

Parallel Perceptions: Gender, Job Enrichment and Job Satisfaction Among Correctional Officers in Women's Jails

Mary K. Stohr
Department of Criminal Justice Administration
Boise State University
Boise, Idaho

G. Larry Mays
Department of Criminal Justice
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico

Nicholas P. Lovrich
Division of Governmental Studies and Services
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington

Amanda M. Gallegos
Department of Criminal Justice Administration
Boise State University
Boise, Idaho

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Las Vegas Nevada in March 1996.

Acknowledgement and Exculpations:

The findings reported here are drawn from field research supported by the Jails Division of the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice and New Mexico State University. This document was prepared under grant number 92JOIGHP5 from the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice. The authors bear sole responsibility for the views expressed here, and full blame for any errors of commission or omission which might adhere to the analyses presented. The authors would like to thank the MC, New Mexico State University and the participating jail managers and their staffs and inmates for their assistance in this research. We are also indebted to Carol Clark and Shannon Henry for their contributions to this research (while at New Mexico State University) and to Craig Hemmens (Boise State University) for reviewing an earlier draft of this manuscript.

INTRODUCTION

The correctional work world presents comparable challenges for women and men. It requires the same job skills, intelligence, perseverance, patience, professionalism and degree of humor from both gender groups. Not surprisingly, the extant social science literature indicates that when the perceptions of men and women regarding of their jobs in corrections are compared, many more similarities than differences are apparent. These parallel perceptions of the correctional work world appear to hold for all but the most "gendered" of issues -- such as support for affirmative action and sexual harassment victimization.

In this paper we explore perceptions of the degree of job enrichment in corrections work and the level of job satisfaction with such work obtaining among female and male correctional employees working in exclusively women's jails. Our intent is to discover to what degree males and females have similar perceptions of their work; this analysis is intended to add to the growing literature in the area of gender studies in criminal justice, and to deepen our understanding of jails as places of professional work.

The Focus

Women's jails are rather uncommon institutions located among a major type of correctional facility -- municipal and county jails. The literature on jails contains little work on these facilities; that literature tends to be preoccupied with a focus on male inmates, and on penal organization run, for the most part, by male staff. Although the top level managers of the women's jails we studied were most often European-American (white) males, they were staffed in large part by females and their core function was to control and serve an exclusively female inmate population. Given these unusual corrections environmental circumstances, the conclusions drawn from staff and inmate

research done in predominately male facilities require fresh examination. Of particular interest here are the perceptions of job enrichment and job satisfaction across gender groups. We are primarily interested in contributing to the growing literature that explores the work environment and circumstances of female justice system workers.

Traditionally excluded from most correctional work except in the restricted role of *matron* supervising women and children, women in corrections have only recently (for the last 10 to 15 years in the main) been allowed to work in virtually all positions in jail facilities.' Aside from some limited evidence of a gender gap in their perceptions of work, the available research comparing men and women in correctional occupations suggests that they tend to be more similar than dissimilar in their job behaviors, and more alike than different in their perceptions of the workplace.

Gender: History, Work, Perceptions

Historically, women have constituted a rather small minority of jail inhabitants, both in terms of inmates and correctional staff. It has only been since the enactment of equal employment opportunity statutes (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964) and the subsequent development of affirmative action plans and programs for public agencies (1972 amendments to Title VII) over the last 20 years that women have been accorded a general correctional staff role in local jail facilities. According to the 1993 *Census of Local Jails* (the closest year to the study period) women occupied nearly one-fourth of the correctional officer jobs in the nation's jails, and they constituted nearly one-third of all jail payroll employees in the early 1990s (Bureau of Justice Statistics 1995).

In the not too distant past women were relegated almost entirely to support services (e.g., clerical,

¹ Notably, some jails still restrict women to supervising living units housing "women or children only."

nursing, culinary etc.) in most correctional institutions (Chapman, Minor, Rieker, Mills and Bottum 1983). Even when women performed correctional work as matrons with female inmates, their functions were seen as ancillary to the main responsibility of the jail, that being to house and maintain in a secure state male inmates. Not surprisingly, recompense in the form of either salary or interpersonal collegial respect for support services or matron work tended to be far below rewards accorded to male counterparts (Zupan 1992).

Despite the recent gains made by women in securing employment in custodial positions in jails, they still tend to be deployed disproportionately in support-like roles as compared to men. For instance, it is common practice for non-commissioned women to work side-by-side with male and female correctional officers in booking and control rooms, doing essentially the same work but without being accorded the occupational status or pay of a commissioned officer (Stohr 1990).

As women move increasingly into traditionally male-dominated realms of public service work, the degree to which they differ from men in perceptions, experiences and job performance has been of interest to many scholars (e.g., Bartol, Bergen, Volckens, and Knoras 1992; Branch, Duerst-Lahti, Duke, Guy, Hale, Johnson, Kelly and Stambaugh 1992; Johnson 1991; Jurik 1988; Lovrich and Stohr 1993; Walters 1992; Zupan 1986). Issues such as workplace sexism, sexual harassment, and comparable worth (equal pay for equal work) have been examined in corrections and other public service work (e.g., Beck and Stohr 1991; Jurik and Halemba 1984; Jurik and Winn 1987; Kane 1992; Martin 1980; Petersen 1982; Wright and Saylor 1991; Zupan 1986).

The limited research that currently is available on gender differences in the corrections field suggests the existence of a few noteworthy similarities and some differences between males and females. For instance, in their analyses of workplace perceptions of men and women correctional officers in the U.S. Bureau of Prisons, Wright and Saylor (1991: 519-521) found among other things

that women's levels of job satisfaction are commensurate to that of men, but their stress levels tend to be higher. These findings were in part replicated in the jail setting by Lovrich and Stohr (1993), who found that there were slight differences in reported stress levels between the genders (women reporting more), but basic congruence between the sexes in their perceptions of job satisfaction, the job environment, and the level of commitment to their workplace.

Such findings coincide with discoveries made by other researchers with respect to job satisfaction (Cullen, Link, Wolfe and Frank 1985; Jurik and Halemba 1984; Walters 1992) and job stress (Bartol et al. 1992; Cullen et al. 1985; Johnson 1991; Stinchcomb 1986). Women tend to report similar levels of job satisfaction as men in most areas of work, and higher levels of stress than their male counterparts in many areas of human services work performed by both genders. In some studies (e.g. Gross, Larson, Urban and Zupan 1994; Morash and Haar 1995) the levels of stress reported for both genders are similar, but the origins for men and women may differ. For instance, women may be "stressed" by the same factors that affect men in the workplace AND by additional circumstances that are generally particular to their status as females (e.g., sexual and gender harassment). For example, Morash and Haar (1995: 132) found in their study of the police work environment that "[a]n additional 5 percent of the variance in women's stress can be explained by workplace problems due to subgroup status, notably bias and language harassment."

As with women police officers and correctional workers in prisons, women correctional officers in jails have reported being the frequent targets of sexual and gender harassment as they have moved into a traditionally male-dominated area (Beck and Stohr 1991). They are also likely to have experienced the increased respect and status, not to mention pay, that attaches to their new correctional roles. This financial gain for women may represent ameliorated circumstances which compensate, to some extent, for the stress of working in environments where one is often not readily

accepted.

Other related findings indicate that women may value their work for its “service” orientation more often than their male counterparts; colleagues who tend to place greater emphasis on the pay and security benefits aspects of the job (Jurik 1985; Jurik and Halemba 1984; Walters 1992). Such findings are bolstered by Feingold’s (1994) recent meta-analysis indicating that females tend to score higher than males on scales of “tendermindedness.” However, Stohr, Lovrich and Wood (1996) found no such support for this notion in their study of male and female perceptions of value placed on training topics designated as either “service” or “security” oriented in predominately male podular/direct supervision jails.’ In their study they found that female officers were no more likely than their male counterparts to value service types of training. Similarly, Stohr, Lovrich and Mays (1997) were unable to document a difference in service or security orientation, as reflected in the rating of training topics, utilizing this exclusively women’s jail data set. In this research we will explore similar work-related issues as were investigated in these previous studies, but we will examine in particular detail gender-based perceptions of job enrichment and level of job satisfaction in particular. The working hypotheses investigated here are these:

1. Given the extant research in this general area, we would predict that men and women correctional officers will not differ in their perceptions of either the inherent challenge of their work or their level of job satisfaction.
2. Relatedly, we also expect that -- to the extent it can be measured in this data set -- women correctional officers will not express more “service related” preferences or “tendermindedness” inclinations than their male counterparts.

² For our purposes, a social service work orientation is one focused on meeting inmate needs, whereas a security work orientation is focused on inmate custody and control.

STUDY AND METHODS

Based on personal correspondence with Ken Kerle, editor of *AMERICAN JAILS* and review of the American Jail Association's (1991) publication *WHO'S WHO IN JAIL MANAGEMENT*, we were able to identify 18 exclusively women's jails.³ In order to facilitate site visits, the research team imposed three criteria on the set of specific jails chosen for in-depth study: (1) the facility had to be confirmed as an exclusively women's jail; (2) the jail had to house more than 100 inmates on average daily headcount; and, (3) to the extent possible, each jail had to provide some degree of geographical representativeness.

Telephone calls to the jail managers confirmed for us that 17 of the original 18 jails identified were exclusively women's facilities. One small jail was not, and it was eliminated from subsequent consideration. Twelve of the jails met our size criterion; however, when it came time to finalize plans, two of the largest jails in the nation declined to participate, citing budgetary constraints and a variety of logistical problems. We do know, through informed sources, that one of these large jails was "frightened off" by the sexual harassment questions in the staff survey because the department was party to a suit at the time of the study and did not wish to risk the chances of our findings used against it in the courtroom setting. Three medium-size jails also declined the invitation to be involved in the research, citing staff shortages, budgetary constraints, and/or concerns with inmate privacy. As a consequence, five jails were chosen from the remaining seven for site visits, and the remaining two jails were surveyed through the mail.

Three caveats should be issued concerning the jails included in this study, and regarding those that refused. First, one of the jails included in the final sample is a combined jail and women's state

³ Personnel at the Bureau of Justice Statistics have since validated this estimate of 18 exclusively women's jails in this country during the 1991-1993 time period.

prison. While this facility represents an exceptional case on some of the factors we examined, we included it because it is a modern facility that does house a substantial short-term detention (jail) population. Second, while every effort was made to insure geographical representation, most exclusively women's jails are located in major urban centers along the east or west coasts of the country. In fact, eight of the jails initially identified were located in one state. Third, the managers of the five jails chosen for site visits in all likelihood agreed to participate because they thought of their facilities in positive terms, organizationally and operationally. It is likely that the five jails that decided not to participate may have been faced with greater than normal crowding, budgetary problems, or other operational burdens.

Even with these substantial limitations in mind, we feel that the data gathered in this research are important to report upon for a variety of reasons. The best available evidence indicates that to date no one has undertaken a systematic, nationwide study of exclusively women's jails. Additionally, given the fairly wide geographical dispersal of the seven facilities (located in five states), their similarities on a number of facility and inmate population dimensions, and the common features of virtually all county jails, there is a reasonable likelihood that the data collected from these jail staff provide a cross-sectional snapshot of working in exclusively women's jails from mid-summer 1992 through Fall/Winter 1992-93.

METHODS

The five jail site visits were completed in July and August, 1992. Mailings to the two additional jails took place in the Fall and Winter of 1992-93. At least two research team members participated in each of the site visits. In addition to the staff survey, additional data were collected from the jail facilities via inmate surveys, institutional profile forms, structured interviews, observation sheets, etc. These data

will be examined in subsequent research.

Staff questionnaires in all instances were mailed to the participating jails and in six jails they were distributed by the jail administrator or his designee. We experienced a rather low return rate in the initial distribution of questionnaires in County 4, so we physically redistributed the staff surveys and collected them upon completion of our visit. In the other four site visits, most questionnaires were collected personally by the researchers, and they were mailed back to the research university for those two jails participating via the mail survey. Also, some employees chose to return their surveys via the mail rather than return them at the time of our visit.

The questionnaires were quite extensive (12 pages in length), and included in them were correctional demographic questions regarding gender, age, race/ethnicity, position type, length of service, etc. Also included were standardized instruments measuring employee perception of job enrichment and sense of job satisfaction, and measuring the quality of the living environment for inmates. Of particular relevance for this research were the questions related to job enrichment and job satisfaction for staff.

The standardized instrument used to measure job enrichment was the Job Diagnostic Survey originally developed by Hackman and Oldham (1974). Use of this measure requires that respondents estimate on a seven-point scale the degree to which certain attributes presently apply to their own job. Included in the Hackman and Oldham instrument are questions geared toward deciphering the degree of *task identification*, *autonomy*, *skill variety*, *task significance*, and *feedback* thought to exist in one's work; these characteristics represent the principal attributes of an "enriched" job.⁴ According to Hackman and Oldham (1974), these five "core job dimensions" translate into three "critical psychological states" which

⁴ The complete version of the Job Diagnostic Survey includes eight sections that measure the enriching characteristics of the job, along with measures of affective reactions to the job and the presence of three critical psychological states. Because of time and space limitations in this research, only one of these sections was used.

result in the personal and work outcomes of high internal work motivation, high quality of work performance, high satisfaction with the work, and low absenteeism and turnover. Skill variety, **task identity** and **task significance** constitute the critical psychological state of “experienced meaningfulness of the work,” autonomy measures the critical state of “experienced responsibility of outcomes of the work,” and feedback measures the “knowledge of the actual results of the work activities” a critical psychological state. Each of the job characteristic scores is weighted to reflect the relative importance of each dimension and combined to create a single “motivating potential” score. The motivating potential scores range from 0 to 360, with 0 reflecting a total absence of motivating potential and 360 indicating a total fulfillment of potential.⁵

The Job Descriptive Index devised by Smith, Kendall and Hulin (1969) is a widely used measure of job satisfaction. Satisfaction is measured as it relates to five areas of work life: *character of work, level of pay, opportunity for promotion, quality of supervision, and regard for other people on the job*. For instance, employees are asked to indicate whether adjectives such as “fascinating” or “tiresome” did or did not describe work on their present job (undecided was also an option). There are 8 to 18 items in each of the five subscales, and the range for the subscale scores varied by weight assigned to each item and scale. Low index scores indicate a low level of job satisfaction, and high scores indicate a high level of job satisfaction.

Across the seven counties a total of 443 questionnaires were distributed and 182 were returned (156 of those respondents were correctional officers), producing an overall return rate of 41%, with a range

⁵ The motivating potential score is created by adding the three task related subscales and dividing them by three to create a task-related mean variable. This newly created variable is then multiplied by the autonomy subscale and then by the feedback subscale, the product of which represents the motivating potential score.

spanning a high of 80% returned in County 2 to a low of 18% returned in County 5⁶ A number of factors accounted for the divergent response rates. The custody staffs at the jails worked numerous shift arrangements, including 10- or 12-hour shifts at some jails. The particular shift assignments made questionnaire distribution and collection follow-up difficult in a number of circumstances. Some of the employees were on sick leave or days off when the site visits were scheduled (we would estimate about 10%). The jurisdiction of County 5 suffered a major natural disaster that interrupted all governmental services (including the return of our questionnaires).⁷ And, finally, the managers differed in their interest in the results and emphasis on having their employees complete the questionnaires.

THE FINDINGS AND ANALYSES

General Characteristics of the Staff Respondents

As indicated on Tables 1 and 2, the staff respondents to our questionnaire tended to be young (under 35), female,⁸ white (but with almost as many minority group members), with some college education and several with a two-year degree or more, and employed for two or more years. In terms of staff gender,

⁶ In Counties 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7, a total of 156, 30, 29, 56, 110, 38 and 24 surveys were distributed, respectively. A total of 62, 24, 16, 22, 20, 19, and 19 surveys, respectively, were returned for a return rate of 42 % , 80 % , 55 % , 39 % , 18 % , 50% and 79 % .

⁷ Given the devastating impact that this disaster had on social service delivery institutions in County 5, we did not think it would be considerate for us to attempt a second survey administration of the questionnaire. Despite the low return rate in County 5, we were also reluctant to drop this jail from our analysis because of the contribution it made in terms of minority group respondents. Consequently, we kept County 5 in the analysis, while recognizing that the data may be weakened by the low return rate of the respondents from this county.

^a The greater number of female respondents is consistent with the greater number of female staff employed in these jails.

the best available evidence to date has indicated that the percentage of female correctional officers nationwide in jails is approximately 24% (Bureau of Justice Statistics 1995: 8). However, these figures include all jails rather than just exclusively women's jails.

As is indicated on Table 2, 76% of the respondents (126) were female. The gender percentages of the respondents were within 5% of the total staff percentages reported in the facility profiles, with the exception of the County 3 and County 4 jails; the staff in these jails were 90% and 66% female, respectively, yet 100% of our respondents to the staff questionnaire in these jails were female. Another notable deviation on the gender dimension were the chief administrators of the facilities, six out of seven of whom were white males.

In terms of race/ethnicity, nearly 53% of the staff respondents were white. The second most common group, almost one-fourth, was African-Americans. As illustrated on Table 1, the staff member respondents to the questionnaire are a relatively well-educated group. This may be a function of the number of female staff members, many of whom tend to be better educated than their male counterparts (see especially Zupan 1992: 328-329). It is important to remember, however, that these jails, unlike many others, are located in major metropolitan areas which offer a variety of educational opportunities. The last section of Table 1 provides information on length of employment. It is apparent from the employees' ages, since most are reasonably young, that there are few long-term staff members working in most of these jails.

When the counties are collapsed into a single group and then disaggregated by gender, as reported in Table 2, we see that in comparison to male officers, the female officers tend to be slightly older, are more likely to be African-American than Hispanic-American when they are minority group members, are more widely dispersed than the males in their educational attainment, have been employed longer in the jail, and are less likely to have previous jail experience than their male counterparts.

Tables 1 and 2 about here

The perceptions of job enrichment as represented by Hackman and Oldham's Job Diagnostic Survey dimensions and items are presented for men and women in Tables 3 and 4. The results reported in Table 3 indicate that female and male correctional officers differ little in their perceptions of the presence (or absence) of enriching characteristics in their jobs, with the sole exception of "autonomy." In this data set, and because of the need to abbreviate the survey, the "autonomy" dimension is composed of a single item -- namely: "The job requires a lot of cooperative work with other people" (see Table 4). This finding of a more cooperative and people- focused perception of correctional work by women is bolstered by another statistically significant gender difference (albeit at only the .10 level) on the item "This job is one where a lot of people can be affected by how well the work gets done" (see Table 4).

In sum, though on most of the job diagnostic items and their dimensions the female and male officers differed little in their perceptions, female officers do appear to be a bit more focused on the cooperative and people-oriented nature of the work. This finding would appear to support the belief in a greater social service work orientation on the part of female public workers as discussed by other scholars in this area (Feingold 1995; Jurik 1985; Jurik and Halemba 1984; Walters 1992). Likewise, this finding runs contrary to our second working hypothesis that female and male correctional officers would not differ with respect to a "social service work" set of perceptions.

Perhaps the most important finding to be gleaned from the results reported in these tables is that the correctional officers in these jails were typically far below the norm observed in typical public sector employee surveys in their assessment of enriching job characteristics. This is starkly illustrated by the roughly 15- and 26-point differences, respectively, between the norm for the overall motivating potential

score and female and male officers in these women's jails. Clearly these jails are not comparable in their enriching characteristics to other public service work typically observed in employee surveys.

Tables 3 and 4 about here

We are disturbed by the low levels of job satisfaction expressed by these correctional officers as compared to appropriate norms for each dimension and the overall job satisfaction measure (see Table 5). Why these differences between the norms for job enrichment and job satisfaction and the perceptions of these correctional officers might exist is not readily apparent. Taken in tandem, however, these findings should raise some concern about the ability of jail jobs to attract and hold the most talented of their staff.

We also find on Table 5 again that there are few discernible differences between male and female staff members and their perceptions on the five dimensions of job satisfaction or on the overall satisfaction measure. On four of the dimensions (character of work, level of pay, quality of supervision, people on the job) and on the overall satisfaction measure, women tend to be more positive in their assessments of job satisfaction than the men, although none of these differences reaches statistical significance. These findings on job satisfaction and the overall findings on job enrichment would lend support to our first hypothesis that men and women correctional officers will differ little in their assessment of correctional work.

When the independent variables are regressed on the motivating potential score and the overall job satisfaction measure, however, it becomes clear that neither gender nor the other demographic variables enhance our understanding of these correctional officers' perceptions of the level of job enrichment or sense of job satisfaction (see Table 6); these findings are confirmed by the weak R squares for both

models. Only months on the job (employed) is statistically significant when regressed on the overall job satisfaction measure, with the ominous observation being that the longer these correctional officer are employed in these county facilities the lower their level of job satisfaction.

Tables 5 and 6 about here

CONCLUSIONS

The data from these seven exclusively women's jails indicate that female and male correctional staff have essentially parallel perceptions of both the enriching characteristics of their work and levels of job satisfaction. This was a finding that was predictable given the literature in this general area. Women and men tend to experience most aspects of their work in the criminal justice system similarly, and they are inclined to derive comparable degrees of satisfaction or dissatisfaction from it.

That their perceptions of job characteristics are far below the norms recorded for other public service work should give us pause, and this observation should motivate jail managers to strive to make improvements in the jail work environment. Numerous studies in the public administration literature suggest that such improvements should include more developmental training for staff (e.g., interpersonal communication, problem solving, diversity, ethics, anger and stress management, sexual harassment, team building), the provision of opportunities for participation by staff in task determination, problem-solving, leadership and self evaluation that affects their work area and pay that is commensurate with their skills and abilities (Behr 1995; Denhardt 1993; Osborne and Gaebler 1992; National Commission on the Public Service 1993). To be run well with staff who are prone to stay and produce, it would appear that jails should be managed with these studies and their findings in mind.

We also found some, albeit limited, support for the hypothesis of other correctional scholars that female staff bring more of a social service orientation to their work than their male counterparts (Jurik 1985; Jurik and Halemba 1984; Walters 1992; [see Tables 3 and 41]). We did not expect to discover even a modest difference with these data in light of the fact that related research in jail settings had failed to unearth such a finding (Stohr et al. 1996; 1997). Why this difference may exist, and the extent to which it translates into actual worker behavior, are important questions begging for future social science research. We believe that such research might be most fruitful if it employs a mixture of methodologies suited to the collection of qualitative and quantitative data which would allow the deciphering of whether, when and why men and women might differ in their job perceptions and behavior.

If women correctional officers are adopting more of a social service work orientation, for whatever reason (e.g., importation of socialized values and roles from the outside and/or exclusion from the subculture and their imposed norms), then they are also performing under the emerging paradigm for correctional work that falls under the aegis of human service work as described by Johnson (1996). Human service correctional officers help inmates cope with their confinement by recognizing their legitimate functions as goods and service providers for inmates, referral agents and advocates for inmates and facilitators in inmate adjustment. Though many correctional officers informally function as human service workers (Johnson 1996), it is not a model that is generally accepted in corrections. It may be that the growth of female staff in corrections will coincide with the movement to widespread and formal adoption of a human service paradigm for corrections work.

References

- American Jail Association (1991) Who's Who in Jail. Management. Hagerstown, MA: American Jail Association.
- Bartol, C. R., Bergen, G.T., Volckens, J.S. and & Knoras, K.M. (1992) "Women in Small-town Policing: Job Performance and Stress." Criminal Justice and Behavior. 19(3): 240-259.
- Beck, A.C. & Stohr, M.K. (1991) "Gender and Harassment-victim Support for Affirmative Action." State and Local Government Review. 23(1): 31-36.
- Behr, R.D. (1995) "Creating an Innovative Organization: Ten Hints for Involving Frontline Workers." State and Local Government Review. 27(3): 221-234.
- Branch, M.F., Duerst-Lahti, G., Duke, L.L., Guy, M.E., Hale, M.M., Johnson, C.M., Kelly, R.M., & Stambaugh, P.M. (1992) Women and Men of the States: Public Administrators at the State Level. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharp.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics (1995) Census of Jails and Annual Survey of Jails: Jails and Jail Inmates 1993-94. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Chapman, J.R., Minor, E.K., Rieker, P., Mills, T.L. & Bottum, M. (1983) Women Employed in Corrections. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cullen, F.T., Link, B.G. Wolfe, N.T. & Frank, J. (1985) "The Social Dimensions of Correctional Officer Stress." Justice Quarterly. 2: 505-33.
- Denhardt, R. B. (1993) The Pursuit of Significance: Strategies for Managerial Success in Public Organizations. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Feingold, A. (1994) "Gender Differences in Personality: A Meta-Analysis." Psychological Bulletin. 116(3): 429-456.
- Gross, G.R., Larson, S.J., Urban, G.D. and L.L. Zupan (1994) "Gender Differences in Occupational Stress Among Correctional Officers." American Journal of Criminal Justice. 18(2): 219-234.
- Johnson, L. B. (1991) "Job Strain Among Police Officers: Gender Comparisons." Police Studies: The International Review of Police Development. 14(1): 12-16.
- Johnson, R. (1996) Hard Time: Understanding and Reforming the Prison. Second Edition. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

- Jurik, N.C. & Halemba, G.J. (1984) "Gender, Working Conditions, and the Job Satisfaction of Women in a Non-traditional Occupation: Female Correctional Officers in Men's Prison." Sociology Quarterly. 25(Autumn): 551-66.
- Jurik, N.C. (1985) "An Officer and a Lady: Organizational Barriers to Women Working as Correctional Officers in Men's Prisons." Social Problems. 32: 375-88.
- Jurik, N.C. & Winn, R. (1987) "Describing Correctional-Security Dropouts and Rejects: An Individual or Organizational Profile?" Criminal Justice and Behavior. 14(1): 5-25.
- Jurik, N.C. (1988) "Striking a Balance: Female Correctional Officers, Gender Role Stereotypes, and Male Prisons." Sociological Inquiry. 58(3): 291-305.
- Kane, E.W. (1992) "Race, Gender, and Attitudes Toward Gender Stratification." Social Psychology Quarterly. 55(3): 311-320.
- Lovrich, N.P. and M.K. Stohr (1993) "Gender and Jail Work: Correctional Policy Implications of Perceptual Diversity in the Work Force." Policy Studies Review. 12(1/2): 66-84.
- Martin, S.E. (1980) Breaking and Entering: Policewomen on Patrol. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Morash, M. and R.N. Haar (1995) "Gender, Workplace Problems, and Stress in Policing." Justice Quarterly. 12(1): 113-140.
- National Commission on the State and Local Public Service [Winter Commission] (1993) Hard Truths/Tough Choices: An Agenda for State and Local Reform. Albany, NY: Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government.
- Osborne, D. and T. Gaebler (1992) Reinventing Government. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Petersen, C.B. (1982) "Doing Time with the Boys: An Analysis of Women Correctional Officers in All-Male Facilities." In B. Raffel Price and N. Sokoloff (eds.) The Criminal Justice System and Women: Women Offenders/Victims/Workers, pp. 437-460. New York: Clark Boardman.
- Pollock, J.M. (1995) "Women in Corrections: Custody and the 'Caring Ethic.'" In Merlo, A.V. and J.M. Pollock (eds.) Women, Law and Social Control, pp. 97-116. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Stinchcomb, J.B. (1986) "Correctional Officer Stress: Looking at the Causes, You May Be the Cure." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, in Orlando, Florida.
- Stohr, M. K. (1990) Staff Turnover and Correctional Management in "New Generation" Jails: Key Implementation Issues for a Significant Correctional Policy Innovation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Pullman, Washington: Washington State University.

- Stohr, M.K., Lovrich, N.P. and G.L. Wilson (1992) "Staff Stress in Contemporary Jails: Assessing Problem Severity and the Payoff of Progressive Personnel Practices." Journal of Criminal Justice. 22(4): 313-327.
- Stohr, M.K., Lovrich, N.P. and M. J. Wood (1996) "Service v. Security Concerns in Contemporary Jails: Testing Behavior Differences in Training Topic Assessments." Journal of Criminal Justice. 24(5): 437-448.
- Stohr, M.K., Lovrich, N.P. and G.L. Mays (1997) "Service v. Security Focus in Training Assessments: Testing Gender Differences Among Contemporary Women's Jail Correctional Officers." Women and Criminal Justice. 9(1): 65-85.
- Walters, S. (1992) "Attitudinal and Demographic Differences Between Male and Female Corrections Officers: A Study in Three Midwestern Prisons." Journal of Offender Rehabilitation. 18(1/2): 173-189.
- Wright, K. & Saylor, W.G. (1991) "Male and Female Employees' Perceptions of Prison Work: Is There a Difference." Justice Quarterly. S(4): 505-524.
- Zupan, L.L. (1992) "The Progress of Women Correctional Officers in All-Male Prisons." In Moyer, I. (ed.), The Changing Roles of Women in the Criminal Justice System, pp. 323-343. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press.
- Zupan, L.L. (1986) "Gender-Related Differences in Correctional Officers' Perceptions and Attitudes." Journal of Criminal Justice. 14: 349-61.

TABLE 1
Distribution of Employee Demographic Characteristics
by County Jail Facility

COUNTY	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Respondents	56	24	12	16	15	16	17
AGE:							
Under 35	84.9%	79.2%	66.7%	60.0%	76.9%	66.7%	80.0%
35 to 49	13.3	20.9	33.2	26.8	15.4	26.8	13.4
50 plus	1.9	00.0	00.0	13.4	7.7	6.7	6.7
GENDER:							
Female	73.2	95.8	100	100	66.7	75.0	70.6
Male	26.8	4.2	00.0	00.0	33.3	25.0	29.4
ETHNICITY:							
African-American	20.0	8.3	00.0	60.0	66.7	25.5	35.3
Hispanic	12.7	20.8	00.0	6.7	20.0	00.0	23.5
White	58.2	58.3	100	33.3	13.3	68.8	35.3
Other	9.1	12.5	00.0	00.0	00.0	6.3	5.9
EDUCATION:							
High School or Less	1.8	4.2	00.0	6.7	00.0	00.0	23.5
Some College	67.8	62.5	83.4	73.3	60.0	66.7	64.7
BA or More	25.0	33.3	16.7	20.0	33.3	33.3	11.8
Other	5.4	00.0	00.0	00.0	6.7	00.0	00.0
POSITION:							
COs	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
MEAN MONTHS EMPLOYED:							
	21.0	34.8	48.0	58.0	52.5	45.7	43.7

Note: all columns may not sum to 100 due to rounding errors.

TABLE 2
Distribution of Demographic Characteristics of
Correctional Officers Across County Facilities, by Gender

GENDER	FEMALES	MALES
NUMBER:	126 (76%)	30 (24%)
AGE:		
Under 35	74.6%	86.2%
35 to 49	20.7	10.2
50 plus	4.0	3.4
RACE/ETHNICITY:		
African-		
American	29.8	16.7
Hispanic	10.5	23.3
American Indian	.8	3.3
Asian-American	00.0	3.3
White	53.2	53.3
Other	5.6	00.0
EDUCATION:		
High School or Less	5.6	00.0
Some College	16.1	13.3
Associate Degree	48.4	66.7
BA/BS	15.3	10.0
Some Graduate and Beyond	11.3	10.0
Other	3.2	00.0
PREVIOUS JAIL EXPERIENCE:		
YES	15.1	27.6
No	84.9	72.4
MONTHS EMPLOYED:		
Mean	37.9	32.9
Standard Deviation	43.4	23.7

Note: all columns may not sum to 100 due to rounding errors.

TABLE 3
Comparison of Job Diagnostic Survey Scale Mean Scores Between Genders

GENDER	FEMALES	MALES
NUMBER:	126 (76%)	30(24%)
SKILL VARIETY (NORM=5.18)		
MEAN	5.1	5.0
SD	1.1	1.1
TASK IDENTIFICATION (NORM= 5.09)		
MEAN	3.5	3.2
SD	1.4	1.5
TASK SIGNIFICANCE (NORM=6.06)		
MEAN	4.3	4.6
SD	2.0	2.0
AUTONOMY (NORM=5.04)		
MEAN	6.6	6.2*
SD	.9	.8
FEEDBACK FROM JOB (NORM=5.12)		
MEAN	4.3	4.4
SD	1.2	1.1
MOTIVATING POTENTIAL (NORM= 140)		
MEAN	124.8	113.7
SD	50.1	32.6

Note: The higher the mean, the greater the presence of the characteristic in the job. Norms listed for public sector employees are based on numerous studies conducted in state and local government agencies (see Hackman and Oldham 1974).

***Statistically significant at the .05 level.**

TABLE 4**Comparison of the 14 Job Diagnostic Item Means Between Genders**

GENDER	FEMALES	MALES
NUMBER:	126 (76%)	30 (24%)
The job requires me to use a number of complex or higher-level skills.		
MEAN	4.0	4.3
SD	1.9	1.5
The job requires a lot of cooperative work with other people.		
MEAN	6.6	6.2*
SD	.9	.8
The job is arranged so that I do not have the chance to do an entire piece of work from beginning to end.		
MEAN	3.0	2.6
SD	1.7	1.6
Just doing the work required by the job provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing.		
MEAN	4.5	4.8
SD	1.6	1.4
The job is quite simple and repetitive.		
MEAN	4.3	4.5
SD	2.0	2.0
The job can be done adequately by a person working alone -- without talking or checking with other people.		
MEAN	2.7	2.4
SD	2.0	1.7
The supervisors and co-workers on this job almost <u>never</u> give me any “feedback” about how well I am doing in my work.		
MEAN	3.8	4.0
SD	2.0	2.2
This job is one where a lot of people can be affected by how well the work gets done.		
MEAN	6.3	5.7**
SD	1.1	1.4

TABLE 4 CONTINUED

he job denies me any chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.		
MEAN	2.7	2.8
SD	1.7	1.8
Supervisors often let me know how well they think I am performing the job.		
MEAN	3.9	4.3
SD	1.9	2.1
The job provides me the chance to completely finish the pieces of work I begin.		
MEAN	4.9	4.9
SD	1.5	1.8
The job itself provides very few clues about whether or not I am performing well.		
MEAN	3.4	3.4
SD	1.8	1.8
The job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.		
MEAN	4.3	4.7
SD	1.8	1.6
The job itself is not very significant or important in the broader scheme of things.		
MEAN	2.6	2.4
SD	1.8	1.6

***Statistically significant at the .05 level.**

****Statistically significant at the .10 level.**

TABLE 5**Comparison of Job Descriptive Index Mean Scores Across County Facilities**

GENDER	FEMALES	MALES
NUMBER:	126 (76%)	30 (24%)
CHARACTER OF WORK (NORM=34.5)		
MEAN	23.9	21.6
SD	9.9	13.2
LEVEL OF PAY (NORM=25.0)		
MEAN	23.1	19.5
SD	12.4	15.3
OPPORTUNITY FOR PROMOTION (NORM= 17.4)		
MEAN	17.6	18.0
SD	14.0	15.1
QUALITY OF SUPERVISION (NORM=39.3)		
MEAN	33.2	32.7
SD	14.6	15.7
PEOPLE ON THE JOB (NORM=40.3)		
MEAN	32.5	31.4
SD	14.3	18.1
OVERALL SATISFACTION (NORM= 156.5)		
MEAN	131.7	125.6
SD	42.6	42.5

Note: Higher means indicate higher levels of job satisfaction in the job. Norms listed for public sector employees are based on ten separate studies (n=25,007) conducted in state and local government agencies over the period 1980 to 1992 (archival data collected by the Division of Governmental Studies and Services at Washington State University).