


2009

Careers in Corrections: Perceptions from the Inside

Kelsey A. Kanoff

Rhode Island College, kkanoff_5462@ric.edu

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.ric.edu/honors_projects

 Part of the [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), [Inequality and Stratification Commons](#), [Law and Gender Commons](#), [Law Enforcement and Corrections Commons](#), [Organizational Behavior and Theory Commons](#), [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology and Interaction Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kanoff, Kelsey A., "Careers in Corrections: Perceptions from the Inside" (2009). *Honors Projects Overview*. 20.
http://digitalcommons.ric.edu/honors_projects/20

This Honors is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors Projects at Digital Commons @ RIC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Projects Overview by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ RIC. For more information, please contact kayton@ric.edu.

CAREERS IN CORRECTIONS:

PERCEPTIONS FROM THE INSIDE

By

Kelsey A. Kanoff

An Honors Project Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for Honors

In

The Sociology Department

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences

Rhode Island College

2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....4

INTRODUCTION.....4

LITERATURE REVIEW.....6

METHODS.....14

RESULTS.....19

DISCUSSION.....39

CONCLUSION.....42

LIMITATIONS.....45

FUTURE RESEARCH.....46

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....48

APPENDIX A.....50

APPENDIX B.....51

APPENDIX C.....53

APPENDIX D.....57

CAREERS IN CORRECTIONS: PERCEPTIONS FROM THE INSIDE

Kelsey Kanoff
Department of Sociology
Rhode Island College

ABSTRACT

This research provides a unique insight into correctional officers and their work. It examines their perceptions on recruitment, retention, and promotion processes within the Rhode Island Department of Corrections. In this systematic random sample of $n = 45$, I examine the extent to which gender, and to a lesser degree race, impact officers at all three stages of their career. I find that although male and female correctional officers hold similar views on issues that can affect recruitment, retention, and promotion, answers vary from sexual harassment, credibility in the promotional process, and coworker support. White male officers have higher levels of job satisfaction and tend to agree with current promotion practices more than women and officers of color. Female officers are more likely to report sexual harassment, and officers of color and women tend to recognize the importance of coworker support on and off the job. Although much progress has been made toward diversity and equity, this study shows that female officers and officers of color still face barriers that are linked to this historically white male field of law enforcement.

INTRODUCTION

This study examines perceptions around barriers to recruitment, retention, and promotion from a representative sample of both male and female correctional officers at the Adult Correctional Institution (ACI) in Cranston, Rhode Island. I focus on three hypotheses: 1) Perceptions around current recruitment practices differ by gender and race.¹ 2) Sexual harassment disproportionately affects women officers, which can affect perceptions on recruitment, retention, and promotion practices. 3) Male correctional

¹ Although these hypotheses target differences in perceptions by race, the sample of non-white officers ($n=12$) proved to be too small to be conclusive in quantitative analyses. Future research should focus on oversampling for nonwhite officers to properly analyze for such differences. Due to a lack of easily accessible demographic information in constructing the sample, racial differences found in the data are largely anecdotal and appear in the qualitative section of this report.

officers are more likely to have positive mentoring and coworker support that enhances job satisfaction and aids in retention.

Prior research on these issues shows the extreme under- representation of women in law enforcement agencies, especially in high-ranking positions. For this reason, women officers were oversampled for this study. For example, of the 200 Rhode Island State Troopers currently serving, less than 13% are female, with only two women successfully completing the last training academy, and only one black female officer who currently serves on the force. In the R.I. Department of Corrections, most women serve as line officers without rank. The National Center for Women in Policing (2001; 2002) acknowledges that progress is slow at best and “equality denied” at its worse. These claims are based on the following data:

- 1) Women currently comprise only 12.7% of all sworn law enforcement positions among large municipal, county, and state law enforcement agencies in the U.S. with 100 or more sworn officers. Women of color hold only 4.8% of these positions (Lonsway, 2002).
- 2) Given that women account for 46.5% of the adult labor force (Bureau of Labor Statistics 2000), the representation of women in large police and correctional agencies remains underrepresented.
- 3) Current evidence suggests that the slow 4% growth from 1990 to 2001 of women in law enforcement has now stalled or even reversed.
- 4) Within the large police agencies, sworn women currently hold only 7.3% of Top Command positions; 9.6% of Supervisory positions, and 13.5% of Line Operation positions. Sworn women of color hold 1.6% of Top Command positions; 3.1% of Supervisory positions, and 5.3% of Line Operations positions.

With the data gained from the respondents in this study (n = 23 male and n = 22 female), the goal is to determine if some of these national trends are present among this sample of correctional officers in Rhode Island. If yes, this information may aid in improving the recruitment, retention, and promotion rates of female and minority officers while also contributing to the rather small body of law enforcement literature on the subject to date.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Women in law enforcement, including corrections, have been historically underrepresented in these fields, which have long been considered male-dominated professions (Greene, 2000). However, women have increased their representation in law enforcement to 13% in 2000 from 2% in 1972. As of 2000, approximately 2% of these women nationally identified themselves as black (Greene, 2000). One of the reasons for such limited female employment and underrepresentation of persons of color is that the career is often associated with an aggressive and authoritarian image that is male and white. This may discourage women from entering the profession (Lonsway, 2001). Until recently the role of women in policing and corrections was restricted to assignments in social welfare (juvenile and family problems); matron; detection of shoplifters; sexual assault investigators; clerks, and guarding only female inmates. (Kakar, 2002). There are many theories that incorporate the issue of low representation, including those that examine the prevalence of sexual harassment. They tend to focus on three areas: 1) the notion that women may be physically or mentally unable to handle the job; 2) gender discrimination at an institutional level; and 3) job-related stress that causes women to drop out and seek an alternate career path (Kakar, 2002). In my study, I find combinations of all three of these reasons but in varying degrees. For example, there are studies that show a correlation between being a female in a male-dominated profession and levels of sexual harassment. “Doing gender is always relevant to social interaction. All members of society do gender... Historically, work has been defined by gender” (Garcia, 2003). My findings indicate that sexual harassment is still an issue, predominantly perceived as a barrier for female correctional officers.

Work settings that have a higher ratio of men to women and are considered predominately male occupations and are staffed by male supervisors may have higher tolerance for sexual harassment. Examples of these work environments include military service, law enforcement, firefighting, and construction. These occupations place a value on characteristics such as power, toughness, dominance, aggressiveness, and competitiveness. Women may be seen as disrupting this culture of masculinity (Vogt, Bruce, Street, & Stafford, 2003). Even for women in the general workforce, research indicates that “almost half of all women experience sexual harassment at some point during their careers” (Vogt, Bruce, Street, & Stafford, 2003). In the 1970s, policewomen were told that because they were one of only a few women among a group of men, they may be “pinched, patted, or played with. At the turn of the 20th century, women were concerned jail “matrons” and wore skirts, as did female police officers who were also given a handbag to carry their gun in (Rathbone, 2001). They were told they should not wear excessive makeup, suggestive clothing, or use abrasive language.” In short, they should not act or appear like men; yet, at the same time, they were told that maintaining their femininity would help them gain respect in their department. With such conflicting roles, it was clear that women were not accepted as equals in policing or corrections, and if hired, held unequal positions while having to portray both masculine and feminine traits simultaneously. They “allowed” themselves to be sexually harassed to attempt to fit in (Garcia, 2003). Some early studies indicate that this harassment and resistance to women in law enforcement stem from male officers who fear that women might violate departmental secrets about corruption and violence because they were outside the “old

boy” inner circle (Kakar, 2002). Bostock and Daley (2007) identify five categories of sexual harassment:

- (1) Crude/Offensive Behavior (e.g., unwanted sexual jokes, stories, whistling, staring);
- (2) Sexist Behavior (e.g., insulting, offensive and condescending attitudes based on the gender of the person);
- (3) Unwanted Sexual Attention (e.g., unwanted touching, fondling; asking for dates even though rebuffed);
- (4) Sexual Coercion (e.g., classic *quid pro quo* instances of job benefits or losses conditioned on sexual cooperation); and
- (5) Sexual Assault (e.g., unsuccessful attempts at and having sex without the respondent’s consent and against his or her will).

When participants in their study were asked about these categories, 69% to 97% of the respondents were not aware that they had actually experienced sexual harassment.

Instead, these elements were often thought of as part of a social bonding process where sexual comments and innuendos that are exchanged between male and female officers are thought to promote social cohesion and camaraderie.

Several negative work outcomes as a result of sexual harassment include decreased morale and job satisfaction, a decline in relationships with coworkers, and finally increased absenteeism and job loss. Negative mental health effects that may result from the stress of sexual harassment include depression, anxiety, substance abuse, as well as physical problems (Vogt, Bruce, Street, & Stafford, 2003, Griffin, 2006).

It is unfortunate that sexual harassment is still a major issue in the workforce but maybe even more so that it is still underreported. Slonaker, Wendt, & Kemper report that there are three explanations for the lack of female officers reporting sexual harassment. First, women become embarrassed and may feel that they have somehow contributed to the treatment. Second, they are concerned that the allegations will result in to their word against the harasser’s word. Lastly, they are concerned about committing “professional

suicide” (Slonaker et al, 2001). In addition, sexual harassment cases that are in fact reported can become extremely costly for the agency or department. In a ten year period, the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department incurred nearly \$19 million in costs defending a single sexual harassment suit brought about by a female officer who had been overlooked for a promotion (Slonaker, Wendt, & Kemper, 2001). Garcia (2003) states that

According to socialist feminism, all human adults are capable of virtually all types of labor. Both sexes can perform the labors required for basic subsistence, sexual satisfaction, and emotional nurturance...Socialist feminism focuses on the social construction of masculine and feminine character types. Because these characteristics are the result of social practices, particularly procreative practices that are not determined by biology, they are transformable (2003).

Yet there are still gender-based stereotypes prevalent in the workforce; especially in male-dominated work settings. Stereotypes may be applied such that the mistake of one female officer becomes exaggerated and associated with all female officers and even basic equipment is not offered in female sizes (including maternity wear) and sexual harassment policies and maternity leave are not taken into consideration (Seklecki & Paynick, 2007). Garcia (2003) finds that women were seen as “emotional and thus irrational, compassionate, cooperative, physically fragile, subjective, gentle, and morally superior. Women do not possess the necessary masculine traits of rationality, aggressiveness, bravery, objectivity, suspicion, and brutality required of good cops to fight crime and apprehend the enemy.” Garcia also mentions that previous studies show that only about 1% of police work is too physically demanding for women, while other studies could not show that physical strength was related to the ability of women to handle dangerous situations. When looking at how higher-ranking female officers perceived their abilities, Schulz cites a study by Wexler & Quinn in her 2003 article that

found women judged themselves less competent than men in the areas of supervising difficult colleagues or those with more street experience than themselves. This was thought to be because the women tended to be newer to patrol so their lack of experience, fewer opportunities to act as leaders, and unsupportive responses from coworkers led to a lack of confidence and lower self esteem. It was also found that the longer women had been police officers, the less likely that would consider advancement as their motive to stay on the force.

However, female officers have been shown to bring important, perhaps gender-specific, traits to policing and corrections.

Female officer generally avoid escalation to the use of violence in police-citizen encounters or inmate-officer encounters, and they seem better prepared to mediate disputes and less likely to arrest or file a complaint than male officers—a desirable trait for officers engaged in keeping the peace on a cell block or in neighborhood policing where proactive and interactive styles of control and oversight are preferred over a reactive, punitive approach. It has been argued that women bring an “ethic care” to law enforcement. This ethnic translates into women’s possessing greater communication skills and more calming demeanors, which means they are empathetic with and better equipped to interact with inmates and citizens. Consequently, the continued underrepresentation of women in law enforcement is contributing to and exacerbating law enforcement’s excessive force problems (Kakar, 2002).

Another desirable trait that can be found in female officers, according to Karkar (2002), is that of taking violence more seriously than male officers, particularly with domestic disputes. Women officers are also less likely to be named in a complaint while on the job, and any allegations against female officers who use excessive force is minimal when compared to allegations of male excessive force (Lonsway, 2001). Miller (1998) cites in her article that the male justice model is often seen as proportionate punishment; as a deterrent and retributive punishment while the female justice model focuses on treatment, rehabilitation, reformation, and reintegration. “Men prioritize

individual rights, autonomy, and impartiality, whereas women reject male values of objectivity and detachment and instead honor and emphasize care, responsibility, and affective connections” (Miller, 1998). The National Center for Women & Policing believes that an increase in the recruitment of female officers will disrupt this stereotype of violence prevalent at the national level (Garcia, 2003). Although studies show that women are equally as capable of law enforcement work as men, bias in hiring, selection practices, and recruitment policies keep the numbers in of women in law enforcement disproportionately low (Kakar, 2002).

A study by Galinsky in 1993 shows that in general, 27% of Americans believe that they have experienced some type of discrimination while at work and 15% feel that the discrimination occurred at the job they currently hold (Slonaker, Wendt, & Kemper, 2001). Specifically for officers, their research showed that 34% of male officers who file discrimination claims used race as their rationale while 65% of female officers used sex as their basis for the complaint. However, 28% of the claims in general were filed by women and men of color filed 72% of all complaints. Since nationally the police force consists of between 10% and 14% women, women are filing claims 2 to 3 times more than would be expected (Slonaker et al, 2001). When looking at the frequency of discrimination allegations, 29% come from not being hired, 24% come from discipline, and 22% come from being terminated. When looking at the frequency of the sources of discrimination, 41% of the claims were about a supervisor and 19% were about departmental policy. Overall, approximately only 10% of officers who believe they are experiencing discrimination will take action (Slonaker, Wendt, & Kemper, 2001).

Discrimination in the workplace can be costly to the department in several ways. First, the initial expense to properly train a new recruit is high. The initial cost to recruit one officer can reach \$3,500 with physical/psychological testing and investigation into their background. Once the applicant completes the training academy, an additional \$15,000 to \$25,000 may have been spent by the department per recruit. From the first time that an applicant or employee feels that they are experiencing discrimination, the agency begins to lose that officer's loyalty and productivity decreases. The pattern is the same: The officer will no longer feel they need to do well on the job, and other officers may begin to wonder if they might experience discrimination next. This in turn decreases their productivity and affects morale. The end result of an accusation of discrimination is negative, for the department as well as the community, when allegations or lawsuits are brought to the courts (Slonaker, Wendt, & Kemper, 2001). The initial cost and effort of training a new recruit may be lost if an officer leaves the department due to experiencing discrimination. Second, discrimination lawsuits can be very costly for departments. In 2000, a suit was brought to a U.S. Court of Appeals in Chicago regarding allegations brought by an African American officer who had been denied "injured on duty" status as white officers had been allowed under similar circumstances (Slonaker, Wendt, & Kemper, 2001).

Several studies show that female correctional officers experience significantly more job-related stress than do men, but organizational support by correctional facilities for equal treatment policies could be a predictor of decreased stress levels. Yet it is the white male correctional officers who held a greater perception of organizational support for equal treatment policies than any other group. Among the factors that increase job-

related stress (significantly more for women than men) were poor supervisory practices and little trust in supervisors, poor coworker support, male resistance to female correctional officers, safety concerns/fear of victimization, work-home conflict (Griffin, 2006). Common causes of stress among all officers include the violent death of a partner, having to take a life in the line of duty, making violent arrests, attending gruesome crime scenes, problems with the administration, and work-family relationships (He, Zhao & Ren, 2005). Wells, Colbert, and Slate (2006) identify four causes of stress for criminal justice practitioners: internal to the organization, external to the organization, the job or task itself, or personal in nature. They also cite that organizational stress can be costly in both economic and human terms, citing long-term effects on employees, managers, significant others, and families. Stress can also lead to lost productivity in the workplace, absenteeism, turnover, and diminished health (Wells et al, 2006).

Internal stressors include the bureaucratic nature of agencies within the criminal justice system, frustration with promotional or reward systems, insufficient salaries, lack of opportunities, poor relationships with supervisors, role ambiguity, and feeling there is insufficient time to meet the demands of the job. External stressors include a judiciary system that is too lenient and lack of appreciation by the public and media while job task stressors include potential danger, excessive paperwork, and too few staff members. Finally, personal stressors include officers' relationships with other officers as well as non-officers and a lack of social support. Female officers often experience stress when they try to juggle their careers with their family (Wells, Colbert, & Slate, 2006). Some researchers argue that peer support is important to police officers because police officers' lives depend on one another in dangerous situations and police work-related stress may

only be comprehensible to other officers. A study by Haarr and Morash in 1999 showed that female officers tended to cope with stress by using escape and keeping written records (He, Zhao & Ren, 2005).

Cardiac disorders, cancer, shortened lifespan, diabetes, chronic fatigue, backaches, alcoholism, suicide, heart attacks, ulcers, and hypertension are just several of the physical and psychological symptoms of stress. Stress is costly to departments in the number of sick days used, long-term medical insurance, and high turnover rates (Wells, Colbert, & Slate, 2006). Anxiety (e.g., restlessness, nervousness, panic attacks) and depression (e.g., withdrawal of interest in activities, lack of motivation, and loss of energy) are also common consequences of stress (He, Zhao & Ren, 2005).

These prior studies are of key interest in my research, although many of the physical ailments brought about by discriminatory practices are not examined and are beyond the scope of this paper. What is relevant are the studies that show the relationships between gender and sexual harassment, and how these factors affect recruitment, retention and promotion. I focus on gender and education as significant independent variables in my analyses. My dependent variables are sexual harassment, perceptions on fairness in promotions, positive relationships with other officers, and how spending time with other officers outside of work mediates some of the negative outcomes females experience as correctional officers while on the job.

METHODS

Operationalization The sociological method used for this study is a semi-structured interview with a random sample of n = 45 correctional officers. The interviews were conducted one-on-one at the ACI and were completely anonymous and

confidential. No individual identifying characteristics, such as name, address, date of birth, or exact age, were recorded on the surveys. Interviews were conducted between September and December 2008. Each survey consisted of three sections: 29 Likert-scale survey questions, 11 open-ended questions, and 9 sociodemographic questions. In total there were 45 respondents (42 correctional officers and 3 deputy wardens).

Sample A systematic random sample was generated from two alphabetized lists of correctional officers; one list for male officers and one list for female officers. The list was retrieved by the Associate Director of Planning & Research at the ACI who facilitated this portion of the research design. For the initial sample, every 10th name was selected from the alphabetized male officer list (out of approximately 900 male officers, 82 officers were randomly chosen for inclusion in the sample). Every 3rd name was taken from the alphabetized female list (out of approximately 100 female officers, in which 34 officers were randomly selected for inclusion in the sample). All potential respondents were sent a letter of introduction via inter-office mail, although it was later found out that many officers did not receive the letters and had no idea that the research was being conducted or that they had been selected to be asked for an interview. Wardens and Deputy Wardens were also sent a letter of introduction via email by the Associate Director of Planning & Research (*see Appendix A*). Nevertheless, out of the initial sample, 23 male officers agreed to participate (one male a deputy warden) and 9 female officers agreed to participate. Due to the low response rate of female officers, a second female sample was generated by taking every 3rd name off of the alphabetized list starting with the second name on the list. This second collection generated another 13 female respondents for a total of 22 (two of these respondents were Deputy Wardens). Thus the

sample size was n=45. Internal Review Board approval was gained to use human subjects in this study (*see Appendix B*). Only two female officers declined to participate. This sample was unable to include officers who were selected who were out sick or out on disability, or were in the process of retiring. One participant selected for the sample died the week prior to interviewing her. Once contacted, participants were asked to sign an informed consent document which detailed the study and informed them of the measures that would be taken to protect the confidentiality of their answers and their identity (*see Appendix C*). Officers from seven of the ACI's eight facilities were interviewed including the Intake Service Center, men's Minimum Security, John J. Moran Medium Security, Donald Price Medium Security, Maximum Security, High Security Center, and women's Gloria McDonald Awaiting Trial and Medium Security facility. Women's Dorothea Dix Minimum Security was excluded because, due to its work-release program, very few officers worked in the building and were not available for interviews.

Despite the systematic random sampling method, this design did have a substantial drawback. Officers of color needed to be oversampled but were not. One reason that this occurred was because the alphabetized lists of male and female officers used to select potential participants did not include this type of identifying information. The lists only contained names, sex, and the facility they worked in. Officer rank was also not included. Because it took over two months to obtain the lists from which to draw the sample from the Office of Research and Planning, no further action was requested for a more specialized list that might satisfy a measure for diversity. The lack of racial and ethnic variation in the sample is problematic, with only 12 officers out of n = 45 who

identified themselves as non-white. This under representation of officers of color resulted in insignificant findings in every statistical analysis designed to measure possible differences by race or ethnicity. However, interviews with these officers did provide some qualitative data that can be used as the basis for future research.

Hypotheses Three hypotheses developed for this study are: 1) Perceptions around current recruitment practices differ by gender and race. 2) Sexual harassment disproportionately affects women officers, which in turn negatively alters their perceptions on recruitment, retention, and promotion practices. 3) Male correctional officers are more likely to have positive mentoring and coworker support that enhance their job satisfaction and aids in retention. These three hypotheses have a basis in the literature that explores the role of male-female relationships in a specialized work setting that has been historically dominated by white males.

Variables The independent variables for this study include demographic information such as gender, age range, years in the agency, rank, level of education, race/ethnicity, marital status, significant other's work status, and number of children provided for. The dependent variables include 29 Likert-scale survey questions (strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree, and no opinion). These survey questions are largely based on relationships with coworkers (both male and female), mentors, and superiors as well as recruitment/promotion practices and family/career balance. The dependent variables also include qualitative responses to 11 open-ended interview questions that ask respondents to elaborate on specific topics including shifts, differences in policing styles (for gender and race), recruitment/retention/promotion, and retirement (See Appendix D for Survey Booklet).

Level of Measurement For the Likert-scale survey questions, strongly agree=4, agree=3, disagree=2, strongly disagree=1, and no opinion/no answer=0. Question 6b of the survey asks respondents to identify how they became aware of recruitment. For this question, family/relative=4, friend=3, fellow officer=2, poster/radio/newspaper/college paper/website/church bulletin=1, and other/no answer=0. The codes for the demographic questions are: gender (male=0, female=1); age (20-30=4, 31-40=3, 41-50=2, 51-65=1, and over 65=0); years on the job (raw number); rank (Deputy Warden= 1, CO=0); level of education (GED=0, high school diploma=1, some college=2, associates degree=3, bachelors degree=4, and graduate degree=5); race (white/Caucasian=3, black=2, Latino=1, and other=0); marital status (single=4, married=3, cohabitating=2, divorced=1, and widowed=0); the work status of significant other if married or cohabitating (full time=2, part time=1, not working/NA=0); and number of children provided for (raw number).

In order to run appropriate descriptive statistics and cross- tabulations, several variables were recoded. Years on the job has been recoded into 1-5 years=0; 6-10 years=1; 11-15 years=2; 16-20 years=3; 21-25 years=4; and 26-30 years=5 (instead of raw numbers with a large range). Race has been recoded into white=1 and non-white=0. Finally, marital status has been recoded into partner=1 and single=0.

Thin cells have been created due to a small sample size and limited racial diversity in the sample. Race has not been found to be a significant predictor of perceptions around recruitment, sexual harassment, and mentoring practices. Dependent variables relating to the three hypotheses of this study have been dichotomized as strongly agree/agree=2, strongly disagree/disagree=1, and no opinion/no answer=0. An

index has been created that incorporates questions in the survey that pertain to relationships between correctional officers and their peers and supervisors. The survey questions that comprise the index are 1, 2, 3, 4, 9, 16, 24, and 25. A second index was created to incorporate the survey questions that pertained to job satisfaction. The job satisfaction index includes survey questions 1, 5, 8, 11, 14, 24, 25, and 29. Other dependent variables for regression analysis include: perception of female recruitment; perception of sexual harassment; method of recruitment; rapport with supervisors; and perception of system fairness. The independent variables used for regression analysis include: gender; level of education; number of years on the job; and marital status.

Data has been entered into excel spreadsheets and will also be converted into SPSS and STATA spreadsheets. These programs will be used to run basic descriptive statistics, frequencies, cross-tabulations, ANOVA, and regression analysis. To complement quantitative findings, qualitative open-ended questions were coded by gender and race.

RESULTS

This section describes qualitative and quantitative results from the Likert-scale survey questions and open-ended interview questions. Quantitative results demonstrate subtle but important gender differences that affect recruitment, retention, and promotion. Because the sample size is relatively small, I show both substantive ($p < .10$) and significant results ($p < .05$). The qualitative findings reaffirm the statistical results and provide anecdotal information through participants' perceptions on recruitment, retention, and promotion. Anecdotal race based information provided in this section is limited, and

a future study with a larger sample of officers of color would need to be conducted to determine if any of these trends are significant.

Table 1 SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

Descriptive Statistics	White n=33 (73.3%)		Non-White n=12 (26.7%)	
	Male 19 (57.6%)	Female 14 (42.4%)	Male 4 (33.3%)	Female 8 (66.7%)
Age				
20-30 yrs	10.5%	7.1%	0.0%	25.0%
31-40 yrs	26.3%	50.0%	50.0%	62.5%
41-50 yrs	57.9%	35.7%	0.0%	12.5%
51-65 yrs	5.3%	7.1%	50.0%	0.0%
Years on the Job				
1-5 yrs	15.8%	28.6%	0.0%	62.5%
6-10 yrs	15.8%	35.7%	50.0%	25.0%
11-15 yrs	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	12.5%
16-20 yrs	52.6%	21.4%	25.0%	0.0%
21-25 yrs	10.5%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
26-30 yrs	5.3%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Rank				
Seniority	5.3%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
CO	94.7%	85.7%	100.0%	100.0%
Education				
High School	5.3%	14.3%	25.0%	12.5%
Some College	10.5%	35.7%	25.0%	37.5%
Associates Degree	57.9%	28.6%	25.0%	25.0%
Bachelor's Degree	26.3%	7.1%	25.0%	25.0%
Graduate Degree	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Marital Status				
Single	21.1%	50.0%	25.0%	37.5%
Partner	78.9%	50.0%	75.0%	62.5%
Partner Job Status				
Yes, full time	42.1%	50.0%	25.0%	62.5%
Yes, part time	31.6%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%
No/NA	26.3%	50.0%	50.0%	37.5%
Number of Children				
0	42.1%	57.1%	25.0%	37.5%
1	15.8%	14.3%	0.0%	25.0%
2	31.6%	14.3%	25.0%	12.5%
3	10.5%	7.1%	25.0%	0.0%
4	0.0%	7.1%	25.0%	25.0%

Table 1 displays the sociodemographic characteristics of the correctional officers comprising the sample of this study. White officers make up 73.3% (n=33) of the sample, and non-white officers make up 26.7% (n=12). Among white officers, 57.6% (n=19) are male and 42.4% (n=14) are female. Among non-white officers, 33.3% (n=4) are male and 66.7% (n=8) are female. The majority of white male officers are between 41 and 50 years old (57.9%); half of non-white males are between 31 and 40 years old, with the next largest age category being 41-50 (35.7%); 50% of white females are between 31 and 40 years old, while the other 50% are 51-65; the majority of non-white female officers are between 31 and 40 years old (62.5%). The majority of white males had been on the job for 16-20 years (52.6%) while white female officers had less years on the job with 28.6% being on the job for 1-5 years and 35.7% being on the job for 6-10 years. Fifty percent of non-white males have been on the job for 6-10 years with the other 50% having been on the job for 16-25 years. The majority of non-white female officers have been on the job for 1-5 years (62.5%). Only three officers in the sample hold a senior rank (Deputy Warden), with two of these senior officers being female. The majority of white men have an Associate's Degree (57.9%) with the white female officers being slightly less educated (35.7% have some college and 28.6% have an Associate's Degree). There is more variation in the educational level of non-white officers. A quarter of non-white male officers have either a high school degree, a quarter has some college experience, a quarter has an Associate's Degree, and a quarter has a Bachelor's Degree. For non-white female officers 37.5% have some college, a quarter have an Associate's Degree, and a quarter have a Bachelor's Degree. The majority of white men (78.9%) have a partner (i.e. married or cohabitating) while 50% of white female officers have a

partner. A majority of non-white male officers also have a partner (75%) and 62.5% of non-white female officers have a partner. For the majority of white men and non-white women, there is a second income in the household (73.7% and 62.5% respectively). Fifty percent of white women and non-white men have a second income in their household. The largest percentages for the number of children that white male officers have can be seen in 0 children (42.1%) and 2 children (31.6%). The majority of white female officers have 0 children (57.1%) which may speak to the fact that corrections is not an easy career for women to hold if they have children at home to care for. Each quarter of the non-white male sample has 0, 1, 2, or 4 children. The largest percentage of number of children for non-white female officer is 0 (37.5%), which may also contribute to the idea that corrections is a difficult job for mothers.

RECRUITMENT

Table 2 displays a frequency table shows that 71% of the sampled correctional officers became aware of a job opening in corrections through either a family member or a friend. Although this type of coworker support is a predictor for job satisfaction, it is also potentially problematic. White officers tend to associate themselves with other white officers, which can impact candidates of diverse backgrounds from being recruited and applying for the job. In general, it is safe to say that a diverse staff will continue to be limited if this dominant recruitment practice prevails.

Table 2 RESPONSES TO “HOW DID YOU BECOME AWARE OF A JOB IN CORRECTIONS?”

<i>Method of Awareness</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Family	14	31.11
Friend	18	40.00
Other Correctional Officer	2	4.44
Advertisement	9	20.00
Other	2	4.44
Total	45	100

Table 2 demonstrates the proportions of correctional officers that were recruited by a family member, a friend, a fellow officer, an advertisement, or another form of recruitment. Over 70% of respondents (male and female) answered that they had either been recruited by a family member or a friend.

Table 3 UNSTANDARDIZED BIVARIATE REGRESSION COEFFICIENT FOR THE EFFECT OF GENDER ON RECRUITMENT METHODS

Variable	b	t	Adjusted R²
Gender (male=0)	0.476 [^] (0.245)	1.96	0.06

() = standard error
[^]p<.10

Table 3 presents a model that shows that men are more likely than their female counterparts to perceive the way in which they were recruited was most effective. The camaraderie that the men share with each other is the primary reason for this.

Evidence in the qualitative findings on this type of recruitment practice is interesting and varies by gender and race. Many officers were of the opinion that the Department of Corrections did an excellent job recruiting females and officers of color;

yet subtle biases were also present. Although one white male commented, *“Opportunities should be made available to everyone. The ACI does a good job. The standards shouldn’t change,”* other officers were less complimentary.

Some males and females also weighed in on whether more women should be recruited. A minority of males were of the opinion that women do not belong in corrections. One non-white male officer suggested that the ACI should have stricter recruitment policies than are already in place. Another white male officer said, *“Women are a burden to work with. They can’t do the physical or mental job as well as men.”* And one non-white female was not complimentary about both genders, saying that only certain women and some men can handle the demands of the job. She said: *“There are lots of useless white males working here. Many women don’t belong here either!”*

One dominant theme that buffers some of these opinions is the trend that working in corrections requires a collective talent. Gender and different ethnicities create that collective talent, which in turn strengthens the department and the effectiveness of the officers working together. One female deputy warden stated: *“My ideal team would consist of both male and female officers because women are more instinctive and gather information while men are the aggressors and make quicker decisions in an emergency. Minority officers tend to be more sensitive to issues. This may be because they come to the job with more experience and knowledge.”*

One anecdotal story told by a white male officer illustrates the benefits of having both male and female correctional officers. This officer told about an attack that occurred on a male officer from three inmates at one of the medium security facilities. A fellow female officer threw herself on top of the injured officer causing the attack to stop, as the

male inmates would not strike the woman. The officer telling the story added that the female officer had most likely saved her colleague's life because the attack had been that vicious.

A story such as this is an important teaching tool at a variety of levels. For example, the public perceives men to be better at handling the physical demands of the job; yet, this story illustrates that women are capable of aggressively asserting themselves into a conflict and saving a fellow officer's life. When asked about being able to handle the physical aspects of the job, one white female said: "*There is the physical aspect. Men are stronger and better equipped to handle altercations. However, women are more patient. There is less altercation when women are involved. Men can be too hostile and "hot". Women listen better and tend to be problem solvers.*" These illustrations echo the beliefs of the Deputy Warden who believes effective teamwork and colleague support is critical in the field of corrections. Many officers in this study believe that men and women bring different but important strengths to the job, and both are equally important and relevant.

The literature also advocates increased levels of education for correctional and police officers in general because this has been found to enhance job performance, including working with diverse populations, and improving officers' analytical abilities. Currently, however, a higher education degree beyond high school is not required. Recruits need to be a U.S. citizen or legal resident, possess either a G.E.D. or high school diploma and speak English.

Table 4 UNSTANDARDIZED BIVARIATE REGRESSION COEFFICIENT FOR THE EFFECT OF EDUCATION ON FEMALE RECRUITMENT

Variable	b	t	Adjusted R ²
Education	0.358* (0.134)	2.668	0.122

() = standard error

*p<.05

Table 4 indicates that an officer’s higher level education significantly predicts an increase in officers’ perceptions that more females need to be recruited. Gender was not significant; therefore educated males and females were equally likely to agree that more needs to be done to recruit more women into the correctional field. This regression model indicates that for every one unit increase in education, the perception that female officers need to be recruited increases by .358. One white female officer quipped that she recognized how good women were at doing the job due to having developed parenting skills. As a mother of three and on the job for over twenty years, she said that being a parent is the best job training because it develops patience, listening, empathy, and decision making – all attributes she said that she uses on the job every day.

RETENTION

This section addresses factors that may influence an officer’s decision to stay on the job. Key findings in this area are the effects of sexual harassment and coworker support.

Table 5 UNSTANDARDIZED BIVARIATE REGRESSION COEFFICIENT FOR THE EFFECT OF YEARS ON THE JOB ON SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Variable	b	t	Adjusted R ²
Years on the Job	0.211** (0.076)	2.766	0.131

() = standard error

**p<.01

Table 5 shows a regression model where for every one year increase on the job, the perception that sexual harassment is *no longer a current issue* increases by .211. Eighty-two percent of the younger officers with 5 years or less (n= 37), either disagree or strongly disagree that “sexual harassment is something of the past.” One possible explanation for this is that the ACI Training Academy has in recent years increased its efforts to hire women. Recruitment flyers state in bold letters that women and persons of color are strongly encouraged to apply. During their cadet training, one seminar is entirely devoted to the topic of sexual harassment where they make recruits aware of the law; how to identify sexual harassment; and encourage officers to report it. At risk is possible dismissal, leave with or without pay, and firing if allegations are found to be substantiated. It may be that because of their training, these younger officers are better able to identify it; have witnessed it; or are experiencing it themselves. One female officer told the interviewer that “It happens quite a bit,” but also said that she did not want to report it for fear of repercussions. She went on to say that it would just make her shift more difficult if she pursued any action against a fellow officer. She also did not want to lose her post, and any conflict would result in one or both persons having to alter their current work location and/or be transferred to another facility.

Another female officer said that exchanging jokes and comments that are sexual in nature are a means to “just get along,” and did not think that these types of communications constituted ‘sexual harassment’ when both males and females participated. Despite this dismissive approach that some officers voiced to the issue, female officers are disproportionately line officers without rank who have male supervisors. Their subordinate status more likely puts them in a position of “going along with it” to fit in whether they like it or not. This trend is identified in *Table 6*, where positive coworker relations are more likely to be experienced by male officers and for those workers who do not experience sexual harassment.²

Table 6 UNSTANDARDIZED MULTIVARIATE REGRESSION
COEFFICIENTS FOR THE EFFECT OF GENDER AND SEXUAL
HARASSMENT ON COWORKER RELATIONS

Variable	b	t
Perception of the prevalence of sexual harassment	-1.452* (0.558)	-2.60
Gender (male=0)	-1.622^ (0.910)	0.082
Adjusted R ² = 0.128		

() = standard error

*p<.05 ^p<.10


Table 6 shows that for every one unit increase in sexual harassment, positive relations between coworkers goes down by -1.45. This model explains 13% of the variance on positive relations with coworkers (adjusted r² = .0128). Therefore, using a 90% confidence interval, the assumption that female correctional officers are less likely to have positive coworker relations independent of sexual harassment is an important

² No male officers reported incidents of sexual harassment.

finding. The impact of sexual harassment significantly affects female officers' perceptions on being able to get along well with their colleagues at work. Positive coworker relations are critical in all types of law enforcement, particularly for line officers who must depend upon each other for assistance throughout their shift. These findings are important because the type of work environment necessitates a team approach and officer support is directly linked to officer safety. Furthermore, if officer support is weak, this can affect an officer's morale and impact his or her ability to do their job. It may also have long term consequences, such as not feeling qualified to seek a promotion and look outside corrections for future employment.

This trend is illustrated in *Graph 1* below, which shows the impact of sexual harassment on job satisfaction by gender. Sexual harassment lowers job satisfaction scores for female officers. Male job satisfaction scores are represented by the cluster on the left hand side and the cluster of female job satisfaction scores is shown on the right hand side of the graph.

Graph 1 IMPACT OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT ON JOB SATISFACTION BY GENDER



Graph 1 shows the relationship between gender and job satisfaction when the perception of prevalent sexual harassment is added to the equation. The result of this graph is that females have overall lower job satisfaction as a result of sexual harassment.

Table 7 UNSTANDARDIZED MULTIVARIATE REGRESSION
COEFFICIENTS FOR THE EFFECT OF EDUCATION AND METHOD
OF RECRUITMENT ON COWORKER RELATIONS

Variable	b	t
Level of education	1.326* (0.518)	2.588
Method of recruitment	0.322^ (0.184)	1.76
Adjusted R ² = 0.113		

() = standard error

*p<.05 ^p<.10

Table 7 shows two important effects for retention. Higher education and method of recruitment positively impact coworker relations. For every one unit increase in the method of recruitment, which typically occurs due to a family member or friend, positive relationships with coworkers also increase. Knowing someone who recruits participants into the DOC explains 11% of the variance of positive coworker relations, and this is significant within a 90% confidence interval. This effect can be seen in two ways. On the one hand, having social support from friends and family members familiar with the systems and procedures of the Department of Corrections helps the new officer to learn the job quickly and can buffer work related stress. On the other hand, if white male officers are recruiting more white male officers, this can limit diversity and unintentionally alienate new recruits. Alienation results in lower job satisfaction and higher stress, which in turn makes it less likely for an officer to make it a permanent career.

From the open-ended interview questions, the qualitative data reveal some bias related to gender and race on these issues. Although white males enjoyed social support from coworkers, they were also the most critical. White males were more likely to comment negatively about their peers when compared to women and officers of color. One white male officer said this about his coworkers: *“I try to keep a line. There are some people you don’t want around your family. You have to know who you’re dealing with.”* Another white male officer felt similarly by saying: *“I hate half the people I work with but I can get along with everyone. I can work with them but can’t stand half of them.”*

When asked about the importance of race, few differences were apparent in the data. However, there was a very small minority of white male officers who held prejudicial views that should be noted here. One white male officer said this of officers of color: *“Officers will turn their back on or overlook the misconduct of inmates that share their ethnicity. It’s the ‘once a brother, always a brother’ mentality. Many black officers know black inmates from the street. It’s difficult for the rest of us to do our jobs.”* Yet a completely opposite point of view was shared by this male Latino officer, fluent in Spanish, who said: *“I never speak Spanish to any inmates. I don’t want them to think that I am going to do him any favors or treat him differently.”* Although these perceptions about race are scant in the data, there are some views that need exploring in a future study.

Another white male officer with rank commented: *“A few of my guys do all the work around here and the rest are just here to collect a paycheck.”* He backed this up by stating he believed that the Department of Corrections needs to go back to the old ways

of recruiting and not worry so much about hiring people with diverse backgrounds. He was of the opinion that the DOC had “diversity quotas” and that they should not be used. He said, *“Do not alter [or] modify testing, physical requirements or standards to accommodate diverse backgrounds. ‘Can’ the quotas to hire diversity. Whether you’re white, black, [or] purple, meet the standards, [and] prepare oneself to pass tests [and] physical requirements...same for all.”* Although he held a minority opinion, together these comments speak to a white male bias within the participants sampled. It is important to acknowledge that the other side of the spectrum that supports diversity was also evident among white males, but to a lesser degree. For example, one white male officer said: *“Working with a variety of colleagues brings change and new ideas to dealing with all aspects of the job. It’s a great tool to have.”*

Female officers and officers of color did not appear to have this level of bias when asked similar questions. In fact, women and officers of color were more likely to comment on the strength of diversity and the importance of working as a team. One white female commenting on the importance of social support from fellow officers said: *“It’s nice to feel like you belong to something. Law enforcement [officers] are a rare breed, sometimes it’s nice to blow off steam with people who can relate to you.”* Another white female officer said, *“We’re all we have here. Everyone else works during the day and when we get out of work everyone is sleeping so we officers go out together, although it can start rumors. My husband isn’t thrilled with it but we need camaraderie.”*

Another finding related to retention is rapport with supervisors. Officers with more education were significantly more likely to say that they got along well with their supervisor or superior officer.

Table 8 UNSTANDARDIZED BIVARIATE REGRESSION COEFFICIENT FOR THE EFFECT OF EDUCATION ON RAPPORT WITH SUPERVISORS

Variable	b	t	Adjusted R ²
Level of Education	0.22 [^] (0.11)	2.0	0.091

() = standard error

[^]p<.10

Table 8 shows that for every one unit increase in education (which is measured by highest academic degree completed), the officers’ rapport with their supervisors increase by .220. This trend holds despite the number of years, few or many, an officer has on the job. The education variable continues to be a strong predictor of work performance success, which can directly impact retention and affect promotional opportunities.

Having a strong rapport with supervisors and thinking of them as a mentor was an important finding in the qualitative data. Of the 45 interviews, only one male and one female officer, both white, mentioned they did not have a mentor. White males were more likely to comment on the importance of a trusted mentor and having a positive rapport with their supervisor. One white male officer said, *“I had a great mentor. He took it upon himself so it was more sincere—very helpful.”* Two white male officers and one non-white female officer specifically mentioned that they would like to see the relationship between correctional officers and superiors/administration improve. They recognize that mentoring can have a positive outcome on performing their job and feeling part of a team. As illustrated in *Table 9*, these factors of higher average education and supervisor rapport significantly contribute to higher levels of job satisfaction.

Table 9 UNSTANDARDIZED MULTIVARIATE REGRESSION
 COEFFICIENTS FOR THE EFFECT OF SUPERVISOR RAPPORT
 AND LEVEL OF EDUCATION ON JOB SATISFACTION

Variable	b	t
Rapport with supervisors	1.078 (0.648)	1.67
Level of Education	1.057* (0.491)	2.15
Adjusted $R^2 = 0.165$		

() = standard error

*p<.05

Table 9 shows that those officers with more education and a positive rapport with their supervisor are more likely to have higher average job satisfaction scores. As rapport with supervisor increases, so does job satisfaction. The same pattern holds true for education. For every one unit increase with positive rapport with supervisor, job satisfaction goes up 1.08 points, holding other variables constant. This evidence supports increased educational opportunities and continued mentoring for new officers. Higher job satisfaction scores are strongly correlated with retention and promotion in the literature.

Another anecdotal story from the interviews is worth sharing because of its potential impact on retention. A white female officer mentioned that she felt there was a double standard for women and men at very fundamental levels. She said it was difficult for women officers who were pregnant to feel supported by the DOC because not only were they expected to hold their post no matter how dangerous it may be until they go on maternity leave, but that also they were expected to pay to have their uniforms altered to accommodate their pregnancy. This officer said that by contrast male officers who typically gain weight over the course of their career would receive new uniforms free of

charge. Although the accuracy of this statement was not verified with DOC officials, the perception of this officer is important to acknowledge. Policies must be fair and equitable to make women feel wanted in corrections. Women should be able to feel that this is a career for women, not just for women who are not pregnant.

PROMOTION

This section explores several factors indirectly and directly related to promotion. Dominant among them are job satisfaction, coworker support, and officers' perceptions on whether they believe the system of promotion is clear and fair. Another factor also discussed in this section is the officers' answers to whether they think that the public perceives male and female officers as equally capable of doing the job. Although public perception is also related to recruitment of females, it is discussed here in the broader context of job satisfaction and worker longevity.

The first table shows the mediating effects of gender and belief that the system is clear and fair on job satisfaction. *Table 10*, Model 1, shows that these two variables explain 21% of the variance on job satisfaction. For females, job satisfaction decreases -1.70, holding other variables constant. For officers who believe that the system of promotion is clear and fair, job satisfaction increases by 2 points, holding other variables constant. The two models in *Table 10* indicate that female officers are less likely to believe in an unbiased promotions system, and this has a negative effect on job satisfaction. Females were not alone in this assumption, however, because male and female officers alike told stories of how "special points" and other awards increased test scores to bump a nephew or friend to the top of the promotions list. The arbitrary way in

which extra points were added to promotions tests was a constant theme in the qualitative data.

Table 10 UNSTANDARDIZED MULTIVARIATE REGRESSION
COEFFICIENTS FOR THE MEDIATING EFFECT OF HAVING
FRIENDS OUTSIDE OF WORK AND SYSTEM FAIRNESS ON JOB
SATISFACTION

Model 1			Model 2		
Variable	b	t	Variable	b	t
Gender (male=0)	-1.696 (1.014)	-1.67	Gender	-0.807 (0.86)	-0.94
System Fairness	1.997** (1.508)	3.20	System Fairness	1.3* (0.538)	2.41
			Add Friends outside of work	1.99** (0.438)	4.55
Adjusted R ² = 0.246			Adjusted R ² = 0.425		


() = standard error **p<.01 *p<.05

The second column that shows Model 2 in *Table 10* includes a third variable: “I believe that it’s important for me to have colleagues and friends who include me in their activities outside of work.” When this variable is added to the original model, gender ceases to be a significant predictor of lower job satisfaction scores. Therefore having colleagues an officer can associate with after work mediates—or buffers—the relationship between gender and lower job satisfaction scores. This kind of social support reduces work related stress, such as sexual harassment, and increases women’s job satisfaction scores so statistically they look no different from their male counterparts on job satisfaction. Therefore, colleague support is a useful tool in predicting whether an officer will stay on the job or look for alternative employment.

What is interesting about Model 2 in *Table 10* is that a belief that the promotional system is clear and fair remains a significant predictor but gender is no longer a

significant variable. Having colleagues and friends who include officers in activities after work significantly increase the model's predictive power. In the first model, 21% of the variance in job satisfaction is explained. In the second model, it doubles to 46%. This is the strongest predictor of retention and promotion in the data. This linear relationship is illustrated in *Graph 2* below. The graph shows that for every increase in positive officer relations, job satisfaction increases incrementally.

Graph 2 THE EFFECT OF POSITIVE COWORKER RELATIONSHIPS ON JOB SATISFACTION



Graph 2 shows the linear relationship between positive coworker relationships and job satisfaction.

Other factors examined to predict positive peer relations as a form of social support are whether officers are married or single, sexual harassment, and public perception. *Table 11* shows several interesting trends. Single officers are significantly more likely to fraternize with other officers after work than are married officers. Sexual harassment continues to be inversely related to positive peer relations, as does the officers' perception about how the public perceives them.

Table 11 UNSTANDARDIZED MULTIVARIATE REGRESSION
 COEFFICIENTS FOR THE EFFECT OF MARITAL STATUS,
 PERCEPTIONS OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT, AND PUBLIC
 PERCEPTION ON COWORKER RELATIONS

Variable	b	t
Marital Status (married=1)	-1.955* (0.854)	-2.29
Perception of sexual harassment	-0.892* (0.428)	-2.08
Public perception of male and female officers	-0.664^ (0.379)	-1.75
Adjusted R ² = .045		

() = standard error

*p<.05 ^p<.10

Both male and female correctional officers do not believe that the public thinks they are equally capable of corrections work, and the logic is that women officers are perceived as less qualified in this male dominated field. This belief, whether true or not, can certainly impact recruitment, retention, and promotion. If the general public does not think of women in these positions as correctional officers, a female’s decision to explore this field as a future occupation is reduced. If the stereotype persists that this is “a man’s job,” fewer qualified women will enter the field, and based on the other data presented in this section, fewer women will be less likely to stay or continue on to seek a promotion.

Anecdotally, officer interviews also helped to explain the dearth of promotions, particularly for women. Many women officers explained why they do not seek a promotion, particularly those with many years on the job. One white female said that she likes her shift and can be home for her kids in the afternoon. If she were to get a promotion, then she would have to go back to second or third shift, not have a Saturday or Sunday off, and this would be too disruptive for her family. Male officers also

complained about similar union constraints. Once you get a promotion you have to start all over again, with typically a bad post and a worse shift. And if seniority as a line officer finally allows one weekend day off, that is taken away and weekend work is commonplace. Although few clear gender differences, women were more likely to mention the impact that a promotion would have on their family while male officers were more likely to mention their unwillingness of giving up a coveted post or days off.

DISCUSSION

The effect of gender and race on variables that affect recruitment, retention, and promotion is evident, although not as straightforward as originally hypothesized. In general, men were more uniform with their answers with smaller standard deviations from the mean on almost all responses when compared to their female counterparts or when compared to answers from officers of color. Answers from women with higher levels of education and above average colleague support are similar to their male counterparts. Yet the regression analyses indicate that gender does contribute, all or in part, to some variations statistically and substantively. Women's perceptions about entering the job, staying on the job, and seeking a promotion are influenced by their perceptions of how well supported they are from their coworker and supervisory relations; their experience with sexual harassment, and to some degree how the public still perceives corrections as a career for men.

Over 75% of all respondents said that they were recruited by a friend, family member or fellow officer, and this type of recruitment impacts how officers perceive their job, their coworkers, and the rapport they have with their supervisors. Males and females alike said they were recruited by a friend, family member, or fellow officer. Yet, male

officers who were recruited by family and friends had slightly higher levels of job satisfaction and positive coworker relations that contribute to job satisfaction and overall retention. Positive peer relations also buffer work related stress on and off the job. Female officers, while also largely recruited by people they knew, had slightly lower job satisfaction scores. These lower job satisfaction scores were a result of sexual harassment and slightly lower peer/colleagues relations as a form of social support. Men were also more likely to believe in the effectiveness of the recruitment and promotion methods.

Officers who were recruited by a family member or friend are also more likely to have better relationships with colleagues and supervisors. This may be due to the fact that knowing others in the Department of Corrections increases an officer's ability to network and readily become a part of the system. This has both pro and con aspects that need to be addressed perhaps in future studies. Recruiting people who you know limits diversity in a work environment that ideally needs to represent the population it serves.

Officers with higher than average education (some college or above) and officers with rank (n=3 Deputy Wardens) were more likely to agree that more effort in recruiting female officers was needed. A higher average educational level was also a predictor of coworker relations and rapport with supervisors. The effect of education on issues that affect retention is an important finding. Education may better facilitate relating and working with others by being exposed to an environment that encompasses diversity in many forms, whether through classroom instruction or simply by being in an academic setting with a diverse student population.

Officers with more years on the job are less likely to perceive that sexual harassment is still prevalent. This may be because the longer an officer has worked for

the department, the more institutionalized the harassment may be, i.e. they may not notice it as readily as a newly hired officer. The perception of sexual harassment is a significant factor in overall scores related to positive coworker relationships and job satisfaction that disproportionately affects women. Public perception that women should not be in this line of work is problematic and needs to be addressed. These findings can affect the entire process: women are less likely to be recruited, stay on the job, or seek a promotion. Officers that perceive higher levels of sexual harassment also experience weaker relationships with coworkers and superiors. This finding is important because this type of social support is an important protective factor against job related stress.

Being single, believing that sexual harassment is not something of the past, and believing that the public views male and female officers differently are all negative predictors of positive coworker relations. These data indicate that despite an emphasis on sexual harassment prevention during Academy training, perhaps more needs to be done to reduce perceptions around sexual harassment. The public should also be made aware of the excellent female officers who do this type of work to reduce the stereotype that this is a field for men. These two areas can affect female recruitment and retention of female officers.

Belief in the promotional system also differs substantively by gender. Women officers on average disagreed that the system of promotion that is clear and fair, as did some male officers, but not to the same degree. When officers believe that those who deserve to be promoted are the ones who in fact receive the promotions, job satisfaction increases. Yet women appeared to be critical of the promotional process and decidedly more disenchanted with the way promotions were achieved. These analyses indicate that

women's ability to get along with their coworkers and have positive relations with them impacts their perceptions on the promotion process.

IMPLICATIONS

The findings of this study coincide with pieces of literature that note the prevalence of patriarchy and sexual harassment in historically male-dominated careers. The equity among correctional officers is still lacking. Education can be considered an important tool for quality policing; this study has found education to be a significant predictor of better peer and supervisor relationships. In turn, better coworker relationships were found to be a significant predictor of higher levels of job satisfaction among correctional officers.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the data indicate that there are opinions from this sample that are both racist and sexist. Racism and sexism seem to have no clear cut boundaries, but more white men tend to express pejorative views than other groups in this sample. It is apparent, that despite the mix of perceptions, change around a job traditionally held by men, is still evolving. What impressed me in talking with the female officers in this study is the way in which they successfully navigate their way, both with inmates and fellow officers. Many female officers said that they do not have to play the game of male one-upmanship that male inmates play with each other and that can also be seen between fellow male officers. One female officer said, *"I see it but I don't have to do it. That makes my job a little easier."* They recognize the importance of teamwork and seek to work collaboratively with others.

An area that is beyond the scope of this research but worthy of future investigation is the problem associated with promotion. Male and female officers tell of a system that, despite having a standardized procedure of test-taking where the highest scoring candidates receive the promotion, these officers will have differing numbers of points added to their total scores that are based on subjective rather than objective outcomes. Promotions come from taking tests, but there is some latitude in the way extra points are awarded that is not standardized. These subjective elements create an atmosphere in which officers think that promotions are based more on who you know than what you know. Also, woven within this complex fabric, is the rigidity of shift work. Many female officers told me that they will not seek a promotion because it means that they will lose their shift or their post, one or both of which they may have worked many years to secure. Once an officer is promoted, a day shift is lost and that officer is often required to begin his or her new command from 3 p.m. to 11 p.m., which is often thought of as an undesirable shift. With this kind of structure, determined by the union of correctional officers, few women or single parents want to change their shift they work because it means adjusting family and childcare schedules to accommodate the new position. One female officer who had more seniority than her husband, who was also a correctional officer, said that she elected to remain on her shift to be with their children after school. They decided together that he would pursue a promotion, which he did. So with 23 years on the job, she has remained as a line officer without rank. Because union rules dictate how promotions work, opportunities for change seem limited in this regard. Integrating officers of color and more women into middle level positions of rank, such as lieutenants or captains, may seem like a personal choice; however, the reality of how

tiered and subjective the promotional structure is results in a slightly different view. There are no female lieutenants presently employed at the ACI; however there is one black female captain employed at the High Security Center and one female supervisor at the Training Academy. Not only does this impact the degree to which ranking officers are able to represent diversity and their composition is able to reflect the population they serve, it also impacts job satisfaction. Dr. Harrison analyzed job satisfaction scores over the number of years on the job and found that job satisfaction steadily declines after ten years on the job. If officers feel as though they are stuck with little opportunity for advancement, this triggers a decline in officer morale; officer relations; and declining overall job satisfaction. The data indicate that this is a potentially serious problem that will continue to impact recruitment, retention, and promotion efforts.

The three hypotheses explored in the study were: 1) Perceptions around current recruitment practices differ by gender and race; 2) Sexual harassment disproportionately affects women officers, which can affect perceptions on recruitment, retention, and promotion practices; and 3) Male correctional officers are more likely to have positive mentoring and coworker support that enhances job satisfaction and aids in retention. All three hypotheses were supported, with exception of race based differences. Gender was found to be a substantive indicator for some of the analyses within a 90% confidence level. Specifically, gender was a predictor associated with sexual harassment that affects officer perceptions around recruitment and an officer's ability to have positive relations with co-workers on the job. At the outset of this research, I suspected that gender differences would be more pronounced. Not seeing these differences in the data was surprising, but this may be due to the neutralization of gender and racial differences in the

ACI's Training Academy and the slow but growing acceptance of women in law enforcement within the culture generally. Another alternative is that the sample size was too small to see statistically significant patterns, which could emerge with a larger sample and by oversampling officers of color. Other variables such as level of education and number of years on the job were found to be significant influences on these outcomes. Recruitment practices, at least on the surface, appear to give men and women an equal chance of becoming correctional officers. Retention practices need to focus on reducing sexual harassment and foster coworker and supervisor support. Promotion practices need to address the arbitrary way points are awarded and for the union to consider changing the way shifts, posts, and/or weekend work is allocated once a promotion is achieved. A public service campaign designed to address the public perception that correctional work is only for men would also benefit women who wish to enter this field.

LIMITATIONS

The major limitation of this study is its relatively small sample size (n=45), especially regarding superior officers (n=3) and non-white officers (n=12). Superior officers and non-white officers should have been oversampled but were not. This is in large part because the list of active-duty officers compiled by the ACI's Department of Research & Planning did not include information on the officers' race or rank. Because of the small sample of non-white and superior officers, these results cannot be generalized to those officers at the ACI. These results also cannot be generalized to other correctional systems in the U.S. or elsewhere as the study was conducted only within Rhode Island's Department of Corrections.

A second limitation of this study is that several of the interviews, due to availability and time constraints, were left for officers to fill out and send back instead of being completed one-on-one with an interviewer. Four out of 45 were returned by mail. Arguably different information is obtained through mail-in surveys than from one-on-one interviews.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Areas of future research should look closer at racial issues among correctional officers in regard to recruitment, retention, and promotion. For female officers, issues of familial obligations should be researched further and how it impacts their decision to stay as a line officer and not seek promotion. Future research should look at whether or not female officers turn down promotions due to a change in shift that is not compatible with their children/family schedule, and if having children at home affects the retention and turn-over rates of female officers compared to male officers. Another area of research that could be furthered is that of relationships between correctional officers and their superiors, and how their perceptions differ on the policies, procedures, and inner-workings of the correctional facilities. Finally, it is evident that “who you know” is a significant factor in recruiting and also plays an important role in retention and possibly promotional opportunities. To what degree nepotism exacerbates some of the issues discussed in this paper would be important to explore.

This study has provided a unique look inside the working lives of forty-five randomly selected correctional officers at the Adult Correctional Institutions in Rhode

Island. Although much progress has been made toward equality and equity in recruitment, retention, and promotional practices, female officers and officers of color still face barriers that are linked to this historically white male field of law enforcement. What is interesting about this study is that perceptions around gender, race, and unequal hiring and promotional practices vary widely and are not tied to race or gender per se; yet, female officers still report sexual harassment and opportunities for promotions are less than straight forward. Recruitment practices are largely a function of knowing someone already in the job, and white male officers are more likely to think that this is the best form of recruitment possible. Although this certainly facilitates positive relations with colleagues and offers an important element of social support on and off the job, this combination may create some unnecessary divisions among other officers who were not recruited in the same fashion and do not know officers with more experience who can support or mentor them. This trend can also impact promotion, where those with positive peer relations, and who fraternize with colleagues, are more likely to perceive that the system for earning a promotion is clear and fair. This means that alienation has the opportunity to appear at the very beginning of the recruitment process and potentially continue through one's chances to earn a promotion. It is my hope that these results can be useful in starting a dialogue about these issues to more effectively combat the discrepancies and address the pockets of racism and sexism that still are apparent in this male dominated field. Because this study is the first of its kind in Rhode Island, it is a good place to start.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bergman, Bodil, & Hallberg, Lillemor R.-M. (2002). Women in a Male-Dominated Industry: Factor Analysis of a Women Workplace Culture Questionnaire Based on a Grounded Theory Model. *Sex Roles* 46(9/10), 311-322.
- Bostock, Deborah J., & Daley, James G. (2007). Lifetime and Current Sexual Assault and Harassment Victimization Rates of Active-Duty United States Air Force Women. *Violence against Women* 13(9), 927-944.
- Garcia, Vanessa (2003). Difference in the Police Department: Women, Policing, and 'Doing Gender'. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 19(3), 330-344.
- Greene, Helen Taylor (2000). Black Female in Law Enforcement: A Foundation for Future Research. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 16(2), 230-239.
- Griffin, Marie L., Armstrong, Gaylene S., & Hepburn, John R. (2005). Correctional Officers' Perceptions of Equitable Treatment in the Masculinized Prison Environment. *Criminal Justice Review* 30(2), 189-206.
- Griffin, Marie L. (2006). Gender and Stress: A Comparative Assessment of Sources of Stress among Correctional Officers. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 22(1), 4-25.
- He, Ni, Zhao, Jihong & Ren, Ling (2005). Do Race and Gender Matter in Police Stress? A Preliminary Assessment of the Interactive Effects. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 33(6), 535-547.
- Kakar, Suman (2002). Gender and Police Officers' Perceptions of Their Job Performance: An Analysis of the Relationship between Gender and Perceptions of Job Performance. *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 13(3), 238-256.
- Miller, Susan L. (1998). Rocking the Rank and File: Gender Issues and Community Policing. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 14(2), 156-172.
- National Center for Women & Policing (2001). Equality Denied: The Status of Women in Policing. *Feminist Majority Foundation*.
- Rathbone, Cristina (2005). *A World Apart*. Random House: New York, NY.
- Savicki, Victor, Cooley, Eric, & Gjesvold, Jennifer (2003). Harassment as a Predictor of Job Burnout in Correctional Officers. *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 30(5), 602-619.

- Schulz, Dorothy Moses (2003). Women Police Chiefs: A Statistical Profile. *Police Quarterly* 6(3), 330-345.
- Seklecki, Richard, & Paynich, Rebecca (2007). A National Survey of Female Police Officers: An Overview of Findings. *Police Practice and Research* 8(1), 17-30.
- Slonaker, William M., Wendt, Ann C., & Kemper, Michael J. (2001). Discrimination in the Ranks: An Empirical Study with Recommendations. *Police Quarterly* 22(1), 63-79.
- Vogt, Dawne, Bruce, Tamara A., Street, Amy E., & Stafford, Jane (2007). Attitudes toward Women and Tolerance for Sexual Harassment among Reservists. *Violence against Women* 13(9), 879-900.
- Wells, Terry, Colbert, Sharla, & Slate, Risdon N. (2006). Gender Matters: Differences in State Probation Officer Stress. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 22(1), 63-79.
- Zhao, Jihong, He, Ni, & Lovrich, Nicholas P. (2006). Pursuing Gender Diversity in Police Organizations in the 1990s: A Longitudinal Analysis of Factors Associated With the Hiring of Female Officers. *Police Quarterly* 9(4), 463-485.

APPENDIX A

INTRODUCTORY LETTER TO WARDENS/DEPUTY WARDENS



RHODE ISLAND DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS
Planning & Research Unit

1 Wilma Schesler Lane, Pinel Bldg. 2nd floor
Cranston, RI 02920

Phone: (401) 462-3920 Fax: (401) 462-1507

TO: Wardens/Deputy Wardens

FROM: Jeff Renzi
Planning and Research

DATE: October 15, 2008

**SUBJECT: Rhode Island College Research: Recruitment, Retention,
Promotion Issues that affects your work and you as a Correctional
Officer**

Rhode Island College/Justice Studies Program has embarked on a research project with law enforcement officers from around the state as well as Correctional Officers concerning recruitment, retention, and promotion issues that affect work. Rhode Island College submitted their research request to the Rhode Island Department of Corrections. This request was reviewed by Planning and Research and forwarded to the Assistant Director Administration and the Director for review and approval. The research request has been approved and meets RIDOC Policy 6.03-3 pertaining to Research.

Professor Jill Harrison and honors student, Kelsey Kanoff are the principal investigators from Rhode Island College. During the next few months, there will be interviews with those Correctional Officers choosing to participate in this study. Correctional Officers were chosen through random sampling. The selected officers were forwarded a letter this past summer from Kelsey Kanoff asking if they would like to participate in the study, an overview of the study, informed consent as well as interview format. The Correctional Officers that were contacted had the opportunity to contact the principal investigators and inform them that they do not want to participate in this study and questionnaire. The research will require outreach to the Correctional Facilities where the officers are assigned. Both Professor Harrison and Kelsey Kanoff have gone through the proper background check process in compliance with DOC policy.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact my office @ 462-0373.

Thank you for your cooperation.

APPENDIX B

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL NOTIFICATOIN

From: CHPRAdmin@ric.edu [mailto:CHPRAdmin@ric.edu]
Sent: Sunday, March 02, 2008 9:36 AM
To: Harrison, Jill Hume
Subject: CHPR: NOTICE OF APPROVAL

Please note that the following email serves as your official notification of approval from the Rhode Island College Committee on Human Participants in Research (CHPR). Please print out this notice for your records.

Rhode Island College
Committee on Human Participants in Research

NOTICE OF APPROVAL

Responsible Investigator: Jill Harrison
Submitted By: Jill Harrison

CHPR Protocol #81
Title: A Study in Gender Differences among Rhode Island Law Enforcement Personnel

Approval Date: 2008-03-02
Continuing Review Deadline: 2009-01-01
Expiration Date: 2009-03-02

The Committee on Human Participants in Research (CHPR) has APPROVED the above Full Review protocol through the review process. Please review your protocol submission page at the following URL for any additional Committee comments:

http://www.ric.edu/orga/chpr/dept_grants_form.php?targetTable=grants_change_applications&id=6

As an investigator of human subjects, your responsibilities also include the following:

1. Report all adverse events and unanticipated problems

involving human
subjects to the Office of Research and Grants
Administration (ORGA) within
three (3) days of your knowledge of the occurrence and
submit an adverse
events form.

2. Submit a complete Continuing Review/Close-out form by
2009-01-01
and/or when the study has been completed.

3. Discontinue all work pertaining to this protocol if a
continuing review
approval is not finalized by the expiration date, 2009-
03-02.

4. Submit all proposed changes to the protocol through
the addendum process
and receive approval from the CHPR before implementation
of the changes.

5. Keep all research data and consent documents in your
possession for at
least three (3) years after the completion of the
research activity.

For further questions, please contact:

Charles Berube
cberube@ric.edu

Kevin Middleton
kmiddleton@ric.edu

Henk Sonder
hsonder@ric.edu

Roberta Pearlmutter
rpearlmutter@ric.edu

Thank you.

APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT

*A Study in Gender Differences
Among Rhode Island Law Enforcement Personnel*

You are being asked to participate in a state-wide research study about recruitment, retention, and promotion of law enforcement officers in Rhode Island. You were selected as a possible participant because you work or used to work directly in the field of law enforcement. Please read this information and ask any questions that you may have before deciding whether to participate in this research. Ultimately, your participation can help guide your agency or department in future recruitment, retention, and promotion efforts.

Researchers at Rhode Island College are conducting this study. Dr. Jill Harrison, Assistant Professor of Sociology, is the principal investigator. She can be reached via telephone at 401 456-8731; or feel free to contact Jill's cell phone at 662 -1167; or email at jharrison@ric.edu.

Background Information

The purpose of this research is to examine perceptions of female and male law enforcement officers on issues that affect recruitment, retention, and promotion in the field of law enforcement. Currently, over 10 different law enforcement agencies state-wide have agreed to participate, including the Providence Police Department and other large law enforcement agencies in the state. Using a semi-structured interview guide and questionnaire in which answers will not be audio- recorded, respondents will be asked for their perceptions on the following topics. These areas have been identified in the research literature as important for understanding gender differences in recruitment and promotion strategies for law enforcement nationwide:

- Current and future recruitment practices and guidelines
- Perceived obstacles in the selection process of candidates
- Academy training and field training programs
- Mentoring as a way to increase retention
- Monitoring and performance evaluations
- Daily and/or special assignments and promotions
- Policies and procedures on the prevention of sexual and gender harassment, discrimination, and retaliation
- Shift work, work schedules, daily administrative tasks

Procedures

If you agree to be a participant in this research, we will ask you to do the following things:

- 1) Call Jill with any questions you may have about the study; sign this informed consent document, which can be faxed back at 401 456 8665; and give Jill a day and time when it might be convenient for you to be interviewed. You may select to be interviewed by telephone or in person.
- 2) Meet with a Rhode Island College Justice Studies student for one semi-structured interview. The interview will last approximately 45 minutes to 1 hour. It will not be recorded and your name will not be used. Students will take brief notes, and they will assign you a pseudonym in place of your name.
- 3) If meeting with a student in person, dress in plain clothes, if you like, and do not identify yourself by name; specific work location; badge number, or give other identifying characteristics.
- 4) Be prepared to answer the questions as honestly as possible and elaborate on your answers when asked. If at any time you feel uncomfortable with any question, you may simply skip the question and go on to the next one.

Risks and Benefits to Being in the Study

This research has two small risks: First, if you are a female law enforcement officer, active or retired, it is possible that due to the relatively small number of females in the study (as of 2/15/2008, approximately 50 females across the state have been contacted for participation), some identifying characteristics may be unintentionally linked to you. The researchers will do their best to protect your anonymity by assigning you an alias; and we will only provide your agency or department with summary information from the entire state-wide study rather than your individual answers or answers from your department or agency alone. Secondly, it is possible that students conducting the interview may know you. Students have signed confidentiality statements to protect your answers and your identity; however, they should be reassigned if they have had prior interaction with you.

The benefits of participation in this research is to aid state law enforcement agencies in understanding ways in which we can improve recruitment, retention, and promotion based on experience from officers like yourself already in the field or who are retired from active duty. This information will be given to all participating departments and agencies statewide – in summary form only - to better assist each agency or department in their own hiring and promoting practices. There are no direct benefits to you, and there is no guarantee that suggestions made during this research will be considered or implemented at your place of work. No compensation of any kind will be given for your participation.

Confidentiality

The records of this research will be kept private. In any sort of report we might publish or presentation we might make, we will not include any information that will make it possible to identify any individual participant. Research records will be kept in a locked file in Dr. Harrison's office at Rhode Island College, and access will be limited to her and honors student, who is the research assistant. If there is an audit of the research, access may be given to the Committee on Human Participants in Research and appropriate regulatory agencies. All of the records and data from this research will be retained for three years after the conclusion of the study; and after the 3 year period, all records will be destroyed.

Voluntary Nature of the Study

Your participation is voluntary. If you choose not to participate, it will not affect your current or future relations with Rhode Island College or your status with the law enforcement agency where you are employed. There is no penalty or loss of benefits for not participating or for discontinuing your participation.

Upon request, you will be provided with a copy of the final report.

Contacts and Questions

The researcher conducting this study is Dr. Jill Harrison. She will contact you directly to see if you would like to participate in this study between February 1 and December 15, 2008. She has trained justice studies students in her classes for the interviews, which will be scheduled at your convenience between Feb. 15, 2008 and December 15, 2008. You may ask any questions directly by email or phone anytime by contacting Jill at jharrison@ric.edu or #401 456-8731 or cell phone # 401 662 1167.

If Dr. Jill Harrison cannot be reached, or if you would like to talk to someone other than the researcher(s) about: (1) concerns regarding this study, (2) research participant rights, (3) research-related injuries, or (4) other human subjects issues, please contact Sue Pearlmutter, Rhode Island College Committee on Human Participants in Research at (401) 456-8753 or write: Sue Pearlmutter, c/o Rhode Island College Committee on Human Participants in Research at Office of Research and Grants Administration, Roberts Hall, 600 Mount Pleasant Avenue, Providence, RI 02908.

Statement of Consent

I have read the above information. I have received answers to the questions I have asked.

I consent to participate in this research. I am at least 18 years of age. (You may fax this signature page of this document to 456 8665 or give to the student interviewer in a sealed envelope at the time of the interview.)

This consent is null and void after December 31, 2009.

Print Name of Participant: _____

Signature of Participant: _____

Participating Agency or Department: _____

Date: _____

APPENDIX D

SURVEY BOOKLET

ANONYMOUS AND CONFIDENTIAL.

DO NOT WRITE ANY NAMES ON THIS DOCUMENT

USE PREPAID POSTAGE ENVELOPE FOR RETURN BY DECEMBER 1, 2008

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

“A STUDY OF GENDER DIFFERENCES AMONG RHODE ISLAND LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL”

Rhode Island College Department of Sociology

Directions: Participation in this short survey is voluntary. All female law enforcement officers across the state of Rhode Island are asked to participate and a random selection of male officers, troopers, deputies, and correctional officers are also asked to participate. Results will be ready to share in the spring of 2009.

Signed Consent Form: Please read the INFORMED CONSENT DOCUMENT. If you agree to participate in this study, please tear off and sign the last page of the document and return it in one of the pre-paid envelopes provided. This consent document explains the purpose of the study and the protections that are in place to keep your identity anonymous and your answers confidential.

QUESTIONNAIRE: Simply answer by circling or checking an answer, and where an open ended question is asked, please write in a brief response. Should you choose not to answer a question, feel free to leave it blank and go onto the next one. Remember that all answers are confidential. Do not put your name on this interview booklet. Return survey questionnaire in the white pre-paid envelope provided. Your opinions are important to us, so thank-you for your participation.

I. SECTION ONE: Perceptions: In this section, we are interested in learning about your opinions on several different issues and values related to your work that may affect recruitment, retention and promotion. Please identify the statement that most closely reflects your opinions and values to the following statements and try to pick the response that most closely matches how you feel. In almost every question we use a 4-item scale of strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree.

1. It's important for me to have a department that does things together.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

2. It's important for me to have colleagues and friends who include me in their activities outside of work.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

3. My friends would say that I found the right balance between my job and spending time with my family and significant others.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

4. It is important to me what my colleagues think of me.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

5. I spend as much time as I can doing special assignments and specialized training.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

- 6a. In thinking back about the recruitment method(s) that you remember, do you believe that they were effective in getting you to join law enforcement?

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

- 6b. Thinking back, how did you become aware of law enforcement recruitment? (**Please check all that apply.**)

- A family member
 A friend
 A relative
 A fellow officer
 A recruiting poster
 An advertisement in the paper
 A radio announcement

- A church bulletin
- A college newspaper
- A Website
- Other(s) _____

6c. Do you believe that these same or similar recruitment method(s) are still used today by your current work place?

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't Know/No Opinion

7. I think the public treats male and female officers the same.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- No opinion

8. I enjoy working by myself.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- No opinion

9. I enjoy working with a variety of colleagues while on the job.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

10. I believe that female officers who are mothers should have different methods of advancement available to them.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

11. I think this career is my life's 'calling.'

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

12. I think my male colleagues can do some aspects of the job somewhat better than my female colleagues.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

13. I believe that we could do a better job recruiting female officers.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

14. My colleagues would say that I am a risk taker.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

15. I believe that promotional opportunities are there for everyone in my department.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

16. I enjoy the fellowship of the other officers I work with on my shift.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

17. I find the daily work schedule often interferes with family obligations.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

18. I believe that the system of earning a promotion is clear and fair.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

19. I think that sexual harassment is something of the past.

Strongly Agree

Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

20. I think that female officers are overlooked for promotions for things that aren't entirely clear to me.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

21. I believe that there are important differences in policing styles depending on the sex of the officer.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

22. I believe that there are important differences in policing styles depending on the race/ethnicity of the officer.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

23. I believe that the system in place promotes the most qualified.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

24. I have (had) a mentor in my department or unit.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

25. My colleagues would say that I have a good rapport with my supervisor.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

26. I've heard other officers in my department say that they wish it wasn't so difficult to get noticed for all their hard work.

Strongly Agree

Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

27. I think we get a lot of community support.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

28. I think it's fair to say that there are a lot of internal pressures with the job, such as excessive paperwork and troublesome internal procedures.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

29. I think it's safe to say that I plan to stay in this line of work until retirement.

Strongly Agree
Agree
Disagree
Strongly Disagree

Section II. Open Ended Questions. Please take a moment to answer these questions with a phrase or two. Again, your insights and opinions are important to us, and we thank you for your responses.

30. What would you say that you love most about the job?

31. What would you say is the most demanding aspect of your job (i.e. what is the most stressful aspect)?

32. What would you say are the **pros** and **cons** of the shift you're currently working? And if you thing you would change, what would it be?

PRO:

CON:

CHANGE 1 THING:

33. Are there plenty of opportunities for you to sign up for specialized training or special assignments? What was the last specialized training or assignment that you did?

34. In your answer to **question 2**, on being able to get together with your colleagues outside of work, can you elaborate a little bit on your answer? Why is it important or unimportant?

35. In your answer to **question 9**, on working with a variety of colleagues, can you tell us why it's important or unimportant? Can you provide us with a "for instance," or an example?

36. In your answer to **questions 12, 21, and 22**, on differences of race and gender, do you think there are specific strengths that women, black or other minority officers bring to law enforcement? Can you give us a recent example?

37. Do you have any suggestions for recruiting, retaining, and promoting more officers of diverse backgrounds?

38. In your answer to **question 23**, on "the system promotes the most qualified," can you comment on your answer or provide us with an example?

39. What helps you the most for advancement or promotion?

40. In your response to **question 29** on "It's safe to say I'll stay in this career until retirement," can you comment on why or why not?

III. Sociodemographic Information: Please share a little bit of background information about yourself with us. (Remember, this information is confidential and individual answers will never be shared with anyone other than the researcher.)

1. Please indicate gender (indicate with an X):

female male

2. Please indicate your age range (indicate with an X):

20-30 31-40 41-50 51-65 over 65 (indicate if retired)

3. About how long have you worked in this agency? _____ years

4. What is your current rank? _____

5. Education: Which of the following best represents the highest level of education that you have completed? (Check X)

GED High school Attended some college

Associates degree Bachelors degree Graduate degree

6. Please indicate race/ethnicity (Check all that apply):

White/Caucasian

Hispanic/Latino

African American/Black

Asian

Native American

Other race/ethnicity: _____

7. Please indicate marital status (check X):

single married cohabitating divorced

8. If married or cohabiting, does spouse or significant other currently work outside the home? (Indicate X)

Yes, full time Yes, part time No

9. # of children, including college age, you provide for: _____

Thank you very much for taking the time to take this survey. Your answers are confidential and will remain anonymous. If you have questions, please contact Dr. Jill Harrison at Rhode Island College at 456-8731. You may also contact her via email at jharrison@ric.edu.