing (cheap)”
- “They were hiring”
- “Went through the training”
- “No lengthy reference letters needed”
- “Wilderness is an environment that has worked therapeutically for me and others in the past”
- “Power of wilderness in creating environment for change”
- “Share life perspectives with youth to broaden perspectives”
- “Adventure”
When asked about the three most important reasons that lead them to work in wilderness therapy (see Table 18), the first reason most often reported corresponded to altruistic characteristics and was reported by 45.4% of participants. The second reason corresponded to outdoor environmental characteristics, with 28.6% of participants using this theme. Finally, the third reason most often reported theme related to personal growth and career development with 10.3% of responses.

Table 18.

*Results for Job Choice*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Choice Themes*</th>
<th>n/ N</th>
<th>(N = 185)</th>
<th>P (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Altruistic characteristics</td>
<td>84/ 185</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outdoor environment characteristics</td>
<td>53/185</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personal growth and career development</td>
<td>19/185</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. OBH specific characteristics</td>
<td>14/185</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Specific program characteristics</td>
<td>5/185</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reputation, referral, recommendation</td>
<td>5/185</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other</td>
<td>4/185</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Location of program</td>
<td>2/185</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Recruitment, training, convenience or hiring</td>
<td>1/185</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Compensation, benefits, rewards</td>
<td>0/185</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In order of importance as chosen by field instructors
None of the respondents reported the themes *compensation, benefit or rewards* has the most important reason for working in wilderness therapy. It was also noticed that out of the 10 themes used for this question, the three most important themes were considered personal reasons compared to the last seven themes, which were either programs specific or related to outdoor behavioral healthcare characteristics.

*Table 19.*

*Results for Organizational Choice*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Choice Themes*</th>
<th>n/ N</th>
<th>(N = 185)</th>
<th>P (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Altruistic characteristics</td>
<td>41/185</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outdoor environment characteristics</td>
<td>32/185</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Personal growth and career development</td>
<td>29/185</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. OBH specific characteristics</td>
<td>25/185</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Specific program characteristics</td>
<td>23/185</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Reputation, referral, recommendation</td>
<td>11/185</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Other</td>
<td>8/185</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Location of program</td>
<td>8/185</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Recruitment, training, convenience or hiring</td>
<td>4/185</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Compensation, benefits, rewards</td>
<td>1/185</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In order of importance as chosen by field instructors*
When asked about the three most important reasons for working for their specific program (see Table 19), field instructors reported that *specific program characteristics* were the most important reason (22.2%). *Altruistic characteristics* was the second most important reason with 17.3% of participants choosing this answer and the third reason was *reputation, referral and recommendation* with 15.7% of respondents choosing this answer. *Location of program* and *outdoor environmental characteristics* came in close with respectively 13.5% and 12.4% of responses. The least reported answer was *compensation, benefits and rewards*, with less than 1% answering within this theme as the number one reason for choosing their specific program.

**Initial Field Instructor Training**

Of the 186 total respondents, 153 individuals had participated in an initial field instructor training (84% of field instructors). Participation in an initial field instructor training ranged from 60% to 100% between the eight programs surveyed. Only one program had 100% of its field instructors indicate that they had participated in an initial training. The length of the initial training ranged from 1 day to 15 days, with a mode of 5 days and a mean of 6.88 days.

**Training Effectiveness**

The coding for initial training was done similarly to the coding for job choice and organizational choice. A first analysis of respondent’s answers yielded 23 themes that were distilled to 10 final themes. A second coder was again asked to look over the
coding and themes were adjusted after both coders agreed on the themes chosen based on similarities among the answers. Table 20 gives details on the coding of each theme.

When asked about the three most important elements of their initial field instructor training, the most common element was *therapeutic and behavioral management skills* indicated by 24.5% of respondents. The second most important element was *experiential learning of program structure* (20.5%) and the third most important element of their initial training was *being in the role of students* (11.9%). These three elements identified in the initial training totaled 56.9% of answers.

The theme that was least often reported was *other trainees* with 1.9% of answers. This theme related to the relationships that had been built between trainees during the initial training, and having the support of other trainees. It is clear that the top three elements identified the importance of the training being experiential in nature, such as being able to role-play behavioral management skills, observing the program structure or being treated like students to build empathy and compassion.
Table 20.

**Detailed Coding for Elements of Initial Training**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final themes</th>
<th>Primary themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being in the role of student</td>
<td>Living like the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Usage of same gear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiential learning of</td>
<td>Observing groups of students/staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program structure</td>
<td>Experiencing the program routine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor living</td>
<td>Learning technical skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiencing the work area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic and behavioral</td>
<td>Learning communication/relationship skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>management skills</td>
<td>Role playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive Control System (PCS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Behavioral management skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting program’s current employees</td>
<td>Meeting members of the administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting founders of program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training organization</td>
<td>Training leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length of the training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stipend for training participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other trainees</td>
<td>Meeting other trainees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understanding work expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies and procedures</td>
<td>Understanding policies/rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Becoming familiar with laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program philosophy</td>
<td>Mission of the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management</td>
<td>Emergency/ Safety protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First aid/ CPR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Initial Training Improvements

The survey also asked field instructors to look back on their initial training, and indicate any elements that they would have liked to see incorporated into their training, or elements that should have been covered more extensively. Field instructors were not asked to rate these in order of importance. Table 21 summarizes the major points that were raised by participants concerning ways to improve the initial training. These are not in order of importance, since there was not any consistency with the elements mentioned.

Table 21.

Initial Training Elements for Improvements

- Increase time with program therapist(s) to ask more questions
- Increase time shadowing a group and/or observing a group
- More thorough map and compass training
- Less “being a student” and more “being an instructor”
- Increase delivery and knowledge of therapeutic tools
- Increase learning of behavioral management skills (including de-escalation and conflict resolution)
- Increase learning of technical skills (ex: LNT)
- Deliver a better method for understanding the staff transition
Chapter 5

Discussion and Recommendations

This study set out to investigate the effects of expectations of job demand stressors in relation to job satisfaction and psychological well-being of field instructors working in wilderness therapy. In addition, this study sought to explain some of the reasons that field instructor choose their jobs and organizations in hopes that the findings increased understanding of this overlook element of wilderness therapy. It also sought to measure satisfaction and important elements of their training from a field instructor’s perspective.

As stated in the introduction, anecdotal reports concerning the stress and consequences related to job demands of working as a field instructor in wilderness therapy are frequently reported in the literature and discussed among professionals (Bunce, 1998; Thompson, 1984). There is also growing research evidence that working as a field instructor in outdoor programming (Thomas, 2001; Dawson, 1979; Wells, 1978), more particularly in outdoor behavioral healthcare settings (Thompson, 1984; Davis-Berman et al., 1994; Kirby, 2006; Marchand et al., 2009) leads to more strain, high attrition, burnout and general difficulties managing work and life in light of the compromises made. There is knowledge concerning the job demands that this type of work may entail, such as unconventional schedules, difficult clients, low pay and physical demands. A recent study reported eight key attributes of successful field
instructors as perceived by the clients. Some of these attributes were hard working, unselfish with their time and service oriented (Taniguchi, Widmer, Duerden & Draper, 2009). We are also starting to better understand the issues surrounding this job, including high attrition rates for organizations, burnout by staff (Kirby, 2006; Marchand et al., 2009) and a potential effect on the therapeutic alliance which could be impacted by field instructors feeling stress, mental fatigue and burnout (Russell, 2003; 2005; 2006). However, little research has examined how the consequences of stressful job demands can be reduced or prevented. Earlier beliefs about outdoor jobs suggested that the difficulties of this type of work would automatically lead to more staff turnover and shorter job commitment, warranting the acceptance of high turnover rates (Dawson, 1979). However, this idea alone seems to simply accept the situation without looking for ways to mitigate the negative effects of this turnover. Further, programs concerned with the quality of service offered to their clients are concerned with the high costs of continuously training new field instructors and more particularly, the effects high turnover may have on the effectiveness of treatment.

The magnitude of field instructors as an integral part of the wilderness therapy process is unique to outdoor behavioral healthcare (Russell, 2005) and one of the most important strength of the wilderness therapy process (Russell & Phillips-Miller, 2002). While most signs of this contribution are regarded as anecdotal (Taniguchi, Widmer, Durden & Draper, 2009), there is evidence that the intense wilderness experience, the small group settings and the challenges associated to wilderness therapy increases the therapeutic alliance between youth and field instructors (Hattie et al, 1997). In more
traditional therapeutic settings, the therapeutic alliance between children and their therapist/caregiver was correlated with positive outcomes, including a reduction of symptoms for the clients (Shirk & Karver, 2003). Field instructors are role models to the youths that benefit from wilderness therapy programs and special attention needs to be paid to reduce the effects of professional and personal issues on the therapeutic relationship. Taniguchi et al (2009) recently reported the importance of being emotionally stable and relax as important qualities of field instructors. These findings are likely to translate into high demands for field instructors and can only warrant the further investigation of the effect that job demands have on field instructors.

This current study utilized key theories in organizational psychology, including expectations of job demands, job satisfaction, and psychological well-being to better understand field instructors’ job demands working in the wilderness therapy industry. This study was also grounded in theories and ideas related to knowledge of outdoor programming professionals, outdoor behavioral healthcare and the human service worker in general. In his article concerning the life of an outdoor educator, Kesselheim (1981) explains the differences between the idealistic images that most individuals have of working in outdoor programming compared to the realities of the profession. One reality has to do with the deliberate use of risks in outdoor programming. While safety precautions are taken, the tension of being in charge of students while involving them in stressful and strenuous activities, can take a toll on professionals delivering the program (Kesselheim, 1981). Outdoor leaders are regularly expected to show elevated knowledge and practice of appropriate communication, leadership skills, group behavior, judgment,
outdoor skills and environmental awareness (Sibthorp, Paisley, Gookin & Ward, 2005). These demands are most likely heightened for outdoor leaders when students of these programs are youth dealing with emotional and behavioral problems. Thompson (1984) raised this issue over two decades ago when looking at Outward Bound instructors working with adjudicated youth and the possibility of the consequences that this job demand has on instructors.

While not always the case, outdoor programs catering to this type of clients are referred to as wilderness therapy programs or more recently, outdoor behavioral healthcare programs. The knowledge that we have of the delivery of wilderness therapy programming guides ideas surrounding this study and the job demands of field instructors. For example, we know that wilderness therapy is generally delivered in remote wilderness areas and includes group and individual therapy sessions (Russell & Phillips-Miller, 2002). We also know that rotating schedules for the individuals working as field instructors are mostly unconventional (Bickman et al., 2004), requiring several overnights in the wilderness in charge of the safety and well-being of clients (Marchand et al., 2009). Through this information, we have some idea of the nature and demands of working as a field instructor in wilderness therapy, but the literature concerning this area of outdoor behavioral healthcare is sparsely developed. One piece of literature that drove this study was the first study by Marchand et al. (2009) and other descriptive reports of the job demands of working as a field instructor (Bunce, 1998). Information concerning the high turnover rates of field instructors, which may be as little as less than 10 months,
also shaped the ideological background and commitment to this study (Kirby, 2006; Marchand et al., 2009).

Knowledge of human service workers informed this study in reason of the similarities between the demands of this type of work and wilderness therapy job demands. The prevalence of burnout among human service worker (Maslach, 1976) is a concerned that the same thing may be happening to field instructors who work with therapeutic clients. A variety of factors have been linked to predict burnout, such as low possibility for advancement, unpredictability, lack of role clarity, (Borritz, Bultmann, Rugulies, Christensen, Villadsen, & Kristensen, 2005), high role conflicts (Reid et al., 1999; Borritz et al., 2005), professional isolation, demand for constant empathy, ambiguous success (Bermak, 1977), lack of therapeutic success, un-gratifying clients (Farber & Heifetz, 1982), organizational structure and climate (Lloyd et al., 2002) and autonomy over clients (Dillon, 1990). These are only a sample of the extensive literature on the subject. Since we have a large body of knowledge concerning burnout, it would be a mistake not to take advantage of it.

While these factors are connected to burnout, they are also connected to job satisfaction in very similar ways. Locke’s (1976) definition of job satisfaction as a worker’s perception of one’s job fulfillment is part of the theoretical background used in this stud and related to organizational psychology. More specifically, recent research has also studied job satisfaction in relation to family (Bruck et al., 2002; Judge & Ilies, 2004), work and cultural values (Brown, 2002) and organizational commitment and turnover (Swagar, 1997; Lawrence et al., 2006). Further, the knowledge that job satisfaction is
linked to psychological well-being played an important role in the theoretical background of this study. A recent meta-analysis showed that mental and psychosocial problems were increasingly associated to job satisfaction (Faragher, Cass & Cooper, 2005). The same study also found that employees with low job satisfaction were more likely to experience burnout and mild levels of depression and/or anxiety.

These findings concerning job satisfaction and psychological well-being in relation to the knowledge of job demands in wilderness therapy raised concerns that may be applicable to field instructors and warranted further investigation. However, the theoretical background concerning job expectations and newcomers enhanced the practical nature of this study. In relation to organizational psychology theories, the hypothesis was that if field instructors had unrealistic expectations, they would potentially be less satisfied with their job, which in return would lead to less psychological well-being. This idea was grounded in the theory of unrealistic expectations that state that if a newcomer forms expectations about his or her work prior to being employed and these expectations are significantly different once working for that organization (Dean et al., 1985), he or she is more likely to experience deception (Hughes, 1958). It has also been demonstrated that emphasizing the positive aspects of a job prior to the start of it, and minimizing the negative characteristics may lead employees to job dissatisfaction, absenteeism, turnover and lack of organizational commitment (Kottler, 1986; Lee et al., 1992; Schein, 1978). There is also some evidence that preparing newcomer for the stress of job demands will actually reduce distress and increase job satisfaction (Nelson & Sutton, 1991). Particularly, it is the underestimation
of job demands stressors rather than simply misestimating the actual stressors that causes the most problems for newcomers (Nelson & Sutton, 1991).

Summary and Interpretation of the Findings

This study obtained 151 usable surveys through eight different programs. The number of returned surveys from this study was a surprise in comparison to a study of field instructors by Marchand et al. (2009) that had obtained 136 surveys from three different programs. Another study concerning field instructors in wilderness therapy reported 99 surveys from five different programs (Kirby, 2006). This variation in the number of field instructors in comparison to the number of programs could be the representation of the state of the economy and the human resource needs of the industry at the time of the study. We also know that programs from this study returned between 11 and 38 surveys, which illustrates how each program employs a vastly different number of field instructors at approximately the same time.

Who Are Wilderness Therapy Field Instructors?

Previous studies that have focused on field instructors working in wilderness therapy have mentioned how important the collection of demographic information on field instructors is for this new area of study (Kirby, 2006; Marchand et al., 2009). Further, certain socio-demographics have shown to be linked to burnout, such as age (Lourel et al, 2008) and years of seniority (Duran, Montalban & Stangeland, 2006). In this regard, the demographics of this study and previous studies contribute to the
expansion of specific knowledge concerning outdoor behavioral healthcare and the individuals that work on a daily basis with clients. These are essentials to understanding how field instructors may affect the treatment process of clients. They are also essential in the ongoing efforts to reduce the voluntary turnover rate and recruit individuals well equipped to deal with the characteristics of outdoor behavioral healthcare.

This study reported that 62% of respondents were male and 38% female. Among comparable studies on field instructors, the division between male and female field instructors seems to be fairly consistent. Previous studies of field instructors had reported a 55% male and 45% female ratio (Kirby, 2006; Marchand et al., 2009). This number seems representative of outdoor professionals in general as seen in other studies, where there the gap between numbers of men and women working as outdoor leader seems to have shrunk. For example, a recent study of outdoor leaders reported 43% females and 67% males (Hayashi & Ewert, 2006). These numbers are also comparable to client’s gender ratio, which was found to be 69% males and 31% females in a study of treatment outcomes in outdoor behavioral healthcare programs (Russell, 2001). There are several reasons for this disparity between males and females working in wilderness therapy, including the lack of females in administrative roles of outdoor programs, the “macho” climate that has been linked to some outdoor programs and difficulties balancing work and family roles (Loeffler, 1996). This research did not look at gender differences, simply because it wanted to concentrate on other issues. However, the data set could easily be used to look for differences between genders and potentially further the research on the
area. While the issue of balancing work and family life should not be only associated with women, in interviewing women outdoor educators, Loeffler (1996) found that:

(...), there is a real need for recognition on the part of outdoor organizations that outdoor leadership is a long-term career choice for many staff. Outdoor organizations need to grapple with the same family issues as the rest of the corporate world: child care, parental leave, and quality of life issues. (p.101)

Family values and quality of life should be cherished without regards for gender to attract qualified staff representing healthy life skills. Interestingly, the difficulties associated to balancing work-life is also linked to the fact that outdoor programming professions are still mainly white dominated careers. Research as shown that the ethnic identity in career choice amongst Asian Americans or African Americans was reflected in greater salience in family significance versus work (Kerka, 1998). The lack of ethnic diversity with wilderness therapy field instructors had also previously been demonstrated (Kirby, 2006; Marchand et al., 2009) and was again reflected through 86% of respondents being white (non-Hispanic). This is fairly higher than the 2005-2007 US census that indicated that 75.7% of the population considered themselves white (U.S. Census Bureau, 2005-2007). The remaining participants were composed of Hispanic (4%) American Indian or Alaskan Native (3%) and black or African American (non-Hispanic), Asian, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander and other ethnic background (totaled 3%). As explained earlier, the lack of diversity among field instructors can be explained by the difficulties balancing work-life in this area of profession. Further, some of it may have to
do with the lack of ethnic diversity from recruiters and clients, as well as cultural differences that don’t necessarily match those of non-Caucasian (James, 1995). For example, researchers often report lower usage of the outdoor for Hispanics, African Americans and Native Americans (Allison, 1996). Further, it has been suggested that unpaid trainings are not very popular with people of color (Benepe, 1992), potentially reducing the appeal of this type of work.

The participants in this study confirmed that field instructors are young adults with an average age of 27 years old. Almost 85% of all participants were 30 years old or younger. The average age of 27 years old may be slighter higher than the average age of most program, since the program that returned the highest number of surveys also had an average age of 31 years old, potentially skewing the data towards an older average. This average age was exactly the same as Marchand et al. study (2009), and representative of Kirby’s study (2006) that reported over 63% of instructors were between the ages of 23 and 28. The young age of field instructors has been blamed for the high turnover rate of field instructors in wilderness therapy because of the transient nature or unstable life style of young adults who may be looking for a professional path or transitory personal growth (Gass, 1993). However, a large meta-analysis reported that age and voluntary turnover only had a very small relationship among psychologist (Healy, Lehman & McDaniel, 1995).

Another reflection of the characteristics of this field of work was illustrated through a majority of participants being single (63%), while 12% were married and 25% in a relationship. These numbers are higher than Marchand et al. (2009) reports of 48% of
field instructors being single. In contradiction, Kirby (2006) reported that 78% of his sample of field instructors was single. The differences may be the reflection of the programs that volunteered for this current study in contrast to past studies. It may be that there is a link between job characteristics and marital status of these individuals. For example, Hughes, Galingsky and Morris (1992) found in a study of work-life spillover, that job characteristics predicted work-life interference, which in return predicted marital quality. A better knowledge of differences between programs, may help understand those characteristics and in return, marital status of field instructors.

Another finding of this study revealed that field instructors were mostly college educated, with 60% having earned a Bachelor’s degree and all participants had graduated high school. This is somewhat lower than Kirby’s findings that 80% of field instructors had an undergraduate education, as well as Marchand et al. study (2009) that reported that 68% of field instructors had at least a Bachelor’s degree. Again, program differences may be responsible for these differences, such as hiring requirements, recruiting procedures and location of the program.

The overall interpretation of the above demographics has the potential to rely on a variety of previous findings in organizational psychology and human resources. Some of these have been mentioned above as marital status and job characteristics (Hughes, Galingsky & Morris, 1992), age and voluntary turnover (Healy, Lehman & McDaniel, 1995) or ethnic values and work-life balance (Kerka, 1998). We could also argue that the young age of these individuals, associated to a mostly single sample, fits well the job
demands of this profession: demanding work hours, physically challenging tasks, difficult clients, and more.

Field instructors in this study were also questioned about their previous experience working in connected professions. Over 40% of instructors reported having worked as a camp counselor, 33% as a non-therapeutic outdoor leader and 18% as commercial guide. A total of 15% had previously worked as a correctional facility employee or a field instructor in another wilderness therapy program. However, when asked about the length of time that they had worked for another wilderness therapy program, over 22% reported having work at some other program. It is possible that this question may have been misinterpreted since it was placed immediately after the question asking field instructors about their total length of time at their current program. While the information concerning previous employment lacks details, there is evidence to suggest that experience in similar organizations help newcomer develop more realistic expectations about their work (Adkins, 1995). This information emphasizes the lack of therapeutic experience by newcomers, as well as the recruiting process by wilderness therapy program. Previous employment experience suggests that programs are primarily hiring individuals with previous wilderness experience, and not necessarily therapeutic experience. Several reasons may explain this, such as employment qualifications required by each program, the target audience for recruiting and the needs of each program. An important question emerging from this data concerns the possibility that outdoor professionals are less prepared to face the job demand stressors of working in wilderness therapy. It is also possible that field instructors who have worked as outdoor leaders in
non-therapeutic settings have a good understanding of some of the similar job demands required by wilderness therapy, including: unconventional schedule, compromises made for work, wilderness living and difficulties creating intimate relationships outside of work. On one hand, the lack of therapeutic knowledge may have influenced the results of this study when underestimating job demand stressors. On the other hand, previous experience in other types of outdoor programs may have influenced field instructors in overestimating some of their job demand stressors.

**Expectations and Current Job Demand Stressors**

Hypothesis 1 predicted that field instructors would not expect individual job demand items as stressors. This hypothesis was rejected for five out of the 30 possible items. The highest score for expectation of job demand stressors was for “I expected missing out on time with friends and family when I am on course/ in the field”. This could also be explained as field instructors from this study expected the most stress from the job demand that required them to be away from friends and family. This same statement was also rejected for Hypothesis 2 that predicted that field instructors would not perceive their current individual job demand items as stressors. In total, this hypothesis was rejected for four out of the 30 possible items, and missing out on time with friend and family obtained the highest level of agreement for current job demand stressors. These findings are in-line with Marchand et al. (2009), who reported that compromises made for work were the most difficult aspect of working in wilderness therapy for field instructors.
Hypothesis 3 and 4 respectively predicted that overall mean score for expected and overall current job demand items would not be perceived as job demand stressors. The overall mean score for expected job demand stressors was not significant, nor was the overall mean score for current job demand stressors. This may suggest that while field instructors are susceptible to some of the job demands of working in wilderness therapy, overall they do not see their job demands as stressors. Again, this would be in-line with the overall rating obtain by Marchand et al. (2009), who evaluated that field instructors were sometimes affected by their job difficulties. It is also possible that the benefits of this job mediate the job demand stressors. Some of the benefits that were previously reported include living in the wilderness, personal growth and making a difference for students (Marchand, 2006).

Finally, one important research objective of this study was to evaluate the differences between expected and current job demand stressors, since unrealistic expectations have been shown to decrease job satisfaction, increase turnover and affect the overall well-being in employees (Kottler, 1986; Lee et al., 1992; Nelson & Sutton, 1991). Hypothesis 5 projected that there would be no significant difference between expectations and current job demand stressors. The usage of a paired t-test showed that the difference in the overall scores for expected and current job demand stressors was not significant. However, the differences between individual items report more detailed information about areas that have differences between expected and current job demands, and help programs target specific areas for improvement. In evaluating individual statements of job demand stressors, a total of 18 out of 30 items (60%) were significantly
different from expectations to current. Seven items had been underestimated (field instructors expected less stress from these items) and 11 items had been overestimated (field instructors expected more stress from these items).

Among the items that had been underestimated, the most underestimated item concerned pay amounts in regards to how much does a field instructor feel he or she should be paid. Instructors also expected that they would feel more comfortable with the turnover rates of their colleagues at that time then they currently do. Another portion of instructors expected that they would have an easier time pursuing meaningful intimate relationships. The underestimation of job demand stressors may be due to a lack of information concerning realistic job demand stressors and programs potentially emphasizing the positive aspects and minimizing the negative aspects (Kottler, 1986; Lee, Ashford, Walsh & Mowday, 1992; Schein, 1978). Field instructors may also expect that they will cope better with certain job stressors until they are actually faced with them, and previous experience with similar type of work may facilitate this adjustment (Adkins, 1995). This information can be utilized in conjunction with the previous employment data collected in this study, which leads to believe that most newcomers have had little to no experience in therapeutic settings before working in wilderness therapy. This may make them more vulnerable or surprised by the actual job demands of this type of work. High turnover rates are a recognized issue of mental health care professions (Balfour & Neff, 1993) and for that reason the resources available to prevent and combat high turnover rates may be more readily available.
Overestimated items of job demand stressors, or items for which field instructors had expected more stress from a specific job demand occurred significantly more often than underestimated items. Among the overestimated items, field instructors reported the amount of physical exhaustion after a course, comfort level with confronting clients on their issues and comfort level working with groups all from the opposite gender. It was also noted that almost all items that were overestimated had to do with specific therapeutic skills and aptitudes necessary for working as a field instructor. Example of these skills are counseling skills, detachment from clients and confronting clients on their issues. The misconceptions or misunderstanding that result in overestimating the job demands concerning important therapeutic skills could be a concern to programs that are recruiting future field instructors. Field instructors commonly use these therapeutic skills, and the overestimation of the job demand stressors relating to these skills may need to be addressed earlier by programs recruiting and training field instructors. More specifically to wilderness therapy, examples of characteristics that had been overestimated are: physical demands of the job, wilderness living skills and living in remote wilderness areas. This overestimation is likely to be attributed to field instructors having normal newcomer fears about the tasks and demands of their new job, since most of them have never worked in this capacity. This response shift is likely to be attributed to a lack of self-knowledge and understanding of the concepts, which has been verified through previous interviews and qualitative research in past response shift-bias studies (Cantrell 2003; Manthei, 1997; Mezoff, 1981). It is also possible that since field instructing is not a well-known profession, individuals considering this work do not have as much
information available to them as one would for a more conventional job. Finally, it could also be argued that field instructors have less confidence in these skills then other individuals may have, but more research would need to be done to evaluate this possibility. However, since these individuals are choosing a non-conventional type of work this idea is unlikely.

This interpretation of overestimation of job demand stressors is also in-line with the usage of a retrospective pretest, reasoned by the lack of knowledge about a certain area, specifically concerning knowledge of outdoor leadership (Sibthorp, Paisley, Gookin & Ward, 2007). Sibthorp et al (2007) presented evidence that aspiring outdoor leaders have a tendency to overestimate their abilities in the area of communication, group behavioral skills and leadership. Interviews done during the same study reported that participants were unaware of their current level of outdoor leadership competencies until after they had experienced outdoor leadership in a more formal context. The application of this past study (see Sibthorp et al., 2007) to the present study is that there is some evidence that individuals may overestimate their job demand stressors based on a lack of information when self-assessing their own knowledge of these job demand stressors. Once field instructors go through the initial training, and acquire the skills needed to perform their job, or realize that they already possess some of the skills they thought they were lacking, they then perceive these skills differently. Field instructors ultimately feel less stressed about their job demand stressors once they go through the training and acquire the skills necessary.
This process of overestimation is also the result of acquiring experience and ultimately more days of field experience. A comparison of days of field experience and overestimation may result in a better picture of this effect, especially when field instructors have been there for only a short period of time. This variable was explored further and is explained in more details further in the conclusion.

**Job Satisfaction**

The elevated job satisfaction score reported by participant suggests that field instructors are generally satisfied with their job. The average score reported by field instructor (154.70) is also higher than the reported norms for the total score for job satisfaction in social work, education, police, mental health and the average American regardless of his work. Even among the individuals who had worked the longest amount of field days, the total mean score was still higher than all these work areas. It is unclear why the profession of field instructor in wilderness therapy would create such high job satisfaction, especially considering some of the difficult aspects of the job such as clients, wilderness living and compromises made because of the schedule. The higher total score for job satisfaction could be a reflection of the job choice factors. Field instructors most often report a passion for the nature of this type of work rather than financial benefits. A more in depth comparison for the differences among job satisfaction scores and reasons for these differences could shed some light on these results.

The *Job Satisfaction Survey* also contains nine subscales that allow for more detailed information about facets of job satisfaction. These areas include pay, promotion,
supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work and communication. The results indicated that field instructors were most satisfied with the nature of their work. This finding is also in-line with the reasons given by field instructors in regards to their job choice. These include altruistic reasons, outdoor environment, and personal growth and development opportunities. These are evidence that field instructors are satisfied with this type of work because of the interpersonal and intrapersonal benefits they gained from their job. The results concerning the job choice factors will be reported in more details further in this section.

The areas that field instructors were least satisfied with included fringe benefits and pay. Some of the fringe benefits offered by OBHIC programs recruiting wilderness therapy instructors include health care coverage, dental care coverage, gear stipend or rebates, retirement plans, counseling services, partially or fully paid trainings and housing. These benefits are generally specific to each program and are available on the web site of each program (www.obhic.com). Fringe benefits are likely to be quite important for field instructors since they are often seen as part of the total compensation for someone’s work (Leibowitz, 1983). In comparison to mental health and social work job satisfaction subscale scores, fringe benefits were the one subscale that rated lower. Some of this may have to do with the fact that mental health workers and social workers have more recognized professions and may generally have better benefits.

The subscale pay was also rated ambivalent, while being the highest underestimated job demand stressor item. This item could be interpreted a variety of ways, including the fact that field instructors feel that their work is worth more or that in
comparison to other similar professionals they should be paid more. This may seem contradictory to what previous studies have shown, that outdoor leaders do not find monetary gains to be the most important reason for choosing this type of work (Barnes, 1997; Barnes, 1999). However, research has also shown that pay is often seen as a reflection of worth and feeling underpaid could be a reason for voluntary turnover (Barnes, 1997).

Psychological Well-Being

In line with previous findings that lower job satisfaction is one reason for reported lower psychological well-being (Faragher et al., 2005), this study as an objective to obtain more information concerning the psychological well-being of field instructors. Results indicated that field instructors did not have any distress, but also did not have positive psychological well-being. It is noteworthy that 25% of the participants scored in the range of moderate or severe distress. In relation to the normative samples, theses numbers are similar to those found by Harold Dupuy (Chassany et al., 2004) who created the original version of the PGWBI. For the average American adult, 71% were found to have no distress or a positive well-being, and 28% had moderate to severe distress. It is possible that the scores reported by field instructors are related to their job demands but more studies need to be done to answer this question. The PWBG-S also includes six subscales. The lowest scored subscales for psychological well-being were both in the vitality categories. Vitality is also representative of energy levels, including feeling tired and nor having as much energy or pep (Chassany et al., 2004). It is hard to tell if these
subscales would consistently return these types of results if repeated over a certain period of time. However, this may also be an area for programs to be aware of when dealing with the well-being of field instructors.

*Expectations of Job Demand Stressors – Relation*

Since realistic or unrealistic expectations of newcomers is likely to affect job satisfaction and psychological well-being, regressions were used to evaluate the relationship between these variables, and the strength of that relationship. Hypothesis 8 projected that expectations of job demand stressors would be related to job satisfaction. This hypothesis was accepted since the regression indicated that expectations of job demand stressors significantly predicted the total job satisfaction score. However, the proportion of the variance accounted for was modest. This modest variance is likely the result of several other characteristics affecting the job satisfaction of an individual, and not only job demands. Newcomer’s expectation only accounts for a small proportion of job satisfaction since factors like performance (Porter & Lawler, 1968), learning new skills, work conditions and management (Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman, 1959) have all been linked to this variable. Another regression was performed for hypothesis 10 which predicted that current job demand stressors would not affect job satisfaction. The results of this regression were also significant, accounting for a bigger portion of the variance. Previous research has shown that job satisfaction and emotional exhaustion (a measure of burnout), were directly related to job characteristics (Janssen et al., 2004), further reaffirming the connection between these variables.
The same research also utilized emotional exhaustion as a measure of psychological outcome, which is a measure of well-being (Janssen et al., 2004). In this study, a regression was also performed for hypothesis 10, which projected that expectations of job demand stressors would be related to psychological well-being. This hypothesis was accepted, since the regression was not significant. These findings may account for the fact that expectations of job demand stressors happened in the past, in some cases over three or four years ago and psychological well-being is a measure that accounts only for the last month of well-being (Chassany et al., 2004). While it is possible that past events, such as expectations of job demand stressors affect psychological well-being, the utilization of the PGWB-S may not be an accurate measure to verify this hypothesis. It seems likely that job demands would affect more than just the job satisfaction variable of field instructors, including some variables related to individual distress. As reported, the most stressful current and expected item of job demand was the anticipation of missing out on time with friends and family, and underestimation of job demand stressors was highest for pay, turnover rate and creating meaningful intimate relationships. Nelson and Sutton (1991) reported in a study of expectations of job stressors that work-home conflicts, time pressure and job scope were all related to higher level of distress. This study may not have shown a direct link between psychological well-being and job demands, but this should not stop our inquiry for the well-being of field instructors. Differences in expectations may be alarming enough to warrant more studies and usage of other variables to understand how the psychological well-being of field instructors is affected.
Evaluation of Realistic Expectations

This study was particularly interested in the direction of change from expectations to current job demands and if this change would be related to job satisfaction and psychological well-being. Mainly, it was thought from previous research that individual who would underestimate their job demand stressors, would be more susceptible to feelings of un-satisfaction with their job (Kottler, 1986; Lee et al., 1992; Schein, 1978). After measuring the mean difference for each respondent, comparing those to the group mean difference for each individual item, as well as looking at the distribution of differences and the standard deviation, three categories were created to represent underestimation, overestimation and fulfilled expectations of job demand stressors. These categories can also be explained as underestimated = expected less stress than current level, overestimated = expected more stress than current level have and fulfilled = stress expected is similar to current stress level. Since this is the first time that these categories were created and were based on a newly created survey, there is no reference point to compare them to and these findings should be examined with caution.

MANOVA was used to examine the categorical variable of change in relation to job satisfaction and psychological well-being. While overall effect of the analysis was significant, psychological well-being did not return any significant findings. However, job satisfaction was significant when using change in mean as the independent variable. Further testing revealed that the group that had underestimated their job demand stressors had lower job satisfaction than those who had overestimated or fulfilled their expectations. These findings are similar to those reported by other studies, which have
shown that underestimation of job demand stressors can translate into a lower job satisfaction (Nelson et al., 1988).

Another multivariate was performed for the nine subscales of job satisfaction and returned overall significant findings. More specifically, the analysis indicated that field instructors who had underestimated their job demand stressors all reported lower job satisfaction on the subscales pay, promotion, fringe benefits, contingent reward, coworkers, nature of work and communication. The subscales pay and promotion all scored higher for individuals who had overestimated or fulfilled their expectations than individuals who had underestimated their expectations. There was also a significant difference between the underestimation group in comparison to the overestimation group, in the area of coworkers, nature of work and communication. Finally, fringe benefits and contingent reward subscales were lower for individuals who had underestimated their job demands stressors compared to higher scores for the individuals who had fulfilled their expectations. However, the group that had fulfilled their expectations also scored lower on contingent reward than the group who had overestimated their expectations. In this regard, we may hypothesized that field instructors who truly expected lower contingent rewards, such as bonus in recognition of their work, were happily surprised if and when they did get them.

Days of Field Experience

This study also collected information concerning the schedule pattern of field instructors. This study revealed three different types of schedule patterns: 8 days on/ 6 days off, 14, 15, 16 days on/ 12, 13, 14 days off and a varied type, with no specific days
on and off. Most field instructors (80.7%) reported the first type of schedule, 8 days on/ 6 days off. It is possible that the scheduling pattern may give us more insight into job satisfaction and reasons for voluntary turnover, and therefore we conducted further analysis to explore this possibility. While this study was not primarily concerned with tenure of field instructors, the issue of staff turnover and retention is inevitable linked to the research objectives of this study: that is to better understand how expectations affect job satisfaction and psychological well-being of field instructors. This study collected several data variables related to tenure of participants. First of all, it asked participants how many months they had worked at their current program. It also asked them if they had worked at any other program and how long was their experience, in month, elsewhere. Finally, to obtain an accurate picture of experience in wilderness therapy, this study also collected information about the schedule patterns of each participant. With this information, this study was able to assess a number of days of field experience for each respondent. This number was between 9 and 662 days of experience or an average of 186 days. This number excluded two participants that had reported unusually high number of months of experience, which translated in above 1000 days of field experience. The number of days of field experience is also limited by the lack of information on any vacation days or sick days that respondents may not have calculated in their total tenure. However, we are confident that this number is fairly accurate because an instructor who would have taken extended vacation time, such as 3 months or more, probably would not have considered those as work months in their total tenure. For those that may have done so, we do not believe that their additional number of months would be high enough to
significantly skewed the data. Another limitation of this variable to consider is the lack of clarity of some respondent’s schedule, which could not be accounted for. A dozen instructors left their schedule blank because they felt it was too varied to sufficiently give days on and day off. Most of these instructors were all working for the same program. These respondents were ultimately not accounted for in this analysis.

Based on this information, a categorical variable representing four levels of days of experience was created using data from the normal distribution. These were group 1) 0 to 52 days of field experience, 2) 53 to 118 days of field experience, 3) 119 to 261 days of field experience and 4) 262 to 662 days of field experience. From this category, a multivariate analysis was performed to evaluate any potential differences between the groups in relation to job satisfaction and psychological well-being. The analysis of the combined dependent variable was significant. However, psychological well-being alone was not significant in the test of between-subjects effect. On the other hand, job satisfaction did indicate a significant difference between the different groups of days of field experience. These results are in-line with previous findings that tenure does predict job satisfaction (Bedeian, Ferris, Kacmar, 1992). Post hoc testing showed that individuals with the lowest number of days of field experience had higher job satisfaction than those who had been there for over 119 days. Barnes (1999) explains that satisfaction of outdoor leaders is mainly high in the first year, but generally drops after the one year “honeymoon” period that generally ends after one year and confront individuals to the reality of this live of work. He hypothesized that after five years field instructors are more settled into the reality of working as an outdoor leader, and their satisfaction with work is
more stable. Another study looked at police officers and burnout, and reported that officers with the highest level of seniority showed the highest levels of burnout (Duran et al, 2006). Both of these ideas are difficult to compare to field instructors in wilderness therapy since very little individuals work over five years in that capacity, but similarities in the job demands may warrant some attention.

To better evaluate the meaning of this analysis, the nine subscales of job satisfaction were also analyzed using a MANOVA. Results indicated that the facets promotion, contingent reward, operating conditions and communication were all significantly different based on days of field experience. All five significant subscales had higher scores for individuals who had been there less than 52 days. Individuals who had been there over 262 days all scored lower on the same subscales. The subscales operating conditions and communication also scored lower for field instructors who had worked between 119 days and 261 days, in comparison to field instructors who had worked less than 52 days. In regards to promotion, it was reported as the number one reason for outdoor leaders to leave their job in a study of motivation in outdoor programs (Barnes, 1999). Bunce (1998) also found that boredom, meaning repetitive work in the field, was one important difficulty of being a field instructor in wilderness therapy. While programs employ a large number of field instructors, the rest of the treatment team positions are limited, and may require certification and education level that not every field instructors possess to get promoted in this direction. This could potentially be a frustrating issue for field instructors who have been working for their program for extended period of time, and for whom the opportunities to be promoted to a new
position inside their program may be limited. Promotional issues may also be related to a lack of contingent rewards, including monetary or promotional forms of recognition that may come with promotional advancement. Finally, it makes sense that operating conditions and communication inside a program would be related. It is possible that field instructors with longer tenure are lacking a voice in their program, more particularly a voice that is equivalent to their number of days of field experience. While there is most likely a communication system in place inside each program, field instructors who have been working there longer may need to feel that their voice has more importance than a field instructor who would have a much smaller number of days of field experience. It could also be argued that the longer someone work for a program, the more experience they have with the application and success of a program’s policies and procedures, making it more frustrating for them when these are failing or seemed inappropriate. This could potentially be aggravated if the same field instructors have tried communicating these problems to their program’s administration and no attempts to modify these policies and procedures were made. Finally, it could also be argued that field instructors with more days of field experience are annoyed by having to follow policies and procedures that they feel are inappropriate. Not being able to make decision was one of the five most important reasons given by outdoor leaders as potential reasons to leave a program (Barnes, 1999)
Training

To compliment this study, questions concerning the initial training were asked of all participants. The final sample size (N=151) was mainly determined by the question asking instructors if they had participated in an initial training. Among the 186 surveys that were first received, 153 individuals (84%) had participated in an initial program. Within the eight programs that volunteered for this study, 60% to 100% of field instructors had participated in an initial training. This initial training ranged from 1 day to 15 days with most field instructors participating in a 5 days training. This information is without precedent in wilderness therapy research, but when compared to other outdoor programs, it seems to be lower than average. For example, Outward Bound’s at Risks Expeditions’ newcomer instructors have to go through an 11 days training (Outward Bound, 2009). Also, among the main outdoor education schools, Outward Bound Wilderness USA requires its newcomer instructors, who are not serving youth-at-risks, to participate in a 9 to 15 days training, depending on their field of expertise (B. Vicchiarilli, personal communication, March 13, 2009), and the National Outdoor Leadership School requires interested newcomer instructors to participate in a 32-34 days initial training (National Outdoor Leadership School, 2009). Another avenue for looking at the length of the initial training is to compare it to state standards. According to a follow-up study of outdoor behavioral healthcare programs, 84% of respondents were operating under state standards. However, not all states have standards and those who do, do not have all the same ones. For example, the state of Utah requires all field instructors to participate in an initial training of a minimum of 80 hours.
The ideal training length is still left unknown and deciding what training length is appropriate for wilderness therapy programs will require more research. Many ethical questions concerning the length and content of the initial training have been raised in the last 15 years among researchers (Davis-Berman & Berman, 1994; Russell, Gillis & Lewis, 2008). Basically, when considering the needs of these programs, which include a variety of technical and therapeutic skills, what should the best practices be? The average number of training days should be evaluated with cautious, because it was also noticed that some of the surveys included side notes concerning internships. There seems to be confusion by some field instructors about the difference between initial training and internship. Finally, in regards to the appropriate length and content of future initial trainings of field instructors in wilderness therapy, we also need to consider what qualification and experience one program requires. For example, programs that require their field instructors to have at least one degree in a therapeutically related degree may not spend as much time teaching them about the skills needed to fulfill that part of their job.

Another question asked field instructors about their initial training satisfaction in regards to the level of preparation for their work. Forty five percent of field instructors rated their initial training as good, while another 26% rated it as sufficient, and 22% as very good. It is possible that this rating of the initial training took into account satisfaction with the internship portion, if a field instructor perceived that internship as part of their initial training.
Qualitative data concerning the initial training was collected from field instructors to obtain information on what they thought were the three most important elements of their initial training. A total of 10 themes were found to be important for field instructors. Among these, *learning about therapeutic and behavioral management skills* was reported most often as the most important element of the training. Imbedded in this theme, field instructors reported role-playing, behavioral management situations and learning de-escalation skills as important aspects of their training. This may have to with the fact that most newcomers have had some previous experience working in a wilderness or outdoor environment, but not as much in therapeutic settings. The participants of this study who reported mainly having previous work experience in camp settings and outdoor programs support this idea. Only a small amount of field instructors had previous experience in another wilderness therapy program, and less than a handful had worked in correctional facilities. This also reiterates that for most of them they mainly have experience working with non-therapeutic individuals and are likely to be seeking more specific therapeutic skills related to working in the wilderness with this type of clients. Also, a previous study of field instructors reported that 25% of instructors had obtained a degree in behavioral or social sciences while 21% had previously obtained a degree in adventure programming or recreation (Marchand et al. 2009). This information would support the need for field instructors to specifically gain new or additional therapeutic skills that are necessary to work in the wilderness therapy environment.

This second most important element of the initial training was reported as *experiential learning of the program structure*. Field instructors indicated that some of
the most powerful learning moments during their initial training were when they visited
groups of students, observed more experienced instructors working and were able to talk
with students and instructors about their experience with the program.

The importance of experiential learning is also reflected in the third most
important element, which is *having been in the role of students*. The large amount of field
instructors reporting this element justified its own category. Field instructors reported the
importance of being able to live in the same conditions as students and to be treated the
same way that students are. It is possible that this experiential aspect of the training helps
build compassion and understanding for the clients, which is later important in building
relationships with the same clients. The idea that experiential learning builds compassion
was at the base of Kurt Hahn’s vision for Outward Bound when the school first started in
1941. He believed immensely in the importance of value forming experiences (Stetson,
n.d.). Even before that, Dewey also mentioned the importance of putting ourselves into
other people’s position, to build our sense of justice and humility (1981). It could be
enlightening to find out how many of the programs actually require their instructors to be
in the role of clients during their initial training, and collect details on how this affects
their work.

More than half of the instructors reported the above three elements of their initial
training. Notably, all elements were related in some form to experiential learning or
experiential education. The demographic and desire of these field instructors to perform
this type of work may make them more incline to appreciate the experiential nature of
their training. Further, wilderness therapy based on experiential learning, where youth
learn to deal with natural consequences and manage skills necessary to live healthy lives back in their home environment (Russell & Phillips-Miller, 2002). It is then no surprise that field instructors would find experiential elements of their training the most important aspects of their preparation for the work of field instructor.

**Job Choice and Organizational Choice**

Finally, information concerning job choice and organizational choice of field instructors were asked of this study’s participants. Foremost, this information was reasoned to increase general knowledge of individuals working in wilderness therapy and begin a discussion concerning their job motivation. It was also believed that this information might give some insights into reactions to job demands and the job satisfaction process. The process of finding the right organizations is highly linked to the theory of person-environment fit (Diener, Larson & Emmons, 1984). There is also evidence that hiring the right people may be more important than what a company does to keep employees happy once they have been hired (Rovner, 2001). For example, if field instructors had simply chosen their job and program because of the convenience of location and benefits, they might not be so receptive to the job demands that include being away for extended period of times, or having to deal with behaviorally difficult clients. Further, it is equally important for employees to collect information about the values of a program and their coworkers in addition to job characteristics (Cable & Judge, 1996). Finally, expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964) also explains some aspects of an applicant’s decision to apply for a certain organization. In the context of this study, this
theory would apply to the belief that a future field instructor has of his or her ability at obtaining employment for a certain program. Further, the expectancy theory is also perceived has a compensatory model, where lower attraction for some aspects of a job choice can be offset or balanced by the higher attraction for other aspects of the job choice (Barber, 1998). This compensatory model is highly relevant in this study since it was demonstrated that participating field instructors have different degrees of expectations towards their job demands, and that they inevitably perceive more benefits than disadvantage in making their job choice, as seen in the qualitative answers provided.

Field instructors were asked two questions concerning this area. The first question asked participants about the three most important reasons for choosing to work in wilderness therapy. The second question asked them about the three most important reasons for choosing their current program. Both questions were to be ranked in order of importance. Since this information was not to be triangulated with any of the quantitative data collected, all instructors who had answered this question were kept for content analysis. This would have to be modified if we were to triangulate this information unto the quantitative data collected. The final sample totaled 185 respondents. Since instructors were often using the same answers for job choice and organizational choice, the coding for both questions was done concurrently, but analyzed separately in the end.

A set of 10 themes emerged within respondents’ answers. In line with job choice decision, the themes all fit in one of these “implicit theories”, which includes objective factors, subjective factors and critical contact approach (Behling, Labovitz & Gainer, 1968). The following explains and gives examples of some of the answers given by field
Objective factors are the ones weighted by individuals, as advantages or disadvantages, such as pay, working conditions, or nature of work. Respondents saying that they enjoy the part of the job that allows them to help others exemplify elements that correspond to nature of work. Elements such as training schedule, physical demands and living outdoors are examples of working conditions. Subjective factors are based on how an individual assess a job choice based on needs, personality and values. For example, field instructors who answered that they believed in the outcomes of outdoor behavioral healthcare or that they wanted a job that was in an outdoor environment used this factor in their decision process. Finally, the critical contact approach relates to aspects of recruitment. An example of this reported by field instructors was the importance of communicating with the administrators during their recruitment process and the easiness of the hiring process, such as no references needed or lengthy application documents to fill.

While specific examples fitted into one of those three factors, the themes utilized seemed more representative of the profession of field instructor, and of specific reason that would have lead to their choice in this field of work and their program. The final themes created were: 1) outdoor environment characteristics, 2) location of program, 3) altruistic characteristics, 4) personal growth and career development, 5) reputation, referral and recommendation, 6) specific program characteristics, 7) compensation, benefits and rewards, 8) recruitment, training and convenience of hiring, 9) OBH specific characteristics and 10) others. It was noticed that the final themes that were created from the reported answers, were closely related to the benefits to working in wilderness.
therapy found by Bunce (1998). These benefits were also evaluated in another study and in order of importance were found to be: 1) making a difference for students, 2) living in the wilderness, 3) break from daily home pressures and concerns, 4) personal growth, 5) clarification of personal values and 6) no technology or media (Marchand, 2006). In further support of these themes, Barnes’ s (1999) study of motivation of outdoor leader also indicated similar factors for job choice, including working in the outdoors, working with people and being part of an alternative educational system.

The most important reason reported by field instructors for choosing to work in the field if wilderness therapy was altruistic characteristics. Forty five percent of respondents gave answers related to wanting to work and help people, specifically youth and youth at risks. Examples of this theme also include responses like “I like and enjoy working in therapy” and meaningful and fulfilling work. In some instances, respondents reported having been a youth at risk at some point, or even had been a student in a wilderness therapy program and wanted to utilize their experience and empathy to help clients.

The second reason most often reported by field instructors was outdoor environmental characteristics with over 28% of answers. For examples, field instructors stated that they had chosen to work in wilderness therapy because it allowed them to be outdoors and practice some of their favorite outdoor activities like camping and backpacking. Barnes (1999) had reported that outdoor leaders reported being motivated to work in outdoor education because it allowed them to pursue a hobby for a job, but this
motivation decreased slightly when asked later on if it contributed to their motivation to continue working in this area.

Finally, the third most reported reason that field instructor decided to work in wilderness therapy was because of the opportunities for personal growth and career development. Answers like “personal growth”, being able to fulfill some requirements for graduate school and being able to develop their professional experiences were reported in over 10% of cases. It was noticed that the top three themes for job choice were all related to personal reasons, while the last seven themes were more related to characteristics of outdoor behavioral healthcare program, such as location, recruitment and reputation. While one study reports that personal development was the most often reported answer for continued work in outdoor education (Barnes, 1999), Bunce (1998) reported that field instructors were struggling with the lack of time to pursue other interests, which could be linked to a form of personal development. The importance of personal growth/development is also associated to gaining additional skills needed for future educational or professional activities. It was estimated that about 24% of outdoor leaders worked in that capacity with other career goals in mind. However, it should also be mentioned that over 50% of outdoor leaders also started working in outdoor education with the intention of making it a lifetime career path (Barnes, 1999). Differentiating personal development, professional development and personal interests would be useful to cater field instructors with their personal needs in mind, potentially when thinking about assigning them work tasks and promotional opportunities.
The second question in this section asked field instructors to think about their three most important reasons for choosing their specific program. This question may be more in line with the person-environment fit theory, since it specifically links an individual with a program and not only a general area of work. While OBHIC only encompasses a small number of programs from the United-States and Canada, the number of programs that competes for competent and dedicated individuals to take over the job of field instructors is thought to be fairly high. It is unclear how many programs are actively recruiting field instructors, but a recent study of outdoor behavioral healthcare programs targeted 124 organizations at the time of the study (Russell, 2007).

The answers provided by organizational choice may help programs focus on their organizational strength when recruiting individuals. The need for more knowledge concerning specific programs was indicated in the most important reason in organizational choice: specific program characteristics. Examples of this theme include attraction to a specific program philosophy, impression of the support system, specific schedule pattern or specific element of the curriculum, such as holistic approach and educational emphasis. This theme came up in almost one quarter of answers.

The second reason most often reported was altruistic characteristics with 17% of responses. It is possible that field instructors have chosen their specific program because they thought they values towards this type of work may be better serve by their specific program, as explained through subjective factors (Behling, Labovitz & Gainer, 1968). This idea is also in line with person-environment fit as explained earlier (Diener, Larson & Emmons, 1984).
Finally, the third answer reported most often was reputation, referral and recommendations. Field instructors reported examples of this theme in over 15% of cases. Examples include program reputation, friends and family recommending the program and knowing of someone who worked there and thought they would be a good fit with this program. It is worth noting that location of program came in close with 13.5% of field instructors indicating how the specific geographic location of their program was an important reason for them. Location of the program would be considered a job attribute, rather than a person-environment fit attribute, but is generally considered an important aspect of job seeker’s decision (Cable & Judge, 1996).

The overall job attributes in the general population, have been reported somewhat differently than what this study indicated. For example, one study found that both men and women ranked meaningfulness first, income second and promotion third as the most important job decision characteristics (Lacy, Bokemeier & Shepard, 1983). These differences with other professional areas may simply reiterate the fact that field instructors are generally motivated by other factors before money and compensation (Barnes, 1999). However, this does not mean that field instructor to not believe that their income should not be representative of their worth. This is supported by evidence that field instructors were most unsatisfied with their pay and expectations of pay. In talking about the importance of humility in leadership roles, Simpson (2003) wrote: “Although experiential educator sometimes complain about their pay, I think that many take some private pride in not letting money entice them to less idealistic work” (p. 16). This disparity between instructors yearning for a higher pay while putting financial benefits at
the low end of their job choice factors is a good example of cognitive dissonance. The idea of cognitive dissonance is explained as having contradictory beliefs, ideas or behaviors (Festinger, 1957). The basic of the theory is that most individuals want to reduce or eliminate their cognitive dissonance by changing. In relation to field instructors, the question that field instructors may be asking themselves is how much and when does a low pay rate, the lack of promotion or insufficient benefits are not enough for a field instructor to stay in a job, further more, to leave the field of wilderness therapy all completely. In comparison to outdoor education professionals, it is most likely a combination of factors, such as the lack of promotion, decision making and personal achievement combined with feelings of low pay that lead field instructors to leave their job and the field of wilderness therapy altogether (Barnes, 1999).

It should be noted that a small number of field instructors reported the same set of answers for both questions, potentially suggesting that they are working for their specific program because of convenience, or simply because it was too tedious to answer both questions in the survey. Another option is that some field instructors are not taking the time to do the necessary work to see if their personal values match their program values, and in the end they do not see differences between their job choice and organizational choice.
Recommendations

Specific Program and Field Instructor Recommendations

The results of this study lead to several practical suggestions to improve hiring, training and retention of field instructors. The following proposals can be applied immediately or in the future, potentially leading to rapid benefits. In line with the main hypothesis, the results of this study have indicated that having realistic job demand expectations as a newcomer will result in having a higher job satisfaction. Expectations should not be the only factor to consider in improving job satisfaction, but in a lot of cases, improving levels of expectations of job demand stressors has the potential to improve other factors that would otherwise become a problem later on. Examples of this may be commuting time, compromises made with home, location of the program, work procedures and more.

Programs must realize that some of these expectations are formed in the early stages of the job choice decision process, and in some cases prior to recruitment and hiring. According to Adkins (1995):

“Because the adjustment that a new job in a new setting must be viewed as a process of turning away from the patterns of behavior and experiences established in the previous settings, individual’s work experience prior to entry into a given organization must be considered in studies of the socialization process” (p.839).
This study did offer some insight on the previous work experience of field instructors, and programs may want to take a better look at what kind of employees they attract and retain in relation to work experience. How this plays a role in the process of expectations and adjustment needs some more evaluation. Other examples of expectation formation may be related to what the media report of wilderness therapy, which is unfortunately not always a positive picture (e.g. Krakauer, 1995). There may also be some expectations formed from knowing of someone who has gone through a wilderness therapy program as a client, or knowing of someone who was or is a field instructor in wilderness therapy. This was reported among the reasons that field instructor chose this field of work and their individuals program. On a more general level, formation of ideas towards becoming a field instructor could come from personal mainstream therapeutic experiences or personal wilderness living experiences. In line with the reasons reported by field instructors, job choice seems to often be a reflection of belief in this therapeutic approach, belief in the power of the outdoors and recommendations from people having had positive experiences, as client or professionals. In the recruitment process and initial training, it would be recommended that recruiters and trainers approach the idea of preconceived notions related to wilderness therapy and field instructors, and work on lowering these or creating some more realistic ones if these are not in-line with the reality of the job.

In view of the knowledge that field instructors have expectations before their first contact with their program, every step of the recruitment process and training process becomes important in establishing realistic expectations that will later help individual
with higher job satisfaction and likelihood of longer retention. Several field instructors will rely on the Internet and specific program’s web site to gain knowledge about being field instructors. Without being discouraging, these web sites must make sure that they convey a realistic vision of the profession and provide details of the daily activities that the job entails. Having the possibility of contacting prior or current field instructors and past students may be one way to let field instructor form their own mind on the job requirements. The importance of experiential learning, and the possibility of talking with current staff during the initial training were reported as one important element and an effective method of preparing field instructor for their job according to study participants. This could even go further by specifically pairing interested field instructor with individuals who have similar demographic such as marital status. This can be justify by the fact that a previous study has shown that individuals in committed relationships were having more difficulties with some of the job demands related to wilderness therapy than non-committed field instructors (Marchand et al., 2009). Another important aspect of the recruitment process to be careful about is for recruiters and administration personnel involved in recruitment and hiring, to spend a considerable amount of time with interested applicants, either on the phone or in person. This time must be dedicated to create a realistic vision of the job. Programs can use the knowledge about job demands to be honest with applicants and avoid sugar coating or embellishing the characteristics of the job because they are having a hard time finding applicants. The problem of protecting field instructors from the reality of the profession is a potential problem of wilderness therapy programs. A previous study reported that one program refused to volunteer for
fear of field instructors being confronted to the reality of the profession when completing a survey about job challenges (Marchand et al. 2009). Finally, it is imperative that the content of the information transmitted to candidates includes the potential for outside challenges and consequences related to this work, such as difficulties in establishing new intimate relationships and balancing life and work elements.

Once an applicant has had a realistic vision of wilderness therapy and field instructing, their next contact with the program is generally during the initial training. It is quite possible that this moment is pivotal in the development of realistic ideas. It is often the first time that future field instructors are taken into the field and exposed to the daily skills of the job. Depending on the content, delivery and situational events of the initial training, first exposure to the job can be high or low in realism. Programs have the power to create realistic expectations through quality training, which should include trainers who have talent for conveying the necessary information. It is pertinent that this information includes details on the job demands both inside the work setting and outside, as a consequence of the job. Among the job satisfaction elements of field instructing, an effort should be made to instill realistic expectations towards pay, promotion, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, nature of work and communication. These have all scored lower for field instructors who had underestimated their job demand stressors. Further, as mentioned by field instructors in this study, enhancing the experiential nature of the training, and including extensive periods to observe and discuss the job characteristics should be a main part of the initial training. It is still unclear exactly how field instructors can reduce the effects of job demands once they start working for their program, but
having access to individuals who have successful advice for doing so could also be an element of the initial training.

The findings of this study should be seen as encouragement for programs to make changes and take actions with their current field instructors. We believe that immediate changes could improve job satisfaction and retention, without extensive efforts from programs. It is also suggested that the longer a field instructor works for a program, the more this program should strive to offer opportunities for promotion, increased contingent rewards and hold on to experienced individuals and the positive assets they bring to their organization. Suggestions for promotional opportunities could include increasing the level of responsibility such as training future newcomer, diversifying work tasks such as reconnaissance of new course areas or gear testing for clients, and offering opportunities to work in other areas of the organization such as logistics, recruitment and administration. In this regard, programs may also have success in offering partial or full tuition payment for field instructors wanting to gain more therapeutic skills or licensing. Corresponding to the results reporting that the more days of experience an instructor has the less satisfied they were with communication, programs could think about increasing the voice of field instructors in the decision making process of the program. Not only this can be a sign of recognition for the experience level of an individual, but an appreciation for their commitment to the program. Since field instructors are essentially the front lines of the organization, there is undoubtedly a sense of knowledge that comes from experiencing the day-to-day operations and having a hand on knowledge of success and problems within the program. Field instructors with longer tenure could benefit from
more opportunities to contribute to the operating conditions of their program, potentially increasing their satisfaction with this element as well.

While field instructors did not show any major signs of distress in their psychological well-being, there was some evidence that their level of vitality, or energy level, may be lower than other elements of well-being. While this can be addressed in advance through the same preparatory channels towards job demand expectations, staying vigilant of signs and symptoms with current field instructors may reduce unnecessary strain. This may be important when past studies have shown some signs of burnout within field instructors (Kirby, 2006). Results of this study indicated that burnout was a significant factor in intent to turnover and that one of the factors leading to burnout was emotional exhaustion. It is difficult to say if lower vitality levels are precursor of burnout or even intent to turnover, but it may be worth paying attention to and tracking well-being of field instructors. While some programs offer personal counseling services to their employees, this should be made available to all. The reports of burnout (Maslach, 1976) and vicarious trauma (Figley, 1993) among human service workers should not be discounted as plausible for field instructors just because they do not have the official role of therapist.

Many of the recommendations apply to field instructors directly, such as obtaining appropriate job choice information. Individuals can take actions to be better prepared for this field of work and increase their job satisfaction and well-being. Benjamin Franklin once said that the only thing more expensive than education is ignorance (Franklin, 2003). This applies to the education of field instructors as well. It is
ultimately the responsibility of the individual choosing a job to obtain the information necessary to make a balance decision. Field instructors have access to a plethora of resources: Internet, books, programs.

While not always clear, there are ample options for individuals wanting to work in outdoor programming, more specifically in outdoor behavioral healthcare, to obtain skills through formal educational avenues. As we know it, there is no specific college degree granted specifically addressing the skills of field instructor in wilderness therapy, but there are programs that have better outdoor programming curriculum than others. Students should be looking for programs that deal with current trends and issues and have evolved with the industry. It is ultimately the responsibility of these programs to create realistic expectations of the profession. That it is through internship or summer work, college programs who teach outdoor leadership classes and wilderness therapy classes need to approach the realities of this area of work. It is not sufficient for professors to be teaching the skills necessary to deal with clients and to live in the backcountry. For several individuals their first training towards the necessary competences and understanding of outdoor behavioral healthcare will be learned in college. This training can be much more powerful if it strives to educate future professionals about a holistic human being in relation to their work and home/life. This study advocates for educational programs to teach and continue research in ways that will enhance field instructor’s professional and personal sustainability. Finally, career counselors need to educate themselves better on the reality and need of working in outdoor behavioral healthcare. This should also be the responsibility of the different programs in the United-States and
beyond, to distribute accurate information about the job of field instructors, as well as other job related to wilderness therapy. Researcher such as the author of this study could also participate in an effort to offer more information to career counselors as well. It is not sufficient to simply recruit and promote one’s own program, it is the responsibility of all programs and researchers to go further and dissipate general information to future field instructors.

Limitations of the study

This study had several limitations that need to be considered in interpreting the results. First of all, the time that this study was performed may have skewed the data. Because the study was performed at the end of the summer and during the fall of 2009, it is possible that field instructors who had worked all summer were more tired and susceptible to rating their job demands and job satisfaction lower. There is also the possibility that with the beginning of a new season, the number of newcomer is larger than later in the year, and they could have rated their current job demands and job satisfaction higher. Reproducing this study during different time periods could give us a better idea of this limitation. Also, increasing the sample number of newcomers and long time field instructors during each time periods, could give us a better idea of how length of tenure and time of the survey affects the findings. As mentioned earlier, there is some evidence that after the first year of work, field instructors may have a lowered level of job satisfaction, and as they get settled in the job and work a couple more years, their satisfaction increases again (Barnes, 1999).
Another effect related to the time administration of this survey could be linked to the economic situation. The number of field instructors employed by each program may have been lower due to decreased enrollment of clients. There are no official records of this hypothesis, but at the time of this study there were quite a bit of anecdotal reports of programs struggling to maintain their clients enrolment and remain operational in this difficult economic period. In 2006, Marchand et al. (2009) study had three programs returned 133 surveys. This present study surveyed eight programs that returned 186 surveys. While the economic situation may be one factor responsible for this ratio, differences among programs are to be considered. In this current study, each program returned between 11 and 38 surveys, yielding a significant difference in the number of field instructors hired by each program at the time of the survey administration.

Pertaining to programs, the differences between and potentially within programs should be considered as one of the biggest limitation of this study. First of all, the management of each program is unique: different ownership, different funding methods and different hierarchy inside the company. While all the programs surveyed are members of OBHIC, which embodies similar values and goals, these programs also have different policies and procedures. They operate in different areas of the United-States and Canada, and in some cases specialize in different types of clients and therapeutic treatments. In regards to field instructors, this research did show differences among length of initial training and ratio of instructors participating in an initial training, differences in schedule patterns and based on the demographic, differences in the field instructors hired by each program. Among these, differences in scheduling pattern and
differences within the demographic are present between each program. Some other
differences not evaluated in this research may be the type of supervision, access to
outside communication, supplemental training options, and minimum requirements for
employment. All of these are bound to influence the responses given by participants.
Future research may want to explore how exactly these field instructors.

In regards to differences among programs, it was noticed during this study that
one program returned demographic information that was visibly different than other
programs, as well as having the largest number of field instructors. While this program
was not visited in person by the researcher, the administration of this program confirmed
that they were similar to all the other programs surveyed. Some of the differences visible
were a larger ratio of males versus women and more ethnical diversity with a larger
sample of American Indian/Alaska Natives. Further more, less than half this program’s
average number of participants had a bachelor’s degree, a larger number of single field
instructors, as well as a larger number of married individuals and over 17% of
participants over 40 years old in comparison to 3% for this study’s average. Due to the
large sample size of this program (n = 23), it is possible that these differences may have
influenced the results of the study, and more analyses between programs are necessary to
accept or refute this possibility.

The study used a convenience sample of field instructors from member programs
of OBHIC who volunteered to participate. While the use of a convenient sample was
justified because of the time and financial constraint of this study, this sampling method
has various limitations. Foremost, it may not represent the average field instructor
working in wilderness therapy programs. Programs and field instructors who did not volunteer or were not approached for this study are automatically excluded from the sample population (Warner, 2007). The programs that agreed to participate in this study where all members of OBHIC at the time of this study, which reflects their commitment to follow a set of standards and policies, as well as pay annual fees to the council. These programs, while reputable, may not be representative of all the wilderness therapy programs available. For example, work conditions may vary between programs, which may greatly affect the perceptions of field instructors regarding their job demand stressors. The major inconvenience with this type of sample is that any findings should not be generalized beyond the sample of participants and we must assume that the information collected is not representative of the overall population. Further, using a convenience sample goes against the assumptions for the use of multivariate analysis, which states that the sample must be random for the initial observation or survey (Hutcheson & Sofroniou, 1999).

Another limitation to consider is the specific usage of the instruments chosen for this study. For example, while the Job Satisfaction Survey (Spector, 1985) was used for this study, there is little information to tell us if this is the most appropriate survey for this type of population. This survey was chosen because it had been developed for social service workers and had been tested with other sectors as well. For example, the Job Satisfaction Survey has been used with teachers and police officers, which comprise similarities with field instructors. For example, police officers have unconventional schedule and deal with elements of risks on a daily basis. Teachers often have to deal
with behavioral issues from students and teach conflict resolutions and resiliency to their students. However, this does not mean that the similarities between social service workers, police officers, teachers and field instructors are enough to warrant the utilization of this survey. At the time of a 2003 systematic review, 29 surveys considering job satisfaction, including the Job Satisfaction Survey were found in the literature (Saane et al., 2003). Among these, 20 surveys were developed for nurses, teachers, social workers and heterogeneous population, yielding a plethora of possibilities for using a different survey in the future.

The same cautions apply to the measurement of psychological well-being. This study justified using the short version of the PGWBI to reduce the administration time of the survey, but it is still unclear if this was the best choice. While the shorter version has shown reliability from its authors, this instrument has never been used in the past with this specific population and may not have been as suitable. In an electronic communication with the author of the shorter version of the original PGWB, the author reiterated the appropriateness of this survey for the population studied (E. Grossi, email communication, November 30, 2008).

The coding method used to analyze job choice and organizational choice looked simultaneously at both questions since several field instructors had used the same answers for both choices. However, this method of analysis has some limitations because the usage of the same words by the same or different respondents may not mean the same thing. For example, one field instructor used “meaningful work” as is second choice for both job choice and organizational choice. Potentially, he or she may have thought that
working in wilderness therapy was a meaningful job choice, while the specific program they had chosen promoted deeper meaning of the work performed. We must be careful not to generalize these results to all field instructors, since the interpretation of the information collected is limited to the two coders who looked at the data.

Limitations concerning the job demand stressor instrument should be considered as well. This area of study, including wilderness therapy and field instructors, is still a newer area and further knowledge needs to be acquired to create the most appropriate survey. For example, some job demand may have been excluded while others may not need to be present in future instrument. The interpretation that each participant makes of for job demand item limits the understanding that we have of this subject. More qualitative research needs to be performed to have more knowledge of this area of research. We will discuss potential changes in details in the next section.

Suggestions for additional research

In reason of the small number of study that have looked at field instructors in the past, this study is believed to particularly enhance the knowledge of wilderness therapy. Nonetheless, there is a tremendous amount of work left to be done through research, as well as practices in the area of wilderness therapy. Some of this work and research is underway, such as the on-going creation of a document discussing preferred practices for adventure therapy programs, including outdoor behavioral healthcare programs (M. Lung, email communication, February 12, 2009). In the case of field instructors, we still have modest knowledge of pay rate, benefits, scheduling and initial training, and a majority of the information comes from program’s web sites and previous workers. The
following sections will discuss suggestions for future research related to the findings of this study and previous knowledge.

Demographic analysis

As seen in the interpretation of findings, there is already a range of previous research that has looked at job demands, job satisfaction and demographics. While we hope that future studies will continue to gather a variety of demographic variables, a solid review of the literature in this area and a comparison to the current knowledge, may help in directing future research. In the case of this study, simple analysis utilizing the demographic variables could be performed easily to evaluate possible differences. Differences among leadership style and gender have been shown in outdoor programming (Henderson, 1996) and differences in job satisfaction and expectations of job demands in this study are likely to be discovered as well. For example, Clark (1997) reports that women tend to have lower job expectations than men, which in return may give them higher job satisfaction. However, it is also possible that the age and higher education level of field instructors negate these differences (Clark, 1997). The relationship between age and voluntary turnover has also been studied, and while it was found to be low, comparing days of field experience and age may reveal a stronger relationship (Healey, Lehman & McDaniel, 1995). Finally, marital status is one more area of future interest concerning demographic. A past study of field instructors showed some differences in the level of difficulties that non-single participants had with time compromises made for work (Marchand, 2006). There is also some knowledge that field
instructors struggle with creating intimate relationships and may be consequently choosing to be single when performing this type of work (Marchand et al., 2009). This information warrants that we pay attention to these potential issues and look into solutions that would help field instructor better balance their work and life.

Replication

Main replication of this study is encouraged in a three phases design. This present study utilized a retrospective pretest to control for response-shift bias. The usage of the retrospective pretest was also preferred in reason of the time frame of this study. To verify credibility of this study, this study could be replicated in a three phases methodology. The first phase would be administered before the initial training, preferably while future field instructors have had a minimum amount of contact with their future program. The second phase would be administered after the initial training and would preferably include two different surveys to verify retrospective pretest accuracy: one post initial training test, and one retrospective pretest that would be used for comparison with the phase one pretest. This type of reliability for retrospective pretest has shown differences in the past in the measurement of perceived outdoor leadership skills (Sibthorp et al., 2007). Finally, phase three would include a posttest at six months. If desired, future studies could continue surveying the same field instructors for as long as possible to obtain longitudinal data, similarly to the recent follow-up study of clients and treatment outcomes of wilderness therapy (Russell, 2005). The results of this study could give us more information concerning the influence of the initial training and how
In replicating this study, it is recommended that future research be done with similar program types. While this study evaluated different programs, the different sample sizes of each program made it hard to compare differences between similar program types, as well as within programs. In studying more similar programs, we may better be able to make significant evaluations between similar program types, such as how the schedule pattern or the type of clients affects field instructors. Qualitative study of smaller sample programs may be the only way to perform this type of research, but as programs return to higher enrolment number and more field instructors, quantitative studies may also be applicable within programs.

*Instruments - PWB*

In replicating this study, with or without changes to the design of the methodology, an investigation should be done to find the best instrument to measure the variable of psychological well-being within this population of field instructors. The fact that this study has shown no differences among psychological well-being may need to be further evaluated and could be the result of the instrument. Future studies could also enlarge their view of psychological well-being, and branch out into the measurement of emotional or physical well-being, self-efficacy, self-actualization, anxiety and depression. Anxiety and depression may be of particular interest within field instructors and the professional area of wilderness therapy. There as been anecdotal reports from researchers that outdoor
leaders and connected professionals choose this type of work to avoid everyday life and reduce anxiety levels that they experience in everyday life. For example, it was suggested that mountaineers use the demonstration of competence in high-risk situations as a way to build personal feelings of competence they lack in their everyday life (Hardy & Jones, 1992). In the area of human service workers, it has been suggested that individuals choose to work as therapists and psychologists to deal with their own issues, among other reasons (Epstein, 1997). While these reasons have not implicitly been reported in the job choice and organizational choice question of this study, the area of personal growth and development could yield some more facts on this notion.

**Triangulation**

This study collected an array of qualitative data concerning the initial training, job choice and organizational choice. This study used this data in descriptive way mainly because of time restriction in performing further analysis. However, triangulation analysis could be done between this information and other variables collected. For example, triangulation between levels of current job demand stressors and ranking of the initial training elements, may show that field instructors who chose experiential learning of their program have lower job demand stressors. Differences in job choice and organizational choice could also be compared to total days in the field and current job demand stressors, again potentially leading to some differences due to initial job and organizational choice. One likely hypothesis would be that field instructors who made
their job choice solely based on location and benefits, may not be as satisfied as
individuals who ranked items related to nature of work as their most important reasons.

*Initial Training*

One of the most unknown areas of field instructors in wilderness therapy may
well be the initial training. This study did obtain some information about the initial
training, but more is left to evaluate. While tedious, qualitative analysis may be the most
accurate way to look at the content, standards and differences between initial trainings. A
researcher observer or even a researcher participant may be able to get insights and
information that would otherwise be lost in quantitative measurement. However, the
usage of quantitative measurements for the initial training should also be performed to
obtain more basic information from programs. For example, since not all programs have
100% of their field instructors participate in the initial training, it would be interesting to
find out why this is and how do they decide who will participate. Simple information
about the initial training length, trainers and contents could also be ask from the
administration, either through a mailed survey or over the phone. In analyzing the content
of the initial training, either through observation, interviews or surveys, special attention
should be paid to methods resembling realistic job preview and expectations lowering
procedures. Finally, asking programs if they hire any outside organizations to conduct
their initial training and what does these organizations provide may lead to more
understanding.
Realistic Job Preview and Expectations Lowering Procedures

With this information in mind and suggestions from field instructors about content of the training, programs could start thinking about implementing an RJP and an ELP during their training or prior to employment if they do not utilize an initial training. Up to now, all the studies reported in the literature concerning wilderness therapy, were non-experimental studies, descriptive nature or relational between different variables. Also, the lack of control groups in previous research in wilderness therapy can be seen as a problem and a reason to reduce the reliability of findings in reason of external influence or confounding variable. With this in mind and the past literature knowledge of expectations of newcomers, a study with an experimental design and a control group could help bring more credibility to the findings. An example of this is to perform a study with three groups of field instructors: a control group, a group receiving an RJP and a group receiving an RJP and an ELP. Since organizational literature as shown that RJP and ELP have a positive effect on job satisfaction (Buckley et al., 2002), the same study may have the same benefits for field instructors.

Survey improvement

The survey utilized in this study was a revision of the Field Instructor Survey used in Marchand et al. (2009). It was modify from the suggestions of previous study participants and professionals of wilderness therapy. However, this survey still needs a lot of work before it is completely reliable. First, to our knowledge there has never been a study, beside Bunce’s roundtable of wilderness therapy professionals (1998), collecting
qualitative information about the job demands that current field instructors have in their job. The importance of a solid qualitative study that would gather information from a variety of programs and field instructors concerning their job demands would greatly enhance this survey and future study concerning this subject. The items currently listed in this survey are the product of Bunce’s findings, personal experience from the researcher as a field instructor and suggestions from other field instructors and non-field instructors individuals. One major concern is that the job demands that are presently used in this study’s survey are too closely related to the measurement of job satisfaction. A better way to measure job demands, may be to offer simpler items and utilize a completely different Likert scale. Example of this could be, instead of using “I am physically exhausted after a course”, utilizing the item “physical exhaustion” and asking field instructors to rate this item on a stress level scale. Further, in creating a new format for items, it is also recommended that the job demands fit into a theoretical model, such as Cartwright and Cooper’s (1997) seven types of job demand stressors, or Peeters, de Jonge, Janssen and van der Linden (2004) three types of job demand stressors. In combining these models with a qualitative study of job demands, the creation of a new survey would rest on a more reliable theoretical background.

Another suggestion concerning the survey would be to create a separate section for questions and items concerning intimate relationships. Since these items are now separated throughout the survey, field instructors who are not in an intimate relationship will either skip this question, or potentially answer it as if they were in a relationship.
This may be a problem in obtaining reliable information, and separating these items may make the survey more user-friendly.

The language used in this survey is also a reflection of a greater problem among outdoor behavioral healthcare programs. That is that there is still some discrepancy in the universality of the words used to talk about field instructors, their skills and tasks. This starts with the usage of the expression “field instructors” which is used by some programs, while other prefer to use the word guide, leader or field staff among others. In general, the usage of one expression to refer to these individuals would further legitimize the profession. It would also make it more clearly to individuals taking this survey that this survey applies to them specifically. There is also the potential that some other words or expression used in this survey were not applicable to all individuals participating in this study. Again, a solid qualitative study of the job demands and other aspects of field instructing would greatly help in solving this problem.

While the information concerning retention and turnover is slowly becoming acceptable rather than anecdotal, there are still some differences between past studies and operating programs that make it hard to compare any information obtained from them. A future survey could improve this by asking participants about current and past schedule patterns, any vacation time or extended leave of absence, and potentially days of field experience rather than months of work. There also needs to be some effort from researcher to continuously utilize the same language and question format to obtain comparable information. In this case, we believe that utilizing days of field experience or days of field-work may be the most accurate method to obtain a measure of experience. A
future survey could invite participants to calculate their number of days of field-work based on their schedule, days off, vacation and months of work at their programs. As for knowledge of retention and voluntary turnover, months of work without significant interruption, such as extended leave of absence, may be the best way to serve this area of information. This distinction is important since it seems likely that days of field-work and months of tenure would serve different purposes and future study. For example, days of field-work seems a more accurate measure for comparing job satisfaction, while months of tenure may be more accurate for overall organizational choice and overall voluntary turnover.

Final Words

Despite the increasing number of studies, the field of outdoor behavioral healthcare is still a new area of research and much work needs to be done to increase credibility and knowledge of this promising therapeutic tool. This study made an attempt to take a more theoretical approach and utilize reliable knowledge from organizational psychology and adventure programming facts to give a solid foundation to this study and future research projects. Most of all, this research project was grounded on the belief that the profession of field instructors who work in outdoor behavioral healthcare program, should be treated with the same respect, benefits and credibility as any other profession focusing on improving the mental health and general well-being of human beings. There is still too much stereotypes surrounding these individuals that do not take into account the incredibly difficult work that they do. Further, the frequent appeal that the media have
for sensationalizing some of the accidents that have happened in outdoor behavioral healthcare, and create a bubble to include boot camps and shady programs, is damaging not only to the industry but also to current and future professionals.

Outdoor behavioral healthcare programs rely greatly on field instructors to bring success and change for their clients, and create an image that will be continued by parents and clients alike once they leave the program. If field instructors are unhappy and struggling against their job demands after only a couple months, the quality of their work is likely to be diminished, which will ultimately affect clients. We must change our thinking that field instructors are transient individuals and by nature will leave their job. While some people may find that field instructing is not for them, programs, workers and clients are all likely to benefits if we put some efforts into this facet of outdoor behavioral healthcare. It takes more than a desire to sleep outside and backpack with difficult youth to be a field instructor. One must commit a lot of time and efforts to become a good agent for transfer of learning. This said, programs must commit the same efforts into creating the best field instructors. These individuals should not only have the skills to be those agents of transfer of learning, but possess the knowledge to take care of themselves first and be there for their program second, meaning balancing their life outside with work.

While this study was done with passion by a researcher who has had previous personal experience as a field instructor, and still works sporadically in wilderness therapy, the findings and interpretation of the results were done with as little bias as possible. This said, the author of this research has also found that to be a great field instructor, you most make your life outside of work a priority so you can be the best
support system for your clients. This includes having compassion and life experience that will only increase the therapeutic rapport that instructors build with clients during their treatment. It may be that one may need a certain personality and interests to be a field instructor. However, like any other jobs, the work environment and the efforts delivered by the employer make a difference for the employee. It is the hope of this research that we can continue to gain knowledge about this subject, which can only benefit everyone who cares about outdoor behavioral healthcare.
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Appendix A

Questionnaire - Expectation of Job Demand Stressors
Field Instructor Study

Job Satisfaction, Job Demand Stressors, & Psychological Well-Being

By
Geneviève Marchand

Outdoor Behavioral Healthcare Research Cooperative
School of Kinesiology
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455
www.obhrc.org
Thank you for your participation in this study

This survey is designed to identify field instructor expectations of job demand stressors while working in wilderness therapy programs. Job demand stressors are defined as the job characteristics that create healthy or unhealthy stress. This study will also examine job satisfaction and psychological well-being, and is particularly interested in your perspective on the initial field instructor training you received when you began your work for your program.

It is important to this study to recognize the extraordinary work that you perform in providing meaningful experiences to your students and hope that the findings of this study will further support the work that you do.

We encourage you to answer this survey to the best of your abilities, while keeping in mind that the information you provide may help us serve you, your program, and future field instructors better. This survey should take you about 15-20 minutes to complete, and includes open ended and multiple choices questions.

All answers are confidential and your individual responses will not be identifiable nor shared with any program administrators or supervisor. Each program will receive a summary of their compiled data without any links to your personal information.

Once completed, please return the survey to the test administrator in the envelope provided for your anonymity. If you would rather not participate in this study, simply return the blank questionnaire in the same envelope.

Thank you again for your contributions to this important study.

Please direct any questions or comments:

Genevieve Marchand, Ph.D. Candidate  
(Keith C. Russell, Advisor)  
march096@umn.edu or (970) 531-0223  
Graduate Assistant,  
Outdoor Behavioral Research Cooperative  
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities
The first section of the survey wants to know about your background related to your work in wilderness therapy, the reasons that led you to work in wilderness therapy, and your perception of your initial training. For open-ended questions, you may write as little or as much as you want.

1) Were you ever employed in any of these areas before working at your current program as a field instructor? Please check all that apply.
   - [ ] Field instructor at another wilderness therapy program
   - [ ] Camp counselor (day camp or residential camp, non-therapeutic)
   - [ ] Outdoor instructor/leader in a non-therapeutic program
   - [ ] Ropes course facilitator
   - [ ] Teacher in public or private school
   - [ ] Guide (ex: rafting, mountain)
   - [ ] Correctional facility employee
   - [ ] Other job(s) related to your current position as a field instructor

   Please specify: ______________________________________

   ______________________________________

2) Please list in order the three most important reasons that led you to work as a field instructor in wilderness therapy.

   1- ________________________________________________
   2- ________________________________________________
   3- ________________________________________________

3) Please list in order the three most important reasons that led you to work for your current program. If needed, you may utilize the same answers as for the above question.

   1- ________________________________________________
   2- ________________________________________________
   3- ________________________________________________

Initial Training

4) Did you participate in an initial field instructor training before you started employment at your current program?

   [ ] Yes  [ ] No  (If you answered No, please skip directly to question #9)

5) If yes, how long was your initial training before you started working as a field instructor? If your training was less than a day, please estimate a number of total hours

   _______ Day(s)   or   _______ Hour(s)

6) Please list in order the three most important elements of your initial field instructor training.

   1- ________________________________________________
   2- ________________________________________________
   3- ________________________________________________
7) Please list any items that you wish had been included or you had more off during your initial field instructor training.

___________________________________________________

___________________________________________________

___________________________________________________

___________________________________________________

___________________________________________________

8) To what degree do you think your initial field instructor training sufficiently prepared you for your job?

☐ Very good preparation for my job
☐ Good preparation for my job
☐ Sufficient preparation for my job
☐ Poor preparation for my job
☐ Very poor preparation for my job
The next section concerns your current job stressors and job satisfaction. There are no right or wrong answers and you should take as much time as needed to think about your opinion for each statement.

Please circle the one number for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion about it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Disagree very much</th>
<th>Disagree moderately</th>
<th>Disagree slightly</th>
<th>Agree slightly</th>
<th>Agree moderately</th>
<th>Agree very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have enough time off as a field instructor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am physically exhausted after a course.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am confident about my counseling skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I feel emotionally safe while at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am able to detach myself from the clients at the end of a course.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am confident that I can meet the treatment goals of the clients I work with.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel pressured to meet the expectations of my group’s therapist.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am comfortable working with opposite gender groups of clients (e.g. all female clients and I am a male instructor).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I feel physically safe while at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am comfortable with the diet and the food I eat in the field.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>It is difficult to leave my partner/spouse/boyfriend/girlfriend when I go on course.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I am comfortable having to confront clients on their treatment issues.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I am emotionally and mentally drained after a course.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Communications seem good within this organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Raises are too few and far between.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the one number for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion about it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DISAGREE V. MUCH ▼</th>
<th>DISAGREE MODERATELY ▼</th>
<th>DISAGREE SLIGHTLY ▼</th>
<th>AGREE SLIGHTLY ▼</th>
<th>AGREE MODERATELY ▼</th>
<th>AGREE V. MUCH ▼</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>My supervisor is unfair with me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I like doing the things I do at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>It takes me several days to unwind from a course or rotation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I enjoy my current work schedule rotation (ex: 8on/6 off, 21 days on…)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I have too much paperwork.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I am comfortable and feel I have the necessary training to restrain a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>client.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I get irritated by the amount of traveling I have to do to get to work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I find it easy to balance my life at work with my life outside of work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I feel confident with my wilderness living skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I get worried about my work affecting my relationship with my spouse/</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>partner/ girlfriend/ boyfriend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the amount of time I have to pursue personal interests</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outside of work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>My spouse/partner/ boyfriend/ girlfriend supports my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>It is difficult to pursue meaningful intimate relationship outside of</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>I am comfortable living in a remote wilderness location.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I get frustrated with the lack of personal communication available to me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>while I am working in the field (e.g. phone, internet).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>receive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>I am comfortable about the turnover rate of field instructors in my</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>I have sufficient personal privacy in the field.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
42. There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please circle the one number for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion about it.</th>
<th>Disagree very much ▼</th>
<th>Disagree moderately ▼</th>
<th>Disagree slightly ▼</th>
<th>Agree slightly ▼</th>
<th>Agree moderately ▼</th>
<th>Agree very much ▼</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43. Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I like the people I work with.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I feel unappreciated by my program when I think about what they pay me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. People get ahead as fast as they do in other places.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of field instructors.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. The benefit package we have is equitable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. There are few rewards for those who work here.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. I have too much to do at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. I enjoy my co-workers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>There are benefits we do not have which we should have.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>I like my supervisor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>I don’t feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>There is too much bickering and fighting at work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>My job is enjoyable.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Work assignments are not fully explained.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>The goals of this organization are not clear to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>I miss out on time with friends and family when I am on course/ in the field.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The next section wants to know about your expectations of job stressors before you started working for your program. You may notice that there are fewer items in this section, which is due to the fact that we are only wondering about job stressors and not job satisfaction. Again, there are no right or wrong answers and you should take as much time as needed to answer this section.

Before you started working as a wilderness therapy field instructor and before your initial training, how did you anticipate the work of a field instructor with your current program?

Please circle the one number for each item that comes closest to reflecting how you anticipated your work to be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>very much</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>slightly</td>
<td>moderately</td>
<td>very much</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I thought I would have enough time off as a field instructor.  
2. I expected being physically exhausted after a course.  
3. I thought I would be confident about my counseling skills.  
4. I anticipated feeling emotionally safe while at work.  
5. I thought I would be able to detach myself from the clients at the end of a course.  
6. I expected being able to meet the treatment goals of the clients I work with.  
7. I thought I would feel pressured to meet the expectations of my group’s therapist.  
8. I expected to be comfortable working with opposite gender groups of clients (e.g. all female clients and I am a male instructor).  
9. I anticipated feeling physically safe while at work.  
10. I thought I would be comfortable with the diet and the food I eat in the field.  
11. I expected having difficulty leaving my partner/spouse/boyfriend/girlfriend when I go on course.
12. I anticipated being comfortable having to confront clients on their treatment issues. ▼

13. I thought I would be emotionally and mentally drained after a course. ▼

14. I expected missing out on time with friends and family when I would be on course. ▼

15. I thought it would take me several days to unwind from a course. ▼

16. I anticipated enjoying my current work schedule rotation (ex: 8on/6 off, 21 days on…). ▼

17. I expected being comfortable and knowing that I would have the necessary training to restrain a client. ▼

18. I thought I would get irritated by the amount of traveling I would do to get to work. ▼

19. I expected finding it easy to balance my life at work with my life outside of work. ▼

20. I thought I would feel confident about my wilderness living skills. ▼

21. I anticipated being worried about my work affecting my relationship with my spouse/partner/girlfriend/boyfriend.

22. I expected being satisfied with the benefits I would receive
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I expected being satisfied with the amount of time I would have to pursue personal interests outside of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I thought that my spouse/partner/boyfriend/girlfriend would support my work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I expected having difficulty pursuing meaningful intimate relationships outside of work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I thought I would be comfortable living in a remote wilderness location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I anticipated getting frustrated with the lack of personal communication available to me while I would be working in the field (e.g. phone, internet).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I expected being comfortable with the turnover rate of field instructors in my program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I anticipated having sufficient personal privacy in the field.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I expected being paid a fair amount for the work I would do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I anticipated having too much paperwork.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Current Schedule
10) What is your regular work schedule? (e.g., 8 days on / 6 days off)

_____ Days on / _____ Days off

11) In total, how long have you worked for this program? Please answer in total months.

_____ Month(s)

12) In total, how long have you worked for any other wilderness therapy programs? Please answer in total months.

_____ Month(s)

This next section concerns your current well-being. For the next six questions, please check the box that best describes how you feel about the statement at this moment.

1) Have you been bothered by nervousness or your “nerves” during the past month?

- Extremely so – to the point where I could not work or take care of things
- Very much so
- Quite a bit
- Some – enough to bother me
- A little
- Not at all

2) How much energy, pep, or vitality did you have or feel during the past month?

- Very full of energy – lots of pep
- Fairly energetic most of the time
- My energy level varied quite a bit
- Generally low in energy or pep
- Very low in energy or pep most of the time
- No energy or pep at all – I fell drained, sapped

3) I felt downhearted and blue during the past month.

- None of this time
- A little bit of the time
- Some of the time
- A good bit of the time
- Most of the time
- All of the time
4) I was emotionally stable and sure of myself during the past month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None of this time</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A little bit of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good bit of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) I felt cheerful, lighthearted during the past month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None of this time</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A little bit of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good bit of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) I felt tired, worn out, used up, or exhausted during the past month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None of this time</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A little bit of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good bit of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General information**

12) What is your gender?

- [ ] Female  
- [ ] Male  
- [ ] Transgender

13) In what year were you born? ___________________ ___________
14) Which of the following best describes your racial or ethnic background? Check one only.

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Black or African American (Non-Hispanic)
- Hispanic or Mexican American
- White (Non-Hispanic)
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Some other ethnic or racial background
- Would rather not say

15) What is the highest level of education you have completed? Check one only.

- Did not graduate high school
- High school graduate
- Some college but no degree
- Associate degree
- Bachelor’s degree
- Master’s degree
- Professional degree
- Doctorate degree
- Other _______________________________

16) Which best describes your marital status? Check one only.

- Single (never married)
- Single (divorced)
- Now married
- Now in a relationship (Boyfriend/ Girlfriend/ Partner)
- Widowed

17) If you are not single, does your spouse or partner work in wilderness therapy or in a connected profession? (e.g. therapist, outdoor educator)

- Yes
- No
Thank you for taking the time to participate in this study. Your contribution is very much appreciated. Please return your completed survey in the envelope provided for anonymity to your test administrator.

If there is anything else you would like to tell me about this survey, or about your experience as a field instructor, please feel free to utilize the space provided below.

If you would like a copy of the study results sent to you, please provide an email address in the space below.

Please direct questions or comments to:

march096@umn.edu
(970) 531-0223
Genevieve Marchand
Outdoor Behavioral Research Cooperative
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities

© Genevieve Marchand 2008
Appendix B

Psychological General Well Being Index – Short

1. **Have you been bothered by nervousness or your “nerves” during the past month?**
   - Extremely so – to the point where I could not work or take care of things……… 0
   - Very much so…………………………………………………………………….. 1
   - Quite a bit………………………………………………………………………… 2
   - Some – enough to bother me……………………………………………….. 3
   - A little……………………………………………………………………………. 4
   - Not at all………………………………………………………………………….. 5

2. **How much energy, pep, or vitality did you have or feel during the past month?**
   - Very full of energy – lots of pep…………………………………………………. 5
   - Fairly energetic most of the time………………………………………………….4
   - My energy level varied quite a bit……………………………………………….. 3
   - Generally low in energy or pep…………………………………………………... 2
   - Very low in energy or pep most of the time………………………………………. 1
   - No energy or pep at all – I fell drained, sapped…………………………………... 0

3. **I felt downhearted and blue during the past month.**
   - None of the time…………………………………………………………………. 5
   - A little of the time……………………………………………………………….. 4
   - Some of the time…………………………………………………………………. 3
   - A good bit of the time…………………………………………………………….. 2
   - Most of the time………………………………………………………………….. 1
   - All of the time……………………………………………………………………... 0

4. **I was emotionally stable and sure of myself during the past month.**
   - None of the time…………………………………………………………………. 0
   - A little of the time……………………………………………………………….. 1
   - Some of the time…………………………………………………………………. 2
   - A good bit of the time…………………………………………………………….. 3
   - Most of the time………………………………………………………………….. 4
   - All of the time……………………………………………………………………... 5

5. **I felt cheerful, lighthearted during the past month.**
   - None of the time…………………………………………………………………. 0
   - A little of the time……………………………………………………………….. 1
   - Some of the time…………………………………………………………………. 2
   - A good bit of the time…………………………………………………………….. 3
   - Most of the time………………………………………………………………….. 4
   - All of the time……………………………………………………………………... 5
6. I felt tired, worn out, used up, or exhausted during the past month.

None of the time .................................................................................. 5
A little of the time .............................................................................. 4

Some of the time .............................................................................. 3
A good bit of the time ....................................................................... 2
Most of the time ............................................................................... 1
All of the time .................................................................................. 0
# Appendix C

## Job Satisfaction Survey

### JOB SATISFACTION SURVEY

Paul E. Spector  
Department of Psychology  
University of South Florida  
Copyright Paul E. Spector 1994. All rights reserved.

Please circle the one number for each question that comes closest to reflecting your opinion about it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the people I work with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications seem good within this organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raises are too few and far between.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My supervisor is unfair to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like doing the things I do at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The goals of this organization are not clear to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLEASE CIRCLE THE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH QUESTION THAT COMES CLOSEST TO REFLECTING YOUR OPINION ABOUT IT.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>The benefit package we have is equitable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>There are few rewards for those who work here.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I have too much to do at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I enjoy my coworkers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>There are benefits we do not have which we should have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>I like my supervisor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I have too much paperwork.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>There is too much bickering and fighting at work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>My job is enjoyable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Work assignments are not fully explained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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