

WOMEN CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS IN INSTITUTIONS FOR MEN: AN
EXPLORATORY STUDY

by

Elizabeth Szockyj

B.Sc., University of Toronto, 1983

THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS (CRIMINOLOGY)
in the School
of
Criminology

© Elizabeth Szockyj 1987

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

November 1987

All rights reserved. This work may not be
reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without permission of the author.

APPROVAL

Name: Elizabeth Szockyj

Degree: Master of Arts (Criminology)

Title of thesis: Women Correctional Officers in Institutions for
Men: An Exploratory Study

Examining Committee:

Chairman: Dr. W. Glackman

~~Dr. C.T. Griffiths~~
Senior Supervisor

Dr. M.A. Jackson

Dr. B. Cunningham
External Examiner
School of Public Administration
University of Victoria

Date Approved: November 27, 1987

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/~~Project~~/~~Extended Essay~~

Women Correctional Officers in Institutions for Men:

An Exploratory Study

Author:

(signature)

Elizabeth Szockyj

(name)

Dec. 14/87

(date)

ABSTRACT

During the 1970's and 1980's, the federal and provincial governments introduced women correctional officers into prisons for men. The integration movement was the product of affirmative action and equal employment policies. However, neither the impact of the female officers on the institutional setting nor the attitudes and perceptions of the staff and prisoners to such a practice have been extensively documented in Canada. This thesis focusses scholarly attention on the issue of female correctional officers employed in male institutions.

Between June and October 1985 the experiences and perceptions of staff and prisoners at a provincial pre-trial centre in British Columbia were solicited. The areas covered in the questionnaires and interviews included: perceptions of the performance of female correctional officers, their relationships with male staff and prisoners, the presence and impact of female officers in the facility, inmate privacy concerns, sexual conflicts and organizational and management issues.

The major findings of the study, based on the responses of the male and female officers, supervisors and prisoners, reveal an overall picture that is consistent with the results from similar studies in the United States. The perceived general performance of the female officers was comparable to or better than their male counterparts. When physical strength was necessary, all but the female officers felt that the male

correctional officers were more effective whereas everyone but the male officers viewed female officers as being more effective in defusing potentially violent situations. Not only was the presence of women viewed as making the institution relatively more relaxed and calm, but female officers made it more bearable for the prisoners, without invading their privacy. Nonetheless, after two years of employing females as correctional officers at the facility, the women interviewed did not feel fully accepted by their male colleagues in their role as correctional officers.

In conclusion, the thesis suggests implications for policy development and offers avenues for future research.

Recommendations regarding female correctional officers across Canada as well as those specific to the research site are discussed.

QUOTATION

CORRECTION'S WOMEN

her firm uniform
of determination
set doll's face, prow forward
in a man's ocean.

from welfare's sloppy couch
clear eyes see the essential
paycheck,
"Yes! I'll pull that fatal trigger too."

A new way of relating
we have, she thinks.
My femininity will bridge the wide con gap,
SMILE. beacon out to the unknown ocean,
again, SMILE - he smiles back
See! and light chat-flirt, the erosion of dikes
she thinks.

Old Bull, scaly and encrusted with
the cynic's truth, says, "You watch, they'll be screwing
them next, *I Know*." he snorts
face age hard.

Correcting woman can be neutra-sex surveillance robot
or girl-next-door coy eyes,
or severe mother.
enlightened and objective she signed up
on the list
saying her boot will stomp firmly down on the human face,
if required.

Old Bull bitter
doesn't believe it,
"They haven't got the balls."
training films are just movies
and bullseyes are made of paper.

but firm face or not
she hears her baby crying
a job doesn't have to be my occupation
it won't come to that
it won't happen to me -
I'll just settle down until the uniform fits.

Jan. 1984
John Abbott

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Without the assistance of numerous individuals, this study would not have been possible; I express my appreciation to all of them.

I am greatly indebted to the staff and prisoners at Vancouver Pre-Trial Services Centre who gave so freely of their time and shared with me their insights and experiences. A special thanks goes to the women correctional officers I interviewed (both past and present) for their cooperation and interest and to the staff at Mission Institution for their support. There are many people who provided information for the historical, statistical and functional contents of this thesis; I owe thanks to them all especially Bill Foster, Vera Bergman, Arando Hashamoto, Barbara Brown, Debbie Olver and John Ekstedt.

Of particular importance in bringing this thesis to completion was my senior supervisor, Curt T. Griffiths. His discerning and critical comments provided a valuable framework for this study. To Margaret A. Jackson, I want to express my utmost appreciation for her immeasurable and limitless encouragement, unerring eye for detail and willingness to go beyond her role as a committee member. Furthermore, I would like to thank Dr. Cunningham for serving as my external supervisor.

To my friends and colleagues, I owe special gratitude. From the helpful advice of John Andersen, to the references for

pertinent literature from Alison Hatch, my fellow graduate students have always shown interest and support for my research. For Aileen Sams, whose thoughtfulness, motherly guidance and patience can never be fully appreciated, I reserve the warmest affection. Finally, I would like to thank my family for their encouragement, love and endurance. Jennie deserves special mention for her computer expertise.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
Quotation	v
Acknowledgements	vi
List of Tables	xi
Introduction	1
I. Historical Trends in Canada	4
British Columbia	8
Federal Developments	10
Current Decisions	14
Conclusions	16
II. Research on Women Correctional Officers in Male Prisons	18
Institutional Setting	19
Performance of Female Correctional Officers	20
Respect for the Authority of Female Correctional Officers	23
Interpersonal Skills	23
Physical Abilities of Female Correctional Officers	25
Female Correctional Officers' Relationships with Male Staff and Prisoners	28
Protection of Female Correctional Officers	30
Acceptance of Female Correctional Officers	33
The Presence and Impact of Female Correctional Officers in the Facility	37
Privacy Concerns	39
Sexual Conflicts	42

Prisoner Frustrations and Emasculation	42
Female Sexual Harassment	44
Organizational and Management Issues	47
Job Satisfaction	47
Promotions	48
Summary	49
III. Method	52
Location	53
Sample	53
Research Instruments	56
Interviews	56
Questionnaires	56
Procedure	61
Limitations	63
IV. Results	66
Background Profiles	66
Performance of Female Correctional Officers	67
Performance in Specific Areas	69
Enforcing Institutional Regulations	71
Respect for Female Authority	72
Interpersonal Skills	75
Physical Abilities	78
Female Correctional Officers' Relationships with Male Staff and Prisoners	83
Protection of Female Correctional Officers by Prisoners	83
Protection of Female Correctional Officers by Male Staff and Supervisors	84

Acceptance of Female Correctional Officers	86
Feedback, Support and Assistance	89
Disagreements	90
The Presence and Impact of Female Correctional Officers in the Facility	92
Privacy Concerns	95
Sexual Conflicts	96
Prisoner Frustrations and Emasculation	96
Sexual Harassment of Female Officers	98
Organizational and Management Issues	100
Training	101
Job Satisfaction With Respect to Women Correctional Officers	102
Promotions	103
Female Correctional Officers Working in Other Male Facilities	106
Summary	107
Conclusions	111
Future Research	115
Appendix A	118
Appendix B	122
Appendix C	157
Appendix D	160
References	186

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1	Correctional Officer Representation for the Province of British Columbia by Institution and Sex as of January, 1987 11
2	Correctional Officer Representation for Correctional Service of Canada by Institution in the Pacific Region and Sex as of June 30, 1987 15
3	Correctional Officer Representation for Correctional Service of Canada by Region and Sex as of June 30, 1987 17
4	Differences Amongst the Five Institutions Surveyed ... 60
5	Correctional Officers' Ratings of Overall Performance in Percentages 161
6	Ratings of the Female Correctional Officers' Effectiveness in Percentages 161
7	Ratings of Performance in Specific Institutional Locations in Percentages 162
8	Ratings of Effectiveness in Dealing with Specific Types of Inmates in Percentages 163
9	Ratings of Enforcing Institutional Regulations in Percentages 163
10	Ratings of Prisoners' Response to Orders in the Last Two Weeks in Percentages 164
11	Ratings of Respect for the Authority of Female Correctional Officers in Percentages 165
12	Ratings of Interpersonal Skills in Percentages 167
13	Ratings of Situations Involving Physical Strength in Percentages 168
14	Ratings of Prisoner Protection of Female Officers in Percentages 169
15	Ratings of Concern for Safety in Percentages 170
16	Ratings by Female Correctional Officers of Male Officer Interference in Percentages 170

17	Ratings of the Acceptance of Women Officers in Percentages	171
18	Ratings of Quality of Feedback Concerning Job Performance in Percentages	173
19	Ratings of Quality of Support in Percentages	174
20	Ratings of the Quality of Help Received in Performing Duties in Percentages	174
21	Ratings of Disagreements in Specific Situations in Percentages	175
22	Extent of Assertiveness of Women in Percentages	176
23	Impact of the Presence of Females in Percentages	177
24	Assessments of the Impact of Female Officers Based on Previous Experience in Institutions Without Women in Percentages	178
25	Perceptions of Sexual Conflicts in Percentages	179
26	Sexual Harassment of Female Officers by Male Officers as Rated by the Females in Percentages	180
27	Ratings of the Effectiveness of Training Programs in Specific Areas in Percentages	181
28	Perceptions of Increased Effectiveness for Women if Training Programs Were Taught by Women Rated by Female Officers in Percentages	182
29	Ratings of the Amount of Correctional Officer Input Sought for the Training Program in Percentages ...	182
30	Ratings of Job Satisfaction With Respect to Women Officers Percentages	183
31	Ratings for the Opportunities for Promotion in Percentages	184
32	Ratings of the Degree of Comfort Felt Depending on the Gender of the Supervisor in Percentages	184
33	Reasons Females Might Not Apply for Promotions as Rated by Females in Percentages	185

INTRODUCTION

Female participation in the labour market has increased tremendously over the past few decades (Boulet and Lavallée, 1984) with women being hired in many traditionally male occupations such as policing and corrections. The objective of this thesis is to explore the factors involved with employing females as correctional officers in male prison facilities.

Female and juvenile correctional institutions have had women correctional officers ever since separate facilities were used to house these groups. Consistent with the philosophy of the 19th century reformers, females provided motherly care contributing to a more humane and family oriented atmosphere (Feinman, 1986; Leon, 1977; Morrison, 1976; Platt, 1977). While the employment of female correctional officers in these institutions is entrenched in the correctional system their recent move into the male prisons is a result of the emphasis on equal employment rights. Both the federal and provincial governments have opened up this male-dominated occupation within the last two decades. The number of institutions for male inmates is much greater than the number housing female prisoners or youthful offenders. Because women had been excluded from the entry level correctional officer positions and since corrections has adopted the tradition of selecting from within its institutional ranks for promotions, this has had implications for the advancement opportunities of women. Thus, they had been,

to a large extent, deprived of a major employment avenue.

The government has proceeded cautiously in introducing female officers into correctional facilities housing adult male prisoners, for, although females have shown their competence at handling female and youthful prisoners, a population of adult men presented a myriad of questions. Will females be capable of handling the physical component of the job? What about the possible infringement on inmate privacy? How will the prisoners deal with this temptation, i.e., will female officers be more likely to be raped? What will be the effect on the institutional environment? How will male correctional officers accept their presence? Very few comprehensive assessments have been conducted by the Canadian government to ascertain the outcome of its policy to employ women.

Research based mostly on studies from the United States indicates that female correctional officers perform the job just as effectively as men except in situations where physical force is required. It has also been found that both male correctional officers and inmates seem to harbour a protective attitude toward the female officers. Women are perceived, though, as the same or better at an interpersonal level with prisoners. Neither inmate privacy nor inmate sexual assault of female officers has been a prominent concern.

The purpose of this thesis is to examine such issues as female job performance, male staff and prisoner attitudes

towards women officers and prisoner privacy through a questionnaire and interview format at a British Columbia provincial facility. It begins by tracing the initial entry of female correctional officers into male facilities at the federal and B.C. provincial levels. In addition, data on the current status of women correctional officers are presented. Chapter II discusses the literature that has explored the effect of employing female correctional officers utilizing the following headings: performance of female corrections, female correctional officers relationships with male staff and prisoners, the presence and impact of female correctional officers in the facility, concerns for inmate privacy, sexual conflicts and organizational and management issues.

In an effort to better understand, from a Canadian perspective, the impact of employing females in such facilities a survey of the perceptions and experiences of female and male correctional officers as well as inmates was conducted. Chapter III details the method utilized in the study while Chapter IV presents the results. In the concluding chapter, the main findings of the thesis are drawn together and the policy implications of the research are discussed.

CHAPTER I
HISTORICAL TRENDS IN CANADA

With the women's movement of the 19th century in North America, women began to take a more active role in corrections (Feinman, 1986; Morrison, 1976). Concern regarding youth (Shoom, 1972) and women (Strange, 1985) incarcerated with adult men spurred the creation of separate facilities resulting in positions for women as matrons (the term used for female correctional officers).

At this time there was a move to replicate the home environment for juveniles stressing the need for a proper maternal figure (Morrison, 1976). Likewise, Feinman (1986) states that in the early programs in the United States prison matrons were to be mother figures for the females. Only women through their innate characteristics had the capabilities to reform their convicted sisters.

The primary advocate, around 1870, for the first separate Canadian prison for women, J.W. Langmuir (an Ontario prison inspector) felt that since female criminals were less dangerous than men, the security would not have to be as extensive (Strange, 1985). Citing the United States as an example, he claimed that an all-female staff could maintain control while reforming the female prisons. In addition, female staff could be paid less than their male counterparts.

Echoing this cost effective rationale after the turn of the century was W.L. Scott, a Local Master at Ottawa for the Supreme Court of Ontario and president of the Ottawa Children's Aid Society (Leon, 1977). Leon writes in his article on juvenile delinquency that Scott suggested:

...that the choice of women as professional probation officers was based not only on the notion, popular among feminists of the time, that "women, intended by nature for motherhood, are better fitted for the work than men" but also because "a better class of women than men can frequently be got for the money available" (pp. 92-93).

Thus, females entered corrections as an extension of their maternal role while, nonetheless, being a source of cheap labour.

During the mid-20th century, the role of females in corrections expanded into adult male facilities with the inclusion of female probation officers¹, psychologists, classification officers, nurses and clerical staff (Hashamoto, 1986). Jurik (1985b) notes that as the rehabilitative or treatment orientation in corrections came into prominence in the late 1960's and 1970's there was an accompanying shift away from a simple custodial philosophy.

It is with this increased emphasis on communication and counselling (human service functions) that female correctional officers have entered male prisons (Hashamoto, 1986). This may have eased the entry for females into the institutions. Even so the movement of women correctional officers into male facilities

¹Personal correspondence with V. Bergman, Justice Institute of British Columbia.

in Canada has not been a product of benevolency and reformation; but rather an act to provide equal employment opportunities to women.

The provincial governments lead the way in exploring and developing this area of employment. Although Manitoba was the first province to begin a programme to hire women correctional officers in male institutions in 1969 (Caron, 1981), the province of Ontario has generally been credited with providing the foundation for the movement (Affirmative Action in the Ontario Public Service 1983/84; Radley, 1982). The Alex G. Brown Memorial Clinic, an Ontario institution for the treatment of male inmates with alcohol and sex problems, hired its first women correctional officers in 1970 (Radley, 1982). This action was followed in 1971 by the Ottawa Correctional Institute (Bronskill, 1980). With the advent of Ontario's Affirmative Action Programme in 1975 (one of the first in Canada), the fledgling practice received a substantial boost. In support of equal employment, the Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services has articulated a comprehensive policy on the assignment of correctional officers by sex, the first of its kind in North America ("Policy on the assignment," 1984).

The acceptance of women as correctional officers can be illustrated by the move to expand the number of positions available to women in correctional systems. Most provinces now employ women at all levels of security - minimum, medium, and maximum (Foster, 1985). This change in attitudes is most

apparent in the province of Saskatchewan. Saskatchewan's correction branch applied to the Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission to ". . .lawfully exclude women from employment in all Correction Officer positions and a number of proposed Corrections Worker positions in male institutions. . ."² and in February 1980 the Commission granted the exemption. In 1982, though, the scope of the exemption was narrowed to include only 48 out of 158 positions.³ Six months later the Commission opened up a further 26 positions to women. This reversal was due to the favourable perception of women correctional officers by the Corrections Division for:

[i]ndeed, all are agreed that their presence in the ranks of line correctional staff has aided the respondent [Saskatchewan Correction Branch] in meeting its institutional goals.⁴

As a result, in 1984, 15% of Saskatchewan's positions in male Centres were occupied by females (Foster, 1985).

Few provinces have developed a formal policy regarding female correctional officers. In the case of British Columbia, females began to work with male inmates as a matter of circumstance and chance.

² *Re Saskatchewan Corrections Branch Application for Exemption*, [1980] 1 C.H.R.R. D/49.

³ *Saskatchewan Social Services, Corrections Branch v. Saskatchewan Government Employee's Union et al.*, [1982] 3 C.H.R.R. D/1047.

⁴ *Saskatchewan Social Services, Corrections Branch v. Saskatchewan Government Employees' Union*, [1983] 4 C.H.R.R.D/1238.

British Columbia

Although no formal policy existed until 1985, female correctional officers have been employed in the provincial prisons for men for years. At Prince George Regional Correctional Centre (formally a co-ed prison and now a medium security male prison) the female officers were transferred to the male section when the female inmate unit was closed in 1978 at the request of Madam Justice Proudfoot.⁵ The relatively tiny number of inmates who were female and the problems encountered trying to convert a male facility to meet the needs of females led to the recommendation that the co-correctional program be discontinued (Proudfoot, 1978). Although the women inmates were moved, the female officers (12) remained to be amalgamated with the male staff. Another correctional centre in Nanaimo, which opened in 1983, was integrated from the beginning through the transfer of staff from the Ministry of Health.⁶ But it was not until the establishment of the Vancouver Pre-Trial Services Centre in 1983 that women were consciously recruited for correctional officer positions. The building itself was designed with the intention of accommodating female staff by providing for prisoner privacy. Females were hired on the merit principle, with the same hiring criteria used for men.

⁵Personal conversation with Mrs. Ashenbrenner, Prince George Regional Correctional Centre, August 1986.

⁶Personal conversation with V. Bergman, Justice Institute of British Columbia, May 1985.

Since 1981, the B.C. Corrections Branch has studied the issue of cross-gender staffing within its correctional centres.⁷ By August of 1983, the Commissioner of Corrections approved the formation of a committee to investigate the integration of posts in the Branch's institutions with a mandate to achieve "the maximum Integration of Posts consistent with the privacy and dignity of inmates and that the same policy and practices should occur to cross gender staffing of male/female institutions".⁸ A policy statement was issued by the Branch in November of 1985 stating that it seeks to "a) maximize the employment opportunities for all staff regardless of sex" and "b) support cross-gender staffing of all posts in correctional centres, except those in change areas or living units where dignity and privacy cannot be provided and for any post where the physical plant prohibits such staffing".⁹

Equal opportunities are provided for men and women presently employed and for those applying for positions within the Branch. Furthermore, the policy statement characterizes the programmatic benefits achieved from integrating the maximum number of posts as including "the opportunity to recruit from the broadest range of qualified people" and the "normalization of the inmate"

⁷Personal correspondence with S. Swabb, British Columbia Corrections Branch.

⁸Personal correspondence with W.F. Foster, Regional Director, Interior Region.

⁹Personal correspondence with S. Swabb, British Columbia Corrections Branch.

environment...".¹⁰ Current figures (see Table 1) indicate that the Branch is hiring women but the numbers remain low.

Federal Developments

Integration at the federal level has been gradually gaining momentum. The Public Service Employment Act, which has encompassed the Canadian Penitentiary Service since 1969, espouses an anti-discriminatory philosophy. However, in the early seventies the application of this provision to correctional officer positions was denied (Côté Committee, 1977). In fact, exemption of women was granted in 1973 and again in 1975 by the Public Service Commission. Reaction, in the form of complaints presented to the Commission, spurred the Anti-Discrimination Branch to justify its restriction of women from this exclusively male domain. A study group, under the direction of J. Côté, was formed in March 1977 to examine the issue and in September of that same year recommended that:

the sex restriction used in filling the correctional group of the operational category (CX-COF, CX-LUF, CX-ST1) in the Canadian penitentiary service be removed and that these positions be opened to both sexes (Côté Committee, 1977: 44).¹¹

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹The Correctional Service of Canada has espoused a living unit concept where correctional officers (CX-COF) have the responsibility for the security of the facility and surveillance and control of the inmates while the living unit officers (CX-LUF) devote the majority of their time to the resocialization of inmates via correctional programs and case management. Security, though, is still part of the duties of a living unit officer who has generally been promoted from the

Table 1
**Correctional Officer Representation for the Province of
 British Columbia by Institution and Sex
 as of January, 1987**

Institution	Security Officer/ Correctional Officer			Auxiliary			Total		
	W	M	%Women	W	M	%Women	W	M	%Women
Vancouver Is. Regional C.C.	0	76	0.0%	0	31	0.0%	0	107	0.0%
Pre-Trial Svc. Centre	6	75	7.4%	6	26	18.8%	12	101	10.6%
New Haven	0	9	0.0%	0	11	0.0%	0	20	0.0%
Alouette River	1	27	3.5%	-	-	-	1	27	3.5%
Lower Mainland Regional C.C.	4	186	2.1%	-	-	-	4	186	2.1%
Kamloops Regional C.C.	1	49	2.0%	0	20	0.0%	1	69	1.4%
Prince George R.C.C.	6	40	13.0%	1	16	5.9%	7	56	11.1%

Source: B. Brown, Personnel Services, Ministry of Attorney General, British Columbia: 1987.

A similar opinion was also voiced in the report by the
 Parliamentary Sub-Committee on the Penitentiary System in Canada

11(cont'd) ranks of the correctional officer. The correctional officer category has eight levels beginning with the job title correctional officer at level one to senior keeper at level eight. Officers after level four are primarily in a supervisory capacity over correctional officers. There are two levels of living unit officers, with the CX-LUF 2 having greater supervisory responsibility. In 1987, however, the living unit program was replaced by functional unit management. Uniformed security personnel, previously confined to perimeter security, will provide the security function within the living units.

(the MacGuigan Report) released in June of that year.

Recommendation 17 of the report states that "Women should be employed on the same basis as men in the Penitentiary Service" (1977: 62). This committee further notes that "[n]o justification exists for excluding competent stable and mature women from the full spectrum of the Penitentiary Service" (p. 62). The principal benefits for the service are thought to be the creation of a pool of new talent and a healthier correctional environment. In addition, women as a result will be able to have the same career opportunities that are available to male correctional officers.

To ensure that the introduction of women correctional officers into facilities housing male inmates was performed in a well-considered and systematic manner, a special pilot project was suggested by the Côté Committee. The purpose of the pilot project ". . .was *not* to decide whether women would work in CSC institutions, but rather, how best to integrate them into all-male institutions" ("Women prison guards," 1980: 1). In January 1978 this recommendation became reality. Twenty-eight women were placed in three facilities across Canada - at the Regional Psychiatric Centre in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, the Federal Training Centre in Laval, Quebec and Mission Institution in British Columbia. An article in a government newsletter stated that:

...although the new women recruits received the same basic training as men, not all the institutions were properly sensitized or prepared for their arrival. It was a sink or swim approach, and the women were told to

do their best. Where sufficient preparation was provided, the integration of female officers went reasonably well ("Women prison guards," 1980: 1).

Yet the project was deemed a positive experience ("The service's women," 1985) and in November 1980 the Senior Management Committee of the Correctional Service of Canada made the decision to extend the integration program to all minimum and medium security institutions.

Much of the impetus for this surge of equity awareness stemmed from the Equal Opportunities for Women program. This policy was adopted by the Treasury Board in 1975 with the following objectives:

1. analyze the systems to ensure artificial barriers are eliminated to allow equal access for women;
2. elaborate programs and take measures to facilitate promotion and career development for women;
3. encourage the women to create a network in order to identify employment areas where improvement is necessary and participate in the development of the program.¹²

In 1984, the Equal Opportunities for Women office was incorporated into the Affirmative Action division with a mandate to identify and conduct analyses and special studies as well as make recommendations. Affirmative action is defined as:

. . .a personnel planning system that seeks to correct years of systemic job discrimination against women, Native and handicapped people ("AA is serious business," 1985: 1).

The positive gains women have made in the federal corrections area are therefore due, in great part, to the Affirmative Action policy.

¹²Personal correspondence with W.F. Foster, Regional Director, Interior Region.

Current Decisions

At the end of 1984, a report of the advisory committee to the Solicitor General of Canada on the management of correctional institutions was released (Carson, 1984). The committee, chaired by J. Carson, expressed concern over the number of women being assigned to correctional institutions, especially those in the Pacific region (Table 2 provides current figures for the Pacific Region). The report mentions that male staff feel much resentment for the lack of transfer opportunities available at medium and minimum security facilities. In addition, there were inmates who expressed concern over the invasion of their privacy. Based on these arguments, the report states:

Although the Service's actions may be consistent with government policy, our observations led us to believe that in the volatile atmosphere of an institution, the over-zealous application of an equal employment opportunities program could be destabilizing and create unacceptable risks (p. 26).

In recommendation 14, the committee declared that:

. . .there be more careful consideration of institutional realities when introducing female staff into institutions housing male inmates (p. 27)

This is the first recommendation to denote a more restrictive approach to the placement of female correctional officers.

In a decision reported in April 1987¹³, the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal held that the RCMP were not discriminatory in denying females employment as guards in their lock-ups. To protect the privacy of the pre-trial detainees, it was decided

¹³*Stanley et al. v. Royal Canadian Mounted Police*, [1987] 8 C.H.R.R. D/3799.

Table 2
 Correctional Officer Representation for Correctional Service of
 Canada by Institution in the Pacific Region and Sex
 as of June 30, 1987

Institution	CX-COF			CX-LUF			Total		
	W	M	%Women	W	M	%Women	W	M	%Women
William Head	8	50	13.8%	3	19	13.6%	11	69	13.8%
Matsqui	37	92	28.7%	0	1	0.0%	37	93	28.5%
Regional Psychiatric Centre	5	68	6.8%	0	0	0.0%	5	68	6.8%
Mountain	20	54	27.0%	0	2	0.0%	20	56	26.3%
Kent	10	87	10.3%	3	82	3.5%	13	169	7.1%
Elbow Lake	0	1	0.0%	0	12	0.0%	0	3	0.0%
Ferndale	0	0	0.0%	1	15	6.3%	1	15	6.3%
Mission	14	48	22.6%	15	40	27.3%	29	88	24.8%

Source: A. Hashamoto, Regional Coordinator Special Programs,
 Pacific Region, Correctional Service of Canada: 1987.

that the RCMP procedure of hiring guards of the same sex as the prisoners was a *bona fide* occupational requirement.

Recently, in a case decided by the Canadian federal court¹⁴, the judge stated that the institutional regulation which allows any guard to conduct a search of a prisoner is too broad to be valid under the Constitution. He indicated that the restriction

¹⁴*Weatherall v. Attorney General et al.*, Unreported decision Federal Court (Trial Division) June, 1987.

U.S. same as
that opposite sex officers be prohibited from conducting a skin search¹⁵ except under emergency conditions must be stipulated within the federal regulations. In addition to searches, inmates may, on occasion, be viewed in a state of undress or engaged in bodily functions. This infringement on prisoner privacy is deemed by some inmates to be demeaning and embarrassing (The Correctional Investigator, 1983; Kirkpatrick, 1984) and according to the federal court it is unlawful, except in emergency situations, for female officers to view male prisoners in their cells without warning. The implications of this decision have yet to be revealed.

Conclusions

At both the provincial and federal levels women have made considerable inroads into corrections, due primarily to affirmative action/equal employment programs. Recent figures on the number of women correctional officers employed (see Table 3) illustrate the federal government's continued support of the practice of hiring females. As evidence of this, in May 1980 the first female warden of a major federal male institution was appointed (Hart, 1985). Mary Dawson, then confirmed warden of Warkworth (a medium security Ontario prison), presently

¹⁵Searching inmates for contraband may take two forms: pat frisks and strip searches. Pat frisks require the correctional officers to briefly physically pat down a clothed inmate. Both male and female correctional officers perform this function in Canadian male facilities. Strip or skin searches, which occur less frequently than pat frisks, primarily involve the viewing of an unclothed inmate rather than physical touching.

Table 3
**Correctional Officer Representation for Correctional
 Service of Canada by Region and Sex as of June 30, 1987**

Region	CX-COF			CX-LUF			Total		
	Women	Men	%Women	Women	Men	%Women	Women	Men	%Women
Atlantic	50	394	11.3%	5	78	6.0%	55	472	10.4%
Quebec	111	1108	9.1%	41	332	11.0%	152	1440	9.5%
Ontario*	161	744	17.8%	35	172	16.9%	196	916	17.6%
Prairie	78	656	10.6%	47	227	17.2%	125	883	12.4%
Pacific	113	415	21.4%	23	173	11.7%	136	588	18.8%

*Includes the female and male correctional officers employed at the Prison for Women.

Source: A. Hashamoto, Regional Coordinator Special Programs, Pacific Region, Correctional Service of Canada: 1987.

continues this ground breaking activity as the warden of Kingston Penitentiary.

Yet, little in the way of a systematic analysis of the way in which the female and male correctional officers and prisoners have adapted and responded to the policy has been carried out in Canada. The next chapter presents the available findings which are based to a large extent on data collected in prisons in the United States.

CHAPTER II

RESEARCH ON WOMEN CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS IN MALE PRISONS

The introduction of female correctional officers in male prisons has spawned a variety of research studies in both Canada and the United States examining the impact that female correctional officers have had in these facilities. The United States is by far the major contributor to this knowledge base with studies conducted in states across the country and at all levels of security. The methods used for data collection include interviews, questionnaires, participant observation and record inspection. Due to the diverse nature of the research techniques and settings, differences in results are anticipated. In Canada, the only substantive research on the effects of employing women correctional officers has come from government initiatives.¹

The discussion which follows incorporates the literature available and categorizes it under the headings: performance, emphasizing authority, interpersonal skills and physical abilities; female officers' work relationships with their colleagues and prisoners with respect to protection and acceptance; the effect which the presence of females has on the facility; the concern of inmate privacy; sexual conflicts in the sense of prisoner frustration and emasculation and sexual harassment of female officers; and organizational issues such as

¹Government supported studies which are based on interviews or questionnaires include: Canadian Human Rights Commission, 1981; Côté Committee, 1977; Plecas and Maxim, 1985; Women's Advisory Committee, 1978.

job satisfaction and promotion.

Institutional Setting

The unique characteristics of prisons are influential in shaping the patterns of interaction among the people who inhabit it. Goffman (1961) refers to the prison as a "total institution", defining it as:

a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals, cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time, together lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life (p. xiii).

Characteristic of all total institutions, according to Goffman, are:

First, all aspects of life are conducted in the same place and under the same single authority. Second, each phase of the member's daily activity is carried on in the immediate company of a large batch of others, all of whom are treated alike and required to do the same thing together. Third, all phases of the day's activities are tightly scheduled, with one whole sequence of activities being imposed from above by a system of explicit formal rulings and a body of officials. Finally, the various enforced activities are brought together into a single rational plan purportedly designed to fulfill the official aims of the institution (p. 6).

In a classic prison simulation experiment at Stanford, university student volunteers were randomly assigned to either a guard or prisoner role in a "mock" prison setting (Haney, Banks & Zimbardo, 1981). The authors state that:

The environment of arbitrary custody had great impact upon the affective states of both guards and prisoners as well as upon the interpersonal processes taking place between and within those role-groups (p. 148).

Other research on correctional officers highlights the

importance of the institutional environment, molding the views and behaviours of the individuals within its walls (Crouch & Alpert, 1982; Fox, 1982; Jacobs & Kraft, 1978; Jurik, 1985; Jurik & Halemba, 1984; Lombardo, 1981; Simpson & White, 1985; Soutar & Williams, 1985; Sykes, 1958; Zupan, [undated]). It is within this organizational context that studies on the perceptions and attitudes toward female correctional officers are set.

Performance of Female Correctional Officers

Job
Different measures have been employed in order to compare the performance levels of male and female correctional officers. The performance of correctional officers have been evaluated on a number of dimensions; not only do the officers have to be security conscious, but must command authority, have good interpersonal skills and proper physical attributes. Supervisory evaluations of performance have been used as a measure but they have certain inherent problems (Wahler & Gendreau, 1985). Supervisory evaluations result in inconsistencies due to their views of the proper role of correctional officers and the type of institutional setting.

Based on staff interviews at 16 federal U.S. institutions, Ingram (1981) found that supervisors were inclined to overrate good female correctional officers and underrate the "problem" females to a greater extent than they did for the same

categories of male officers. In addition, Jurik (1985b) stated that evaluations at the seven prisons run by a department of corrections in a western state that she studied still tend to focuss on security to the exclusion of the service functions. Therefore, the validity of such evaluation measures is questionable.

Even so, perceptions of female correctional officers held by those in direct contact with them were quite positive; the majority of respondents in various studies indicated that female correctional officers were as good at their job as their male counterparts (Breed, 1981; Holeman & Krepps-Hess, 1983; Holt, 1981; Kissel & Katsampes, 1980; Kissel & Seidel, 1980; Petersen, 1982; Women's Advisory Committee, 1978). In a 1983 comprehensive California survey of all 11 male prisons Holeman and Krepps-Hess found no significant difference between male and female correctional officers comparison groups (matched on age and institutional experience) on any performance indicator including the number of commendations and reprimands received or sick leave time used. But when exploring the issue further, it was found that in specific situations where physical force was required, the perceived effectiveness of female correctional officers dropped substantially (also see Kissel & Seidel, 1980).

Inwald and Shusman (1984), on the other hand, found from their survey of recruits to a large urban correctional department, that females were absent and late twice as often as men. Although numbers were not sufficient for these researchers

to control for other variables, they speculated that this finding may be due to the higher percentage of single parents among the females or a lack of employment experience. Nonetheless, females were disciplined less frequently than the male officers.

The number of involuntary terminations is another indicator of the performance of correctional officers. It was found by Holeman and Krepps-Hess (1983) that a lower rate of women than men terminated their positions in this way, even though there was a higher rate of voluntary separations for female than male officers. It is interesting to note that with regard to personality characteristics, Holeman and Krepps-Hess (1983) found that extroverted, assertive females were more likely to be terminated (also see Inwald & Shusman, 1984). Such results are consistent with those of Schuerger, Kochevar and Reinwald (1982) concerning preferences in supervisory evaluations in a large U.S. metropolitan area. Based on a personality questionnaire and performance reports completed by the officers' supervisors, the authors interpreted their findings as showing that supervisors, predominantly male, had a slight preference for female correctional officers who tended to be trusting and low in dominance.

Performance of a correctional officer may be also gauged by the authority he/she commands, the level of interpersonal skills and the physical ability of the officer. These measures of performance are considered in the following subsections.

Respect for the Authority of Female Correctional Officers

Kissel and Seidel's 1980 survey results from five prisons in four states indicated that orders by female correctional officers were obeyed quicker and to a greater degree than orders by male officers. A New South Wales study of female correctional officers working in a maximum security jail (Nicholson, 1984) reported that females were able to request that tasks be performed without using autocratic commands to the prisoners. As one female provincial correctional officer in Canada stated:

If I tell an inmate to do something, his male pride isn't at stake with the other inmates...Whereas, I feel, if a male guard tells him to do something, it sparks his ego. He feels almost a compulsion to talk back to impress his peers ("Equal is as equal does," 1979: 9).

Pollock (1986), based on interviews with female officers from a U.S. state department of corrections, found female officers claimed that male inmates treated them with respect and were willing to follow their orders. On the other hand, a Canadian study (Women's Advisory Committee, 1978), whose numbers were exceedingly small, asked whether orders by male officers were more likely to be obeyed than orders by females. Although the staff disagreed with this statement, a number of inmates supported it.

Interpersonal Skills

Several researchers have reported that many females officers and/or prisoners feel that female correctional officers appear to be easier to talk to (Harm, 1981; Zimmer, 1982), better

listeners (Côté Committee, 1977; Zimmer, 1982) and utilize a more personal method of interaction (Nicholson, 1984; Petersen, 1982). One study (Pollock, 1986) found that both male and female correctional officers stated that female officers were somewhat more likely to be receptive to inmate problems. This was not the case in all studies, for inmates surveyed in Boulder, Colorado felt that they were encouraged to talk equally by male and female correctional officers (Kissel & Katsampes, 1980).

One researcher (Harm, 1981) noted that women correctional officers relied on verbal skills to deal with altercations. In a Colorado prison survey by Kissel and Katsampes (1980) the females' ability to settle disputes without force received laudatory acknowledgment from their male coworkers. Owen (1985: 155) makes the comment, based on over 100 interviews and participant observation at San Quentin, that most men:

...acknowledge that a good officer should never have to lay hands on a prisoner to subdue them. Much of the job involves talking to the prisoners and setting a tone in the work or living unit that is conducive to nonviolence. Women appear to be extremely good in this part of the job, and this is grudgingly recognized on an individual basis.

If women are more capable of calming potentially violent situations this may result in an avoidance of physical confrontations.

W.
peter 2-3
effect

Physical Abilities of Female Correctional Officers

Probably the major obstacle in the perception of the competence of female correctional officers is the question of their physical strength. While it is certainly the case that men are physically superior to women in strength, it does not imply that women are not able to meet the physical requirements of a correctional officer. In fact it has been noted that many male correctional officers may not be physically competent due to age, weight or lack of exercise (Fox, 1982; Côté Committee, 1977).

The Côté Committee (1977), after a cross-Canada tour of federal institutions to examine the justifications for sex restrictions in the penitentiary service, claimed that the concern for physical strength was highly overrated. They stated that the use of force is the exception not the rule. Corrections already compensated for the majority of correctional officers who were not up to physical fitness standards by deploying the most capable persons for the situation. The Canadian Human Rights Commission (1981: 10) in their report based upon interviews of the administration, female officers and union and committee representatives at eight Canadian medium security institutions elaborated on this:

Senior staff generally take the position that, when violence does occur, most staff members would not be able to control an inmate in a one-to-one struggle, but would rely instead on numbers to overpower the inmate. Further, some staff members are considered more capable of dealing with violent situations than others, based on their size, strength and trustworthiness. In the case of

a riot, the expectation is that all security staff will participate in its control.

A study by Kissel and Katsampes (1980) in Colorado found that female officers tended to feel that they were capable of handling most situations and that security is not diminished. Differences in gender response indicated that females are inclined to view their ability more positively than do the male officers (also see Boxersox, 1981). Kissel and Seidel (1980), in their study of five U.S. institutions at various security levels, report that females did not believe they needed more assistance than males but the view was contradicted by the male correctional officers. Additionally, the majority of females questioned by Andersen (1978), at a male detention facility in Washington, D.C., believed that female correctional officers were generally at least as aggressive in their job as males, whereas most of the men disagreed.

A majority of the male correctional officers, but only 36% of the women, felt that female correctional officers were in greater danger at the South Nevada Correctional Centre (Kinsell & Sheldon, 1981). The responses become even more polarized when the question was asked if female officers endangered male correctional officers in times of crises; 76% of the males responded positively compared to seven percent of the females. *Alford* *CMS*
This negative male attitude was also expressed in an extensive study by Fox (1982) of five maximum prisons in the U.S. and in Ingram's (1981) task force report of 16 institutions in the

federal prison system. Interestingly, when prisoners in California state institutions were asked a similar question by Holeman and Krepps-Hess (1983) two-thirds of these inmates thought females did not endanger the lives of the male staff or the prisoners.

The fairly positive results of Kissel and Katsampes (1980) and Kissel and Seidel (1980) suggested that the assistance females provide was good except when it came to the actual use of force. The majority of men and inmates believed that men were more successful in handling threatening physical situations. Although the majority of women felt they were competent at breaking up a fight or, to a lesser extent, controlling a large or physically tough inmate, they were slightly more inclined to feel that males were better able to handle these situations when they occurred. Thus, when it came to the point where physical force was necessary, there is the perception that men may have the advantage.

A United States task force examining the employment of female correctional officers in male prisons ascertained that the majority of females lacked self-confidence in their physical competence (Ingram, 1981). Since females were rarely relegated to duties involving physical altercations, they did not have the opportunity to develop self-esteem in their abilities. Kissel and Katsampes (1980) also noted that females occasionally felt vulnerable because of their physical size and strength. But the research detailed so far does not propose that women

correctional officers represent a ^{not} liability to corrections by virtue of their physical ability even though many male correctional officers continue to hold this view.

As females prove themselves, the question of their physical abilities to handle the job may become less of a concern. Crouch (1985) cites an example of this:

...at San Quentin a small, elite, special-security squad (known locally as the "goon squad") included a woman in 1978. Her supervisor admitted that he and the other men on the squad had been extremely resistant to her presence but could not legally exclude her. Over time, her persistence and courage in handling aggressive inmates, "shake-downs," and incidents as part of the squad impressed her co-workers and supervisor to the point that she became generally accepted.

Female Correctional Officers' Relationships with Male Staff and Prisoners

The view that women correctional officers have more lenient tendencies toward prisoners than their male counterparts is not borne out by the data. A longitudinal study of correctional officers in the Correctional Service of Canada found that females held lower opinions of inmates than males prior to their employment as correctional officers, with their opinion dropping proportionately to the males after a nine month follow-up period (Plecas & Maxim, 1985). Using a questionnaire, the researchers found that the new female recruits were inclined to hold a more punitive opinion about correctional treatment and this opinion approached that of the experienced male officers. Moreover,

Jurik and Halemba (1984) found no significant relationship between gender and attitude toward inmates in their survey of a medium-minimum security facility in a Western state even though female correctional officers expected themselves to be more sensitive than males (also see Jurik, 1985a).

In opposition to the notion that females are more sensitive to the needs of inmates, a study by Zupan (undated) in Washington State found strong similarities between male and female correctional officers working in county jails in their perception of inmate needs and the strength of these needs. In fact, when this perceived inmate need inventory was compared with the responses of real needs provided by inmates there was a vast discrepancy. Both male and female officers were considerably off the mark. In addition, there was no significant difference between male and female correctional officer evaluations of other staff and inmates. Few substantial differences in attitudes based on gender were noted indicating that the institutional environment may play a more important part in dictating and shaping the correctional officer role.

Ingram (1981), in the U.S. task force report, indicated that some male staff believed that female correctional officers occasionally became too close to their prisoners and consequently ignored the enforcement of certain institutional rules. One study (Kinsell & Sheldon, 1981) found that the majority of staff surveyed in a medium security correctional centre in Nevada perceived females as being emotional. This may

lead to greater involvement with prisoners. Such emotional vulnerability may also mean that females might be more easily manipulated.

The results of an extremely small Ontario staff exchange project showed that a substantial minority (45%) of inmates felt that they were more likely to successfully manipulate female officers (Women's Advisory Committee, 1978). Whereas larger and better designed studies showed that women were not thought to be more easily "conned" (Kissel & Katsampes, 1980; Petersen, 1982). Further, Harm (1981: 270), the Assistant Warden at Joliet Correctional Center in Illinois, pointed out that:

...the incidence of male staff members bringing in contraband to inmates, being involved with inmates after they leave prison, and so on, is proportionately and significantly higher than the incidence of these types of events with female staff.

Protection of Female Correctional Officers

The belief held by many male officers that it is necessary to protect females from harm or difficult situations has been documented extensively (Bowersox, 1981; Côté Committee, 1977; Holeman & Krepps-Hess, 1983; Ingram, 1981; Kissel & Katsampes, 1980). It was reported by the U.S. researchers, Kissel and Seidel (1980) in their study of five institutions that on occasion, male officers might have interfered unnecessarily when a female was performing her duties although this seemed to be a rare occurrence. Not only did they find that this behaviour contributed to a lack of confidence on the part of female

correctional officers, but it might have left them feeling slighted and resentful.

The protection of female officers from physical confrontations, on the other hand, was a more common behaviour. As one male correctional officer interviewed in the Kissel and Seidel (1980) study remarked:

If there is a fight or disturbance to quell and it is going to require physical restraint to do it, I think the male staff actually have a tendency to go over the top of women or trample 'em on the way past them to get to it before they do (p. 45).

A sex-role questionnaire distributed by Bowersox (1981) to correctional officers in the Missouri Department of Corrections showed that neither the demonstrated competence of female correctional officers nor the fear of competition changed this male desire to shield female correctional officers from a physical assault. Many women correctional officers in the studies by Kissel and Seidel (1980) and Zimmer (1982) appeared to be appreciative of this attitude, but such a view could have worked to their disadvantage for they might be perceived as not performing all their job functions (Canadian Human Rights Commission, 1981).

overprotected & under
The Canadian Human Rights Commission (1981) found from interviews at eight medium security federal facilities that females were overprotected in some instances and underprotected in others, such as being sent to conduct counts on their own or escorting large groups of prisoners to different locations in the institution. As Fox (1982: 70), in his extensive survey of

maximum security U.S. prisons, commented:

It appears that most male guards fail to completely understand the implications of their setups intended to test the performance capability of women. According to our observations, these actions (unsanctioned by prison management) occasionally subjected women to unnecessary security risks and personal humiliation. For example, at one research site, there were official reports that prisoners and guards had attempted to stage a "game" that would have seriously jeopardized the personal safety of a female guard.

Therefore, acts which disregarded ^{Test female guards} standard correctional procedures, in an effort to test a female correctional officer's capabilities or to persuade women to quit, occurred in both Canadian and U.S. correctional institutions.

The protective attitude of the male staff appears to extend to the prisoners. The chivalrous notion of protecting a "lady in distress" oversteps the situational boundaries since inmates in Petersen's (1982) study of four Wisconsin institutions claimed that they were more likely to protect a physically threatened female correctional officer than a male officer. Kissel and Katsampes (1980) found that a substantial minority of prisoners in a Colorado prison took a protective stance when females were in danger. In addition, these authors stated that prisoners were somewhat reluctant to be physically aggressive with women correctional officers. This was substantiated by Ingram's (1981) findings, from the 16 institutions he canvassed, that prisoners perceived females as less powerful and more vulnerable; thus not an appropriate target to physically accost. Furthermore, in Canada, the Women's Advisory Committee reported in 1978 that 90% of the inmates at Brampton Adult Training Centre in Ontario

stated they would assist a female correctional officer if she were assaulted. The protective and less physical response of prisoners to women correctional officers may contribute to the value of female officers in abating potentially violent scenes.

Acceptance of Female Correctional Officers

Male Attitudes

Opinions range from the traditional perspective that women should not be exposed to prison conditions or as one inmate said, "A rose does not grow in asphalt" (Côté Committee, 1977: 24); to fear of physical or emotional incapacities of women to handle the job; to the professed extra burden of protecting the females from harm.

Lower Security = more accepting
Crouch's (1985) hypothesis that lower security prisons might experience greater acceptance since they are more treatment oriented is in line with Jurik's (1985b) conceptualization that when security concerns reign over rehabilitative ideals the competency of women is more heavily suspect. Support for this view is garnered from a questionnaire study by Simpson and White (1985) involving a minimum, medium and maximum security federal prison. Based on 96 returned responses of the 320 solicited, the authors found that the level of security was the strongest predictor of attitudes; the greater the security level the less liberal the attitudes toward female correctional officers.

Adverse relationships between female correctional officers and their male counterparts was evident in the findings of a

number of studies. In the South Nevada Correctional Center, Kinsell and Sheldon (1981) found that 79% of the female correctional officers, compared to 41% of the males surveyed, felt the inmates were more appreciative of their performance than the other staff. A more recent study by Jurik and Halemba (1984) reported that female correctional officers were more likely to express negative attitudes towards coworkers and to state that coworkers cause the majority of problems for them on the job. Fox (1982) found from his questionnaire, interviews and observation, that nearly all females stated that their primary irritant was the male officers and not the inmates (also see Harm, 1981). Similarly, Owen (1985) after conducting in-depth interviews and some participant observation at San Quentin reported that females were aware of the uneasiness and lack of acceptance on the part of their male colleagues. Even inmates have been found, as reported by Petersen (1982) in a U.S. study, to detect the resentment of the male staff toward female correctional officers. One inmate, in an interview cited by Cardozo-Freeman (1984: 237) at Washington State Penitentiary commented:

Well I've had long talks with guards about women guards and they're just sick of it, man. Most of em want to quit. They get one here and they treat em like dirt because they're friendly to us.

Finally, both Fox (1982) and Holeman and Krepps-Hess (1983) in their work in various U.S. states and security levels found male correctional officers held a neutral or negative opinion regarding female correctional officers.

However, in a U.S. multi-security level survey Kissel and Seidel (1980) contend that the majority of male staff they approached approved of their female coworkers, as was the case in the Kissel and Katsampes' (1980) Colorado study. Nevertheless, in this latter survey 46% of the female correctional officers said they encountered prejudice which hampered their effectiveness. Likewise, in Australia, interviews in a New South Wales maximum security prison revealed that 70% of the male correctional officers had a positive bias toward female officers working in a maximum security jail three months after their introduction (Nicholson, 1984). After 11 months, however, the male officers were equally divided about whether more females were needed and, although there are no reports or complaints filed to verify the claim, a substantial minority (44%) believed that female correctional officers had caused security problems. The author claimed that it was difficult to account for the disparity in responses between the two sets of informal interviews. It was noted, though, that the more mature correctional officers with a lengthy service record had a more accepting approach to female officers. Contrarily, Petersen (1982), in her study of three facilities in Wisconsin found evidence that the hostility or resentment among male correctional officers dissipated over time, but she believed that it simply became less visible.

Jurik (1985b) presented the argument that organizational factors such as the prominence of security concerns,

overcrowding, staff shortages and the inadequate implementation of the human service strategy have exacerbated and accentuated the generalized attitudes that male correctional officers hold regarding their female counterparts.

Prisoner Attitudes Toward Female Correctional Officers

Many inmates in Canada (Côté Committee, 1977) and the U.S. (Harm, 1981; Holeman & Krepps-Hess, 1983; Petersen, 1982) appeared quite receptive to the idea of female correctional officers. A passage from Cardozo-Freeman's (1984: 236-237) account of life inside the Washington State Penitentiary illustrates the inmates' point of view:

Well, it's nice to talk to em and just sit by em or something. They're not mean. Feeding time is hell in here [during lockdown]. Guys are usually throwing coffee at the guards. It didn't happen that day, not with her on the tier, it didn't. Women guards will joke and laugh with us like when a woman guard gives me my TV dinner I say, 'Aw man, chicken again?' And she says, 'Well, it's all I could cook tonight.' That kind of bullshit. But when the male guard comes by he just throws it in. You say that and he freezes up on it.

same as in ASC study

In fact, Holland, Levi, Beckett and Holt (1979) noted in a study of male and female felons and civil addicts randomly chosen from California state prisons that inmates did not typically oppose cross-sex assignments and when strong preferences were expressed they were usually for opposite sex staff members. It should be noted that caution needs to be applied when persons other than prisoners are requested for their opinions. For instance, Holeman and Krepps-Hess (1983) discovered that male correctional officers generally perceived

more resistance among inmates relating to the employment of female correctional officers than actually existed while female officers perceived more acceptance than existed.

The Presence and Impact of Female Correctional Officers in the Facility

One of the reasons touted by correctional authorities for employing women correctional officers is the claim that they "normalize" the environment. However, this seems slightly ironical considering the abnormality of the entire prison structure. Yet, there is the view that the introduction of women correctional officers into this artificial all-male environment makes the prison somehow more similar to the world outside (Harm, 1981; Ingram, 1981; Nicholson, 1984; Potter, 1980).

Among the benefits cited for employing female correctional officers is that they relax or reduce the tension which is inherent in such an environment (Harm, 1981; Ingram, 1981; Kissel & Seidel, 1980; Petersen, 1982). In an extensive survey, Holeman and Krepps-Hess (1983) reported that more than two-thirds of the inmates in institutions operated by the California Department of Corrections believed that female correctional officers improved the prison environment (also see Breed, 1981; Harm, 1981; Petersen, 1982). Other studies indicated that the presence of females made the institution a more tolerable place for inmates to live and correctional staff

to work (Kissel & Katsampes, 1980; Kissel & Seidel, 1980).

Several researchers have found that the presence of females reduced the "macho" conflict and tended to improve the behaviour of inmates (Harm, 1981; Kinsell & Shelden, 1981; Kissel & Katsampes, 1980; Petersen, 1982). Other more peripheral benefits due to their presence were the reduction of inappropriate language and the encouragement for better dress (Ingram, 1981; Kissel & Seidel, 1980; Petersen, 1982). In addition, an improvement in morale for both prisoners and staff has been noted (Harm, 1981).

One of the questions posed by Kissel and Seidel (1980) in their U.S. study was whether male correctional officers who had worked at institutions where no female correctional officers had been employed noticed a difference in the behaviour of staff and inmates when females were present. The males reported that there was no difference as to the number of arguments or physical confrontations between staff and inmates or between inmates themselves. However, prisoners who had previously been incarcerated in non-integrated facilities reported reductions in arguments and physical altercations between staff and inmates but that there was no difference in the number of physical confrontations between inmates.

01/00/10.0
11

Privacy Concerns

Since privacy is a point which directly affects prisoners, their attitudes have been solicited by a number of researchers. In Ontario, offenders were questioned about this issue during a small scale staff exchange project between Brampton Adult Training Centre (a provincial male institution) and the Vanier Institute (a provincial female facility). Eighty-six percent of the prisoners and 70% of the staff at Brampton Adult Training Centre felt that "the female correctional officers working in an all male institution do not interfere with the residents' privacy" and less than a quarter of the inmates felt less comfortable in their presence. Surprisingly, when asked if "residents would rather not have female correctional officers present when they are dressing or undressing", only 29% of the prisoners responded affirmatively (Women's Advisory Committee, 1978).

A later report by the Canadian Human Rights Commission in 1981 found that in the eight institutions where interviews took place that some inmates objected to women correctional officers conducting cell counts or shower supervision since "...they may be observed in a state of undress, attending to personal hygiene, or otherwise engaged in personal activities" (p. 7). Furthermore, in the living areas some inmates felt more restricted behaviourally or psychologically with respect to their dress, language and actions. Inmate searches were not

viewed as an important concern by either the Canadian Human Rights Commission (1981) or the Côté Committee (1977).

Studies in the United States have reported similar findings. Kissel and Katsampes (1980) found that the majority of inmates did not feel that the presence of women affected their sense of privacy at all (55%) or not much (29%). Holeman and Krepps-Hess (1983) substantiated these results although they indicated that this was the topic raised most often in any written comments offered by the inmates in the California state prisons. Even so, they noted a trend toward decreasing concern among prisoners on this subject.

From an assessment of how comfortable inmates felt about the presence of women in various areas of the institution, Kissel and Seidel (1980) reported that the vast majority of men were not concerned with the presence of women in any area except shower facilities where 40% stated they were uncomfortable having females present. In regard to duties that involved an invasion of privacy, Holland et al. (1979) found that civilly committed narcotic addicts from randomly selected California state prisons had a tendency to select female staff for these roles compared to male felons.

As with the Canadian Human Rights Commission (1981) study, Zimmer's study (1982) of New York correctional officers found that women working in areas where they sometimes saw prisoners undressed was disturbing for some inmates. For others, the

protection of bodily privacy was not the problem, but rather they resented the adjustments that had to be made to accommodate women correctional officers. An inmate interviewed by Zimmer commented:

I can't be myself with women around. I've got to watch what I do and watch what I say, when there's just guys around you can relax (p. 124).

Inmates concentrated on this aspect rather than complaining about women correctional officers infringing on their bodily privacy in interviews by Kissel and Seidel (1980). As one inmate stated:

Yes, it invades your privacy. After you come out of the shower from rec and you got to put on a suit or something. That invades it to that extent. You can't walk around in your shorts, or whatever. There shouldn't be a woman working here that can't accept a man in shorts. Or naked. It shouldn't be a big thing... (p. 71).

Although one study of eight county jails in Washington State (Zupan, undated) found the need for privacy might be rated more highly by inmates than by either male and female correctional officers, the male prisoners surveyed in the U.S. and Canada have generally not viewed the intrusion on their privacy by female correctional officers as a point of contention. Still, there is a minority of prisoners for whom this subject does raise deep concern and resentment.

Sexual Conflicts

Prisoner Frustrations and Emasculation

The potential for sexual conflicts is an additional factor regarding the deployment of female correctional officers in male institutions. Concern regarding the psychological effects on inmates in terms of frustration and emasculation as well as the the fear that the female correctional officers may be raped has received sporadic attention in the literature.

In a 1976 article by Herrington, three psychiatrists in the U.S. presented their opinions on the topic of inmate frustration. The doctors interviewed did not perceive this to be a problem in practice and suggested possible benefits which could flow from the employment of female correctional officers, e.g., provides an opportunity for inmates to observe females and reduce any false fantasies; diminish situational homosexuality². Morris (cited in Flynn, 1982: 327) who advocated female staffing in prisons with repetitively violent male offenders stated:

As a matter of observation, men behave better in the presence of women. The social skills of many male offenders in dealing with women are distorted and undeveloped. Frequent and constructive association with women as staff members of the prison will have a positive impact upon the prisoners' later social relationships.

²Most inmates surveyed by Petersen (1982) in the U.S. and the Women's Advisory Committee (1978) in Ontario did not believe homosexuality would be reduced but support for this position was received from a U.S. study by Kissel and Seidel (1980).

In her study of a maximum security jail in New South Wales, Nicholson (1984) further expounded on this reintegrative function of preventing sex-based distancing. She stated that prisoners incarcerated for long periods of time needed female interaction to maintain the ability to communicate with women and help alleviate any reservations regarding post-release contact with the family.

Empirical studies which have examined this issue do not present a consistent picture. Petersen (1982) found, from 95 of the inmates responding to a questionnaire from institutions in Wisconsin, that there was an equal split in opinion on whether females make the lack of sex more frustrating, but in another study by Kissel and Katsampes (1980), the majority of inmates felt their presence did not increase the level of sexual frustration or actually decreased it. Although there is not overwhelming agreement by prisoners on this subject, male ^{So} correctional officers interviewed by Petersen (1982) viewed the sexual frustration of inmates as a serious problem.

Even though the vast majority of prisoners appeared to be in favour of female supervision there was resentment or humiliation on the part of some inmates in taking orders from females (Kissel & Katsampes, 1980; Zimmer, 1982). Kissel and Seidel (1980), in their survey of five U.S. facilities, also found that inmates were slightly more likely to be bothered (52%) when taking orders given by female correctional officers than male officers. Zimmer (1982) explained that this may be caused by the

T

reversal of the traditional stereotypic view of women as subservient to men which threatens their "macho" image and violates their conception of proper female roles.

Female Sexual Harassment

In an effort to disclaim the perception that they were weak and in order to avoid ridicule, it was revealed by a U.S. task force that female correctional officers may go so far as not to report sexual harassment from inmates (Ingram, 1981). According to an article by the Canadian journal Liaison ("Women in corrections," 1985), some females also refrained from exposing sexual harassment by their male co-workers. Petersen (1982), through her interviews and observations, found that the resentment and hostility harboured by the males was expressed in sexual innuendos and allegations of sexual misconduct. When male jocular put-downs occurred, Kissel and Seidel (1980) found from their U.S. survey that they were not generally seen as offensive by the women. Some of the women interviewed by Ingram (1981) for his task force report claimed that such harassment revealed a fear of competition instead of being sexually motivated.

The possibility that women correctional officers might be raped by inmates was a concern raised by the United States Supreme Court³, some Canadian union personnel⁴, as well as the

³Dothard v. Rawlinson, 433 U.S. 321, 335 (1977).

⁴Personal conversation with W. Grenkow, Regional Vice President, CSC B.C. S.C.C., July 1985; Côté, 1977: 23.

Carson Committee⁵. But the Côté Committee noted that raping a woman, be she a correctional officer or not, was viewed unfavourably by the prisoners. Inmates interviewed by the Committee stated that the female correctional officers were "...quite safe in this regard except for the most unusual circumstances which also occur in society" (p. 32).

The Canadian Human Rights Commission (1981) cited that the protective attitude exhibited by the male staff and the inmates' own respect for women as reasons for the unlikelihood of a sexual attack on female correctional officers. As one inmate responded in Zimmer's (1982) study of New York and Rhode Island prisons:

Sure, that's a bit of a problem--especially with the good looking ones. But I know I would be a fool to try anything. My ass would be in big trouble. So I look, but don't touch. Touching would be nice, but looking is better than nothing at all (p. 121).

Inmates interviewed by Zimmer claimed to control "troublemakers" in this regard, and, as noted previously, were protective of the females themselves. Some dissension does exist, though, for the Women's Advisory Committee in a very small Ontario study noted that 33% of the inmates they questioned did think females were in danger of being sexually attacked by the inmates. Sexual assaults and even physical assaults on female correctional officers are infrequent and certainly not disproportionate to the number of assaults on male

⁵Personal conversation with J. Carson, Chairman of the Carson Committee, July 1985.

staff (Harm, 1981; Holeman & Krepps-Hess, 1983; Ingram, 1981).

However, they do occur.⁶

Rather than physical assaults of a sexual nature, inmates may vent their frustrations in the form of crude or obnoxious comments (Kissel & Katsampes, 1980; Kissel & Seidel, 1980). Such verbal propositions were not viewed as a major problem by female correctional officers in the U.S. prisons sampled by Kissel and Katsampes (1980) or Kissel and Seidel (1980). On the other hand, half the prisoners questioned by Petersen (1982) in her survey of institutions in Wisconsin indicated that most female correctional officers will have difficulty with inmates making improper advances. Indeed, harsh treatment by inmates is common when female correctional officers are first employed in male prison, but the novelty soon wears off (Ingram, 1981; Zimmer, 1982).

The concern by male correctional officers and some inmates that female workers were susceptible to sexual assaults was not shared by the majority of female officers (Fox, 1982). A comment by Fox, who conducted an extensive study of five maximum security prisons in the U.S., elucidated this outlook, "Several of the women told us that fear of sexual violence was a constant

⁶In an incident at William Head Institute on May 4, 1984, a prisoner, high on hallucinogenic mushrooms and nude from the waist down, grabbed a female correctional officer's wrist and was pushing her towards the wall when a male officer intervened. The prisoner was found guilty of sexually assaulting the female officer as well as assaulting two male correctional officers in the incident ("Prison grounds growing," 1985: A1; "Sexual assault," 1985: A15).

threat in prison or in the free community that was long ago accepted as the social reality of womanhood" (p. 70). As Harm (1981), the Assistant Warden at Joliet Correctional Center in Illinois, pointed out, the design of the facility also affected feelings of vulnerability; that is, a traditional facility with many "nooks and crannies" elicited greater concern regarding safety.

Organizational and Management Issues

The physical structure of the facility is not always equipped to accommodate female correctional officers. Ingram (1981), in his task force report, noted that inappropriate plant construction such as prisoner showers located in front of the staff station, lack of convenient female restrooms and lack of appropriate clothing have resulted in problems for the female officers. This lack of facilities was echoed by Sakowoki (1985/86) who claimed that when females correctional officers were first introduced in Canada at the federal level, uniforms and appropriate change areas for women were not available.

Job Satisfaction

The findings on termination ratios appear to be contradictory. Holeman and Krepps-Hess (1983) in their California state survey found that there was a significantly greater percentage of terminations among female officers. This finding was supported by Ingram (1981), who, after interviewing 250 employees in 16

all-male federal prisons claimed that the termination/ resignation rates were higher for women. Additionally, Andersen (1978) found in a detention facility in Washington, D.C. that a greater number of females tended to be more dissatisfied with the job compared to males. Contrary to these studies, data obtained by Inwald and Shusman (1984) from a large, urban correctional facility in the U.S. suggested that a greater percentage of male correctional officers resigned within their first year. A third result was documented by Plecas and Maxim (1985) who reported that the percentage of female recruit correctional officers who resigned from Canadian federal corrections was not disproportionate to the percentage of men.⁷ Similarly, Jurik and Halemba (1984) found no difference in job satisfaction between genders in the Western U.S. prison facility they surveyed.

Promotions

In a randomly selected survey of 25% of the employees at six Federal Prison System facilities in the U.S., Kane and Vanyur (undated) reported that the promotion rate, when controlled for length of employment, was equivalent for females and males. They did note that females were more pessimistic regarding the opportunities available for career advancement. Bergen (1984), in a narrative account, also describes the impediments that face

⁷Linden (1985) reported higher attrition rates for females than for males in the R.C.M.P., provincial police forces, and the Canadian military but the rates were similar for municipal police forces.

females in their move up the corrections ladder.

Promotions based on perceived favouritism due to the physical appearance of the female or innuendos of sexual favours represented a problem for women (Jurik, 1985b). The promoted females not only need to prove their qualifications but must disprove the implications of favouritism. An additional burden for women correctional officers is finding a style of behaviour which is comfortable for them and suitable for the position without them becoming "one of the boys" (Owen, 1985). This is made more difficult because of the lack of female role models (Crouch, 1985). For women are not just a threat to the male correctional officer subcultural solidarity, but they are also a perceived threat to promotional advances (Fox, 1982; Jurik, 1985b).

Summary

Inconsistencies in the findings reported by research studies of female correctional officers may be attributable, in part, to variations in prison size, characteristics of the inmate population, security classification, organization goals and resources, and the length of time females have been employed in the particular institution. Surprisingly, even with all these varied factors, findings in many areas appear consistent across studies.

The research, in general, indicates that the performance of female officers was perceived by all respondent groups as equivalent to that of males. Women either possessed the same or better interpersonal skills when dealing with prisoners and their ability to defuse potentially violent situations through nonviolent means has been acknowledged by their male counterparts. The females had a higher perception of their physical abilities than men; they did not believe that they endanger the male officers during a crisis. Male officers and inmates felt that men handled forceful situations more effectively and the women were less inclined to disagree with this statement.

Although females may have been perceived as more emotional than males, they did not appear to be manipulated more easily. Additionally, the sensitivity women exhibited toward inmates and their needs was similar to that of males, indicating that the institutional environment may play a more important role in shaping such attitudes.

The tendency to protect female officers was claimed by both male coworkers and inmates. Prisoners, on the whole, seemed to approve of female correctional officers, but the majority of studies have found that females did not feel accepted by the male officers.

Various studies indicate that females have contributed to the prison a sense of normalcy, have improved the environment by

relaxing or reducing tension, made prison life more tolerable, improved the behaviour of the inmates and improved language, dress and morale. Generally, the inmates have not found the intrusion of privacy by female correctional officers to be a major issue, although it is a concern for a small minority. Some inmates, though, resented taking orders from women officers. Finally, rape of the female officers was not felt to be a substantive barrier in employing women.

At the management level, there were problems with plant design and lack of uniforms. The termination data was inconsistent and, therefore, inconclusive. One study that compared promotion rates found no difference based on gender when the length of employment was controlled. Nonetheless, women may encounter problems on the road to promotion.

A major objective of the present research was to test these findings through a study conducted in a provincial pre-trial centre in British Columbia. In the following chapter the method of this study is discussed.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

In Canada the increased employment of women in male correctional facilities has been facilitated by affirmative action and opportunity initiatives. Minimal attention has been paid to the possible receptivity of the institutional organization and co-workers to the presence of women or their effectiveness in the performance of correctional duties. The policy objective has been to employ women in correctional facilities on an equal basis with men. As evidenced in the literature review, there are some perceived drawbacks to hiring women in such a capacity. For the most part these involve issues of inmate rights to privacy and the physical abilities of the females. In addition, the attitudes of the males within the institutional context must be considered because of the implications they have on the success and promotability of women.

Canadian newsletters and officials stress the need to increase the numbers of women in corrections ("Correctional Service Canada," 1982; "Female CXs on the increase," 1984; "Women in CSC," 1983). Yet comprehensive studies to assess the impact of female officers in such facilities are lacking. This thesis is designed to contribute to the literature on female correctional officers in male institutions through the use of questionnaires and structured interviews at a provincial

pre-trial centre.

Location

The study was conducted at the Vancouver Pre-Trial Services Centre during the months of June to October 1985. This provincial facility, in the heart of Vancouver, houses prisoners awaiting trial. Accommodating up to 150 prisoners, the highly sophisticated complex is designed more like a university dormitory than a traditional jail. Doors and elevators are controlled electronically from a central location. Constructed to accommodate female correctional officers, the institution affords added privacy for the inmates.

Sample

For the purpose of obtaining a well-rounded picture of the impact women correctional officers have on the Vancouver Pre-Trial Services Centre, a sample was selected consisting of prisoners, male correctional officers and supervisors.¹ All these individuals have direct and frequent contact with female officers and are in a position to comment on the abilities of females or any problems or benefits that arise from their

¹In British Columbia, security officers are promoted to correctional officer then principal officer and finally senior correctional officer. The security and correctional officers are the individuals who maintain the greatest contact with inmates and are grouped together under the generic term "correctional officer". There is no living unit concept at the provincial level.

presence.

Prisoners are subject to body frisks by officers of the opposite sex and must be more discrete in their living areas. Therefore their responses on this issue were requested. But females may possess abilities that are appreciated by the inmates, such as good communication skills or providing a "softer feel" to the stark prison environment.

Male officers and supervisors may also benefit from this female influence in terms of a better working atmosphere. Their acceptance of females is necessary not only to ensure good morale but for security reasons as well. On the rare occasion, overprotectiveness or lack of confidence in the physical abilities of female correctional officers in critical situations may have deleterious results. Therefore their opinions are crucial.

Since supervisors conduct performance evaluations and are consulted when problems arise, their perceptions and comments provide insight into the areas discussed. Responses of the females themselves, who present first-hand experiences, are of greatest interest.

The different populations sampled were approached in a systematic and sequential manner:

1. female correctional officers;
2. male correctional officers;
3. supervisors (principal officers and senior correctional

officers); and

4. prisoners.

The entire population of nine actively employed female correctional officers participated in both the interview and questionnaire portion of the study.² For the male staff, 15 randomly chosen male correctional officers and five supervisors completed the interview and questionnaire.³ Following these interviews, the questionnaire was distributed to the remaining officers (about 80) and 37 surveys were returned.

A similar procedure was employed for the prisoners resulting in 20 out of 24 randomly selected individuals completing the interview and questionnaire, and 37 from the remaining prisoner population of approximately 135-140 responding to the questionnaire. Only prisoners who were incarcerated at Pre-Trial for more than two weeks were selected for the more comprehensive interview since it was thought such a period would allow sufficient contact with female staff to offer an informed opinion on the issue.⁴

²There was one female on sick leave who did not take part in the survey.

³One male officer declined to participate and a replacement officer was randomly selected.

⁴Although the primary interest were opinions formed at Pre-Trial, those based on previous contact with female officers in other settings were also encouraged in the questionnaire and interview process.

Research Instruments

Interviews

The content of the interview was primarily designed to complement the questionnaire, thus providing the respondent with the opportunity to elaborate on and prioritize the issues (see Appendix A). Questions pertaining to perceived advantages and disadvantages of employing female correctional officers, as well as the problems faced by these women, were posed. In addition, time was taken at this stage to inquire about previous experiences with female correctional officers in other institutions. This open-ended procedure took approximately 30 minutes. However the length was subject to considerable individual variation.

Questionnaires

Due to the limited number of female correctional officers employed at Pre-Trial, a set of pretested questionnaires was adopted (see Appendix B).⁵ Because it was directed at many of the same issues that are of interest in this study, a three questionnaire set, developed by Kissel and Seidel (1980) for a similar study of several institutions in the United States, was utilized. Due to their length, the questionnaires were streamlined, eliminating items that were beyond the scope of

⁵Used by permission from the creators P.J. Kissel, Research Analyst, Bureau of Prisons, Federal Correctional Institution, Colorado and J. Seidel, Director of Computer Center, University of Colorado School of Nursing, Colorado.

this survey, such as attitudes toward women in general, the function of the facility (treatment or custodial) and questions on job satisfaction; deleting questions that were similar to each other, e.g., effectiveness and competency ratings in certain situations; and modifying a few questions to accommodate the institutional setting, for instance, the floor numbers or the names used by the staff were provided in a question on specialized work areas. A different questionnaire was given to the three target populations to adequately reflect the specific issues and perspectives of each group. Still, these three surveys contained many similar questions that allow for comparisons to be made across groups.

All of the items had fixed responses with the exception of a few open-ended questions in the demographics section. The questions were generally structured along a four or five point scale which varied with the nature of the item. A wide array of issues received attention including:

1. the effectiveness and performance of women correctional officers in general and in specific situations or areas;
2. the softening effect or normalizing of the environment for male staff and prisoners;
3. the working dynamics of female and male correctional officers (e.g., protective behaviour, respect, confidence in their abilities, and sexual harassment);
4. the dynamics between women officers and prisoners (e.g., general relationship, respect of female authority, and

- sexual harassment);
5. the effect the employment of women had on organizational factors; and
 6. background characteristics.

The time required to complete the questionnaire was estimated to be 20 minutes.

Because the same research instrument (with modifications) was used for both studies, a comparison with the Kissel and Seidel results on an item by item basis was possible. Not only was the same questionnaire applied in the present study but a similar inmate population was surveyed; the average prisoner in four out of the five participating institutions in the Kissel and Seidel report was a pre-trial detainee.

The Kissel and Seidel Study - 1980

Between August and November 1979, Kissel and Seidel distributed a questionnaire to all the female staff, male staff and inmates who voluntarily agreed to participate at five correctional facilities in the United States. A separate version of the questionnaire was developed to tap into the perceptions of each group of interest. In addition, recorded oral interviews took place at three sites exploring issues similar to those expounded in the questionnaire. These voluntary interviews were carried out on an individual basis for the male and female correctional staff, but a group discussion format was used with

the inmates.

The five research sites were:

- Alexandria Correctional Center -- Alexandria, Virginia
- Fairfax County Adult Detention Center -- Fairfax, Virginia
- Metropolitan Correctional Center -- Chicago, Illinois
- The Boulder County Jail -- Boulder, Colorado
- Pueblo County Jail -- Pueblo, Colorado

The survey was conducted in different states with variations in building design and the proportion of female correctional officers employed (see Table 4).

A breakdown of the number of respondents surveyed at each institution is not provided. Nor is the total number of respondents noted. From examining the data, however, it appears that 115 male staff, 185 inmates and 61 female staff responded to the questionnaire. Response rates, although not calculated by the researchers, were approximately 79% for the female correctional staff (61 out of a total of 77 females) and 58% for the male members of the correctional staff (115 out of a total of 198). An estimated calculation of the inmate response rate cannot be computed since the figures cited in the report are the housing capacity or the average daily inmate population for the facility rather than the inmate population at the time of the study.

For the results section of the report the data is collapsed across institutions and used in its aggregate form, thereby

Table 4

Differences Amongst the Five Institutions Surveyed

Building Design

Old (common cell blocks with bars) - Alexandria, Pueblo
New (individual cells without bars) - Boulder, Chicago,
Fairfax

Setting

Large urban - Alexandria, Chicago
Upper middle class - Fairfax, Boulder
Rural community - Pueblo

Inmate Population - Size

Large daily population (over 200) - Chicago, Fairfax
Smaller (around 100) - Alexandria, Boulder, Pueblo

Inmate Population - Ethnicity

Predominantly white - Boulder, Fairfax
Predominantly minority - Alexandria, Chicago
Mixed - Pueblo

Proportion of Females on Corrections Staff

Pueblo	44% (15 female officers)
Boulder	29% (13 female officers)
Fairfax	29% (23 female officers)
Alexandria	25% (12 female officers)
Chicago	18% (14 female officers)

Jurisdiction

County - Alexandria, Boulder, Fairfax, Pueblo
Federal - Chicago

Common Elements of the Five Institutions

1. Employment of women as corrections officers.
 2. Predominantly male inmate population.
 3. Expectation that women perform essentially the same duties as male corrections officers.
-

Source: Kissel and Seidel, 1980: 11-12.

masking any difference that may exist among the various facilities. In fact, there does appear to be some difference in the attitudes of the staff across institutions. An analysis of variance between institutions and the questions dealing with approval of women correctional officers ($p=.05$) and whether the male staff currently like working with female correctional officers ($p=.001$), revealed that Boulder and Pueblo had a higher rating for the women officers than Chicago, Alexandria and Fairfax, although all tended to rate the female correctional officers positively. Even though variations existed between institutions, it is difficult to postulate a hypothesis for these results based solely on the descriptions provided. Nonetheless, the results of this study will be used as a vehicle of comparison between the United States and Canadian experiences.

Procedure

Instead of simply distributing questionnaires to the entire population, which might have resulted in a poor response rate, a random sample from each target group was selected from institutional lists. These individuals were asked to complete a questionnaire and then remain for an in-depth structured interview. This procedure took anywhere from 25 minutes to just over an hour to administer. Once the data collecting process was concluded, the questionnaires were distributed to the remainder

of the target population.

The correctional officers selected for the interview portion of the survey were initially notified of the researcher's presence by an introductory letter explaining the purpose of the survey (see Appendix C). Subjects were then approached in person to determine if they would be interested in responding to a questionnaire and a set of interview questions.⁶ Once the initial agreement was made, everyone completed both sections of the survey. The interviews were scheduled during the officer's lunch break, before or after shifts, or, in some cases, while the officer was on duty. For the rest of the officers, a similar introductory letter (see Appendix C) was placed, along with the questionnaire, in an envelope and left in their mail box.

The approach for the interviewed prisoners varied slightly in that an in-person verbal introduction occurred prior to the participation request. The discussions, with one exception, were held in private in the visits area of the institution. The final distribution of the questionnaires to the other prisoners was done in-person and they were picked up later the same evening.

Responses were tape recorded in most instances. However, written notes were taken for the first few interviews (when a tape machine was not available) or when someone felt uncomfortable speaking into the machine.⁷ Most people were

⁶The compliance rate was extremely high with this method; only one male officer declined to participate.

⁷One officer preferred not to be taped.

amenable to having their response verbally recorded, thereby greatly facilitating the discussion process and ensuring an accurate transcription. There appeared to be no difference in the content of the response between the two modes. Due to the nature of the topic and the more sensitive issue of interviewing prisoners, their responses were not taped.

Assurances of confidentiality and the voluntary nature of the participation were printed on the cover page of the questionnaire and were also verbally expressed to those participating in the interview.

As a supplement to the study, a few less formal interviews took place in the beginning of November, 1985 at Mission Institution; a medium security federal prison located on the outskirts of Mission, B.C. The opinions of women who had been employed in other locations such as Mountain Institution, Matsqui Institution, Prince George Regional Correctional Centre and Kingston Penitentiary were also canvassed during the course of the research for this thesis.

Limitations

Only one institution was surveyed extensively. Not only was this a new provincial pre-trial facility but its modern design provided additional privacy and security benefits. As a pre-trial facility, there is a high turnover rate of inmates as opposed to the longer length of stay experienced in other

custodial prisons. In addition, female correctional officers were present when the institution opened instead of being introduced into an existing officer network. Therefore, responses provided by its inhabitants may not be representative of those from other institutions across Canada. Furthermore, since the research site was a provincial facility it was not subject to an affirmative action program as are the federal prisons. Discussions with individuals from various prisons at both the federal and provincial level, however, provide some insight into the differences that may be anticipated.

The results were not cross-checked using institutional records. Therefore, the extent to which the perceptions of the respondents correspond to the behaviour in question is unknown.

Moreover, because the principal researcher was female, this may have coloured the responses obtained. Nonetheless, answers to the questionnaires distributed to the population of male officers and prisoners were quite similar to those received in the more intimate one-to-one questionnaire/interview approach used initially. Additionally, the results are comparable to those reported by other researchers. The study does provide a general understanding of female correctional officers working in male prisons in Canada as well as groundwork for future research in this area.

The results from the questionnaire and interview procedure are presented in the following chapter. Frequency of responses

is provided for the questionnaire items and this quantitative data is supplemented by the more personalized interview material.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The findings from the questionnaire and interviews for the present survey touch upon a plethora of issues related to the employment of female correctional officers in a male detention facility. A number of dimensions regarding employment performance and abilities are assessed under the following subheadings: performance in specific institutional areas, ability to enforce institutional rules and regulations, respect for female correctional officers' authority, interpersonal skills and physical abilities. The next section discusses the type of relationship female officers have with prisoners and their male co-workers. The effect that the presence of women has on the facility, the issue of inmate privacy and an examination of sexual conflicts in this setting follow. In addition, organizational issues such as training, promotions and job satisfaction are covered. Finally, data from conversations and correspondence with females from other institutions are discussed.

Background Profiles

The average female correctional officer was 25 years of age¹ with a college or university degree. She had worked at Pre-Trial for approximately one year with no previous experience

¹The median was taken due to a skewed distribution.

in corrections.

The typical male correctional officer was 31 years of age and had undertaken some college or university education. Sixty-nine percent (n=36) of the men had been at Pre-Trial since it opened its doors and 60% (n=31) had worked in other correctional institutions.

Prisoners, on average, were 29 years old with some high school education. The modal current charge was break and entry (n=14) and the majority of inmates had been incarcerated previously three to five times, having served a total of one to two years in prison.² Sixty-five percent (n=34) of the prisoners had been previously confined in institutions which employed female correctional officers. On average, most of the prisoners (73%, n=42) sometimes or often came into contact with female correctional officers during the day.

Performance of Female Correctional Officers

Perceptions of the respondents' overall performances were solicited in the questionnaire (see Table 5).³ The majority of female correctional officers (77.8%, n=7) and male correctional officers (69.2%, n=36) rated their own performance as very good or excellent. When rating the performance of the female

²The next most common charge was robbery (19.3%, n=11), followed by assault (14%, n=8) and murder (14%, n=8), and then drugs or alcohol (12.3%, n=7).

³Tables for the results section are found in Appendix D.

findings *sup* *correctional* *officers* *response* *female*
correctional officers solely, the response of the female participants remained constant with 77.8% (n=7) of them stating that the overall performance of other female officers was very good. Likewise, 71.4% (n=5) of the supervisors felt that the females' performance was very good or excellent. The male correctional officers were divided on this question with 45.1% (n=23) indicating that the performance of the female correctional officers was either very good or excellent and 47.1% (n=24) rating it as good.

This lower male correctional officer response was not a reflection of the male correctional officers' attitude toward female officers in particular, but was an indicator of the males' opinion toward the performance of all of their colleagues. Here 32% (n=16) of the male correctional officers rated the performance of their male co-workers as being very good or excellent whereas 56% (n=28) said it was good. Both the female correctional officers and supervisors had lower ratings of the overall male performance in comparison to the overall female performance. For the female officers, 66.7% (n=6) stated the males performed very well and 33.3% (n=3) said the performance was good. Similarly, 42.9% (n=3) of the supervisors indicated that the performance of the male staff was very good, but the majority rated it as good (57.1%, n=4). Generally, the perception of the male correctional officers' overall performance was slightly, although not much, lower than the ratings for the female officers.

less rating given to male
supervisors

It was perceived that females were just as effective in carrying out the job of correctional officer (female correctional officers 100%, n=9; male correctional officers 71.1%, n=37; and supervisors 100%, n=7 - see Table 6). Moreover, in the discussions the vast majority of the prisoners indicated that the women correctional officers were either as capable at handling the job as men or better at it. This positive evaluation rating by both male and female officers was comparable to the results found in the Kissel and Seidel (1980) study.

Performance in Specific Areas

A comparison of the performance of the male and female correctional officers in various areas of the facility revealed very little difference based on gender (see Tables 7 and 8). Both men and women were viewed by the majority of the female and male correctional officers and supervisors as performing equally as well in the intake/records area (88.9%, n=8; 76.9%, n=40; and 57.1%, n=4 respectively), the activity rooms (88.9%, n=8; 94.1%, n=48; and 100%, n=7) and the living units (88.9%, n=8; 84.6%, n=44; and 85.7%, n=6), but in the protective custody area, the females were undecided as to whether both performed equally well (44.4%, n=4) or whether females were somewhat better (44.4%, n=4). Sixty-seven point three percent of the male correctional officers (n=35) and 85.7% (n=6) of the supervisors felt the performance of both was the same. Many of the inmates housed in the protective custody area are accused or convicted of a sexual

assault and all of the respondents indicated that male and female correctional officers were equally as effective in dealing with this type of prisoner (female correctional officers 55.6%, n=5; male officers 58%, n=29; supervisors 71.4%, n=5; and prisoners 56%, n=28).

The majority of both female correctional officers (77.8%, n=7) and supervisors (42.9%, n=3) rated the performance of females in the area housing the mentally disturbed prisoners as better than that of the male correctional officers. Most of the male officers though saw little difference in performance in this area (55.8%, n=29). When asked who was more effective in controlling a mentally or emotionally disturbed prisoner, the findings were similar with 55.6% (n=5) of the women, 57.1% (n=4) of the supervisors and 51.8% (n=29) of the prisoners stating that women were more or much more effective. The majority of the male correctional officers (64%, n=32) felt that there were no differences between men and women in how effectively they performed with this inmate population.

The only area where male officers were perceived as performing better was in the maximum security area, and there was not unanimous consent among respondent groups here. A large percentage of male correctional officers (73.1%, n=38) and supervisors (85.7%, n=6) felt that the performance of the men was somewhat or much better than that of the women but only 33.3% (n=3) of the women correctional officers felt this way. The majority, 55.6% (n=5), said that there was little difference

only
better
of
prisoners

in performance at this location which is consistent with the Kissel and Seidel results. These researchers also found either little difference in the rest of the specific areas or that females performed better.⁴

Enforcing Institutional Regulations

Part of the duties of a correctional officer are to enforce institutional regulations. There were several items on the questionnaire which tapped into this area of performance (see Table 9). All of the female correctional officers felt that both men and women were equally as effective in enforcing rules but the male respondents were less consistent in their responses. Although 58.8% (n=30) of the male correctional officers felt that there was no difference in effectiveness between male and female officers, a substantial minority (41.2%, n=21) rated men as being more effective. The supervisors were virtually split between men being more effective than women (42.9%, n=3) and both being just as effective (42.9%, n=3). When evaluating the responses of the prisoners, 50% (n=29) of them felt that men were more effective. These results are similar, with only minor variations, to those of Kissel and Seidel (1980).

The gender of the correctional officer does not appear to be an indicator of who was more fair and impartial in enforcing rules. A large number of all participants stated that males and

⁴The Kissel and Seidel study also included court security and areas housing female inmates, but did not evaluate the protective custody area.

females were about the same when it came to fairness (female correctional officers 77.8%, n=7; male correctional officers 73.5%, n=36; supervisors 71.4%, n=5; and prisoners 61.4%, n=35). There was a slight difference, though, regarding who was more strict in enforcing the rules; the majority of the supervisors (42.9%, n=3) and a large minority of the prisoners (37.5%, n=21) stated that men tended to be more strict while most of the male (49%, n=25) and female (66.7%, n=6) correctional officers as well as 41.1% (n=23) of the inmates said that both enforced the rules just as strictly.

Respect for Female Authority

The authority of the female officers does not appear to be tested differentially by the prisoners (see Table 10). Most of the male and female officers stated that rarely in the last two weeks⁵ did an inmate refuse to quickly follow their orders (57.7%, n=30; and 66.7%, n=6 respectively) and never did a prisoner refuse outright to obey an order during this time period (55.8%, n=29; and 66.7%, n=6 respectively). The prisoners tended to confirm that gender was not a factor in whether they followed an order quickly or at all during the last couple of weeks prior to the study.

When broadening this question to the general statement that "inmates are more likely to obey an order given by a female officer than a male officer" attitudes varied (see Table 11).

⁵This time span was used in the original Kissel and Seidel survey.

The female officers tended to agree with the statement (44.4%, n=4) or remain neutral (44.4%, n=4) while the majority of the male correctional officers disagreed (48.1%, n=25). The neutral category was the most frequent response for the supervisors (42.9%, n=3) and prisoners (48.2%, n=27). Therefore, only slightly less than half of the female correctional officers felt that they had an advantage in this regard. Yet Kissel and Seidel deduced that inmates were slightly more likely to obey an order given by a female correctional officer.

The perception of a majority of the female officers (66.7%, n=6) was that inmates cause more trouble for the male staff than they do for the women (see Table 11). The rest of the respondents exhibited less agreement with a very close split between this response (male officers 44%, n=22; supervisors 42.9%, n=3; and prisoners 44.6%, n=25) and the response that the inmates caused just as much trouble for either male or female correctional officers (male officers 48%, n=24; supervisors 57.1%, n=4; and prisoners 41.1%, n=23). Again respect for the female officers' authority was demonstrated by the response from the majority of all respondent groups that inmates, in general, gave men a harder time than they gave women (female correctional officers 66.7%, n=6; male correctional officers 61.5%, n=32; supervisors 71.4%, n=5; and prisoners 46.4%, n=26) and that prisoners did not engage in more violent behaviour in front of female correctional officers compared to male officers (female correctional officers 100%, n=6; male correctional officers 51%,

n=26; supervisors 57.1%, n=4; and prisoners 62.5%, n=35).

The majority of all respondents did not feel that prisoners "lip off" more to women than men (female correctional officers 88.9%, n=8; male correctional officers 51.9%, n=27; supervisors 57.1%, n=4; and prisoners 57.9%, n=33) but there were differing opinions as to how effectively female officers dealt with verbally abusive prisoners. Most of the women (77.8%, n=7) felt that both were equally as effective in dealing with a verbally abusive inmate. Many of the male officers (49%, n=25) held this opinion also, but a substantial minority (41.2%, n=21) felt that men were more effective. The supervisors were divided on this issue with 42.9% (n=3) indicating that both were equally as effective and another 42.9% (n=3) expressing that male correctional officers were somewhat more effective. Almost half of the prisoners (49.1%, n=28) though, felt that men were more effective than women in this situation. Thus, there seemed to be little difference, according to the female correctional officers and most of the male officers, between men and women in how effectively they handled verbally abusive prisoners. But there was a tendency for prisoners and to some extent the male officers to lean toward the attitude that males dealt with this type of inmate better. These same results were found by Kissel and Seidel.

In the discussions, most of the females felt that the approach women used was more "laid back" and relaxed. Women did not have a "macho" or abrasive attitude. One woman commented

women are laid back
74

that female officers could use a different tone of voice, being more manipulative:

A man can't suck up. Females can do it and get away with it ... They can say "please" and be feminine to get what they want with prisoners.

A number of the prisoners interviewed said they responded to orders by females quicker with less retaliation. For example, one inmate stated:

They're glad to do it if a female says something. ... Women can tell an inmate to do something and most of the time they don't mind. They do things quicker for women. The job is easier for them. Men have more hassles.

Thus, inmates gave female correctional officers fewer problems and, as illustrated in the following section, they appeared to have a more positive relationship.

Interpersonal Skills

When dealing with prisoners on a one-to-one basis, most of the women (88.9%, n=8) and supervisors (57.1%, n=4) regarded women correctional officers as being more effective (see Table 12). But the male officers (70.6%, n=36) and prisoners (50%, n=29) were more likely to feel that there is little difference in effectiveness based on the gender of the correctional officer. Furthermore, there appeared to be little difference in their ability to deal with prisoners in groups (female correctional officers 77.8%, n=7; male correctional officers 56%, n=28; supervisors 57.1%, n=4; and prisoners 48.3%, n=28).

The vast majority of all respondents (except prisoners) felt that the gender of the correctional officer was not a factor in how effectively prisoners were counselled (female correctional officers 66.7%, n=6; male correctional officers 84.3%, n=43; and supervisors 85.7%, n=6).⁶ The prisoners were divided, with 41.4% (n=24) of them agreeing with the rest of the respondents and 41.4% (n=24) favouring female correctional officers. Even though there appeared to be little difference between sexes in the effectiveness of counselling most of those surveyed indicated that prisoners tended to discuss their feelings and problems more with women (female correctional officers 77.8%, n=7; supervisors 85.7%, n=6; and prisoners 42.9%, n=24). Once again, the male staff held a neutral position: 66% (n=33) felt both were about the same. There was some indecision as to whether the female correctional officers were perceived as getting along better with the prisoners than their male counterparts (female correctional officers 55.6%, n=5; male correctional officers 43.1%, n=22; and prisoners 44.8%, n=26) or whether male and female officers were equal in this regard (female correctional officers 44.4%, n=4; male correctional officers 43.1%, n=22; supervisors 71.4%, n=5; and prisoners 46.6%, n=27). In the Kissel and Seidel research, the greatest number of participants felt both men and women were about the same on these items. But of those whose opinions differed, a greater proportion responded in favour of female correctional officers than male officers.

⁶Pre-Trial is not regarded as a counselling facility.

The prisoners supported these empirical findings in the interviews. The vast majority had a positive image of the female officer's interactive abilities because, as one inmate said, "they sit down and talk to you like people, with respect, and the males treat you like shit". Another prisoner commented:

It's more than a job for women. Some males put in their hours and then get out. But the women are interested in you and what you're feeling and how things are going with you. They're more feeling. 4You need to know that someone's interested in your welfare.

The attentiveness and thoroughness that the female officers exhibited may pay off in other ways. For instance, a supervisor claimed that:

I've got my best leads on contraband in units and breaking up cliques that are in units from one or two female staff that work here.

females are at advantage

The ability to defuse potentially violent behaviour is a beneficial skill in this setting. With the exception of the male correctional officers, all the respondent groups felt that women were more effective in "cooling down" an angry prisoner (female correctional officers 77.8%, n=7; supervisors 71.4%, n=5; and prisoners 59.6%, n=34). The male officers tended to say that both male and females were equally as effective in handling this situation (52.9%, n=27). Of those who indicated a preference, 75% (n=18) felt that female officers were better at cooling down an inmate.

In the interviews, the females indicated that women tend to rely on their communication skills to a greater extent than men. As one officer said:

Men are more aggressive to begin with; women are pacifiers. Men will use their fists; women will use their tongues. They'll use their heads to talk themselves out of a situation.

Although many male correctional officers mentioned in the interviews that the women generally did have better interpersonal skills, a few saw this as creating problems or difficulties for the male staff who take over a unit from a female officer since they do not have the same relationship with the prisoners.

Physical Abilities

In the situations where physical strength was required such as breaking up a fight between two inmates there was considerable agreement among those surveyed that men were either somewhat or much more effective than women (male correctional officers 78.4%, n=40; supervisors 83.3%, n=5; and prisoners 69.6%, n=39). But this agreement did not extend to the female correctional officers. The vast majority of them (75%, n=7) felt that both men and women were equally as effective at breaking up a fight in progress.

When the situation was not quite as violent but strength might still be involved, such as separating inmates who are about to fight or controlling large or physically tough inmates, opinions were less skewed. The great majority of female correctional officers (77.8%, n=7) believed that there was no difference based on gender regarding the effectiveness of the correctional officer to separate two inmates about to fight.

This view was supported by 56.9% (n=29) of the male correctional officers and a substantial minority of the prisoners (39.7%, n=23). The supervisors (71.4%, n=5) and 46.6% (n=27) of the prisoners, on the other hand, held the view that men were more effective under these circumstances.

In response to the question, "who is more effective at controlling a large or physically tough inmate", 44.4% (n=4) of the female officers chose the category of "both equally as effective". Here, there was some divergence of opinion because 33.3% (n=3) of the females felt that men were somewhat more effective. Forty-six percent (n=23) of the male correctional officers and 62.5% (n=35) of the prisoners also felt that men were much more or somewhat more effective than women. This time a large percentage of the supervisors (42.9%, n=3) felt that both men and women were equally as effective.

Thus, there was a tendency for male correctional officers, supervisors and prisoners to rate *men as more effective in dealing with situations which may require physical strength. The women correctional officers, though, believed that they were just as effective in handling such situations. The ability of the female officers to cool out or calm prisoners and their more positive relationship with prisoners may explain why more of the respondents felt they were just as effective in controlling or separating prisoners. The respondents in the Kissel and Seidel study tended to believe that male correctional officers were better able to handle all the above situations with the one

exception - most of the female staff felt both males and females were just as effective at separating two prisoners about to fight. The women, although much less decisive, were more inclined to favour the male correctional officers than in the present study.

Although females, in the interviews, admitted that men were physically superior to women they did not believe this fact speaks deleteriously for their own performance. It was felt that women were new to corrections and lacked the experience of physically subduing inmates or even physically fighting in general. As a result, men may be better in a one-to-one situation. But, it was stated by some female officers and supervisors, brute force was rarely required. All officers, male and female, received the same training; it was the competence and ability of the individual not their sex that was important.

In relation to back-up, the following feelings were expressed by the females:

What kind of back-up is any guy going to be when the ratio is 17 prisoners against two.

It doesn't matter who your partner is, because they're not allowed to move by themselves to help you anyway. Either way you're looking at a whole group of people. So I don't think it really matters.

The females were not worried about working with other females and did not believe male officers were justified in any concerns they might put forth. One inmate reflected on the situation as follows:

Guards don't step into a fight when there's inmates fighting. They don't step into it alone. All they do is push a button. Both can do that equally as well.

But most of the prisoners interviewed felt that female correctional officers lacked the physical strength in a fight situation. This was perceived as one of the few disadvantages to their employment.

One male officer commented that:

I think the biggest question that we had when we first opened was would they [female officers] be able to back us up in a situation where it was warranted. I think that was the biggest concern at the time, but since then it's no longer the question or issue because we've had situations where the back up was a woman; it was handled quite good. So I can't believe that it's much of a worry anymore.

preference for male back-up

Nevertheless, in the discussions, the majority of male officers expressed a preference for male back-up in a violent situation.

A number of officers cited as reasons the feeling that either most females are simply not as physically capable as some of the men, or, those who indicated that the females could handle such occurrences, that an instinctive or protective attitude to females in general prevailed. Less than one-third of the males interviewed stated that they were comfortable with female back-up.

*less than
one-third
comfortable
with female
back-up*

Currently, fitness or physical ability tests are incorporated into the selection criteria for correctional officers at the federal level as well as in some provinces. In British Columbia a new physical ability test was introduced for correctional officers in 1984 (officially adopted in March

1985). Applicants in British Columbia are required to pass the physical ability test in order to be hired; if they fail the test they are disqualified from the applied-for position. The same physical standards apply regardless of gender for all-male or co-ed facilities, but lower physical levels are used for the female institutions. Presently, applicants are being informed of the test and provided with information on how to prepare for it in advance of the actual testing.⁷

In general, the majority of all respondents disagreed that the presence of women correctional officers makes the institution a more dangerous place for the male staff to work (female correctional officers 100%, n=9; male correctional officers 42.3%, n=22; supervisors 57.1%, n=4; and prisoners 63.6%, n=35). In addition, most of them either did not feel that female correctional officers required more assistance than males in performing their duties or were neutral (female correctional officers 100%, n=9; male correctional officers 69.2%, n=36; supervisors 71.5%, n=5). The male officers and supervisors were much more reluctant to claim that female correctional officers

⁷Charles (1982: 204) recommends that police recruits pass the job-related fitness test after completing training and before acceptance as police officers instead of using the test as a screening mechanism which may eliminate potentially good police officers:

Research does indicate that large gains in fitness are possible within short periods of time. Therefore, by allowing applicants to partake in an individualized training program at the academy, potentially fine officers will not be rejected, because they do not meet fitness standards prior to academy training.

This suggestion could be applied to corrections as well.

did not require more assistance which is consistent with the findings in the Kissel and Seidel report.

Female Correctional Officers' Relationships with Male Staff and Prisoners

Protection of Female Correctional Officers by Prisoners

Even though the male respondents tended to feel that women correctional officers were less effective in situations which may require physical strength, there was a general consensus among all respondents that inmates used more physical force against male correctional officers than they did against the females (female correctional officers 88.9%, n=8; male correctional officers 69.2%, n=36; supervisors 71.4%, n=5; and prisoners 58.9%, n=33 - see Table 14). In fact, the female correctional officers thought that the inmates were a little (55.6%, n=5) or somewhat (44.4%, n=4) concerned for their personal safety.

It was generally stated by all the women that inmates were more protective of female officers than males in the sense that striking a female was frowned upon by the prisoners. It seemed to be almost an unwritten law that "you do not hit a female" and if an inmate did "his name would be mud". A female officer confided that:

One inmate had me literally pinned against the wall and I talked my way out of it. A few of the inmates came up to me and said '____ we would not have let him touch you'.

Whether this would be true in a riot situation was debated but in a normal setting the women felt they had an advantage.

The prisoners confirmed this assessment in the interviews. Not only did they feel inmates were more likely to help a female correctional officer in trouble but they were also apprehensive about taking physical action against females. The male officers, on the other hand, were divided on this issue. Some thought that inmates would be slightly more inclined to protect female correctional officers whereas others stated that prisoners would treat both male and female staff alike with respect to protecting them in dangerous situations.

Protection of Female Correctional Officers by Male Staff and Supervisors

Although the participants were currently either a little (female officers 55.6%, n=5; male officers 46.2%, n=24) or not at all (female officers 44.4%, n=4; male officers 34.6%, n=18) worried about their personal safety, concern for the women officers was slightly greater: 40.4% (n=21) of the male officers were somewhat worried about the female correctional officers personal safety and 42.3% (n=22) of them as well as 85.7% (n=6) of the supervisors were a little worried. Most of the female officers felt that the male staff were adequately concerned for their safety although one-third (n=3) indicated that the male officers were overly concerned (see Table 15).

more support *performance*

This raises some questions about paternalism as a hinderance to a female's performance. More than half (55.6%, n=5) of the female correctional officers stated that their male co-workers sometimes kept them from performing duties that they were capable of doing while 22.2% (n=2) of the women report that this happened often and the other 22.2% (n=2) said it rarely occurred (see Table 16). In addition, 44.4% (n=4) of the women felt that males sometime interfered unnecessarily with their ability to perform their duties. Another 44.4% (n=4) stated that this rarely occurred. Only one person reported that it never happened. These results generally concur with those found by Kissel and Seidel.

Initially, there seemed to be evidence of protective behaviour especially from the older staff. In the interviews, a few male staff felt that some males were more likely to put themselves in a precarious situation to aid or protect a female. Others said that they simply did a few extra checks if a female was working with them. And still others stated that there was generally no difference in their treatment. As one male reflected:

If there's a code yellow on a female unit, then the officers' response is no quicker and no more efficient, but it is more fervoured.

hinderance

The women reported that male officers felt there was favouritism because females were stationed in "easier" units or received more attention. The women countered this by saying that some men were also given preferential treatment. One female

stated that in emergency situations there did not appear to be a difference in gender, rather:

As far as the riots and code yellows go, they'll do that [demonstrate protective behaviour] with the guys as well. They'll pick somebody who's an ex-Oakie [Oakalla], who's a big strapping guy known for his roughness over a guy who's maybe not like that. So I don't necessarily know if it's just because they're female. They pick and choose who they want anyhow regardless of what sex.

The women wanted to perform the job on the same terms as men. A representative response was:

I don't want to be treated any differently. I don't want any favouritism. I want to find out if I can do it myself. How else are we going to build our own self-confidence up?

By the initiative of the females, male favouritism appeared to have declined considerably at Pre-Trial based on discussions with the female and male correctional officers and supervisors. Still, some males felt it existed. They argued that the females hired tended to be more outgoing and received more attention from the male officers and supervisors.

Acceptance of Female Correctional Officers

As noted above, the way in which the female officers are treated by their male co-workers and supervisors has an impact on their job performance. Chapman et al. (1983: 81) argued that differential treatment of men and women within an organization will affect their aspirations and ultimately their attainment. The questionnaire results (see Table 17) showed that the majority of participants felt that the male staff had as much respect for their female co-workers as they did for other male

co-workers (female correctional officers 55.6%, n=5; male correctional officers 51%, n=26; and supervisors 57.1%, n=4). Also, male correctional officers (46.2%, n=24) disagreed with the statement that they were more receptive to advice from male co-workers than female co-workers. Interestingly, the majority of female correctional officers (55.6%, n=5) in this study were neutral in response whereas the females in Kissel and Seidel's study predominantly disagreed.

Overall
On the whole, the majority of the respondents approved of female correctional officers to a great extent (male officers 48%, n=24; supervisors 85.7%, n=6; and prisoners 47.3%, n=26) or were somewhat in approval of their presence (male officers 32%, n=16; and prisoners 25.5%, n=14). Likewise, a large proportion of participants in Kissel and Seidel's research approved of employing females in such a facility.

As a result of the study, the biggest obstacle reported for the majority of the women was having the male officers accept them and allow them to perform the duties that the job entails. A large proportion of women felt that male correctional officers rarely (33.3%, n=3) or only sometimes (44.4%, n=4) gave them adequate recognition for their accomplishments on the job. Even though the majority of male officers indicated that they never (56.9%, n=29) or rarely (31.4%, n=16) resented women working in a traditionally male job, most of the women said that at least sometimes they felt resentment from male co-workers (66.7%,

n=6). Based upon the interviews, this could be due to a small segment of the male staff who refused to accept women as correctional officers. The percentages were slightly lower in the Kissel and Seidel report.

One question posed to the women was whether scheduled meetings for the women on the staff to discuss issues and problems they encounter on the job would be helpful. Although responses varied, 44.4% (n=4), stated that it would be very beneficial. They are, however, very sensitive about drawing attention to themselves. Many felt that they were "being watched"; *taken on* their performance was singled out due to the recent entrance of women into the field and the small number employed. The comment, "When a male staff member makes a mistake then it's forgotten, but if a woman makes a mistake then it's talked about for weeks", was typical of the opinions expressed by the female officers.

Many prisoners and male officers interviewed were also aware of this. They mentioned that being recognized and treated as equals by the male staff was one of the biggest problems faced by the female correctional officers. Some of the male officers went on to say that women must also perform at a higher level to prove they were just as capable of performing the job.

Feedback, Support and Assistance

high quality feedback

Females rate the quality of feedback they received from supervisors concerning their job performance higher than the male line staff (see Table 18). On a five point "poor" to "excellent" scale, 88.8% (n=8) of the females felt the feedback from supervisors was good, very good or excellent, whereas only 62.8% (n=32) of the male circled these categories. The rating by female correctional officers for the quality of feedback received from male and female co-workers dropped considerably to 66.6% (n=6) for these three categories and was more in line with the male correctional officers' rating which dropped slightly to 58.8% (n=30). Therefore, it appears that females were receiving a better response from supervisors to their performance than the male staff even though both men and women were thought to be just as open to suggestions about how to improve their performance of duties (female officers 55.6%, n=5; male officers 70.6%, n=36; and supervisors 57.1%, n=4).

When examining the quality of support received from supervisors, once again the majority of females rated it higher than the males (see Table 19). In fact, 66.6% (n=6) of the females rated it as very good or excellent compared to only 27.5% (n=14) of the men. The quality of support received from male (female officers 55.6%, n=5; and male officers 52.9%, n=27) and female (female officers 66.7%, n=6; and male officers 47.1%, n=24) co-workers was rated as good by the majority of both sexes.

help received

The quality of help that most of the female officers received from male (66.7%, n=6) and other female co-workers (66.7%, n=6) was rated as very good (see Table 20). The rating of good was given by 51% (n=26) of the male correctional officers for the help they received from other male officers and by 55.8% (n=29) for the quality of help provided by their female counterparts. Thus, there is little difference between the quality of help given by male and female staff except that females tended to rate both somewhat higher. However, the findings by Kissel and Seidel show that males rate the help they received from males higher than that received from their female colleagues.

Disagreements

One question focusing on the working relationship between male and female officers provided interesting results. Contrary to expectations, women correctional officers seemed to have more disagreements with other women correctional officers than with male officers (see Table 21). In all the six areas of potential disagreements presented, that is, enforcement of rules, disciplining inmates for minor or major rule violations, performance of duties in general, methods of handling crisis situations and what the proper relationship of staff to inmate should be, none of the women officers stated that they had more disagreements with male officers compared to female correctional officers. This was also the case with supervisors with the exception of one situation in which a single supervisor

indicated that he had more disagreements with the males about what the proper relationship of staff to inmate should be. In general, the majority of male and female correctional officers, supervisors and prisoners felt there was little difference in the number of disagreements they had with males or females in the specific situations presented.

There was one anomaly to this across the board finding and that relates to the performance of duties. Females (55.6%, n=5) and supervisors (57.1%, n=4) had more disagreements with female correctional officers concerning the way in which duties in general are performed. This perception of conflict with female officers was shared by only 17.6% (n=9) of the male officers. Thus, there seemed to be some, although not an overwhelming amount of friction between the female officers themselves and also between the supervisors and the females. The disagreement with the supervisors could be due to the conflicts previously discussed regarding favouritism or protection. Kissel and Seidel did not find that gender was a factor in disagreements over these specific issues.

Most of the females (55.6%, n=5) did not refrain from voicing their opinions because of their gender (see Table 22). However, 33.3% (n=3) sometimes did. It was of interest to note that all the women reported that if they had a grievance they would not hesitate to take action on it.

The Presence and Impact of Female Correctional Officers in the Facility

The presence of women seemed to have ^{little impact} little impact on the behaviour of the male correctional officers. The consensus among the male correctional officers, supervisors and prisoners was that it did not have an effect on the amount of physical force male officers used against inmates, the severity of the punishments, the strict interpretations of rules, or the fairness in enforcing rules (see Table 23).

There is, however, a perceived decrease in the amount of ^{↓ crude} crude language used when females are present: 74.5% (n=38) of ^{crude} the male correctional officers, 85.7% (n=6) of the supervisors and 58.5% (n=31) of the prisoners responded that the male staff used somewhat or much less crude language. In addition, most of the participants felt that inmates took more care in their ^{hygiene} appearance when in the presence of female correctional officers (female correctional officers 88.9%, n=8; male correctional officers 61.5%, n=32; supervisors 100%, n=7; and prisoner 56.1%, n=32). Likewise, it was perceived that male staff were more conscious of their appearance when working with female correctional officers (female correctional officers 44.4%, n=4; male correctional officers 53.8%, n=28; and supervisors 57.1%, n=4).

When interviewed, most of the female and male officers thought that the female correctional officers' presence

contributed to a more relaxed, calm environment as well as an increase in morale. It was stated by many of the females that inmates handled themselves differently and were less prone to violence because they had nothing to prove to a female. A male officer confirmed this by stating:

110-115
110/11

The effect they [female officers] have on the prisoners is that they are more subdued. They don't become as agitated. It seems they have more of a calming effect naturally, rather than if it was a male they wouldn't think twice of flipping out or whatever. If it's a female they seem to hold it back.

Some of the women felt that they tend to be more perceptive to the needs of inmates. As one female officer stated, "Little things are important to us like getting a visit or special phone call or family pictures brought in - women see that as important to prisoners. A lot of men let it go." A large number of prisoners noticed this difference in atmosphere as well and this 'softening' effect was elaborated upon in the Kissel and Seidel report.

In short, there was some perceived benefit from the employment of women correctional officers at Pre-Trial. Generally the majority of all respondents agreed that female officers make the institution a more tolerable place for the inmates to live (female correctional officers 100%, n=9; male correctional officers 51%, n=26; supervisors 57.1%, n=4; and prisoners 57.1%, n=32). In the interviews, the vast majority of both male and female officers as well as the prisoners indicated that female correctional officers could calm an inmate down; they provided a more relaxed environment. There was the sense

make more tolerable

that they also "add a bit of class" to the facility. As one prisoner stated:

Take the old adage, music calms the savage beast, well females have a calming effect on someone who's hurting.

Over half of the male officer respondents (55.8%, n=29) had worked in a facility that did not employ female correctional officers and similarly 33 of the 56 prisoners had been confined in some non-integrated correctional institution. Based on their experience in such facilities (see Table 24), most felt that the presence of women at Pre-Trial made little difference with respect to the number of arguments between inmates (male officers 62.1%, n=18; supervisors 66.7%, n=4; and prisoners 57.6%, n=19) and the amount of physical confrontations between inmates (male officers 72.4%, n=21; supervisors 83.3%, n=5; and prisoners 53.1%, n=17).

But prisoner responses to conflicts between staff and inmates was much more varied. The number of arguments between correctional staff and inmates was felt by 34.4% (n=11) of the prisoners to increase and 34.4% (n=11) to decrease due to the presence of women. Thirty-one percent (n=10) felt their presence made no difference. The largest proportion of the male correctional officers (82.8%, n=24) and supervisors (83.3%, n=5) felt there was little difference. As for the amount of physical confrontations between staff and inmates, 36.4% (n=12) of the prisoners said the presence of females increased it, 6 24.3% (n=8) felt it decreased and 39.4% (n=13) thought it made no

difference. Once again, the majority of the male correctional officers (69%, n=20) indicated that the amount of such physical confrontation was not dependent on the presence of women officers. Unlike the male officers, 66.7% (n=4) of the supervisors felt that women do decrease the physical conflicts a little. The male staff did not believe the presence of women itself either increased or decreased the conflicts examined. The prisoners, on the other hand, were more ambiguous in their responses regarding the effect that females had on staff/inmate problems.

In the Kissel and Seidel research, the male staff reported a similar experience but a large number of inmates felt that females tended to reduce confrontations.

Privacy Concerns

All of the females and most of the male correctional officers interviewed thought inmates have enough privacy and did not believe it was an issue for the prisoners. The building was designed to protect inmate privacy: the cells have a solid door rather than bars and the toilet is in an area which is not visible from outside the cell. The women indicated that they ^{respect} respect the privacy of the male inmates; if the door is closed ^{privately} they will knock before entering. The females are restricted from working in the area of the institution where incoming or outgoing prisoners are changing. Moreover, they may not perform

skin frisks on the male prisoners. Some of the male officers were concerned about the effect on the female officers and/or prisoners with respect to prisoner masturbation at night. Interestingly, even though this was an issue raised by the male officers it was not mentioned by either the female officers or the prisoners.

The prisoners when interviewed expressed an analogous opinion. Due to the structure of the centre, privacy with respect to the female officers is not a problem. The only complaint cited by a few of the prisoners was a resentment toward females frisking them.

Sexual Conflicts

Prisoner Frustrations and Emasculation

Females, with respect to their job as correctional officers, have dominance or authority over males which is a unique and non-traditional position. In reference to the issue of emasculation of prisoners (see Table 25), there is substantial variation of opinion to the statement "it bothers inmates more to take orders from women than it does from men". Two-thirds (n=6) of the women officers disagreed with this statement, but the majority of the male officers (57.7%, n=30) and supervisors (57.1%, n=4) felt that this was the case. The prisoners, on the other hand, had mixed opinions with 31.6% (n=18) agreeing, 36.8% (n=21) remaining neutral and 31.6% (n=18) disagreeing. There

appeared to be little consensus on this issue as confirmed by Kissel and Seidel.

When speaking to the prisoners, some of them indicated that it was psychologically difficult to take orders from women and as a result there was some internal hostility. Others said that even though prisoners may resent it they respectfully obeyed the orders.

A few speculated on the reasons why females become correctional officers stating that some women took the job to "pull power trips" so that they could dominate males or classified single women as "in it for the guys". One prisoner summed it up by stating:

You ask is she doing it because she wants authority or because of a rule. It doesn't enter your mind for a male staff.

The prisoners reported that the chances of a female correctional officer being raped were extremely low. If it did occur they suggested that the rapist would have to be an inmate in protective custody. But even this was doubtful, as one prisoners noted:

There are about ten females in Mountain [a medium security federal prison] and most of the inmates are in for sexual assault. You just don't see it.

Furthermore, according to male officers (82.8%, n=24) and prisoners (75.8%, n=25) who had experience in correctional facilities that did not employ women correctional officers, the presence of women did not have an effect on the amount of sexual

M. L. ...

activity between inmates. However, a significant minority of prisoners (35.6%) in the Kissel and Seidel study felt that females reduced the number of sexual assaults of inmates against inmates.

Sexual Harassment of Female Officers

Prisoners

Verbal propositions from prisoners occurred rarely or sometimes (88.9%, n=8) and even though most females were not bothered at all by this (55.6%, n=5), some 44.4% (n=4) were (see Table 26). Sexual harassment by way of physical contact was never (77.8%, n=7) or rarely (22.2%, n=2) experienced by the women correctional officers. This occurrence did bother the majority (55.6%, n=5) considerably even though it had little if any effect on the rest of the women. Like harassment in the form of physical contact, crude jokes never (55.6%, n=5) or rarely (33.3%, n=3) occurred. Again, when this happened, it bothered 44.4% (n=4) of the women somewhat or a lot. Because of their authoritative position, the women when interviewed reported that sexual harassment by prisoners was not a problem. If it occurred, they could charge the prisoner but usually just ignoring any comments was sufficient to prevent its repetition.

The prisoners, when speaking on this topic, confirmed that female officers were subjected to sexual comments. A generalization made by one prisoner indicated that male and female correctional officers were tested differently by those


they guard. Male officers were tested either mentally or physically to assess how "macho" they were but female officers were tested more on a sexual basis to see if they could be manipulated.

Male staff

The amount of sexual harassment that female correctional officers encountered from the male staff as well as from the prisoners was solicited (see Table 26). Most of the females (55.5%, n=5) stated that the male staff sometimes or often sexually harassed them with verbal propositions but they were only somewhat (33.3%, n=3) or a little (44.4%, n=4) bothered by this. Sexual harassment in the form of physical contact occurred sometimes for 33.3% (n=3) of the women and never for the remainder. However, those who did experience harassment were not particularly bothered by it. For others (44.4%, n=4) this behaviour, if it occurred, bothered them somewhat or a lot. Sexual harassment from crude jokes was experienced rarely or sometimes by the majority (66.6%, n=6) and it only bothered them a little (55.6%, n=5).

Sexual harassment in the form of propositions and to some extent crude jokes were not an infrequent occurrence but this was not viewed as a major problem by the female officers. The women who said that physical contact was not a particular issue for them were sexually harassed in this manner the most.

The women officers interviewed indicated that there was no real sexual harassment by the male staff at Pre-Trial. In any work situation or on the street women expected to be harassed and some were quite surprised by the lack of it in this male dominated setting. Crude jokes, rumours and inappropriate male staff behaviour occurred but they had learned to deal with such situations by confronting the males. As one female said, "If you tell them you don't like it, they get the message".

The females in the present study received more verbal propositions from the male officers than in the Kissel and Seidel study and were somewhat more bothered by this. Otherwise, the results were quite similar. 

The organization was believed by most women (62.5%, n=5) to deal effectively with complaints of sexual harassment made against male co-workers and inmates.

Organizational and Management Issues

The optimum percentage of female officers to work at Pre-Trial was felt to be between 20-50% according to the female officers. Those women who thought that men should make up a greater percentage stated that more men were needed for the change room area, skin frisks and for physical situations. It was, after all, as one female officer stated, "a man's world". Many felt that the men would feel threatened or were not ready for a 50-50 split. The three females that preferred to see 50%

females claimed that women contributed via their defusion and communication skills. The novelty of having females around would then diminish, making it easier for women.

The percentages cited most frequently by the male correctional officers ranged from 10-25%. One individual did not feel women should be employed at all in male institutions because of the large number of men unemployed whereas another said they should only be deployed in areas where they are needed (i.e., in the visits area to search female visitors). Only three of the males interviewed felt that a third or more of the staff should be female. The vast majority felt that from a physical and security point of view more men than women were required.

For the prisoners, the percentage of females that they thought would be best in this institution ranged from 15-50%. Eight of the 20 interviewed cited 50% as the appropriate number stressing equal rights and the ability of females to perform the job. Those who suggested fewer (six prisoners picked a range from 25-40% and six said less than 25%) felt that more men were needed for situations which required physical strength. Only one prisoner felt that females should be removed entirely from the Living Unit area.

Training

The training program in the areas of self-defence, riot control, first aid, crisis intervention, counselling and standard operating procedures was deemed by both male and female

officers to be somewhat effective on a scale consisting of the following categories: not at all, a little, somewhat and very effective (see Table 27). The majority of the female correctional officers did not feel that the training program would be more effective in the above mentioned areas if taught by a woman with one exception; five of the female correctional officers felt that training by a female in counselling would be a little to very much more effective (see Table 28).

When male and female correctional officers were asked how much their ideas had been sought after in relation to the training program and its contents, the response was quite similar (see Table 29). The officers' response was bimodal with 44.4% (n=4) of the females and 30.8% (n=16) of the males indicating that their ideas were somewhat requested and 33.3% (n=3) of the women and 36.5% (n=19) of the men stated their ideas were not solicited at all.

Job Satisfaction With Respect to Women Correctional Officers

When they first took the job, a large number of male officers expected that they would like working with women (32.7%, n=17) but many were uncertain (40.4%, n=21 - see Table 30). The majority of female officers (77.7%, n=7) felt that they would like working as a female somewhat or a lot. Most anticipated few or some problems due to this integration (females 77.8%, n=8; male officers 76.5%, n=39; and supervisors 95.8%, n=6). With time, however, apprehensions dissipated and

the majority enjoyed working with or as female correctional officers (female officers 100%, n=9; male officers 65.4%, n=34) Concurrently, the number of problems was less than initially expected since 100% (n=9) of the women correctional officers, 77% (n=40) of the male officers and 85.7% (n=6) of the supervisors indicated that there were few or no problems.

Kissel and Seidel also found that the large number of men who were undecided about working with females initially tended to exhibit a favourable attitude after having some experience in this situation.

Even so, very few of the women would like to make this their career. The majority preferred to move into other aspects of the criminal justice system and away from institutional corrections. As a result, there will be only a few women left to accumulate the seniority necessary for promotions. For a little more than one-third of the men interviewed, corrections was their intended career. Another third were uncertain. The difference in career ambitions between males and females as well as within the gender group might be attributed to the age of the person and the number of years of experience in corrections.

Promotions

limited
The ability for women to move up in the ranks of the correctional hierarchy, in the view of the female respondents, appeared to be limited. Although there was an expressed desire by administrators to hire women correctional officers, the

opportunities for advancement were perceived to be much lower than for their male counterparts.

The opportunities for women correctional officers to be promoted were rated as very good or excellent by 44.4% (n=4) of the female officers and 42.9% (n=3) of the supervisors but only 19.3% (n=10) of the male officers responded this way (see Table 31). When the response category 'good' was included in the percentage, then the ratings climbed to 66.6% (n=6) for the female officers, 57.2% (n=4) for the supervisors and 52% (n=27) for the male officers. The chances for the male officers to be promoted were rated as excellent or very good by a much larger percentage of female and male staff (female officers 66.7%, n=6; male officers 50%, n=26; and supervisors 42.9%, n=3). Once more, when the 'good' category of responses was added the ratings rose to 77.8% (n=7) for the women, 76.9% (n=40) for the male correctional officers, and 100% (n=7) for the supervisors. The male officers seem to possess a particularly bleak view of the opportunities for advancement for women.

It should be noted, though, that there were very few women at Pre-Trial that were eligible for promotion at the time of the study. Furthermore, the sheer number of male staff and the numbers who had prior correctional experience made the chances slim for those women qualified to compete for the few positions available. As one female said, promotions in corrections work on seniority rather than the ability to do the job. In addition, a physical fitness test must be passed for any advancement

opportunity.

But a belief that women were discriminated against in promotions was not an impediment for two-thirds (n=6) of the women in considering applying for one (see Table 33). What did seem to present a barrier for the women was the belief that men do not like to be supervised by a woman. Fifty-five point five percent (n=5) of the women officers stated that this affects their decision to not apply somewhat or a lot. In the interviews, the females were aware that some males may have negative attitudes, but nevertheless felt that a female supervisor would be a benefit to women correctional officers.

Reactions to being supervised by a female compared to a male (see Table 32) were noted on a scale ranging from 1 (very uncomfortable) to 5 (very comfortable). Fifty-four point nine percent (n=28) of the male officers and 57.2% (n=4) of the supervisors circled either 4 or 5 on the scale indicating that they felt quite comfortable being supervised by a female whereas 82.4% (n=42) of the males and 100% (n=7) of the supervisors felt similarly about being supervised by a male. Of interest to point out, is that approximately 25% of the males (n=12) and supervisors (n=2) fell on the opposite end of the scale, i.e., they were quite uncomfortable being supervised by a female. This is supported by the interview responses. A large majority of males felt that the reaction to a woman supervisor would not be very good. If she demonstrated she could handle the job and proved her competence, then it was speculated that she would be

accepted by most, but probably not all, male staff.

Female Correctional Officers Working in Other Male Facilities

Similar responses were obtained from females who had or are working in other male correctional institutions.⁸ They tended to express the same advantages to the employment of female, e.g., females reduce tension, have better interpersonal skills. At the federal level, where the Affirmative Action program is in effect, there appears to be a greater problem with male staff attitudes. The larger number of females working there and the relatively sudden influx since the early 1980's meant that the males were given little time to adjust to the situation which made it even more difficult for the females. When any of the women prove unable to handle the job it is highly publicized and reflects poorly upon all the women correctional officers employed. Furthermore, the women hired under the Affirmative Action program are not viewed by the previous staff as being as competent since they are not hired on their merit alone. Because British Columbia has retained the merit principle in hiring, a difference in perceived effectiveness of performance may exist between the federal and provincial levels, but this needs to be further explored.

⁸Personal conversations or correspondence with a former female counsellor at Mountain Institution, a former female supervisor at Prince George Regional Correctional Centre, former female officers at Matsqui Institution, a female officer at Burnaby Community Correctional Centre, Kingston Penitentiary and officers at Mission Institution.

Summary

Generally, the perception of all of the respondents was that the overall performance of the male correctional officers was slightly, although not much, lower than that of the women officers. In looking at the various institutional areas, there was little difference based on gender found between the perceptions of the performance of the female and male officers. There was the perception that women may be better at dealing with mentally or emotionally disturbed prisoners whereas men may have the advantage in maximum security areas where physical strength may be a more important factor. Moreover, gender did not appear to be a factor in the question of who was more fair and impartial or strict in enforcing the institutional regulations.

There seemed to be a convergence of opinion that inmates rarely or never refused to follow the orders of the correctional officers irrespective of gender. But the majority of the male officers and supervisors felt that it bothered inmates more to take orders from a female than a male while the prisoners were ambiguous on this issue. Even though there existed no strong feelings that prisoners were more likely to obey the orders of female correctional officers, there was the tendency to lean toward the perception that inmates cause more trouble for men, if a differentiation was given, and that they gave men a harder time than women in general.

From responses, it seemed that female correctional officers possessed either comparable or better interpersonal skills than their male colleagues. They were perceived by everyone but the male officers as being more effective in defusing potentially violent situations and having a better rapport with prisoners when it comes to discussing feelings and problems. Little difference is perceived in how effectively male and female correctional officers counsel prisoners or deal with inmates in groups. Only a very small percentage of respondents felt that men were better with these sorts of skills.

When physically subduing prisoners in the case of breaking up a fight, male correctional officers were rated as more effective by all but the female officers. The data indicate that male officers are perceived as better at or the same as females in controlling large or physically tough prisoners or separating two prisoners about to fight. Most of the female officers felt that women were just as capable of handling these situations as men. In addition, prisoners were perceived as using less physical force against female officers.

Concern for the safety of the female officers was exhibited by male officers, supervisors and prisoners but this was not overbearing. Problems were occasionally encountered with demonstrations of protective behaviour by the male staff or supervisors which hindered the female correctional officers effective performance or resulted in a feeling that females were being favoured in some way. Females rated the quality of

feedback, support and help they received higher all round, but the ratings were particularly high regarding the feedback and support they received from supervisors in comparison to the responses of the male staff. It is interesting to note that the females tended to have more disagreements with other female staff than with male officers, although the majority of all respondents did not show a gender distinction. Even though most of male officers said they had as much respect for their female counterparts as they did for their male co-workers and did not resent women for working in this field, the women officers did not feel fully accepted.

There did not seem to be a difference in the perceptions of how male officers performed their duties when females were present. In fact, their presence appeared to improve the appearance of the prisoners and male officers. Not only did females make the institution more relaxed and calm but they made it more bearable for the prisoners without invading their privacy.

There was no perceived problem with sexual harassment of the female officers from either the male officers or prisoners. Also, based on the interviews, there seemed to be little chance of a female officer being raped in the facility.

Both the prisoners and female officers felt that more females should be employed at Pre-Trial. The optimum percentage most of them suggested tended to range between 20-50%. The male

officers, on the other hand, were much more conservative in their estimation, with most of them stating 10-25% as the best mix. However, most of the male officers liked working with females and the majority of female officers enjoyed their job. There was perceived to be few or no problems due to this integration.

Female officers tended to be younger, with a higher level of education and much less prior experience in corrections compared to the male officers. Because of the small number of females working in the facility and their limited experience, their promotional opportunities were thought to be lower than their male counterparts. Even if a female were promoted she would have to deal with the possible resentment and negative reaction of the male staff. The results obtained in this study are reflective of those garnered by Kissel and Seidel (1980) and supported by discussions with females from other male correctional facilities.

CONCLUSIONS

The study focussed attention on the attitudes and perceptions of the various participants in the corrections setting with respect to female correctional officers. Women are currently employed as correctional officers in Canadian male prisons, but little is known about the reaction of male staff and prisoners to this policy, nor the problems that the females have encountered. Yet there appears to be a more critical and cautious sentiment regarding female correctional officers as presented by the Carson Committee's (1984) dissatisfaction of the way in which female correctional officers have been deployed, the ruling restricting females from security positions in RCMP lock-ups¹ and the recognition of prisoner privacy rights².

Through affirmative action and equal opportunity policies corrections has brought females into its fold; but systematic and comprehensive evaluations of the policy have not followed. The Human Rights Commission (1981) completed an interview study soon after female correctional officers were introduced into the federal prison system and recently Plecas and Maxim (1985) have been able to incorporate a sex factor into their longitudinal analysis of Correctional Service of Canada recruits. This is the extent of the research available on female correctional officers

¹*Stanley et al. v. Royal Canadian Mounted Police.*

²*Weatherall v. Attorney General of Canada et al.*

in Canada.

This thesis was designed to expand upon the established knowledge base on female correctional officers. A provincial pre-trial centre in British Columbia was selected as the research site. Through the use of questionnaires and structured interviews, the perception and opinions of male correctional officers, supervisors, female correctional officers and prisoners were tapped. The questionnaires were adopted, in a modified form, from a study conducted in 1979 at five sites in the United States (Kissel & Seidel, 1980); enabling comparison between the two countries.

The findings from the study at the Vancouver Pre-Trial Services Centre did not vary substantially from the results obtained by Kissel and Seidel (1980) six years earlier. Female correctional officers were perceived to be as effective or better than their male colleagues in overall job performance, interpersonal skills and defusing situations of potential violence. Since other research also indicates that females are perceived as being as effective or better at calming potentially violent disturbances, consideration should therefore be given to deploying females in this role.

Male officers, on the other hand, were viewed as comparable to or more effective than females on tasks requiring physical strength such as physically subduing prisoners. In this study and in previous research, female officers had a higher opinion

of their physical abilities than did the men. Protective behaviour on the part of both prisoners and the male staff toward female officers had the potential to create discord among the sexes. Attempts to protect females from dangerous situations or to treat them differentially from the males may be cause for resentment. Therefore, it is recommended that the gender of the officer should not be a consideration when assigning duties (unless there are prisoner privacy concerns) or responding to emergency situations.

Inmate privacy was not a concern because of the physical design of the cells at Pre-Trial. It may cause problems for women, however, in older correctional institutions. The Côté Committee in 1977 commented that it:

...was appalled at the unnecessary lack of privacy for inmates regarding their showering and toilet facilities. With very little imagination, and without reducing security, more privacy could and should be provided (p. 30).

By 1984, modifications promised at a federal institution to enhance inmate modesty and dignity had not begun (Conway, 1984). It is suggested that privacy procedures with respect to inmates should be adhered to by both male and female correctional officers. Efforts should be made to allow maximum privacy for prisoners without jeopardizing institutional security.

The perceived improvement in the environment and the appearance of prisoners and male staff was attributed to the presence of female officers. Furthermore, from the female officers' responses there appeared to be no problem with sexual

harassment from either the male officers or prisoners. Most male officers enjoyed working with females and the majority of females liked being correctional officers. There were few or no problems at the time of the study with the integration of females. Lack of acceptance by the male staff, nonetheless, was cited as the major problem women officers encountered. Also, due to small number of females and their limited experience, there is little optimism regarding their promotion. The findings in this study are corroborated not only by Kissel and Seidel (1980) but by various other studies conducted in the United States.

Based upon a consideration of the literature as well as from informal discussion amongst interviewees in the present study, it is recommended that there be an awareness in corrections management that increases in the number of females or their employment in previously non-integrated facilities requires accompanying administrative actions such as changes to the physical plant (female change rooms and washroom facilities) and ordering appropriate uniforms for the females. In addition, it is proposed that regional and cross-Canada group meetings for female correctional officers be established to discuss issues and problems they may encounter. This female network could also act as a support system for new recruits and a forum for the creation of possible policy initiatives.

A recommendation specific to the research site is implicit from the findings. The percentage of female correctional officers at Pre-Trial was approximately 10% at the time of the

study. Responses varied as to the optimum percentage of females to work at this facility; the majority seemed to feel that more women could be hired. It is felt that females can perform in the position as effectively as men and may contribute in terms of their interpersonal skills. In considering all three groups' responses, a 20-25% ratio appears to be the optimum at this point in time. In order to accomplish this, it is necessary to place greater emphasis on the recruitment of females.

Future Research

Only the perceptions of correctional staff and prisoners were discussed in this thesis. Observational data and record inspection could offer alternative perspectives. For example, observation of the interactions amongst staff and with prisoners by a researcher could flesh out the fine subtleties touched upon in this study. Moreover, an analysis of institutional records could indicate whether there is a difference, based on gender, in the number of charges laid against prisoners, the types of charges laid and the outcome of the charges. Such an approach has yet to be implemented.

It appears that the role of the institution plays an integral part in the shaping of correctional officers' attitudes and perspectives. The literature suggests that this is perhaps more important than gender. One study has shown that the security level of the facility has an effect on the attitudes of

the staff toward female officers (Simpson & White, 1985). Furthermore, Jurik and Halemba (1984) and Zupan (undated) expound on the similarities between male and female officers; emphasizing the influence of the job on determining behaviour and attitudes. It is therefore necessary to examine the impact of the setting on the officers.

The contrast between the B.C. provincial policy of equal employment opportunity and the federal affirmative action program requires scholastic attention. Differences in attitudes toward females hired under the affirmative action program may produce divergent reactions. Everyone must meet the requisite entry criteria, but females are given priority in hiring for federal institutions. Even though the selection requirements are not necessarily indicative of the success of the correctional officer at the job, there exists the perception, which surfaced in the discussions that took place during the course of this thesis, that females hired under the affirmative action program are not the cream of the crop. A more intensive look at the impact of the affirmative action program would be informative for policy analysts.

Finally, consideration needs to be given to the proportion of females at the facility. The changes in the institutional environment and the relationships and performance of staff as well as any procedural modifications made when different ratios

of females are employed should be examined. It is hoped that this thesis will provide groundwork for further research on women correctional officers in Canada.

APPENDIX A

Female Interview Schedule

1. What are the strengths of employing women as correctional officers?
What contributions have they made?
2. What are the disadvantages of employing women as correctional officers?
3. What do you think would be the optimum percentage of women to be employed at Pre-Trial?
4. What is the biggest obstacle or problem for women officers in general or you in particular?
What suggestions would you make to alleviate the problem or improve the situation?
5. How would you describe the way you get along with male officers?
Prisoners? (protective behaviour, privacy, job promotions, back-up, sexual harassment)
6. Is there a difference in how women handle the job compared to men in their approach or philosophy?
7. Why did you choose to become a correctional officer? (how did you hear about it?)
Do you plan to make this a career?
8. Is there anything that is not mentioned in the questionnaire that you feel would be of interest to study?

Male Interview Schedule

1. What are the strengths of employing women as correctional officers? What contributions have they made?
2. What are the disadvantages of employing women as correctional officers?
3. What do you think would be the optimum percentage of women to be employed at Pre-Trial?
4. What is the biggest obstacle or problem for women officers?
What suggestions would you make to alleviate the problem or improve the situation?
5. How would you describe the way you get along with female officers?
How would you describe the way the female staff get along with the prisoners? (protective behaviour, privacy, job promotions, back-up)
6. Is there a difference in how women handle the job compared to men in their approach or philosophy?
7. Why did you choose to become a correctional officer? (how did you hear about it?)
Do you plan to make this a career?
8. How do you feel about working with women?
9. Supervisors only - How would you compare the performance of female officers to the male officers?
10. Is there anything that is not mentioned in the questionnaire that you feel would be of interest to study?

Prisoner Interview Schedule

1. What are the strengths of employing women as correctional officers? What contributions have they made?
2. What are the disadvantages of employing women as correctional officers?
3. What do you think would be the optimum percentage of women to be employed at Pre-Trial?
4. What is the biggest obstacle or problem for women officers?
What suggestions would you make to alleviate the problem or improve the situation?
5. How would you describe the way the female staff get along with the prisoners? (protective behaviour, privacy)
6. Is there a difference in how women handle the job compared to men in their approach or philosophy?
7. How effective are women at doing the job compared to men?
8. Is there anything that is not mentioned in the questionnaire that you feel would be of interest to study?

APPENDIX B

Female Staff Questionnaire

Introduction

This questionnaire is part of a research project being conducted for graduate study in Criminology at Simon Fraser University. I am interested in finding out your own evaluation of the benefits and/or disadvantages of having female correctional officers in an institution like this. Your answers to these questions will provide a major source of information for this project.

Please answer the questions as honestly as possible based on your experience. While I appreciate your taking part in this exercise, you should be aware that you are free to withdraw your participation at any time. Your identity and individual responses to this questionnaire will remain completely anonymous and confidential. Please do not write your name anywhere on the questionnaire. The results of this study will be presented in the form of summary statistics which in no way could be traced to the identity of any participant. Please feel free to ask any questions you might have concerning the project.

The questionnaire will take about 20 minutes to complete, and I want you to know that I appreciate your taking the time to participate in the study. A copy of the results will be left at Pre-Trial and will be available to you on request.

Please answer each question based on your experience on the job as a corrections officer. It is very important that you base your answers on things you have actually seen or experienced on the job. It is also very important that you answer each question.

If you have any questions about the study please feel free to phone me, Liz Szockyj (pronounced Shotski), at the Department of Criminology, Simon Fraser University - - 291-4216.

Instructions

To answer almost all of the items on this questionnaire all you need to do is circle the number that represents the answer of your choice. For example:

<u>Poor</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
1	2	3	4	5

A few questions ask you to give a specific number for an answer. In these cases fill in the boxes as shown in the following example.

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	Years Old
----------------------	----------------------	--------------

	Men Much More <u>Effective</u>	Men Somewhat More <u>Effective</u>	Both Equally As <u>Effective</u>	Women Somewhat More <u>Effective</u>	Women Much More <u>Effective</u>
1. Indicate the extent to which either <u>men</u> or <u>women</u> are <u>more effective</u> in handling each of the following situations:					
a. Breaking up an ongoing fight between two inmates.	1	2	3	4	5
b. Cooling down an angry inmate.	1	2	3	4	5
c. Separating two inmates who are about to fight.	1	2	3	4	5
d. Controlling a mentally or emotionally disturbed inmate.	1	2	3	4	5
e. Controlling a large or physically tough inmate.	1	2	3	4	5
f. Dealing with inmates on a one-to-one basis.	1	2	3	4	5
g. Dealing with inmates in groups.	1	2	3	4	5
h. Handling a crisis such as giving first aid to a seriously injured inmate.	1	2	3	4	5
i. Counselling inmates.	1	2	3	4	5
j. Enforcing rules.	1	2	3	4	5
k. Dealing with a verbally abusive inmate.	1	2	3	4	5
l. Dealing with an inmate accused or convicted of sexual assault.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Men Always</u>	<u>Men Usually</u>	<u>Both The Same</u>	<u>About The Same</u>	<u>Women Usually</u>	<u>Women Always</u>
2. Who do inmates <u>get</u> <u>along with better?</u>	1	2	3		4	5
3. Who do inmates tend to <u>discuss</u> their <u>feelings</u> and <u>problems</u> with?	1	2	3		4	5
4. Who do inmates <u>cause</u> <u>more trouble</u> for?	1	2	3		4	5
5. Who on the staff tends to be <u>more strict</u> in enforcing rules?	1	2	3		4	5
6. Who on the staff is <u>more</u> <u>fair</u> and <u>impartial</u> in enforcing rules?	1	2	3		4	5

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
7. How often in the last <u>two weeks</u> has an inmate. . .					
a. refused to <u>quickly</u> <u>follow</u> an order you gave him?	1	2	3	4	5
b. refused <u>outright</u> to obey an order you gave him?	1	2	3	4	5

The following general statements are concerned with situations that could take place in this facility. Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each statement.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mildly Agree</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Mildly Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
In general. . .					
8. inmates give men a <u>harder time</u> than they give women.	1	2	3	4	5
9. inmates <u>lip off</u> more to women than they do to men.	1	2	3	4	5
10. it bothers inmates more to <u>take orders</u> from women than it does from men.	1	2	3	4	5
11. inmates are more likely to <u>obey</u> an order given by a female officer than a male officer.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Mildly</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Mildly</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>
In general. . .					
12. inmates take more <u>care</u> <u>in their appearance</u> when in the presence of women staff.	1	2	3	4	5
13. male staff take more <u>care in their appearance</u> when in the presence of female staff.	1	2	3	4	5
14. the presence of female corrections officers makes the institution a more <u>tolerable place</u> for the inmates to live.	1	2	3	4	5
15. the presence of female staff makes the institution <u>a more dangerous place</u> for male staff to work.	1	2	3	4	5
16. inmates use more <u>physical</u> <u>force</u> against male staff than they do against female staff.	1	2	3	4	5
17. inmates engage in more <u>violent behaviour</u> in front of female staff compared to male staff.	1	2	3	4	5
18. female staff require more <u>assistance</u> than male staff in performing duties.	1	2	3	4	5
19. male staff have as much <u>respect</u> for female co-workers as they do for other male co-workers.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I am more <u>receptive to</u> <u>advice</u> from male co-workers than female co-workers.	1	2	3	4	5

21. What were your expectations about working as a woman corrections officer when you first took the job?
- | | <u>Dislike It
A Lot</u> | <u>Dislike It
Somewhat</u> | <u>Not
Sure</u> | <u>Like It
Somewhat</u> | <u>Like It
A Lot</u> |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. I would. . . | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | <u>No
Problems</u> | <u>Few
Problems</u> | | <u>Some
Problems</u> | <u>Many
Problems</u> |
| b. There would be. . . | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 |
22. How do you feel about working as a woman correction officer now?
- | | <u>Dislike It
A Lot</u> | <u>Dislike It
Somewhat</u> | <u>Not
Sure</u> | <u>Like It
Somewhat</u> | <u>Like It
A Lot</u> |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| a. Now I. . . | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | <u>No
Problems</u> | <u>Few
Problems</u> | | <u>Some
Problems</u> | <u>Many
Problems</u> |
| b. Currently there are. . . | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 |
23. Do you have more disagreements with women or men on the staff concerning the following situations?
- | | <u>Much
More
With Women</u> | <u>Somewhat
More
With Women</u> | <u>Both
About
The Same</u> | <u>Somewhat
More
With Men</u> | <u>Much
More
With Men</u> |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| a. Enforcement of rules. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. Disciplining inmates for minor rule violations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. Disciplining inmates for major rule violations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. Performance of duties in general. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e. Methods of handling crisis situations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f. What the proper relationship of staff to inmate should be. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>A Little</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Very</u>	
24. To what extent were you worried about your personal safety when you took this job?	1	2	3	4	
25. Currently how worried are you for your personal safety?	1	2	3	4	
26. How would you rate the concern of inmates for your personal safety?	1	2	3	4	
	<u>Not Concerned Enough</u>	<u>Adequately Concerned</u>	<u>Overly Concerned</u>		
27. How would you rate the concern of male staff for your personal safety?	1	2	3		
	<u>Men Much More</u>	<u>Men Somewhat More</u>	<u>Both About The Same</u>	<u>Women Somewhat More</u>	<u>Women Much More</u>
28. Are men or women co-workers more open to suggestions about how to improve the performance of duties while on the job?	1	2	3	4	5
	<u>Never</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
29. Do male co-workers ever give you adequate recognition for your accomplishments on the job?	1	2	3	4	5
30. Do male co-workers ever keep you from performing duties that you feel you are capable of performing?	1	2	3	4	5
31. Do male co-workers ever interfere unnecessarily with your ability to perform your duties?	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
32. How would you rate. . .					
a. <u>your</u> overall performance of duties?	1	2	3	4	5
b. the overall performance of <u>other women</u> in performing their duties?	1	2	3	4	5
c. the overall performance of <u>men</u> in performing their duties?	1	2	3	4	5
d. the quality of help <u>male staff</u> give you in performing your duties?	1	2	3	4	5
e. the quality of help <u>female staff</u> give you in performing your duties?	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Men Are Much Better</u>	<u>Men Are Somewhat Better</u>	<u>Not Much Difference</u>	<u>Women Somewhat Better</u>	<u>Women Are Much Better</u>
33. How would you <u>compare</u> the overall <u>performance</u> of men and women in the following locations in the institution. . .					
a. Intake/Records Area.	1	2	3	4	5
b. Maximum Security Area (6th Floor North).	1	2	3	4	5
c. Areas holding mentally or emotionally disturbed inmates (6th Floor South).	1	2	3	4	5
d. Activity Rooms.	1	2	3	4	5
e. Living Units.	1	2	3	4	5
f. Protective Custody.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
34. How would you rate the <u>quality of feedback</u> you get concerning your job performance from. . .					

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. supervisors. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. male co-workers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. female co-workers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

35. When things aren't going right for you on the job, how would you rate the quality of support you receive from. . .

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. supervisors. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. male co-workers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. female co-workers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
36. How often do you feel that criticism is directed at you as a <u>person</u> rather than at <u>how you do your job</u> when it comes from. . .					

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. supervisor. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. male co-workers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. female co-workers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mildly Agree</u>	<u>Mildly Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
37. Women are as effective in doing the job of corrections officer as men.				

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|---|---|---|---|

38. If I had a grievance I would not hesitate to take action on it.

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|---|---|---|---|

Very Uncomfortable
Very Comfortable

39. How comfortable do
feel being supervised
by a. . .

a. man	1	2	3	4	5
b. woman	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
40. How would you rate the opportunities for <u>women</u> to be <u>promoted</u> on this job?	1	2	3	4	5

	1	2	3	4	5
41. How would you rate the opportunities for <u>men</u> to be <u>promoted</u> on this job?	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>A Little</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Very</u>
42. How <u>effective</u> are training programs in the following areas in helping you do your job?				

a. self-defense	1	2	3	4
b. riot control	1	2	3	4
c. first aid	1	2	3	4
d. crisis intervention	1	2	3	4
e. counselling	1	2	3	4
f. standard operating procedures	1	2	3	4

43. How much have <u>your</u> <u>ideas</u> been asked for in regard to the training programs and their content?	1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---	---

44. How helpful would it be to have scheduled meetings for women on the staff to discuss issues and problems you encounter on the job?	1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---	---

45. How much more effective would the following training programs be for women if they were taught by a woman?

	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>A Little</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Very</u>
a. self-defense	1	2	3	4
b. riot control	1	2	3	4
c. first aid	1	2	3	4
d. crisis intervention	1	2	3	4
e. counselling	1	2	3	4
f. standard operating procedures	1	2	3	4

46. Do you ever not voice your opinions while on the job because you are a woman?

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Always</u>
	1	2	3	4	5

47. Do you ever feel resentment from male co-workers for working in a traditionally male job?

	1	2	3	4	5
--	---	---	---	---	---

48. To what extent might you not apply for a promotion because. . .

	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>A Little</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>A Lot</u>
a. you believe women are discriminated against in promotions?	1	2	3	4
b. you believe men do not like to be supervised by a woman?	1	2	3	4
c. it's not worth the stress?	1	2	3	4

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
49. How often do you experience sexual harassment from <u>male co-workers</u> in the form of. . .					
a. verbal propositions?	1	2	3	4	5
b. physical contact?	1	2	3	4	5
c. crude jokes?	1	2	3	4	5
50. How often do you experience sexual harassment from <u>inmates</u> in the form of. . .					
a. verbal propositions?	1	2	3	4	5
b. physical contact?	1	2	3	4	5
c. crude jokes?	1	2	3	4	5
	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>A Little</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>A Lot</u>	
51. How much does it <u>bother</u> you when sexual harassment occurs from <u>male co-workers</u> by. . .					
a. verbal proposition?	1	2	3	4	
b. physical contact?	1	2	3	4	
c. crude jokes?	1	2	3	4	
52. How much does it <u>bother</u> you when sexual harassment occurs from <u>inmates</u> by. . .					
a. verbal propositions?	1	2	3	4	
b. physical contact?	1	2	3	4	
c. crude jokes?	1	2	3	4	
53. Does the organization <u>deal effectively</u> with complaints of sexual harassment of females made against. . .					
a. male co-workers?	1	2	3	4	
b. inmates?	1	2	3	4	

54. How old are you?

--	--

55. Circle the number that indicates the highest level of education that you have completed.

Less than <u>High School</u>	High School <u>Graduate</u>	Some College or <u>University</u>	College or <u>University</u> <u>Graduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u> <u>Degree</u>
1	2	3	4	5

56. How many years have you worked as a corrections officer at this institution?

--	--

57. Have you ever worked at some other corrections institution prior to your current employment?

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
1	2

THANK YOU
FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN FILLING OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

Comments:

Male Staff Questionnaire

Introduction

This questionnaire is part of a research project being conducted for graduate study in Criminology at Simon Fraser University. I am interested in finding out your own evaluation of the benefits and/or disadvantages of having female correctional officers in an institution like this. Your answers to these questions will provide a major source of information for this project.

Please answer the questions as honestly as possible based on your experience. While I appreciate your taking part in this exercise, you should be aware that you are free to withdraw your participation at any time. Your identity and individual responses to this questionnaire will remain completely anonymous and confidential. Please do not write your name anywhere on the questionnaire. The results of this study will be presented in the form of summary statistics which in no way could be traced to the identity of any participant. Please feel free to ask any questions you might have concerning the project.

The questionnaire will take about 20 minutes to complete, and I want you to know that I appreciate your taking the time to participate in the study. A copy of the results will be left at Pre-Trial and will be available to you on request.

Please answer each question based on your experience on the job as a corrections officer. It is very important that you base your answers on things you have actually seen or experienced on the job. It is also very important that you answer each question.

If you have any questions about the study please feel free to phone me, Liz Szockyj (pronounced Shotski), at the Department of Criminology, Simon Fraser University - - 291-4762.

Instructions

To answer almost all of the items on this questionnaire all you need to do is circle the number that represents the answer of your choice. For example:

<u>Poor</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
1	2	3	4	5

A few questions ask you to give a specific number for an answer. In these cases fill in the boxes as shown in the following example.

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	Years Old
----------------------	----------------------	--------------

	<u>Men Much More Effective</u>	<u>Men Somewhat More Effective</u>	<u>Both Equally As Effective</u>	<u>Women Somewhat More Effective</u>	<u>Women Much More Effective</u>
1. Indicate the extent to which either <u>men</u> or <u>women</u> are <u>more effective</u> in handling each of the following situations:					
a. Breaking up an ongoing fight between two inmates.	1	2	3	4	5
b. Cooling down an angry inmate.	1	2	3	4	5
c. Separating two inmates who are about to fight.	1	2	3	4	5
d. Controlling a mentally or emotionally disturbed inmate.	1	2	3	4	5
e. Controlling a large or physically tough inmate.	1	2	3	4	5
f. Dealing with inmates on a one-to-one basis.	1	2	3	4	5
g. Dealing with inmates in groups.	1	2	3	4	5
h. Handling a crisis such as giving first aid to a seriously injured inmate.	1	2	3	4	5
i. Counselling inmates.	1	2	3	4	5
j. Enforcing rules.	1	2	3	4	5
k. Dealing with a verbally abusive inmate.	1	2	3	4	5
l. Dealing with an inmate accused or convicted of sexual assault.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Men Always</u>	<u>Men Usually</u>	<u>Both About The Same</u>	<u>Women Usually</u>	<u>Women Always</u>
2. Who do inmates get along with better?	1	2	3	4	5
3. Who do inmates tend to discuss their feelings and problems with?	1	2	3	4	5
4. Who do inmates cause more trouble for?	1	2	3	4	5
5. Who on the staff tends to be more strict in enforcing rules?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Who on the staff is more fair and impartial in enforcing rules?	1	2	3	4	5
	<u>Never</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
7. How often in the last two weeks has an inmate. . .					
a. refused to quickly follow an order you gave him?	1	2	3	4	5
b. refused outright to obey an order you gave him?	1	2	3	4	5

The following general statements are concerned with situations that could take place in this facility. Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each statement.

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mildly Agree</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Mildly Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
In general. . .					
8. inmates give men a harder time than they give women.	1	2	3	4	5
9. inmates lip off more to women than they do to men.	1	2	3	4	5
10. it bothers inmates more to take orders from women than it does from men.	1	2	3	4	5
11. inmates are more likely to obey an order given by a female officer than a male officer.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Mildly</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Mildly</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>
In general. . .					
12. inmates take more <u>care</u> <u>in their appearance</u> when in the presence of women staff.	1	2	3	4	5
13. male staff take more <u>care in their appearance</u> when in the presence of female staff.	1	2	3	4	5
14. the presence of female corrections officers makes the institution a more <u>tolerable place</u> for the inmates to live.	1	2	3	4	5
15. the presence of female staff makes the institution <u>a more dangerous place</u> for male staff to work.	1	2	3	4	5
16. inmates use more <u>physical</u> <u>force</u> against male staff than they do against female staff.	1	2	3	4	5
17. inmates engage in more <u>violent behaviour</u> in front of female staff compared to male staff.	1	2	3	4	5
18. female staff require more <u>assistance</u> than male staff in performing duties.	1	2	3	4	5
19. male staff have as much <u>respect</u> for female co-workers as they do for other male co-workers.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I am more <u>receptive to</u> <u>advice</u> from male co-workers than female co-workers.	1	2	3	4	5

21. What were your expectations about working with women corrections officers when you first took the job?
- | | | | | | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| | <u>Dislike It
A Lot</u> | <u>Dislike It
Somewhat</u> | <u>Not
Sure</u> | <u>Like It
Somewhat</u> | <u>Like It
A Lot</u> |
| a. I would. . . | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | <u>No
Problems</u> | <u>Few
Problems</u> | <u>Some
Problems</u> | <u>Many
Problems</u> | |
| b. There would be. . . | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
22. How do you feel about working with women correction officers now?
- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|
| | <u>Dislike It
A Lot</u> | <u>Dislike It
Somewhat</u> | <u>Not
Sure</u> | <u>Like It
Somewhat</u> | <u>Like It
A Lot</u> |
| a. Now I. . . | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | <u>No
Problems</u> | <u>Few
Problems</u> | <u>Some
Problems</u> | <u>Many
Problems</u> | |
| b. Currently there are. . . | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
23. Do you have more disagreements with women or men on the staff concerning the following situations?
- | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| | <u>Much
More
With Women</u> | <u>Somewhat
More
With Women</u> | <u>Both
About
The Same</u> | <u>Somewhat
More
With Men</u> | <u>Much
More
With Men</u> |
| a. Enforcement of rules. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. Disciplining inmates for minor rule violations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. Disciplining inmates for major rule violations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. Performance of duties in general. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e. Methods of handling crisis situations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f. What the proper relationship of staff to inmate should be. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>A Little</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Very</u>
24. To what extent were you worried about your personal safety <u>when you took this job?</u>	1	2	3	4
25. <u>Currently</u> how worried are you for your personal safety?	1	2	3	4
26. How would you rate your <u>concern</u> for the <u>personal safety of women</u> on the staff?	1	2	3	4

	<u>Men Much More</u>	<u>Men Somewhat More</u>	<u>Both About The Same</u>	<u>Women Somewhat More</u>	<u>Women Much More</u>
27. Are men or women co-workers more <u>open to suggestions</u> about how to improve the performance of duties while on the job?	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
28. How would you rate. . .					
a. <u>your</u> overall performance of duties?	1	2	3	4	5
b. the overall performance of <u>women</u> in performing their duties?	1	2	3	4	5
c. the overall performance of other <u>men</u> in performing their duties?	1	2	3	4	5
d. the quality of help other <u>male staff</u> give you in performing your duties?	1	2	3	4	5
e. the quality of help <u>female staff</u> give you in performing your duties?	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Men Are Much Better</u>	<u>Men Are Somewhat Better</u>	<u>Not Much Difference</u>	<u>Women Are Somewhat Better</u>	<u>Women Are Much Better</u>
--	------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------

29. How would you compare the overall performance of men and women in the following locations in the institution. . .

a. Intake/Records Area.	1	2	3	4	5
b. Maximum Security Area (6th Floor North).	1	2	3	4	5
c. Areas holding mentally or emotionally disturbed inmates (6th Floor South).	1	2	3	4	5
d. Activity Rooms.	1	2	3	4	5
e. Living Units.	1	2	3	4	5
f. Protective Custody.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Much More</u>	<u>Somewhat More</u>	<u>About The Same</u>	<u>Somewhat Less</u>	<u>Much Less</u>
--	----------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------	----------------------

30. When women are present do you use more or less. . .

a. physical force against inmate.	1	2	3	4	5
b. crude language.	1	2	3	4	5
c. severe punishments.	1	2	3	4	5
d. strict interpretation of rules.	1	2	3	4	5
e. fairness in enforcing rules.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>A Little</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Very Much</u>
31. In general, to what extent do you approve of women as corrections officers?	1	2	3	4
32. Have you ever worked in some other correctional facility that <u>did not</u> have women on the staff?			<u>Yes</u> 1	<u>No</u> 2

IF NO, then skip Question 33 and go on to Question 34 on the next page.

IF YES, answer Question 33, then go on to Question 34 on the next page.

	<u>Increases A Lot</u>	<u>Increases A Little</u>	<u>Makes No Difference</u>	<u>Decreases A Little</u>	<u>Decreases A Lot</u>
33. Based on your experience in correctional facilities that did not have women corrections officers, does the presence of women at this facility <u>increase or decrease</u> . . .					
a. <u>physical confrontations</u> between staff and inmates.	1	2	3	4	5
b. the <u>number of arguments</u> between staff and inmates.	1	2	3	4	5
c. <u>physical confrontations</u> between inmates.	1	2	3	4	5
d. the <u>number of arguments</u> between inmates.	1	2	3	4	5
e. the <u>amount of sexual activity</u> between inmates.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
34. How would you rate the <u>quality of feedback</u> you get concerning your job performance from. . .					

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. supervisors. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. male co-workers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. female co-workers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

35. When things aren't going right for you on the job, how would you rate the quality of support you receive from. . .

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. supervisors. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. male co-workers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. female co-workers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
36. How often do you feel that criticism is directed at you as a <u>person</u> rather than at <u>how you do your job</u> when it comes from. . .					

- | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. supervisors. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. male co-workers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. female co-workers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

	<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Mildly Agree</u>	<u>Mildly Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>
37. Women are as effective in doing the job of corrections officer as men.				

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|---|---|---|---|

38. If I had a grievance I would not hesitate to take action on it.

- | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|--|---|---|---|---|

	<u>Very Uncomfortable</u>			<u>Very Comfortable</u>	
39. How comfortable do you feel being supervised by a . . .					
a. man	1	2	3	4	5
b. woman	1	2	3	4	5
	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
40. How would you rate the opportunities for <u>women</u> to be <u>promoted</u> on this job?	1	2	3	4	5
41. How would you rate the opportunities for <u>men</u> to be <u>promoted</u> on this job?	1	2	3	4	5
	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>A Little</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Very</u>	
42. How <u>effective</u> are training programs in the following areas in helping you do your job?					
a. self-defense	1	2	3	4	
b. riot control	1	2	3	4	
c. first aid	1	2	3	4	
d. crisis intervention	1	2	3	4	
e. counselling	1	2	3	4	
f. standard operating procedures	1	2	3	4	
43. How much have <u>your ideas</u> been asked for in regard to the training programs and their content?	1	2	3	4	
	<u>Never</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
44. Do you ever feel <u>resentment</u> towards women for working in a traditionally male job?	1	2	3	4	5

45. How old are you?

--	--

46. Circle the number that indicates the highest level of education that you have completed.

<u>Less than</u> <u>High School</u>	<u>High School</u> <u>Graduate</u>	<u>Some</u> <u>College</u> <u>or</u> <u>University</u>	<u>College</u> <u>or</u> <u>University</u> <u>Graduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u> <u>Degree</u>
1	2	3	4	5

47. How many years have you worked as a corrections officer at this institution?

--	--

48. Have you ever worked at some other corrections institution prior to your current employment?

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
1	2

THANK YOU
FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN FILLING OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

Comments:

Prisoner Questionnaire

Introduction

This questionnaire is part of a research project being conducted for graduate study in Criminology at Simon Fraser University. I am interested in finding out your own evaluation of the benefits and/or disadvantages of having female correctional officers in an institution like this. Your answers to these questions will provide a major source of information for this project.

Please answer the questions as honestly as possible based on your experience. While I appreciate your taking part in this exercise, you should be aware that you are free to withdraw your participation at any time. Your identity and individual responses to this questionnaire will remain completely anonymous and confidential. Please do not write your name anywhere on the questionnaire. The results of this study will be presented in the form of summary statistics which in no way could be traced to the identity of any participant. Please feel free to ask any questions you might have concerning the project.

The questionnaire will take about 20 minutes to complete, and I want you to know that I appreciate your taking the time to participate in the study.

Please answer each question based on your experience as an inmate in this institution. It is very important that you base your answers on things you have actually seen or experienced. It is also very important that you answer each question.

If you have any questions about the study please feel free to phone me, Liz Szockyj (pronounced Shotski), at the Department of Criminology, Simon Fraser University - - 291-4216.

Instructions

To answer almost all of the items on this questionnaire all you need to do is circle the number that represents the answer of your choice. For example:

<u>Poor</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Very Good</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
1	2	3	4	5

A few questions ask you to give a specific number for an answer. In these cases fill in the boxes as shown in the following example.

<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	Years Old
----------------------	----------------------	--------------

	<u>Men</u> <u>Much</u> <u>More</u> <u>Effective</u>	<u>Men</u> <u>Somewhat</u> <u>More</u> <u>Effective</u>	<u>Both</u> <u>Equally</u> <u>As</u> <u>Effective</u>	<u>Women</u> <u>Somewhat</u> <u>More</u> <u>Effective</u>	<u>Women</u> <u>Much</u> <u>More</u> <u>Effective</u>
1. Indicate the extent to which either <u>men</u> or <u>women</u> are <u>more effective</u> in handling each of the following situations:					
a. Breaking up an ongoing fight between two inmates.	1	2	3	4	5
b. Cooling down an angry inmate.	1	2	3	4	5
c. Separating two inmates who are about to fight.	1	2	3	4	5
d. Controlling a mentally or emotionally disturbed inmate.	1	2	3	4	5
e. Controlling a large or physically tough inmate.	1	2	3	4	5
f. Dealing with inmates on a one-to-one basis.	1	2	3	4	5
g. Dealing with inmates in groups.	1	2	3	4	5
h. Handling a crisis such as giving first aid to a seriously injured inmate.	1	2	3	4	5
i. Counselling inmates.	1	2	3	4	5
j. Enforcing rules.	1	2	3	4	5
k. Dealing with a verbally abusive inmate.	1	2	3	4	5
l. Dealing with an inmate accused or convicted of sexual assault.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Men Always</u>	<u>Men Usually</u>	<u>Both About The Same</u>	<u>Women Usually</u>	<u>Women Always</u>
2. Who do inmates <u>get</u> <u>along with better?</u>	1	2	3	4	5
3. Who do inmates tend to <u>discuss their feelings</u> <u>and problems</u> with?	1	2	3	4	5
4. Who do inmates <u>cause</u> <u>more trouble</u> for?	1	2	3	4	5
5. Who on the staff tends to be <u>more strict</u> in enforcing rules?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Who on the staff is <u>more</u> <u>fair and impartial</u> in enforcing rules?	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Never</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
7. How often in the last <u>two weeks</u> have you. . .					
a. refused to <u>quickly</u> <u>follow</u> an order given by a <u>male staff</u> <u>member</u> ?	1	2	3	4	5
b. refused <u>outright</u> to obey an order given by a <u>male staff member</u> ?	1	2	3	4	5
c. refused to <u>quickly</u> <u>follow</u> an order given by a <u>female staff</u> <u>member</u> ?	1	2	3	4	5
d. refused <u>outright</u> to obey an order given by a <u>female staff member</u> ?	1	2	3	4	5

The following general statements are concerned with situations that could take place in this facility. Indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each statement.

	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Mildly</u> <u>Agree</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Mildly</u> <u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly</u> <u>Disagree</u>
In general. . .					
8. inmates give men a <u>harder time</u> than they give women.	1	2	3	4	5
9. inmates <u>lip off</u> more to women than they do to men.	1	2	3	4	5
10. it bothers inmates more to <u>take orders</u> from women than it does from men.	1	2	3	4	5
11. inmates are more likely to <u>obey</u> an order given by a female officer than a male officer.	1	2	3	4	5
12. inmates take more <u>care in their appearance</u> when in the presence of women staff.	1	2	3	4	5
13. the presence of female corrections officers makes the institution a more <u>tolerable place</u> for the inmates to live.	1	2	3	4	5
14. the presence of female staff makes the institution a <u>more dangerous place</u> for male staff to work.	1	2	3	4	5
15. inmates use more <u>physical force</u> against male staff than they do against female staff.	1	2	3	4	5
16. inmates engage in more <u>violent behaviour</u> in front of female staff compared to male staff.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Much More With Women</u>	<u>Somewhat More With Women</u>	<u>Both About The Same</u>	<u>Somewhat More With Men</u>	<u>Much More With Men</u>
17. Do you have more <u>disagreements</u> with women or men on the staff concerning the following situations?					
a. enforcement of rules.	1	2	3	4	5
b. being disciplined for minor rule violations.	1	2	3	4	5
c. being disciplined for major rule violations.	1	2	3	4	5
d. what the proper relationship of staff to inmates should be.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Much More</u>	<u>Somewhat More</u>	<u>Makes No Difference</u>	<u>Somewhat Less</u>	<u>Much Less</u>
18. When women are present male staff use <u>more</u> or <u>less</u> . . .					
a. physical force against inmates.	1	2	3	4	5
b. crude language.	1	2	3	4	5
c. severe punishments.	1	2	3	4	5
d. strict interpretations of rules.	1	2	3	4	5
e. fairness in enforcing rules.	1	2	3	4	5

	<u>Not at All</u>	<u>A Little</u>	<u>Somewhat</u>	<u>Very</u>
19. In general, to what extent do you approve of women as corrections officers?				
	1	2	3	4

20. Have you ever been confined in some other correctional facility that <u>did not</u> have women on the staff?	<u>Yes</u> 1	<u>No</u> 2
---	---------------------	--------------------

IF NO, then skip Question 21 and
go on to Question 22 on the next page.

IF YES, please answer Question 21, then
go on to Question 22 on the next page.

	<u>Increases A Lot</u>	<u>Increases A Little</u>	<u>Makes No Difference</u>	<u>Decreases A Little</u>	<u>Decreases A Lot</u>
21. Based on your experience in correctional facilities that did not have women corrections officers, does the presence of women at this facility <u>increase or</u> <u>decrease</u> . . .					
a. <u>physical confrontations</u> between staff and inmates.	1	2	3	4	5
b. the <u>number of arguments</u> between staff and inmates.	1	2	3	4	5
c. <u>physical confrontations</u> between inmates.	1	2	3	4	5
d. the <u>number of arguments</u> between inmates.	1	2	3	4	5
e. the <u>amount of sexual</u> <u>activity</u> between inmates.	1	2	3	4	5

22. How old are you?

--	--

23. Circle the number that indicates the highest level of education that you have completed.

Less than <u>High School</u>	Some <u>High School</u>	High School <u>Graduate</u>	Some College or <u>University</u>	College or <u>University Graduate</u>	<u>Graduate Degree</u>
1	2	3	4	5	6

24. How many times have you been in prison?

<u>Never</u>	<u>One or Two Times</u>	<u>Three to Five Times</u>	<u>Six to Ten Times</u>	<u>More than Ten Times</u>
1	2	3	4	5

25. How many years in total have you been in prison?

<u>Never</u>	<u>Less than One Year</u>	<u>One or Two Years</u>	<u>Three to Five Years</u>	<u>Six to Ten Years</u>	<u>More than Ten Years</u>
1	2	3	4	5	6

26. On the average, how often do you come into contact with female staff during the day?

<u>Never</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
1	2	3	4	5

27. Have any of the previous correctional institutions in which you have been confined employed women on the staff?

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
1	2

28. What offense(s) are you currently charged with?

<u>Weapons</u>	<u>Burglary(B&E)</u>	<u>Assault</u>	<u>Robbery</u>	<u>Theft</u>
1	2	3	4	5
<u>Drugs/Alcohol</u>	<u>Sexual Assault</u>	<u>Murder</u>	<u>Other</u>	
6	7	8	<hr/>	
			(please specify)	

THANK YOU
FOR YOUR COOPERATION IN FILLING OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

Comments:

APPENDIX C

August 1985

Dear _____:

I am conducting a study at the Pre-Trial Centre which focuses on female correctional officers as part of my Master's thesis at S.F.U. The study will attempt to find out what the impact and consequences are of having female staff employed at correctional institutions based on the experiences of female staff, male staff and prisoners. It will be composed of a questionnaire and interviews. Some of the issues that will be examined are female and male staff work relationships, inmate-staff relationships, and perceptions of female and male staff performance in certain situations.

I look forward to meeting you and discussing the study with you further.

Sincerely,

Liz Szockyj

August 1985

I am conducting a study at the Pre-Trial Centre which focuses on female correctional officers as part of my Master's thesis at S.F.U. The study will attempt to find out what the impact and consequences are of having female staff employed at correctional institutions based on the experiences of female staff, male staff and prisoners. Much of the study is premised on responses to the attached questionnaire and your input would be greatly appreciated.

Please place the completed questionnaires in the box provided within the next week. If you have any questions or would like more information do not hesitate to call me at 291-4762.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Liz Szockyj

APPENDIX D

Table 5

Correctional Officers' Ratings of Overall Performance in Percentages

	Fair (n)	Good (n)	Very Good (n)	Excellent (n)
Their own performance				
Females		22.2 (2)	77.8 (7)	
Males	1.9 (1)	28.8 (15)	57.7 (30)	11.5 (6)
Performance of women				
Females		22.2 (2)	77.8 (7)	
Males	7.8 (4)	47.1 (24)	35.3 (18)	9.8 (5)
Supervisors	14.3 (1)	14.3 (1)	57.1 (4)	14.3 (1)
Performance of men				
Females		33.3 (3)	66.7 (6)	
Males	12.0 (6)	56.0 (28)	28.0 (14)	4.0 (2)
Supervisors		57.1 (4)	42.9 (3)	

Table 6

Ratings of the Female Correctional Officers' Effectiveness in Percentages

	Agree		Disagree	
	Strongly (n)	Mildly (n)	Strongly (n)	Mildly (n)
Female c.o.'s are just as effective as men				
Females		100.0 (9)		
Males	42.3 (22)	28.8 (15)	19.2 (10)	9.6 (5)
Supervisors	71.4 (5)	28.6 (2)		

Table 7

**Ratings of Performance in Specific
Institutional Locations in Percentages**

	Men (n)	Both (n)	Women (n)
Intake/records area			
Females		88.9 (8)	11.1 (1)
Males	19.2 (10)	76.9 (40)	3.8 (2)
Supervisors	28.6 (2)	57.1 (4)	14.3 (1)
Maximum security area			
Females	33.3 (3)	55.6 (5)	11.1 (1)
Males	73.1 (38)	26.9 (14)	
Supervisors	85.7 (6)		14.3 (1)
Area for mentally/ emotionally disturbed			
Females		22.2 (2)	77.8 (7)
Males	19.2 (10)	55.8 (29)	25.0 (13)
Supervisors	28.6 (2)	28.6 (2)	42.9 (3)
Activity rooms			
Females		88.9 (8)	11.1 (1)
Males	5.9 (3)	94.1 (48)	
Supervisors		100.0 (7)	
Living units			
Females		88.9 (8)	11.1 (1)
Males	15.4 (8)	84.6 (44)	
Supervisors		85.7 (6)	14.3 (1)
Protective custody			
Females	11.1 (1)	44.4 (4)	44.4 (4)
Males	26.9 (14)	67.3 (35)	5.8 (3)
Supervisors	14.3 (1)	85.7 (6)	

Table 8

**Ratings of Effectiveness in Dealing
With Specific Types of Inmates in Percentages**

	Men More Effective (n)	Both Equally Effective (n)	Women More Effective (n)
Mentally/emotionally disturbed inmate			
Females		44.4 (4)	55.6 (5)
Males	16.0 (8)	64.0 (32)	20.0 (10)
Supervisors	14.3 (1)	28.6 (2)	57.1 (4)
Prisoners	23.2 (13)	25.0 (14)	51.8 (29)
Inmates accused/convicted of sexual assault			
Females		55.6 (5)	44.4 (4)
Males	38.0 (19)	58.0 (29)	4.0 (2)
Supervisors	28.6 (2)	71.4 (5)	
Prisoners	38.0 (19)	56.0 (28)	6.0 (3)

Table 9

**Ratings of Enforcing Institutional
Regulations in Percentages**

	Men (n)	Both (n)	Women (n)
Effectiveness in enforcing rules			
Females		100.0 (9)	
Males	41.2 (21)	58.8 (30)	
Supervisors	42.9 (3)	42.9 (3)	14.3 (1)
Prisoners	50.0 (29)	44.8 (26)	5.2 (3)
More fair and impartial in enforcing rules			
Females		77.8 (7)	22.2 (2)
Males	20.4 (10)	73.5 (36)	6.1 (3)
Supervisors		71.4 (5)	28.6 (2)
Prisoners	17.5 (10)	61.4 (35)	21.1 (12)
More strict in enforcing rules			
Females	11.1 (1)	66.7 (6)	22.2 (2)
Males	39.2 (20)	49.0 (25)	11.8 (6)
Supervisors	42.9 (3)	28.6 (2)	28.6 (2)
Prisoners	37.5 (21)	41.1 (23)	21.4 (12)

Table 10

**Ratings of Prisoners' Response to
Orders in the Last Two Weeks
in Percentages**

	Never (n)	Rarely (n)	Sometimes (n)	Often (n)	Very Often (n)

A prisoner refused to quickly follow an order given by a male officer					
Males	19.2 (10)	57.7 (30)	19.2 (10)	1.9 (1)	1.9 (1)
Prisoners	50.0 (28)	23.2 (13)	21.4 (12)	3.6 (2)	1.8 (1)
A prisoner refused to quickly follow an order given by a female officer					
Females	11.1 (1)	66.7 (6)	11.1 (1)	11.1 (1)	
Prisoners	55.4 (31)	23.2 (13)	19.6 (11)	1.8 (1)	
A prisoner refused outright to obey an order given by a male officer					
Males	55.8 (29)	40.4 (24)	3.8 (2)		
Prisoners	64.3 (36)	26.8 (15)	7.1 (4)	1.8 (1)	
A prisoner refused outright to obey an order given by a female officer					
Females	66.7 (6)	33.3 (3)			
Prisoners	69.6 (39)	21.4 (12)	8.9 (5)		

Table 11

**Ratings of Respect for the Authority of
Female Correctional Officers in Percentages**

	Agree (n)	Neutral (n)	Disagree (n)
Prisoners are more likely to obey orders given by a female officer			
Females	44.4 (4)	44.4 (4)	11.1 (1)
Males	11.5 (6)	40.4 (21)	48.1 (25)
Supervisors	28.6 (2)	42.9 (3)	28.6 (2)
Prisoners	14.3 (8)	48.2 (27)	37.5 (21)
Inmates give men a harder time than women			
Females	66.7 (6)		33.3 (3)
Males	61.5 (32)	15.4 (8)	23.1 (12)
Supervisors	71.4 (5)	28.6 (2)	
Prisoners	46.4 (26)	23.2 (13)	30.4 (17)
Prisoners engage in more violent behaviour in front of female officers			
Females			100.0 (9)
Males	5.9 (3)	43.1 (22)	51.0 (26)
Supervisors		42.9 (3)	57.1 (4)
Prisoners	8.9 (5)	28.6 (16)	62.5 (35)
Inmates lip off more to women officers			
Females		11.1 (1)	88.9 (8)
Males	26.9 (14)	21.2 (11)	51.9 (27)
Supervisors	28.6 (2)	14.3 (1)	57.1 (4)
Prisoners	15.8 (9)	26.3 (15)	57.9 (33)

Table 11 (con't)

	Men (n)	Both the Same (n)	Women (n)
Who do inmates cause more trouble for			
Females	66.7 (6)	22.2 (2)	11.1 (1)
Males	44.0 (22)	48.0 (24)	8.0 (4)
Supervisors	42.9 (3)	57.1 (4)	
Prisoners	44.6 (25)	41.1 (23)	14.3 (8)
Who is more effective dealing with a verbally abusive inmate			
Females		77.8 (7)	22.2 (2)
Males	41.2 (21)	49.0 (25)	9.8 (5)
Supervisors	42.9 (3)	42.9 (3)	14.3 (1)
Prisoners	49.1 (28)	35.1 (20)	15.8 (9)

Table 12

**Ratings of Interpersona
Skills in Percentages**

	Men (n)	Both the Same (n)	Females (n)
Who is more effective in dealing with inmates on a one-to-one basis			
Females		11.1 (1)	88.9 (8)
Males	13.7 (7)	70.6 (36)	15.7 (8)
Supervisors		42.9 (3)	57.1 (4)
Prisoners	13.8 (8)	50.0 (29)	36.2 (21)
Who is more effective in dealing with inmates in groups			
Females		77.8 (7)	22.2 (2)
Males	36.0 (18)	56.0 (28)	21.1 (4)
Supervisors	28.6 (2)	57.1 (4)	14.3 (1)
Prisoners	31.0 (18)	48.3 (28)	20.7 (12)
Who is more effective in counselling inmates			
Females		66.7 (6)	33.3 (3)
Males	7.8 (4)	84.3 (43)	7.8 (4)
Supervisors		85.7 (6)	14.3 (1)
Prisoners	17.2 (10)	41.4 (24)	41.4 (24)
Who is more effective in cooling down an angry inmate			
Females		22.2 (2)	77.8 (7)
Males	11.8 (6)	52.9 (27)	35.3 (18)
Supervisors		28.6 (2)	71.4 (5)
Prisoners	8.8 (5)	31.6 (18)	59.6 (34)
Who inmates get along with better			
Females		44.4 (4)	55.6 (5)
Males	13.7 (7)	43.1 (22)	43.1 (22)
Supervisors		71.4 (5)	28.6 (2)
Prisoners	8.6 (5)	46.6 (27)	44.8 (26)
Who inmates tend to discuss feelings and problems with			
Females		22.2 (2)	77.8 (7)
Males	8.0 (4)	66.0 (33)	26.0 (13)
Supervisors		14.3 (1)	85.7 (6)
Prisoners	28.6 (16)	28.6 (16)	42.9 (24)

Table 13

**Ratings of Situations Involving
Physical Strength in Percentages**

	Men (n)	Both the Same (n)	Women (n)
Breaking up an ongoing fight			
Females	25.0 (2)	75.0 (7)	
Males	78.4 (40)	19.6 (10)	2.0 (1)
Supervisors	83.3 (5)	16.7 (1)	
Prisoners	69.6 (39)	23.2 (13)	7.1 (4)
Separating two inmates about to fight			
Females	11.1 (1)	77.8 (7)	11.1 (1)
Males	37.3 (19)	56.9 (29)	5.9 (3)
Supervisors	71.4 (5)	28.6 (2)	
Prisoners	46.6 (27)	39.7 (23)	13.8 (8)
Controlling a large or physically tough inmate			
Females	33.3 (3)	44.4 (4)	22.2 (2)
Males	46.0 (23)	38.0 (19)	16.0 (8)
Supervisors	28.6 (2)	42.9 (3)	28.6 (2)
Prisoners	62.5 (35)	19.6 (11)	17.9 (10)
	Agree (n)	Neutral (n)	Disagree (n)
Females make the institution a more dangerous place for males to work			
Females			100.0 (9)
Males	21.2 (11)	36.5 (19)	42.3 (22)
Supervisors		42.9 (3)	57.1 (4)
Prisoners	12.7 (7)	23.6 (13)	63.6 (35)
Females require more assistance in performing their duties			
Females			100.0 (9)
Males	30.8 (16)	28.8 (15)	40.4 (21)
Supervisors	28.6 (2)	28.6 (2)	42.9 (3)

Table 14

**Ratings of Prisoner Protection
of Female Officers in Percentages**

	Agree (n)	Neutral (n)	Disagree (n)
Prisoners use more physical force against male staff			
Females	88.9 (8)	11.1 (1)	
Males	69.2 (36)	21.2 (11)	9.6 (5)
Supervisors	71.4 (5)	28.6 (2)	
Prisoners	58.9 (33)	25.0 (14)	16.1 (9)
Perception of inmate concern for the personal safety of female officers			
	Not at All (n)	A Little (n)	Somewhat (n) Very (n)
Females		55.6 (5)	44.4 (4)

Table 15

**Ratings of Concern
for Safety in Percentages**

	Not at All (n)	A Little (n)	Somewhat (n)	Very (n)
Currently worried about your personal safety				
Females	44.4 (4)	55.6 (5)		
Males	34.6 (18)	46.2 (24)	17.3 (9)	1.9 (1)
Worried about the personal safety of females				
Males	7.7 (4)	42.3 (22)	40.4 (21)	9.6 (5)
Supervisors	14.3 (1)	85.7 (6)		
	Not Concerned Enough (n)	Adequately Concerned (n)	Overly Concerned (n)	
Perception of male officer concern for the personal safety of females				
Females		66.7 (6)	33.3 (3)	

Table 16

**Ratings by Female Correctional Officers
of Male Officer Interference in Percentages**

	Never (n)	Rarely (n)	Sometimes (n)	Often (n)
Male co-workers keep you from performing duties of which you are capable		22.2 (2)	55.6 (5)	22.2 (2)
Male co-workers interfere unnecessarily with your ability to perform duties	11.1 (1)	44.4 (4)	44.4 (4)	

Table 17

**Ratings of the Acceptance
Of Women Officers in Percentages**

	Agree (n)	Neutral (n)	Disagree (n)		
Male staff have as much respect for female co-workers as they do for other male officers					
Females	55.6 (5)	22.2 (2)	22.2 (2)		
Males	51.0 (26)	21.6 (11)	27.5 (14)		
Supervisors	57.1 (4)	28.6 (2)	14.3 (1)		
Personally more receptive to advice from male co-workers					
Females		55.6 (5)	44.4 (4)		
Males	17.2 (9)	36.5 (19)	46.2 (24)		

	Never (n)	Rarely (n)	Sometimes (n)	Often (n)	Always (n)

Male co-workers give adequate recognition for your accomplishments on the job					
Females	33.3 (3)	44.4 (4)	11.1 (1)	11.1 (1)	
Male officers feel resentment toward women for working in a traditionally male job					
Females	11.1 (1)	22.2 (2)	55.6 (5)	11.1 (1)	
Males	56.9 (29)	31.4 (16)	7.8 (4)		3.9 (2)

Table 17 (con't)

	Not at All (n)	A Little (n)	Somewhat (n)	Very Much (n)
Extent of approval of female correctional officers				
Males	6.0 (3)	14.0 (7)	32.0 (16)	48.0 (24)
Supervisors		14.3 (1)		85.7 (6)
Prisoners	16.4 (9)	10.9 (6)	25.5 (14)	47.3 (26)
How helpful would scheduled meetings for women be to discuss issues and problems encountered on the job.				
Females	22.2 (2)	22.2 (2)	11.1 (1)	44.4 (4)

Table 18

**Ratings of Quality of Feedback
Concerning Job Performance in Percentages**

	Poor (n)	Fair (n)	Good (n)	Very Good (n)	Excellent (n)
From supervisors					
Females		11.1 (1)	44.4 (4)	33.3 (3)	11.1 (1)
Males	15.7 (8)	21.6 (11)	45.1 (23)	11.8 (6)	5.9 (3)
From male co-workers					
Females		33.3 (3)	44.4 (4)	22.2 (2)	
Males	7.8 (4)	33.3 (17)	49.0 (25)	7.8 (4)	2.0 (1)
From female co-workers					
Females		33.3 (3)	33.3 (3)	33.3 (3)	
Males	11.8 (6)	29.4 (15)	49.0 (25)	7.8 (4)	2.0 (1)

Table 19

**Ratings of Quality of Support
In Percentages**

	Poor (n)	Fair (n)	Good (n)	Very Good (n)	Excellent (n)
From supervisors					
Females			33.3 (3)	55.6 (5)	11.1 (1)
Males	11.8 (6)	25.5 (13)	35.3 (18)	21.6 (11)	5.9 (3)
From male co-workers					
Females	11.1 (1)		55.6 (5)	33.3 (3)	
Males	2.0 (1)	23.5 (12)	52.9 (27)	17.6 (9)	3.9 (2)
From female co-workers					
Females			66.7 (6)	33.3 (3)	
Males	7.8 (4)	23.5 (12)	47.1 (24)	19.6 (10)	2.0 (1)

Table 20

**Ratings of the Quality of Help Received
In Performing Duties in Percentages**

	Poor (n)	Fair (n)	Good (n)	Very Good (n)	Excellent (n)
From male staff					
Females			22.2 (2)	66.7 (6)	11.1 (1)
Males		9.8 (5)	51.0 (26)	33.3 (17)	5.9 (3)
From female staff					
Females			11.1 (1)	66.7 (6)	22.2 (2)
Males		13.5 (7)	55.8 (29)	26.9 (14)	3.8 (2)

Table 21

**Ratings of Disagreements in Specific
Situations in Percentages**

	Men (n)	Both the Same (n)	Women (n)
Enforcement of rules			
Females		88.9 (8)	11.1 (1)
Males	5.9 (3)	82.4 (42)	11.8 (6)
Supervisors		71.4 (5)	28.6 (2)
Prisoners	7.1 (4)	71.4 (40)	21.4 (12)
Disciplining inmates for minor rule violations			
Females		55.6 (5)	44.4 (4)
Males	15.7 (8)	72.5 (37)	11.8 (6)
Supervisors		71.4 (5)	28.6 (2)
Prisoners	16.1 (9)	57.1 (32)	26.8 (15)
Disciplining inmates for major rule violations			
Females		77.8 (7)	22.2 (2)
Males	9.8 (5)	76.5 (39)	13.7 (7)
Supervisors		100.0 (7)	
Prisoners	3.6 (2)	63.6 (35)	32.7 (18)
Performance of duties in general			
Females		44.4 (4)	55.6 (5)
Males	7.8 (4)	74.5 (38)	17.6 (9)
Supervisors		42.9 (3)	57.1 (4)
Methods of handling crisis situations			
Females		66.7 (6)	33.3 (3)
Males	21.6 (11)	62.7 (32)	15.7 (8)
Supervisors		85.7 (6)	14.3 (1)
What the proper relationship of staff to inmate should be			
Females		66.7 (6)	33.3 (3)
Males	15.7 (8)	80.4 (41)	3.9 (2)
Supervisors	14.3 (1)	57.1 (4)	28.6 (2)
Prisoners	16.4 (9)	69.1 (38)	14.5 (8)

Table 22

Extent of Assertiveness of
Women in Percentages

	Never (n)	Rarely (n)	Sometimes (n)	Often (n)	Always (n)

Extent you do not voice opinions on the job because you are a woman					
Females	55.6 (5)	11.1 (1)	33.3 (3)		

	Strongly Agree (n)	Mildly Agree (n)	Mildly Disagree (n)	Strongly Disagree (n)	

Would not hesitate to take action on grievance					
Females	66.7 (6)	33.3 (3)			
Males	40.4 (21)	44.2 (23)	13.5 (7)	1.9 (1)	

Table 23

Impact of the Presence of Females in Percentages

	More (n)	About the Same (n)	Less (n)
Crude language			
Males	2.0 (1)	23.5 (12)	74.5 (38)
Supervisors		14.3 (1)	85.7 (6)
Prisoners	5.7 (3)	35.8 (19)	58.5 (31)
Severe punishments			
Males		92.2 (47)	7.8 (4)
Supervisors	14.3 (1)	85.7 (6)	
Prisoners	30.9 (17)	60.0 (33)	9.1 (5)
Strict interpretation of the rules			
Males	5.8 (3)	94.2 (49)	
Supervisors		100.0 (7)	
Prisoners	34.6 (19)	52.7 (29)	12.7 (7)
Fair enforcement of rules			
Males	1.9 (1)	98.1 (51)	
Supervisors		100.0 (7)	
Prisoners	21.8 (12)	65.5 (36)	12.7 (7)
	Agree (n)	Neutral (n)	Disagree (n)
Inmates take more care in their appearance			
Females	88.9 (8)	11.1 (1)	
Males	61.5 (32)	17.3 (9)	21.2 (11)
Supervisors	100.0 (7)		
Prisoners	56.1 (32)	22.8 (13)	21.1 (12)
Male officers take more care in their appearance			
Females	44.4 (4)	44.4 (4)	11.1 (1)
Males	53.8 (28)	25.0 (13)	21.2 (11)
Supervisors	57.1 (4)	14.3 (1)	28.6 (2)
The institution is a more tolerable place for inmates to live			
Females	100.0 (9)		
Males	51.0 (26)	31.4 (15)	17.6 (9)
Supervisors	57.1 (4)	28.6 (2)	14.3 (1)
Prisoners	57.1 (32)	17.9 (10)	25.0 (14)

Table 24

**Assessments of the Impact of
Female Officers Based on Previous
Experience in Institutions Without Women
In Percentages**

	Increase (n)	No Difference (n)	Decrease (n)
Amount of physical confrontations between staff and inmates			
Males	6.9 (2)	69.0 (20)	24.1 (7)
Supervisors		33.3 (2)	66.7 (4)
Prisoners	36.4 (12)	39.4 (13)	24.3 (8)
Number of arguments between staff and inmates			
Males	3.4 (1)	82.8 (24)	13.8 (4)
Supervisors		83.3 (5)	16.7 (1)
Prisoners	34.4 (11)	31.3 (10)	34.4 (11)
Amount of physical confrontations between inmates			
Males	3.4 (1)	72.4 (21)	24.1 (7)
Supervisors		83.3 (5)	16.7 (1)
Prisoners	21.9 (7)	53.1 (17)	25.0 (8)
Number of arguments between inmates			
Males	20.7 (6)	62.1 (18)	17.2 (5)
Supervisors		66.7 (4)	33.3 (2)
Prisoners	18.2 (6)	57.6 (19)	24.2 (8)

Table 25

**Perceptions of Sexual Conflicts
In Percentages**

	Agree (n)	Neutral (n)	Disagree (n)

It bothers inmates more to take orders from females			
Females	33.3 (3)		66.7 (6)
Males	57.7 (30)	28.8 (15)	13.5 (7)
Supervisors	57.1 (4)	42.9 (3)	
Prisoners	31.6 (18)	36.8 (21)	31.6 (18)

		No	
	Increases (n)	Difference (n)	Decreases (n)

Effect the presence of women have on the amount of sexual activity between inmates			
Males	10.3 (3)	82.8 (24)	6.8 (2)
Prisoners	9.1 (3)	75.8 (25)	15.2 (5)

Table 26

**Sexual Harassment of Female
Officers by Male Officers as
Rated by the Females in Percentages**

	Never (n)	Rarely (n)	Sometimes (n)	Often (n)	Very Often (n)
Frequency of					
Verbal propositions					
By male staff	33.3 (3)	11.1 (1)	33.3 (3)	22.2 (2)	
By prisoners	11.1 (1)	55.6 (5)	33.3 (3)		
Physical contact					
By male staff	66.7 (6)	33.3 (3)			
By prisoners	77.8 (7)	22.2 (2)			
Crude jokes					
By male staff	11.1 (1)	44.4 (4)	22.2 (2)	22.2 (2)	
By prisoners	55.6 (5)	33.3 (3)			11.1 (1)
<hr/>					
	Not At All (n)	A Little (n)	Somewhat (n)	A Lot (n)	
Extent bothered by					
Verbal propositions					
By male staff	22.2 (2)	44.4 (4)	33.3 (3)		
By prisoners	55.6 (5)	33.3 (3)		11.1 (1)	
Physical contact					
By male staff	22.2 (2)	33.3 (3)	11.1 (1)	33.3 (3)	
By prisoners	22.2 (2)	22.2 (2)		55.6 (5)	
Crude jokes					
By male staff	22.2 (2)	55.6 (5)	22.2 (2)		
By prisoners	22.2 (2)	33.3 (3)	22.2 (2)	22.2 (2)	
Effectiveness of the organization in dealing with complaints of sexual harassment of females					
Against male staff	37.5 (3)		37.5 (3)	25.0 (2)	
Against prisoners	25.0 (2)	12.5 (1)	12.5 (1)	50.0 (4)	

Table 27

**Ratings of the Effectiveness
Of Training Programs in Specific Areas
In Percentages**

	Not At All (n)	A Little (n)	Somewhat (n)	Very (n)
Self-defense				
Females		44.4 (4)	44.4 (4)	11.1 (1)
Males	9.6 (5)	30.8 (16)	32.7 (17)	26.9 (14)
Riot control				
Females	11.1 (1)	44.4 (4)	33.3 (3)	11.1 (1)
Males	9.6 (5)	23.1 (12)	34.6 (18)	32.7 (17)
First aid				
Females		33.3 (3)	44.4 (4)	22.2 (2)
Males	27.5 (14)	23.5 (12)	35.3 (18)	13.7 (7)
Crisis intervention				
Females	11.1 (1)	22.2 (2)	66.7 (6)	
Males	21.2 (11)	32.7 (17)	34.6 (18)	11.5 (6)
Counselling				
Females	22.2 (2)	11.1 (1)	66.7 (6)	
Males	25.5 (13)	31.4 (16)	33.3 (17)	9.8 (5)
Standard operating procedures				
Females		11.1 (1)	77.8 (7)	11.1 (1)
Males	7.7 (4)	19.2 (10)	51.9 (27)	21.2 (11)

Table 28

**Perceptions of Increased Effectiveness for Women
If Training Programs Were Taught by Women
Rated by Female Officers in Percentages**

	Not At All (n)	A Little (n)	Somewhat (n)	Very (n)
Self-defense	55.6 (5)	22.2 (2)	22.2 (2)	
Riot control	66.7 (6)	11.1 (1)	22.2 (2)	
First aid	66.7 (6)	22.2 (2)	11.1 (1)	
Crisis intervention	55.6 (5)	11.1 (1)	33.3 (3)	
Counselling	44.4 (4)	22.2 (2)	22.2 (2)	11.1 (1)
Standard operating procedures	66.7 (6)	11.1 (1)	22.2 (2)	

Table 29

**Ratings of the Amount of Correctional
Officer Input Sought for the Training Program
In Percentages**

	Not At All (n)	A Little (n)	Somewhat (n)	Very (n)
Extent ideas asked for regarding training programs and their content				
Females	33.3 (3)	22.2 (2)	44.4 (4)	
Males	36.5 (19)	26.9 (14)	30.8 (16)	5.8 (3)

Table 30

**Ratings of Job Satisfaction
With Respect to Women Officers
In Percentages**

	Dislike It (n)	Not Sure (n)	Like It (n)	
Initial expectations about working as a female officer				
Females		22.2 (2)	77.7 (7)	
Initial expectations about working with female officers				
Males	26.9 (14)	40.4 (21)	32.7 (17)	
Current feelings about working as a female officer				
Females			100.0 (9)	
Current feelings about working with female officers				
Males	19.2 (10)	15.4 (8)	65.4 (34)	
	No Problems (n)	Few Problems (n)	Some Problems (n)	Many Problems (n)
Initial expectations				
Females	11.1 (1)	11.1 (1)	77.8 (7)	
Males	17.6 (9)	31.4 (16)	45.1 (23)	5.9 (3)
Supervisors	14.3 (1)	42.9 (3)	42.9 (3)	
Currently				
Females	22.2 (2)	77.8 (7)		
Males	30.8 (16)	46.2 (24)	19.2 (10)	
Supervisors	28.6 (2)	57.1 (4)	14.3 (1)	

Table 31

**Ratings for the Opportunities
For Promotion in Percentages**

	Poor (n)	Fair (n)	Good (n)	Very Good (n)	Excellent (n)
Female promotions					
Females	22.2 (2)	11.1 (1)	22.2 (2)	33.3 (3)	11.1 (1)
Males	19.2 (10)	28.8 (15)	32.7 (17)	13.5 (7)	5.8 (3)
Supervisors	14.3 (1)	28.6 (2)	14.3 (1)	28.6 (2)	14.3 (1)
Male promotions					
Females		22.2 (2)	11.1 (1)	55.6 (5)	11.1 (1)
Males	1.9 (1)	21.2 (11)	26.9 (14)	28.8 (15)	21.2 (11)
Supervisors			57.1 (4)	14.3 (1)	28.6 (2)

Table 32

**Ratings of the Degree of Comfort
Felt Depending on the Gender of the
Supervisor in Percentages**

	Very Uncomfortable			Very Comfortable	
	1	2	3	4	5
Supervised by a female					
Females				22.2 (2)	77.8 (7)
Males	13.7 (7)	9.8 (5)	21.6 (11)	23.6 (12)	31.4 (16)
Supervisors	14.3 (1)	14.3 (1)	14.3 (1)	28.6 (2)	28.6 (2)
Supervised by a male					
Females				22.2 (2)	77.8 (7)
Males	3.9 (2)	2.0 (1)	11.8 (6)	21.6 (11)	60.8 (31)
Supervisors				28.6 (2)	71.4 (5)

Table 33

**Reasons Females Might Not Apply
For Promotions as Rated by Females
In Percentages**

	Not at All (n)	A Little (n)	Somewhat (n)	A Lot (n)
Believe women are discriminated against in promotions	66.7 (6)	11.1 (1)	22.2 (2)	
Believe men do not like to be supervised by a woman	33.3 (3)	11.1 (1)	44.4 (4)	11.1 (1)
Believe it is not worth the stress	66.7 (6)	33.3 (3)		

REFERENCES

- AA is serious business. Let's Talk, June 15, 1985, p. 1.
- Abbott, J. Correction's women. Prison Journal, December, 1984, pp. 57-58.
- Affirmative Action in the Ontario Public Service 1983/84.
Ontario. Women's Directorate.
- Andersen, L. A survey of female and male correctional officers attitudes at the Central Detention Facility Washington, D.C., Washington, D.C.: D.C. Dept. of Corrections, 1978.
- Bergen, D.R. Women managers in corrections. The Prison Journal, 1984, 64(1), 110-119.
- Bowersox, M.S. Women in corrections: Competence, competition, and the social responsibility norm. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 1981, 8(4), 491-499.
- Boulet, J. and Lavallée, L. The changing economic status of women. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada, 1984.
- Breed, A.F. Women in correctional employment. American Correctional Association Monographs, 1981, 1(1), 37-44.
- Bronskill, A. Female correctional officers in the Ministry of Correctional Services. Unpublished paper, Affirmative Action Programme, Ontario, 1980.
- Canadian Human Rights Commission. Special employment program to integrate women into the correction officer occupational group (CX-COF and CX-LUF) in male penitentiaries. Ottawa: Correctional Service Canada, 1981.
- Cardozo-Freeman, I. The joint: Language and culture in a maximum security prison. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1984.
- Caron, G.A. Female correctional officers in adult male correctional institutions. Unpublished professional project, Human Resource Management, St. Lawrence College, 1981.
- Carson, J. (Chairman). Report of the advisory committee to the Solicitor General of Canada on the management of correctional institutions. Ottawa: Solicitor General Canada, 1984.

- Chapman, J.R., Minor, E.K., Rieker, P., Mills, T.L. and Bottum, M. Women employed in corrections. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, 1983.
- Conway, P.J. Inmate Privacy. Justice Report, 1984, 1(1), 3.
- The Correctional Investigator. Annual report of the Correctional Investigator. 1981-1982. Ottawa: Solicitor General of Canada, 1983.
- Correctional Service Canada: Women to preempt staffing. Bulletin of the Canadian Association for the Prevention of Crime. May, 1982, p.11.
- Côté, J.E., McCarthy, L. and Lavoie, J. A study of the existing sex restrictions in the correctional group CX (COF-LUF-STI). Ottawa: Public Service Commission, 1977.
- Crouch, B.M. Pandora's box: Women guards in men's prison. Journal of Criminal Justice, 1985, 13(6), 535-548.
- Crouch, B.M. and Alpert, G.P. Sex and occupational socialization among prison guards: A longitudinal study. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 1982, 9 (2), 159-176.
- Equal is as equal does. Liaison, April, 1979, pp. 6-10.
- Feinman, C. Women in the criminal justice system (2nd ed.). New York: Praeger, 1986.
- Female CXs on increase. Let's Talk, January 30, 1984, p. 5.
- Flynn, E.E. Women as criminal justice professionals: A challenge to change tradition. In N.H. Rafter and E.A. Stanko (Eds.), Judge Lawyer Victim Thief. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1982.
- Foster, W.F. (Chairman). Report to Branch Management submitted by Integration of Posts Committee. British Columbia: Ministry of Attorney General, 1985.
- Fox, J.G. Organizational and racial conflict in maximum-security prisons. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1982.
- Freedman, E.B. Their sisters' keepers: An historical perspective on female correctional institutions in the United States: 1870-1900. Feminist Studies, 1974, 2(1), 77-95.

- Goffman, E. Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates. New York: Anchor Books, 1961.
- Haney, C., Banks, C. and Zimbardo, P. Interpersonal dynamics in a simulated prison. In R.R. Ross (Ed.), Prison guard/correctional officer: The use and abuse of the human resources of prisons. Toronto: Butterworths, 1981.
- Harm, N.J. Female employees in male institutions. American Correctional Association Monographs. 1981, pp. 269-274.
- Hart, M. Breaking into Kingston Pen. The Financial Post Magazine, June 1, 1985, pp. 20-27.
- Hashamoto, A. Women in corrections. Unpublished professional project, Pacific Region, Correctional Service of Canada, 1986.
- Herrington, B.S. Women guards: Oedipal threat to men? Psychiatric News, March 19, 1976, pp. 1; 12-13.
- Holeman, H. and Krepps-Hess, B.J. Women correctional officers in the California Department of Corrections. Sacramento, California: California Department of Corrections, 1983.
- Holland, T.R., Levi, M., Beckett, G.E., and Holt, N. Preferences of prison inmates for male versus female institutional personnel. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1979, 64(5), 564-568.
- Holt, L.K. Patterns of career mobility and retention among correction officers of the Massachusetts Department of Correction. Massachusetts: Massachusetts Department of Correction, 1981.
- Ingram, G.L. The role of women in male federal correctional institutions. American Correctional Association Monographs. 1981, pp. 275-281.
- Inwald, R.E. and Shusman, E.J. Personality and performance sex differences of law enforcement officer recruit. Journal of Police Science and Administration, 1984, 12(3), 339-347.
- Jacobs, J.B. and Kraft, L. Integrating the keepers: A comparison of black and white prison guards in Illinois. Social Problems, 1978, 25, 304-318.
- Jurik, N.C. Individual and organizational determinants of correctional officer attitudes toward inmates. Criminology, 1985, 23(3), 523-539 (a).

- Jurik, N.C. An officer and a lady: Organizational barriers to women working as correctional officers in men's prisons. Social Problems, 1985, 32(4), 375-388 (b).
- Jurik, N.C. and Halemba, G.J. Gender, working conditions and the job satisfaction of women in a non-traditional occupation: Female correctional officers in men's prisons. The Sociological Quarterly, 1984, 25, 551-556.
- Kane, T.R. and Vanyur, J.M. Geographic mobility and promotions: Female versus male FPS staff. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice Federal Bureau of Prisons, undated.
- Kinsell, L.W. and Sheldon, R.G. A survey of correctional officers at a medium security prison. Corrections Today, January/February 1981, pp. 40-51.
- Kirkpatrick, A.M. Female guards and inmate privacy. Bulletin of the Canadian Association for the Prevention of Crime, April 1984, pp. 3-4.
- Kissel, P.J. and Katsampes, P. The impact of women corrections officers on the functioning of institutions housing male inmates. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 1980, 4(3), 213-231.
- Kissel, P.J. and Seidel, J. The management and impact of female corrections officers at jail facilities housing male inmates. National Institute of Corrections, 1980.
- Leon, J.S. The development of Canadian juvenile justice: A background for reform. Osgoode Hall Law Journal, 1977, 15(1), 71-106.
- Linden, R. Attrition among male and female members of the RCMP. Canadian Police College Journal, 1985, 9(1), 86-97.
- Lombardo, L.X. Guards imprisoned: Correctional officers at work. New York: Elsevier North Holland, Inc., 1981.
- MacGuigan, M. (Chairman). The sub-committee on the penitentiary system in Canada: Report to parliament. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1977.
- Morrison, T.R. 'Their proper sphere' feminism, the family, and child-centered social reform in Ontario, 1875-1900. Ontario History, 1976, 67, 45-64.
- Nicholson, R. Women's function in N.S.W. male prisons. In S.E. Hatty, Women in the prison system, Canberra, A.C.T.: Australian Institute of Criminology, 1984.

- Owen, B.A. Race and gender relations among prison workers. Crime and Delinquency, 1985, 31(1), 147-159.
- Petersen, C. Doing time with the boys: An analysis of women correctional officers in all-male facilities. In B.R. Price and N.J. Sokoloff (Eds.), The criminal justice system and women: Women offenders, victims, workers. New York: Clark Boardman Co. Ltd., 1982.
- Platt, A.M. The child savers: The invention of delinquency (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977.
- Plecas, D. and Maxim, P. CSC correctional officer development study: A nine-month follow-up survey of 1984 CSC recruits. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada, 1985.
- Policy on the assignment of male and female correctional officers. Correctional Update. March/April 1984, p. 7.
- Pollock, J.M. Sex and supervision: Guarding male and female inmates. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1986.
- Potter, J. Should women guards work in prisons for men? Corrections Magazine, October 1980, pp. 30-38.
- Prison grounds growing high. The Victoria Times Colonist, August 1, 1985, p. A1.
- Proudfoot, P.M. (Chairman). Report of the British Columbia Royal Commission on the incarceration of female offenders. Victoria: Ministry of the Attorney General, 1978.
- Radley, P.A. A comparison study of the impact of affirmative action programmes on the employment of women correctional officers in the Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services and U.S. State Departments of Corrections. Master of Arts thesis, Centre of Criminology, University of Toronto, 1982.
- Sakowski, M.H. Women guards in Canada: A study of the first women to work in a federal penitentiary for male offenders. Resources for Feminist Research/Documentation, 1985/86, 13(4), 52-53.
- Schuerger, J.M., Kochevar, K.F., and Reinwald, J.E. Male and female corrections officers: Personality and rated performance. Psychological Reports, 1982, 51, 223-228.
- The service's women officers are doing o.k. Let's Talk, Vol. 6(5), 1981, p. 7.

- Sexual assault of guard nets 9 months. The Vancouver Sun, August 15, 1985, p. A15.
- Simpson, S. and White, M.F. The female guard in the all-male prison. In I.L. Moyer (Ed.) The changing roles of women in the criminal justice system: Offenders, victims and professionals, Illinois: Waveland Press, 1985.
- Shoom, S. The upper Canada reformatory, Penetanguishene: The dawn of prison reform in Canada. Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 1972, 14, 260-267.
- Soutar, G.N. and Williams, T.A. Prison officers' work attitudes: The influence of background and work experience. The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 1985, 18(1), 17-24.
- Strange, C. "The criminal and fallen of their sex": The establishment of Canada's first women's prison 1874-1901. Canadian Journal of Women and the Law, 1985, 1(1), 79-92.
- Sykes, G.M. The society of captives. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1958.
- Wahler, C. and Gendreau, P. Assessing correctional officers. Federal Probation, 1985, 49(1), 70-74.
- Women in CSC: An active presence. Let's Talk, May 30, 1983, p. 2.
- Women in corrections. Liaison, November 1985, pp. 9-12.
- Women prison guards in all-male institutions. Let's Talk, September 30, 1980, pp. 1; 3.
- Women's Advisory Committee. Recommendations resulting from the pilot project: Staff exchange programme for correctional officers at Vanier Centre for Women and Brampton Adult Training Centre. Ontario: Ministry of Correctional Services, 1978.
- Zimmer, L.E. Female guards in men's prisons: Creating a role for themselves. Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1982.

Zupan, L.L. Gender-related differences in correctional officers' perceptions and attitudes. Unpublished paper, Dept. of Political Science, Washington State University, undated.