INMATE-PERPETRATED HARASSMENT: EXPLORING THE GENDER-SPECIFIC EXPERIENCE OF FEMALE CORRECTION OFFICERS

by

SARAH BILLINGSLEY CHAPMAN

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Criminal Justice in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2009

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Criminal Justice in satisfaction of the dissertation requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Jayne Mooney

Date — Chair of Examining Committee

Karen Terry

Date — Executive Officer

Maureen O'Connor

Ned Benton

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

ABSTRACT

Inmate-Perpetrated Harassment:
Exploring the Gender-Specific Experience of
Female Correction Officers

by

Sarah Billingsley Chapman

Dissertation Advisor: Jayne Mooney

Perhaps no other work environment is as mysterious to non-participants as is the institute of corrections in America. Other than the officers and inmates of a correctional institution, few people understand, or even care to venture into, the dynamics of a prison or jail. Because of this disregard, many important sociological studies have failed to explore the correctional institution as a legitimate workplace. In particular, sexual harassment studies have all but neglected the correctional workplace. Nevertheless, as in any work environment, sexual harassment is a significant issue in jails and prisons, even more commonplace and more often ignored than that harassment in other workplaces. Furthermore, a significant portion of harassment against female correction officers is perpetrated, not by their coworkers, but by the inmates for whom these officers are responsible.

This exploratory research effort utilizes a questionnaire to examine the nature and consequences of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female correction officers. The respondents to the study's questionnaire indicate the existence of a significant amount of sexual harassment perpetrated against female correction officers by male inmates. Yet, the majority of the sample group were reluctant to identify either their

experiences as sexual harassment or themselves as victims of such harassment. From the combined analysis of the quantitative and qualitative responses of 21 female officers of the Lafayette Parish Correctional Center in Lafayette, LA, the study proposes the existence of a labeling disjunction among female correction officers with respect to their perceptions of the sexual misconduct of male inmates. This study concludes with recommendations for both future research and policy developments that may enhance general understanding and management of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female correction officers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to first express my sincere gratitude to those at the Lafayette Parish Correctional Center for their assistance and cooperation in conducting this research. I am indebted to Captain Griff Champagne and Lieutenant Myra Mouton whose support during the data collection phase made this research possible. And, to the correction officers who participated in the study, thank you for sharing your experiences. This research would not have been possible without your participation.

I would also like to thank my committee, most notably Jayne Mooney, my dissertation mentor. Your guidance and support throughout this entire process has been invaluable to the completion of my dissertation. I also thank Maureen O'Connor and Ned Benton for their support and assistance, especially in the latter stages of the writing process. Your individual insights have brought added dimensions to my research. Without each of the members of my committee, I feel my final dissertation would be lacking in its completion.

I lastly would like to express my deepest gratitude to those who have a personal impact on the successful completion of my dissertation. First, to my over-achieving siblings whose very existence provides me with inspiration and motivation to fulfill my dreams, I thank you all. Emily, Daniel, and Bradly, I could not ask for better siblings or better friends. Thank you for always being there for me. Secondly, without the persistent encouragement of my parents, Arthur and Kathy Billingsley, I am not sure I would have undertaken graduate school, much less this dissertation. I would like to express my most sincere thanks to you both for everything you have done that has made my higher education possible. Finally, to my patient and supportive husband, Lawrence, you have

been an absolute source of strength for me in the final stages of the dissertation process. Thank you for your unwavering support and faith during my many nights of research and writing. Without your steadfast encouragement and belief in me, I am not sure I would be writing these acknowledgements for my dissertation today.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Workplace and employee studies have received a great deal of attention in recent years. Sexual harassment in the work environment is recognized as a serious social problem that produces detrimental consequences not only to the individual target, but also to the productivity of the company in which the target is employed. While recent studies have elicited many reforms in improving the work environment, research has neglected those arenas that are sheltered from the public eye. Most notably, the correctional setting has garnered little attention in the sexual harassment research despite evidence that suggests its susceptibility to the problem.

Need for Research

One of the most significant findings of recent sexual harassment research has been the disproportionately high prevalence of such harassment in those workplaces historically reserved for men (Pogrebin & Poole, 1997, p. 118; Stohr, Mays, Beck & Kelley, 1998, p. 136). For example, women in sports and those in the military are more often targeted, not only by the lewd comments and sexual advances, but also by accusations of homosexuality and masculinity, than women in more traditionally female work environments experience (Kirby, Greaves & Hankivsky, 2002, p. 133). Despite the obvious masculinized nature of the unique environment, few sexual harassment studies have concentrated specifically on corrections (Belknap, 1995, pp. 413-415; McMahon, 1999, pp. 31-32; Sbraga & O'Donohue, 2000; Zimmer, 1986). Much of the current knowledge regarding women in corrections and sexual harassment has been inferred from

the data collected from women in other nontraditional occupations (Jenne & Kersting, 1998, p. 167; McMahon, p. 4). However, these studies are unable to account for the unique correctional environment and experience of female correction officers.

In general, the correctional environment differs from most work environments in many aspects. First, correctional institutions are "enclosed, all-encompassing environments" (Wortley, 2002, p. 11). Because of the secluded nature of many correctional institutions, the officers employed in these institutions are responsible for performing a wide variety of tasks necessary for keeping the facilities operating (Zimmer, 1987). In addition to many routine duties, correction officers are responsible for maintaining the custody and control of the institution's inmate population despite having very little formal power relative to other members of the institutional hierarchy.

The work of a correction officer can be simultaneously mundane and emotionally taxing. Correction officers' shifts can last up to 18 hours with the possibility of overtime. During these shifts, officers are often unable to leave the facility and must adapt to the environment just as the inmates do (Lombardo, 1981). Part of their distinctive adaptation is the correction officers' dependence on one another for "support in times of crisis and at times information and cooperation while they attempt to carry out their normal work duties" (Lombardo, p. 163). This interdependence is necessary, not only for the efficiency of the officers' duties, but also for the safety and security of themselves and the institution.

The correctional environment is also unique from other workplaces in the nature of the relationship between officers and inmates. Jacobs and Kraft (1978) define this relationship as one of structured conflict, in which tension between the groups is

persistent as a result of role conflict. This structured conflict influences every interaction between officers and inmates and may contribute to an environment characterized by distrust and stress.

The experience of female correction officers has additional unique features not present in other work environments. Most notably, the duties of a correction officer are in almost direct contrast to the traditional expectations for women's behavior (Zimmer, 1987, p. 415).

> [T]he position of female jail officer is a unique form of nontraditional work for women; it is qualitatively different from other work in that violence is prevalent in the work environment and also that the job is perceived to be a highly sex-typed male job requiring qualities of dominance, authoritativeness, and aggressiveness. (Pogrebin & Poole, 1997, p. 41)

Female correction officers experience a "type of role conflict that . . . occurs when sexual status and occupational status are incongruent" (Zimmer, 1987, p. 420). Unlike many other female professionals who resolve such conflicts by adopting the expectations of either their sexual status or their occupational status, female correction officers "have integrated certain aspects of the traditional female gender role into a traditional male occupational role to create new ways of performing the job" (Zimmer, p. 420). Though such a tactic may ease the role conflict these women experience at work, it also acts to further distinguish the women from the men in corrections, thereby hindering their complete integration.

Adult male prisons in most states have increasingly employed female correction officers over the past two decades. Today, women represent nearly 30 percent of all

correction officers nationally, comprising about 42,500 of the nation's 151,200 total correction officers (Maguire & Pastore, 2003, p. 92). Like their male counterparts, female correction officers enter the work sphere with their own family-related, personal or social issues which they must suspend for their own – and coworkers' – safety. The stress that the prison or jail setting alone can impose on preexisting problems can be overwhelming, but when coupled with sexually harassing behavior, the stress experienced by female officers can not only negatively affect their job performance, but it can also affect their mental health. Previous studies fail to elaborate on the confluence of both the correctional environment and sexual harassment in the workplace.

More importantly with respect to gaps in the current literature, there is virtually no research focusing on the effects of sexual harassment perpetrated against female correction officers by members of the male inmate population. Just as the correctional environment warrants an individualized focus in sexual harassment research, the population of male inmates is equally unique in its nature and characteristics. The dynamic between male inmates and female officers differs from the traditional supervisor-employee or employee-employee relationships in the workplace. The sociological and psychological conceptions of sexual harassment may not equally apply to this distinct type of relationship. Furthermore, the legal definition of sexual harassment lacks any definitive relevance to this unique form of sexual harassment in the workplace, primarily because female correction officers may have little means of formal or legal retaliation against sexual harassment perpetrated against them by members of the male inmate population. Despite the lack of attention given to male inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female correction officers, there is ample reason to believe that

this type of harassment not only exists in the correctional environment, but also differs substantially in nature from the more traditional forms of sexual harassment in the workplace.

Perceptions among both male inmates and female correction officers concerning cross-gender supervision are varied. One study suggests that female correction officers overwhelmingly prefer working with male inmates over female inmates (72 percent) because they feel the male inmate population expresses more respect for women in corrections (Pollock, 1986, pp. 91-100). Other researchers, however, found that female corrections officers feel they are generally considered incompetent among the male inmate population and must prove their abilities before earning any degree of respect for authority from the inmates (Pogrebin & Poole, 1997, p. 47). A study of inmate perceptions of women in corrections reports a comparable degree of mixed feelings regarding cross gender supervision (Zimmer, 1986, pp. 60-65). Zimmer concludes that a male prisoner's first reaction to a female correction officer is usually based on "stereotypic images of women" (p. 60). The most common initial reactions among incarcerated men to the integration of female officers include amusement, concerns regarding her appearance, and hostility. While the research found that the novelty wears relatively quickly, most male inmates eventually developed one of three belief systems regarding female correction officers. Inmates report either feeling neutral, strongly in favor, or adamantly opposed to women in corrections. Among those who are either in favor or opposed to the integration of female correction officers, sex and gender stereotypes dominate their rationales. Inmates reported concerns ranging from privacy and physical ability to feelings of humiliation at taking orders from women.

Any one or more of these feelings toward female correction officers may culminate in expressions of sexual harassment. Inmates, generally, are likely to embody the characteristics common of sexual harassers: hyper-masculinity, increased desire for power and status, and traditional ideals regarding stereotypes of male behavior (Pryor, 1987; Pryor & Whalen, 1997). "[T]he blending of environmental factors and the predisposition of the potential perpetrator that combine to produce sexually harassing behaviors" (Sbraga & O'Donohue, 2000, p. 270) may suggest a susceptibility within the correctional atmosphere to inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment.

The demand that persistent sexual harassment imposes upon an individual's work performance, as well as upon the quality of their social lives, can be detrimental. It is important, both for officer safety and for cost effectiveness in the operation of jails and prisons, for supervisors to be aware of the possible nature and effect of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment on female employees. If such harassment does exist in corrections, with greater understanding of its dynamics, it will then be possible to develop a training program and policy aimed at preparing female correction officers in managing inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment.

This dissertation analyzes officer-reported perceptions of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment in the correctional setting. Specifically, these reported behaviors are presented in terms of the *Prevalence and Nature* of the behavior, the officers' *Recognition* of the behavior as a form of sexual harassment, the *Effects* of such behavior on the officers' health and job satisfaction, and officers' reported methods of *Management* related to inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment. This dissertation further explores a thematic explanation of the type of sexual harassment perpetrated against

female correction officers by male inmates, and offers some potential implications for correctional administrative policy.

Operationalization

The following terms are defined according to their meanings for the purposes of this study:

Correction Officer

The term "correction officer" applies only to those uniformed officers employed in county/parish, state, or federal penitentiaries who, by shift duty of 10 or more hours per day, are primarily concerned with the supervision of inmates. By this, I am excluding clerical, administrative, and supervisory staffs that operate either within or outside of the correctional facility. The reason I choose only to focus on the prior group of employees is because, in my experience, it is those herein defined as correction officers who suffer the intensity characteristic of the correctional setting: long hours, constant interaction with inmates, and seclusion from the "real world" during each shift.

Correctional Facility/Institution

For the purposes of this project, the terms "correctional facility" and "institution" – used interchangeably – refer only to such facilities that incarcerate either male inmates only or predominately male inmates. Obviously, for the purposes of this research, these facilities must also employ both male and female correction officers.

Sexual Harassment

There are three primary ways of defining sexual harassment: legally, behaviorally, and psychologically (Fitzgerald, Swan, & Magley, 1997). While each view of sexual

harassment is important to a comprehensive understanding of the behavior, the behavioral definition is most closely associated with "the taxonomies and survey instruments designed to collect data on offensive sex-related experiences in the workplace" (p. 9).

Just as there are numerous research projects focusing on the concept of sexual harassment in the workplace, there are equally numerous behavioral characterizations of the actions and comments that constitute sexual harassment. Because the correctional environment is an integral component of the current research, this study utilizes the definition of sexual harassment as outlined by the Department of Corrections.

The Department of Corrections defines sexual harassment in terms of the work environment in a way that it only applies to that harassment from coworkers or supervisors. However, it supplements this definition with a list of "prohibited conduct" which informs the definition of sexual harassment for the purposes of this study.

- Sexual flirtation, touching, advance, or proposition
- Verbal abuse of a sexual nature
- Any graphic or suggestive comment about an individual's dress or body
- Sexually degrading verbal descriptions of an individual
- Workplace display of sexually suggestive objects or pictures, including nude photographs
- Verbally making or circulating a rumor that embarrasses, ridicules, or demeans an individual based on gender or sexual orientation
- Any threat or insinuation, explicit or implicit, that an employee's refusal to submit to sexual advances will damage . . . any aspect of [the officer's] employment (Moran, 2002, p. 2)

The current study will focus on these behaviors as indicative of sexual harassment; however the behaviors need not be accompanied by any threat to job security or satisfaction for the purposes of this research.

Impact of the Project

Sexual harassment against women in the workplace has recently been recognized as a serious social problem (O'Connor & Vallabhahosula, 2004, pp. 116-118). Though the existence of such behavior predates the Industrial Revolution (Crouch, 2001; Fitzgerald & Shullman, 1993), the use of the term *sexual harassment* is a relatively new development. Thus, while the existence of sexual harassment in the workplace is certainly not new, its identification as a social issue worthy of attention is relatively recent. In their research of the experiences of working women, Lin Farley and her colleagues (1978) found that "the male behavior [which often caused women to be fired from or quit their jobs due to discomfort in the workplace] eventually required a name, and sexual harassment seemed to come about as close to symbolizing the problem as the language would permit" (p. 12). Shortly after these researchers labeled the behavior perpetrated against women in the workplace, the issues relevant to sexual harassment gained popularity in social research. As with any newly discovered social malady, the volume of relevant research has multiplied in recent years. Women are increasingly encouraged to confront instances of sexual harassment in the workplace. Agencies have been formed and/or expanded in order to address this problem. The research and advancements made in the area, however significant in the reduction of such harassment in the workplace, are not entirely applicable to the specific type of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment characteristic of the prison setting. Traditional proposals for

combating workplace sexual harassment – that harassment which occurs between co-workers or between employees and supervisors – involve the threat of legal retaliation in response to lewd or offensive behavior. While such proposals have been adopted by a vast number of correctional institutions concerning employee-to-employee and employee-to-inmate sexual harassment, correctional facilities in general lack the ability to effectively confront inmate-to-employee harassment.

Although not entirely unlike other work environments, correctional institutions are faced with unique financial and economical barriers to curtailing the problem of inmate-perpetrated harassment upon female officers. It is impossible to regulate all inmate behaviors, a fact which requires officers to make allowances as to which behaviors should warrant formal discipline (Lovell & Jemelka, 1996). Less-threatening sexual comments and behaviors may not pose a threat great enough to be considered a security breach, and therefore could go ignored. It is possible that some officers – even those women that experience harassment by male inmates – may agree that this behavior does not justify full implementation of disciplinary measures. However, those who ignore such behavior may not fully understand the consequences of being a constant target of sexual harassment. It may be important for this behavior to be corrected – not only for the punishment of the offenders, but for the safety of the officers and the facility.

The stress that female workers experience as a result of constant sexual harassment may contribute to the likelihood that a harasser inmate will continue to target them. Studies have hypothesized that sexual harassers do so as a means of control and power (Skaine, 1996) so it is natural that a harasser, who recognizes the psychological impact his harassment has on the target of his harassment, will attempt to maintain the

power he has already established. Other research claims that sexual harassment may occur as a means of punishing a woman occupying a traditionally male role (Gutek & Morash, 1982; Pogrebin & Poole, 1997; Skaine, p. 20). In such cases, it is likely that the harassment will continue until the woman relinquishes her position. This assumption receives some credibility in Zimmer's study (1986) that recounts a scenario in which a group of male inmates succeeded in driving a female officer out of her assignment with continuous lewd and offensive behavior (pp. 60-61). This use of sexual harassment as a means of punishment may also account for some degree of the high turnover rate among women in corrections (Doerner, 1995, p. 202; Bondurant & White, 1996, p. 73). Moreover, as one of the fundamental concepts of correctional training, the demand for respect of authority from inmates proves to be impossible if an inmate believes he can control the officer's emotions.

Constant suffering from and lack of retaliatory means against inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment may lead to a:

- weakening in the trust between coworkers;
- financial burden on the institution as a result of increased "sick days" and therapy needs among female employees;
- greater turnover rate and/or decreased productivity; and
- risk to the facility's security as a result of a lack of officer respect by male inmates (O'Connor & Vallabhajosula, 2004, 131-132).

Through greater awareness of the problem of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female correction officers, department supervisors and individual officers will be better equipped to combat the problem.

The Current Study

The current study examines inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female officers in a Louisiana correctional facility. This dissertation relies on the survey responses of 21 female correction officers regarding their experiences with and opinions of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment.

Chapter Two reviews the literature relevant to workplace sexual harassment and the occupational environment of female correction officers. Because of the limitations of research in the specific area of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female correction officers, the literature review is presented into distinct sections outlining each of the two major areas of research from which the current study's focus is drawn: sexual harassment and female officers. This chapter concludes with a discussion of the existing literature to establish the framework of the current research.

Chapter Three describes the methodology of the current study, the statistical demographics of the sample in the current study, and the advantages and limitations of the current study's design. The research used a questionnaire to gather data about female correction officers' perceptions of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment in the correction setting. Because of the unique nature of this particular type of harassment, I designed a survey instrument for the current research. A discussion of the survey instrument and its properties concludes this chapter.

The results of the current study are reported in Chapter Four and further analyzed in Chapter Five. Chapter Four discusses the quantitative results of the survey. This data is framed in terms of the study's four distinct research questions:

1. To what extent are female correction officers subject to inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment?
2. To what extent do female correction officers recognize inmate-perpetrated sexual comments and behavior as sexual harassment?
3. To what degree, and how, are female correction officers affected by inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment?
4. To what extent, and how, do female correction officers attempt to manage the effects of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment?

To supplement the quantitative data, Chapter Five summarizes the qualitative results of the survey. In this chapter, I present the participants' responses to open-ended questions, and evaluate their contribution to the study's research questions. Chapter Five concludes with an analysis of the sexual harassment perpetrated by male inmates against female correction officers based on the themes derived from the qualitative data.

Chapter Six reviews the conclusions gathered from the current research and implications for both future research and correctional policy. Though intended only as an exploratory research effort, the current research yields some suggestions for both sexual harassment research and administrative correctional policy in addressing the issue of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment.

CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

The current research seeks to identify and explore the sexual harassment of female correction officers by male inmates. In its exploratory nature, this study involves four distinct research questions which individually address the *Prevalence and Nature*, *Recognition*, *Effects*, and *Management* of sexual harassment perpetrated by male inmates against female correction officers.

Due to the scarce resources dedicated to the issue under study, this chapter explores both the theoretical and empirical examinations of the components relevant to the current study – sexual harassment and female officers in the correctional setting. The chapter concludes with a discussion of how the issues relevant to these two distinct areas of research intersect and give rise to the questions implicit in the current research.

Sexual Harassment

Today, sexual harassment in the workplace is a widely recognized social problem. Though the term *sexual harassment* does not appear to have been used before 1976, its existence has been documented prior to the Industrial Revolution (Crouch, 2001; Fitzgerald & Shullman, 1993). There are multiple accounts of sexual harassment in the workplace throughout history and among all types of working women from the colonial days through industrialization (Bularzik, 1978). However, in the historical context and ideology of this earlier period, sexual harassment was considered inherent to the workplace and therefore normal. The existence of sexual harassment then is not new; rather its identity as a social problem is.

Social problems are social issues that have been identified and defined as problematic. The fundamental nature of a social problem depends on a process of "claims-making" (Spector & Kitsuse, 1977), in which individuals or groups – *claims-makers* – bring attention to a particular set of conditions that they consider "a deviation from some social norm which they cherish" (Fuller & Myers, 1941, p. 320). The "social construction approach to social problems" (Spector & Kitsuse, p. 5) suggests the conception of social problems is ultimately subjective regardless of whether the problem appears objective.

> Every social problem thus consists of an objective condition and a subjective definition. The objective condition is a verifiable situation which can be checked as to existence and magnitude by impartial and trained observers… The subjective definition is the awareness of certain individuals that the condition is a threat to certain cherished values… **Social problems are what people think they are** (authors' emphasis) and if conditions are not defined as social problems by the people involved in them, they are not problems to those people, although they may be problems to outsiders or scientists. (Fuller & Myers, p. 320)

With respect to sexual harassment, the Feminist Movement of the 1960s and 1970s appears responsible for the current conceptualization. In their efforts, the feminist claims-makers of that period insisted that sexual harassment was an expression of the unequal power between men and women in the workforce. Most notably, Catherine MacKinnon (1979) argued sexual harassment was a violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Eventually, the Supreme Court agreed and thus began the development of the legal construction of sexual harassment.

Definition of Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment is a form of sex discrimination that is prohibited by Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) defines sexual harassment as

> unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature . . . when submission to or rejection of [such] conduct explicitly or implicitly affects an individual's employment, unreasonably interferes with an individual's work performance or creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive work environment. (Section 1604.11(a))

Sexual harassment generally takes two forms. The first, *quid pro quo*, occurs when "submission to sexual conduct is made a condition of receiving tangible employment benefits" (*Hicks v. Gates Rubber Co*., 1987, p. 1413). The last part of the EEOC's definition describes the second type of sexual harassment, *hostile work environment*. A claim for such abuse can be made when the plaintiff can show

> (1) that he or she was subjected to sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, or other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature, (2) that this conduct was unwelcome, and (3) that the conduct was sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the conditions of the victim's employment and create an abusive working environment. (*Ellison v. Brady*, 1991, p. 875-876)

Although considered the most common form of such abuse (Pryor & Whalen, 1997, p. 129), sexual harassment is not only an offense against woman perpetrated by men. Similarly, workplace harassment is not always against a subordinate employee.

The target-harasser relationship can occur in many contexts, including, but not limited to the following:

- The target as well as the harasser may be a woman or a man. The target does not have to be of the opposite sex.
- The harasser can be the target's supervisor, an agent of the employer, a supervisor in another area, a co-worker, or a non-employee.
- The target does not have to be the person harassed but could be anyone affected by the offensive conduct.

The EEOC defines sexual harassment in the anti-discrimination legal context. Fitzgerald, Swan, and Magley (1997) argue that a distinction should be made between the legal definition of sexual harassment and the psychological definition. Not all behavior that might be considered sexual harassment meets the legal definition nor requires legal intervention or compensation, but such conduct may still have a psychological impact that should be addressed. The EEOC's definition of sexual harassment is narrow and depends to a certain extent "on criteria that is external to the victim," such as evidence of intent or employment-related consequences that ignores the target's psychological experience (O'Donohue, Downs, & Yeater, 1998, p. 112). Yet, some of the most potentially emotionally damaging forms of sexual harassment might not satisfy the legal definition.

Fitzgerald and her colleagues (1997) define sexual harassment as a behavior "consisting of three related but conceptually different dimensions: gender harassment, unwanted sexual attention, and sexual coercion" (pp. 10-11). Gender harassment includes a wide range of verbal, physical, and symbolic behavior that insinuates a hostile,

degrading, and insulting attitude toward women (p. 10). Such behavior may include sexual comments or gestures, the display of sexually suggestive objects, or gender-based threats, intimidation, or hostility. Unwanted sexual attention refers to "both verbal and nonverbal behavior that is unwelcome, offensive, and unreciprocated" (p. 10). Sexual coercion refers to that behavior most expressly prohibited by the EEOC – that which is characterized by "extortion of sexual cooperation in return for job-related consideration" (p. 11).

Macmillan, Nierobisz, and Welsh (2000, p. 307) categorize sexual harassment into two spheres. Workplace abuse involves a perpetrator known to the target, such as a co-worker or supervisor, while stranger harassment – implicit by its title – occurs through an encounter with someone unknown to the target, usually taking place in a public arena. Louise Fitzgerald and her colleges (1997) recognize that this form of stranger harassment can also occur within the workplace. They define this integrated type of psychological abuse as "an unwanted sex-related behavior at work that is appraised by the recipient as offensive, exceeding her resources, or threatening her well-being" (Fitzgerald, et al., p. 20).

Prevalence and Nature of Sexual Harassment

Because of the inconsistency with which sexual harassment as a concept is defined, a clear assessment of the frequency of such abuse is yet to emerge. The rate of sexual harassment victimization varies from as high as 90 percent to as low as 16 percent (Macmillan, et al, 2000, p. 307) depending on the way sexual harassment is defined along with a number of methodological factors that affect reporting rates. These factors include: (a) the sampling strategy and the representativeness; (b) the characteristics of the

sample; (c) response rate; (d) the data collection method; and (e) the scope of time from which experiences are reported (Gruber, 1997, p. 85; O'Donohue, et al., 1998, p. 113). Gruber found, for example, that studies with low response rates reported higher than average rates of sexual harassment, while those using homogenous sample populations had below-median reporting rates (p. 85). Furthermore, survey instruments using either less than six categories of sexual behavior (e.g., Maypole, 1986) or those using open-ended questions to develop harassment categories (e.g., Gruber & Bjorn, 1982) concluded lower rates of sexual harassment among the studies' samples.

In terms of official statistics collected by the EEOC of filed complaints of workplace sexual harassment, underreporting seems to be a significant concern. While more than 15,500 complaints of harassment are filed annually (Toplitt, 1999, p. 2), studies conducted throughout Canada and the United States estimate that only 10% to 20% of victims report instances of sexual harassment (Welsh, 2000, p. 118). Additionally, Gruber (1989) found, in his review of ten prior studies, that only 10 or 15 percent of sexually harassed women respond assertively or reported their harasser. The predominance of nonassertive responses may be the result of many factors, including cultural stereotypes about harassment against women and ambiguity regarding different forms of sexual interaction (Gruber & Smith, 1995, p. 546). Studies have further shown a correlation between nonassertiveness and the severity of sexual harassment (Gruber & Bjorn, 1986; Terpstra & Baker, 1989), a relationship that may explain the similarity in the low levels of reporting and the infrequency of the most severe forms of sexual harassment, such as touching, bribery, and assault (Gruber & Smith).

The most common form of reported sexual harassment is unwanted sexual attention, such as illicit comments, groping, and requests for sexual performance (Welsh, 2000, p. 120). Secondly, gender harassment – derogatory comments about a woman's rightful position in society – is cited in almost half of all complaints (Welsh, p. 121; Belknap, 1995, p. 213). While these types of harassment do not necessarily present any immediate physical danger, the psychological impact on the target can lead to more severe problems.

Victimization by sexual harassment can cause feelings of fear, uneasiness, distrust, and sleeplessness (Macmillan, et al., 2000, p. 308; Lee, 2001, p. 48). For some, these feelings may manifest themselves as a projection of vulnerability, which may lead to future victimization and/or the worsening of symptoms associated with the victimization. Thus, even those forms of sexual harassment that do not present an immediate or physical danger to the target may have severe and long-lasting consequences to the individual and the organization in that "sexual harassment can manifest itself physically and psychologically. . . . It can poison a woman's work environment to the extent that her livelihood is in danger" (Thompson, 2002, p. 22).

Effects of Sexual Harassment

The effects of sexual harassment can be divided into individual and organizational consequences. There is a substantial overlap between the two, beginning mainly with the financial consequences of sexual harassment. Most obviously, the abundance of lawsuits against organizations based on sexual harassment claims has cost American businesses millions of dollars per year (United States Merit System Protection Board, 1995). In addition to legal costs, these organizations suffer from the burden of lost productivity,

increased absenteeism, turnover, and increased use of medical benefits and employee assistance programs (Conlon & Voigt, 1997, p. 41). The typical Fortune 500 company spends an average of $6.7 million dollars a year combating and dealing with the effects of sexual harassment (Sbraga & O'Donohue, 2000). Decreased morale, absenteeism and loss of concentration are reportedly costing the government $90 million per year (O'Donohue, et al., 1998, p. 118). Individual targets of sexual harassment suffer financially from lost wages due to absenteeism or termination of their employment. Individual harassers may also suffer financially from individual accountability through either demotion or termination or personal liability resulting from a legal claim.

For individual targets of sexual harassment, the effects may transcend obvious work-related consequences. Loy and Stewart (1984) conducted a telephone survey of American adults concerning social problems. Seventy-five percent of the women that reported at least one experience as a target of sexual harassment had symptoms of emotional and physical distress following the instance of harassment. The most common symptoms reported were nervousness, irritability, uncontrolled anger, sleeplessness, weight loss, uncontrolled crying, and stomach problems. Using a retrospective survey, Crull (1982) examined the case files of 262 women who had sought assistance from the Working Women's Institute after they experienced sexual harassment in the workplace. Information regarding the women's harassment experience and the effects it had on their job performance and satisfaction was gathered through a questionnaire administered to 92 of those women and extracted from the case files of the remaining 170. Three-fifths of those women reported that their work suffered from a lack of concentration due to continued sexual harassment. Many went to great lengths to avoid their harasser often at

the expense of their job productivity. More than half of the women reported physical symptoms, such as headaches, tiredness, and nausea. By far, the most common reaction to sexual harassment, even by women who may not classify sexually offensive behavior as such, is a generalized fear of the harasser (Macmillan, et al., 2000, p. 319). While it has yet to be applied to the specific circumstances of the current research, this fear that women experience toward their harasser is possibly most significant in the corrections setting. As mentioned before, a female officer cannot perform her job in assurance of her own and her co-workers' safety if she exhibits any of the aforementioned symptoms, especially if she expresses, either directly or indirectly, a fear of the inmates.

Correction/ Law Enforcement Officers

The job of a correction officer is perhaps one of the most dangerous and multi-faceted in the criminal justice system. Correction officers are expected to maintain the security and safety of the nation's offender population and of the institutions in which they are incarcerated. They encounter a wide range of issues on a daily basis, from violence to drug addiction and mental illness.

While stoicism is necessary to the impartial and safe administration of justice in corrections, the impact of the correctional atmosphere on an officer's attitude and emotions may prohibit him or her from performing work-related duties in the safest way possible. The correctional environment in general is one "characterized not only by periodic episodes of extreme violence but also by almost constant disruption, turmoil, and confusion" (Zimmer, 1986, p. 3). A correction officer under a stressful influence cannot manage inmates or the processes of the correctional institution as well as one with a clear mind (Finn, 2000, pp. 8-9). In their profession, correction officers are expected to repress

their emotions, pains, and problems while in the work setting to a much greater extent than must many other professionals. Furthermore, any personal issues with which an officer is suffering are only compounded by the despondency of their daily experiences at work. Despite the overwhelming stress that such a career would place on an officer's mental health, few studies have concentrated on the workplace pressure of a correctional institution.

Historical Background

> The entry of women into corrections parallels their entry into the police profession. Both have a long history in each of these subsystems of criminal justice but only recently have challenged their separate status and role. Both are still represented in small numbers, especially in administrative positions. Both attained their current position only by court challenge and struggle against strong male resistance. Finally, in both areas, there is evidence that women, with only a few exceptions, succeed as well as men in the performance of their role. (Pollock, 1986, p. 5)

By most accounts, the history of women in criminal justice is divided into two major time periods: prior to the 1970s and since the 1970s. This time distinction is undoubtedly due to the impact of the passage of the Equal Opportunity Act of 1972, which extended the provisions of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act to state and local governments. The Equal Opportunity Act prohibits discrimination in employment opportunities based on gender. The passage of the act was followed with legislative, executive, and judicial action confronting selection criteria, promotional opportunities, and equality in work assignment. Additionally, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) was

created to mediate and endorse enforcement of the act. During this period, in conjunction with the support of affirmative action, anti-discrimination lawsuits, and women's movements, women gained greater acceptance in traditionally male work atmospheres (Martin, 1992).

Prior to this period, progress made in the equitable treatment of women in law enforcement was negligible. During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, women began to enter the criminal justice work sphere in response to growing national concern over social problems involving women and girls (Feinman, 1986; Pollock, 1986). The underlying concern effectuating the emergence of women in this field was the preservation of sexual purity among the young female population.

While women had been employed as matrons for the protection of women in public institutions since the early 1800's, the integration of female correction officers into male prisons did not occur until the 1970s. Initially, women employed in male prisons were relegated to tasks solely concerned with searching female visitors and performing administrative duties (Pollock, 1986, p. 8-9). Although these women gradually began to enjoy more varied duties, the states continued enforcing policies which limited the work-role of the female correction officer. Some of these policies including prohibiting women from performing strip searches, supervising inmate showers, or escorting inmates outside of the facility.

Much of what is known about early female correction officers – or matrons, as they were known prior to the 1960s – is derived from few reports during that period. One such source is an autobiography written by Kate O'Hare, a female inmate at the state prison in Jefferson City, MI in the early 1900s.

> The matrons were required to live in the prison and were never, except on rare leaves of absence, out of the sights and smells of prison. They were prisoners to almost the same degree that we were, and they all staggered under a load of responsibility far too great for their limited intelligence and untrained powers. They handled human beings at their worst, and under the worst possible conditions, and saw nothing day or night but sordid, ugly things ungilded by the glow of hope or love. (O'Hare, 1976, p. 162)

O'Hare's sentiments of correction officers in the early 20th century are resonant of the conditions today. Correction officers work in a "locked-in culture" in which "they are literally locked in the institution for the entire period of their duty" (Feinman, 1986, p. 140). It is the combined effect of both the recent emergence of women in corrections and the isolative nature of the corrections environment that contribute to the uniqueness of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female correction officers.

Attitudes Toward Female Correction Officers

While women have worked in corrections for over a century, they still face obstacles that prohibit their full integration into the profession (Hemmens, Stohr, Schoeler, & Miller, 2002, p. 473). Since the passage of the 1972 amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, women have legally been entitled to equal opportunity employment in traditionally male positions. Despite their attempts over the last three decades however, women are often still considered incompetent – by society, the organization, and their co-workers – to perform the masculinized duties of a corrections officer (Belknap, 2001; Heidensohn, 1992, pp. 200-201; Jurik & Martin, 2001; Pogrebin & Poole, 1997, p. 43).

Jenne and Kersting (1996) conducted a survey to assess the aggressive tendencies of male and female correction officers. Contrary to the hypothesis, females were more likely to act aggressively in at least three proposed scenarios. When asked how they would respond to an inmate refusing to submit to a body search, male officers were much more likely to attempt to reason with the inmate than were women (17% and 4%, respectively). Women were also slightly more likely to threaten the inmate in the above proposed scenario (p. 448). Female officers also reported more aggressive reactions than their male co-workers to an inmate deliberately spilling his tray in the dining hall and to an inmate swearing at an officer (pp. 448-449). Jenne and Kersting posit that a female officer may be compelled to respond aggressively to the aforementioned incidents because "such challenges to her authority might evoke a greater sense of vulnerability than for the men" (p. 454). Since feelings of vulnerability and fear are common effects of sexual harassment against women, it is conceivable that women react more aggressively as a result of their general fear resulting from repeated sexual harassment.

Several studies have examined how the sexual harassment of female correction officers is related to the reported perceptions of their co-workers and the inmates under their control regarding the woman's ability to perform correctional duties in general. Jurik conducted two separate research projects (1988; Jurik & Halemba, 1984) exploring the sexual harassment of female officers by their male counterparts in Arizona prisons. Similar studies were done by Zimmer (1987) using ethnographic methods, by Belknap (1995) with jail interviews, and by Lawrence and Mahan (1998) through surveys. Altogether, these studies concluded that much of the sexual harassment perpetrated against women by their male co-workers occurred as a result of the men's disbelief of the

women's abilities to perform the job. This doubt seems to stem from the traditional notion of patriarchy that demands the protection and role compliance of women. Yet empirical evidence contradicts this idea of female incompetence. In a study of the female experience of working in a male maximum-security prison – presumably the most dangerous of such facilities – Rowan (1996) reports male officers are almost four times more likely to be physically assaulted within the institution than are their female counterparts (p. 187).

Perceptions of Female Correction Officers

Perceptions of female law enforcement officers in general – in both policing and corrections – may greatly contribute to an environment which supports or condones sexual harassment in the workplace. Many studies conclude that women in law enforcement have not been, and continue to not be, accepted by their colleagues and supervisors (Belknap, 1995; Jurik, 1988; Pogrebin & Poole, 1998; Zimmer, 1986; Zupan, 1992). Female correction officers report being "regarded as tokens, sex objects, and as inferior by some of their male colleagues" (Hemmens, et al., 2002, p. 475).

The reported perceptions among inmates concerning the integration of female officers in corrections vary widely both within the inmate population and as compared to those of male officers. Few inmates report a neutral response to the integration of women into male prisons (Zimmer, 1986, pp. 61-65). The majority of male inmates – categorized as either in support or against the integration of female officers – attribute their opinions to a variety of concerns regarding female correction officers. While some cite protection and privacy concerns, the vast majority of inmate perceptions regarding female officers rest on some sexualized aspect (p. 65; Petersen, 1982).

> Contacts between female guards and male inmates are always sex-bound. Even if corrections officials were to develop policies of equality for male and female guards, male inmates would not treat them identically. Sex remains a "master status" in our society and influences the interactions between people of the opposite sex despite the other statuses they posses. Thus, although "guard" and "inmate" are powerful statuses, the interactions between female guards and male inmates are strongly influenced by the sex of each. (Zimmer, 1986, p. 101)

From the "degradation" of receiving orders from a woman to the "torture" of not being able to start a sexual relationship within the confines of the jail, inmates overwhelmingly perceive female officers in a sexual manner (Zimmer, 1986, p. 64-65; Petersen, 1982, p. 456). It is reasonable to assume that, regardless of an inmate's intentions, harmful or not, female officers may commonly experience some form of sexual comments or behavior from the male prison population.

The general attitude of the women themselves toward the integration of female correction officers into male correctional facilities also exhibits troubling signs. Many female correction officers report some doubt as to their own abilities to perform the duties of a correction officer in a male institution (Kissel & Katsampes, 1980, p. 226). Nevertheless, it appears that as women become comfortable with their positions as correction officers, they also become more confident in their abilities. Kissel and Katsampes found that 84 percent of female officers favorably assess their own job performance (p. 225).

Much of the negative reaction to women in corrections is linked to traditional occupational norms and sex-role stereotypes (Pogrebin & Poole, 1997, pp. 42-44). Such

expectations have been shown to contribute to both negative evaluations of a woman's competency or capabilities and to a general environment of harassment against women in the workplace. According to some research, the perceived threat among men to their own power and control in the workplace contributes to the level of sexual harassment against women (Erez & Tontodonato, 1992). When women enter traditionally masculine occupations, they are often viewed as "occupational deviants," and are therefore simply getting what they deserve for their "perceived violation of specific gender norms" (Pogrebin & Poole, pp. 42-43; see also Gutek & Morasch, 1982). Similarly, research also suggests some of the harassment perpetrated by male inmates against female correction officers could be a result of "their attitude toward women's 'proper' role in society" (Horne, 1985, p. 50).

This perception of women in the workplace may have important implications for the specific type of harassment under study in the current research. Male officers report viewing female officers as "emotionally and psychologically weaker than men." (Zimmer, 1986, p. 54) Sexualized perceptions such as these inhibit men from respecting the rights of their female co-workers. Especially within blue-collar, male-dominated occupations, women's opinions and complaints may be disregarded as trivial based on the assumption that these women just cannot handle the job (pp. 56-57). As such, women may be less likely to report sexual harassment imposed upon them by inmates for fear that male officers will ridicule these female officers' experiences. Because of their reluctance to seek assistance or admit their victimization, female correction officers may suppress their fears and anxiety concerning their interactions with male inmates. As

such, the work performances of these women could suffer, leading to a breach of the safety and security of these officers, their co-workers, and the facility itself.

Correctional Officer Stress

Most studies of officer stress have focused on the patrol division of law enforcement, while fewer efforts have targeted corrections (Childress, Talucci, & Wood, 1999, p. 72). Patrol-based studies have been considered relevant to corrections research though, because the stressors that affect patrol officers are relatively comparable to those experienced by correction officers (Slate & Vogel, 1997, p. 398). Like patrol officers, most correction employees suffer from work-related physical and emotional stress (Slate & Vogel, p. 397; Strickland, 1999, p. 152; Childress, et al., p. 70). This stress is an expected aspect of any law enforcement job, but an officer's failure to deal with the pressure will inevitably lead to detrimental health problems, both psychologically and physically. The security of the facility itself is compromised by individuals' heart problems, family breakdowns, emotional burnout, violence, and suicide, each of which may result from officer stress (Davis, 1984, p. 75-79; Slate & Vogel, p. 398). Furthermore, the correctional facility suffers from "decreased productivity, turnover, health care costs, disability payments, sick leave, and absenteeism" (Slate & Vogel, p. 398) attributable to the pressures correction employees are subject to on the job.

Though the level of stress among all correction officers is considerable, Pogrebin and Poole (1997) suggest "that women experience higher levels of stress than do their male peers in male-dominated professions" (p. 52). Related studies have concluded that the differential stress between male and female officers may be a function of the sexualized work environment (Bartol, Bergen, Volckens, & Knoras, 1992; Johnson,

1991). In her research, Johnson found that women in policing were more susceptible to *Internal Burnout* – a general feeling of being emotionally drained by the job – whereas men more often expressed *External Burnout* – a lack of compassion for others and feeling hardened by the job (p. 13). She concludes that the higher level of *Internal Burnout* among women in policing may "partly result from their constant struggle to be accepted in a male-dominated occupation" (p. 15).

Research on sexual harassment in general has revealed numerous emotional and physical symptoms suffered by the targets of this behavior (Crull, 1982; Dansky & Kilpatrick, 1997; Gruber & Smith, 1995; Loy & Stewart, 1984; Macmillan et al., 2000). It is logical to assume that repeated exposure to sexual harassing behavior within the confines of a correctional facility, from which the target can claim little or no official repercussion, will induce such symptoms to a greater degree and magnitude. With respect to officers in general, of the research that exists addressing the problem of sexual harassment-induced stress, none considers harassment perpetrated by inmates. However, studies of work-related stress on the whole suggest deleterious effects to the facility, supervisors, and the safety of co-workers.

Discussion

It is my contention that the unique nature of the current study's focus warrants specialized attention to the subject of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female correction officers. The intersection of the issues relevant to this type of harassment in the correctional environment presents the possibility of a previously unexplored conception of sexual harassment in the workplace. Each of the research hypotheses in the current study is grounded in the existing literature.

H_1: Female correction officers are subject to persistent and daily instances of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment.

Previous research lends credence to the hypothesis that female correction officers may experience considerable levels of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment. The sexualized work environment of a correctional facility has been shown to contribute to a greater incidence of sexual harassment in general in the workplace. Pogrebin and Poole (1997) found that "[t]he sexualized work environment embodies the treatment of women as objects" (p. 44) and allows the sex role of women to eclipse their work role as correction officers.

There is reason to believe this treatment of women by co-workers and supervisors in a sexualized work environment may resemble that by male inmates. Research suggests much of the interaction between female officers and male inmates involves a sexual tone (Zimmer, 1986, pp. 100-104). Given that the environment in which interactions occur between female officers and both male co-workers and male inmates is identical, it may be expected that the prevalence and nature of sexual harassment between both groups may also be similar.

H_2: Female correction officers do not label or identify most instances of inmate-perpetrated sexual comments and behavior as sexual harassment.

The combined influence of the prevailing definitional concept of sexual harassment and the sexualized environment of the correctional institution suggests female correction officers may be less likely than other types of working women to identify their experiences as sexual harassment. Since the sexualized work environment of the correctional institution is likely to have high rates of sexual harassment, it is reasonable

to expect the women working within these institutions may consider such behavior a normal aspect of their jobs. Early recorded history suggests women were reluctant to define the sexual incidents they experienced in the workplace as problematic because they assumed this behavior was inherent to the working environment.

In a similar sense, I expect the women in the current study to be so accustomed to the sexualized work environment of the correctional institution that they do not label or define sexual behaviors and comments from male inmates as sexual harassment. Furthermore, in their efforts to adjust to the predominately male workplace of a correctional institution, these female officers may be reluctant to further distinguish themselves from their male co-workers by admitting to the presence of a distinctly sex-based issue. In her study of female correction officers, Zimmer (1986) found that "[s]ome women avoid complaining about harassment because they want to prevent further deterioration in the relationship between male and female guards" (p. 98).

H_3: Female correction officers experience fear and decreased job satisfaction as a result of persistent inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment.

Because of the unique nature of the correctional working environment, in which violence and danger are inherent, and the well-documented impact of a sexualized work atmosphere on female employees, it is the expectation of the current study that fear and decreased job satisfaction will be commonly cited effects of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment. Fear of the harasser and a general fear of the location of the harassment are the most commonly cited symptoms of sexual harassment among working women (McMillan, et al., 2000, p. 319). Likewise, women in non-traditional occupations report

greater levels of decreased job satisfaction associated with harassment than do women in more traditional working environments (O'Farrel & Harlan, 1982, p. 262).

H_4: Female correction officers employ a variety of methods to manage inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment but rarely confide in other female or male officers.

The collective impact of a sexualized work environment and the typical nature of targets' responses to sexual harassment in general suggests that female correction officers may be unlikely to respond to inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment in an aggressive or direct manner. First, as previously mentioned, women employed in a sexualized work environment might be less likely to report instances of sexual harassment due to their reluctance to draw attention to themselves and their unique sex-related issues in the workplace. Secondly, sexual harassment research has found that direct and assertive responses to sexual harassment are uncommon (Dansky & Kilpatrick, 1997, pp. 158-160; Fitzgerald, Swan, & Fischer, 1995). I expect, based on this research, that women in corrections will rarely report instances of sexual harassment by inmates to their co-workers or supervisors, and instead employ a variety of personal techniques for managing this specific form of harassment.

Female correction officers use a variety of methods for controlling all types of inmate behavior violence, so it may be naturally expected that they would be as innovative in managing sexual harassment. Female officers in general – in both corrections and policing – adapt to the sexualized work environment in law enforcement by adapting their own work-related behaviors which, in many cases, differ substantially from their male counterparts (Zimmer, 1987). For this reason, it is reasonable to expect that the female officers' responses regarding their management of inmate-perpetrated

sexual harassment to be varied and distinct from those of other populations of working women.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology and Sample

The research design described in this chapter addresses the following research questions:

1. To what extent are female correction officers subject to inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment?
2. To what extent do female correction officers recognize inmate-perpetrated sexual comments and behavior as sexual harassment?
3. To what degree, and how, are female correction officers affected by inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment?
4. To what extent, and how, do female correction officers attempt to manage the effects of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment?

Hypotheses

The current study tests the following hypotheses:

H_1: Female correction officers are subject to persistent and daily instances of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment.

H_2: Female correction officers do not label or identify most instances of inmate-perpetrated sexual comments and behavior as sexual harassment.

H_3: Female correction officers experience fear and decreased job satisfaction as a result of persistent inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment.

H_4: Female correction officers employ a variety of methods to manage inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment but rarely confide in other female or male officers.

Methodology

This cross-sectional study utilizes a questionnaire, with individual female correctional officers as the unit of analysis. The setting for this research study is the Lafayette Parish Correctional Center (hereafter referred to as LPCC) of the Lafayette Parish Sheriff's Office (hereafter referred to as LPSO) in Lafayette, Louisiana.

The participating site was selected for the current research based on a series of criteria. Most importantly, the participating facility must primarily house male inmates. LPCC is responsible for the incarceration and supervision of approximately 750 inmates, of which almost 90 percent are male at any given time.

Secondly, the facility's total inmate and population sizes are important factors in this research. The majority of Louisiana's 113 facilities have inmate capacities of less than 300 persons (Stalder, 2005). Small facilities are not ideal sites for conducting research on female officers, as it is likely that smaller agencies will not employ a substantial number of officers, especially female officers. LPCC represents a relatively large correctional facility by Louisiana's standards and thus employs a comparatively large number of officers, both male and female.

LPCC employs an average of 110 uniformed correctional officers, of which half are female. Having an average female officer population comprising 50 percent of the total correction officer population is a diversion from both the national average of approximately 28 percent and the state of Louisiana's average of 26 percent (Maguire & Pastore, 2003, p. 92). While there is an admitted weakness in using such an atypical facility, the larger female population provides a convenient sample for this exploratory research effort.

Thirdly, LPCC is an attractive site for corrections-related research because its organizational structure represents a varied cross-section of correctional characteristics. Specifically, the supervision style, inmate concentration, facility design, and officer-to-inmate ratio are consistent with the national and state averages and norms. LPCC practices both direct and traditional supervision of inmates, a characteristic that may serve as an interesting comparative variable for future data analysis. Individual officers employed by LPCC also vary in terms of their shift rotation styles of an average workday, i.e. some officers work *straight days*, 6a.m. to 6p.m., some work *straight nights*, 6p.m. to 6a.m., and some work rotating schedules where their shift alternates every two weeks.

The inmate population is also characteristically varied. LPCC houses both pre-trial and sentenced offenders of parish, state, and federal custody ranging from minimum to maximum-security levels. The facility design reflects these varied security needs. An annex area houses minimum-security inmate workers. Medium-security inmates are housed in pod style 13-cell units of which each holds 26 individuals. Solitary confinement and specific supervision in pod areas are reserved for maximum-security inmates. Each of these areas is characterized by differing degrees of inmate-officer interaction and contact. Lastly, the facility's inmate to officer ration is about 6.75 to one, a rate consistent with the state average of six inmates per officer and the national average of 4.4 inmates per officer (Maguire & Pastore, 2003, p. 90).

With the assistance of LPCC's warden, Captain Griff Champagne, and one of its shift supervisors, Lieutenant Myra Mouton, this study's questionnaires were made available to all sworn correctional officers, both male and female, employed full-time at

LPCC between the 15th of December 2005 and the 3rd of January 2006. The questionnaires were individually placed in sealed envelopes and the envelopes were left at a designated area in the control room within which each shift's roll call is performed. Officers were informed at the beginning of each roll call that they could take one of the envelopes and complete the survey if they so chose. The first page of each copy of the survey outlined the purpose of the study and the officers' rights as participants. Officers were informed that their participation was voluntary and they had the right to discontinue their participation at any point. They were further instructed if they chose to complete the questionnaire, the envelopes could be returned to a locked box located in the same designated area.

The completed questionnaires were collected from the locked box on a weekly basis between the 15th of December 2005 and the 3rd of January 2006. After the 3rd of January 2006, the unused questionnaires and the return box were removed from the control room. The return rate was 31.8 percent of the total sample of 110 officers, both male and female. Twenty-one (21) of the 35 total questionnaires returned were completed by female officers. Thus, the return rate for the female officers specifically was 38.2 percent of the total 55 female officers.

Informed Consent and Data Security

All participants in the current study were informed of the purpose of the study and their rights as participants through an informed consent document attached to the surveys. The informed consent document used in this study can be found in Appendix A. The potential participants to the current study were informed of their right to refuse participation or to withdraw at any time from the study. Furthermore, the informed

consent document offered contact information for participants seeking further information concerning the study and for participants experiencing adverse effects as a result of the study. All phases and testing relevant to the current study were approved by the Internal Review Board (IRB) of John Jay College of Criminal Justice.

To protect the confidentiality and well-being of all participants, the data collected from the survey instrument were coded and all identifiers removed. All computer files relevant to the study are password protected and available only to the principle investigator. Lastly, all final reports of the research data are devoid of any identifying information specific to the individual respondents.

The Sample

Appendix B presents the following demographic information in raw form:

Nine officers were, at the time of completing the survey, between the ages of 18 and 25 years, five were between 26 and 35 years of age, 2 officers were between 36 and 45 years old, and three officers were 46 years of age and older. Two respondents, 9.5 percent of the total, did not indicate their ages. With respect to race, eleven officers, or 52.4 percent of respondents described themselves as white and 28.6 percent, six officers, as African-American. One respondent indicated her race is best described as other than white, African-American, American Indian, Latino, or Asian though she did not specify. Three officers did not respond to this question.

When asked to report the last grade they completed three officers, indicated they had graduated from college and one officer reported graduating from business or trade school. Twelve respondents reported completing some college work and three ended their education with a high school graduation. Two officers, 9.5 percent, did not respond

to this question. Regarding their current marital status, one-third reported being married, three divorced and nine never married. No officer indicated being widowed or separated and two did not indicate their current marital status.

Of the 21 female officers responding to the survey, their distribution within the Lafayette Parish Correctional Center was as follows: 17 respondents (81 percent) were currently serving in the position of deputy, two officers (9.5 percent) as sergeant, and one (4.8 percent) as lieutenant. One officer did not report her current position. Most of the responding officers – 71.4 percent – reported spending between 75 and 100 percent of their average shifts interacting with inmates. The remaining officers reported spending about half (between 40 and 74 percent of their shifts) or very little (between one and 19 percent of their shifts) interacting with inmates, 23.8 and 4.8 percent respectively.

With respect to years of experience in corrections, female respondents' mean length of current service was 20.5 months (sd=20.16), while the mean length of previous employment in corrections was 4.71 months (sd=12.82). Among the reasons cited for taking a job as a correctional officer, interest in human service work or in inmate rehabilitation ranked highest with eight officers (38.1 percent) citing this as their primary reason for working in corrections. Six respondents (28.6 percent) accepted their current position because it was an entry-level position for other jobs in the department. Three officers (14.3 percent) responded that either salary or interest in security work prompted their employment in corrections, and one officer was primarily interested in job security.

Design Advantages and Limitations

The current study suffers from three notable limitations: the use of questionnaires for collecting data, generalizability issues related to research design, and the study's

small sample size. These limitations, however, are less problematic in light of the exploratory nature of this research, since exploratory research attempts to analyze a subject or phenomenon in a preliminary way.

> Researchers explore when they have little or no scientific knowledge about the group, process, activity, or situation they want to examine but nevertheless have reason to believe it contains elements worth discovering. . . . [T]he main goal of exploratory research is the production of deductively derived generalizations about the group, process, activity, or situation under study. (Stebbins, 2001, p. 6)

Stebbins further suggests that since the exploratory research necessarily lacks the finality of definitive research, the issues relevant to validity, reliability, and generalizability of research results are best left to the confirmatory phase of research (pp. 46-50). Thus, the current research intends only to provide a framework for future studies, whereby "separate studies by different scholars centered on the same or related groups, processes, or activities will, over time, result in the most solid and convincing validations possible of the concepts and generalizations emerging from this body of research" (p. 49).

In his research of correction officers' attitudes, Kauffman (1981) acknowledges the limitations of using questionnaires in social science research due to its tendency to impose "one-dimensional responses on multidimensional problems" (p. 281). Nevertheless, the use of questionnaires has had some success in the measurement of perceptions and attitudes among populations in general and of the correction officer population specifically. The survey questionnaire is the most common method of gathering data in the social and political sciences (Babbie, 2003, p. 246), and is appropriate for gathering data relevant to "how people feel about crime and criminal

justice policy" (p. 247). In an effort to compensate for the one-dimensional nature of the questionnaire format, the survey instrument employed in the current research includes open-ended questions designed to illicit more detailed and individual responses from the current study's sample of female correction officers. The purpose of the questionnaire in the current study is to provide quantitative data, in the form of percentages and frequencies, to supplement the qualitative responses gathered through open-ended questions. Thus, the statistical data will be used to test the hypotheses, while the qualitative responses will elaborate on the conception of the inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female correction officers.

The second limitation of the current study is also relevant to the use of a survey instrument to gather data. However, this weakness pertains to the use of an original survey, lacking established reliability and validity in research. In any research effort, issues related to validity and reliability tend to decrease the generalizability of the research results. The exploratory nature of the current study coupled with the use of an original instrument for data collection limit the validity and reliability of the results. Furthermore, qualitative data, though important to the understanding of participants' subjective experiences, suffer from limited generalizability. Though this study culminates in a deeper understanding of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female correction officers, the results gathered therein are not proposed for comparison either to other populations of working women or to related research results. Furthermore, it is advisable that future research attempt to confirm the results with replication studies.

The final major limitation of the current study is its small sample size. While repeated efforts were made to recruit a larger sample, this study relies on the responses of

only 21 female correction officers, a response rate of 38.2%. Many survey research projects suffer from a low response rate, a trend that introduces the concern of sample selection bias in sexual harassment research (Avery & Cavanaugh, 1995, p. 45). Specifically, a problem exists in the number of individuals who chose not to respond to the survey. It is difficult to determine whether there is a significant difference in those who responded and those who did not. Given this limitation, this study is intended to provide a foundation for future research. It should not be assumed that this study provides any definitive results regarding the inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment of female correction officers, especially for comparison to the findings of existing research. Furthermore, the results and analysis of the data collected in this research are not intended to generalize to the population of female correction officers in the facility under study, the state of Louisiana, or the United States. The current research, which represents the first attempt to analyze the nature of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female correction officers, offers preliminary data that hope to serve as an impetus for further research.

The Questionnaire

Because of the unique nature of the current study's focus, I designed the survey instrument drawing on both previous research in workplace sexual harassment and my own experience as a correction officer. Existing surveys on sexual harassment in the workplace are inadequate for this research for two reasons. First, the two leading surveys for measuring sexual harassment in the workplace focus on the form of sexual harassment commonly referred to as quid pro quo harassment, which requires that submission to a sexual request or demand be made a condition of some employment-

related benefit or security. Such harassment is irrelevant to the current study, since the target population of offenders do not have the type of power necessary for such demands. Secondly, existing surveys do not focus on the types of behaviors and opportunities unique to the inmate population. The survey instrument utilized in the current research attempts to incorporate the nature of the correctional environment and population. Since this research is not solely concerned with the frequency of sexual harassment, but also includes issues related to the recognition, impact, and management of such harassment, it is necessary to tailor these questions to the specific population and environment under study. For example, questions related to the punishment of offenders should reflect the nature of this unique environment that is not reflected in the existing survey instruments.

The inadequacies of existing sexual harassment surveys required that I create an original survey for purposes of the current research. The complete questionnaire may be found in Appendix B. The questionnaire contains several types of questions aimed at exploring the four research questions of this project. The survey questions may be categorized according to three different purposes: (1) descriptive data; (2) comparative data; and (3) predictive data. The third category, predictive data, is furthered subdivided according to its relevance to each of the four research questions.

Descriptive data.

Questions 1 through 5 and questions 39 through 44 were included in the survey solely for descriptive purposes. The first five questions intend to gather data relevant to the respondents' work-related backgrounds. Cumulatively, these five questions provide a description of each respondent's role in the correctional facility. The first three descriptive questions pertain to the respondent's current position in the correctional

facility and her current, as well as past, length of employment in corrections. Questions 4 and 5 ask the respondent to describe the nature of her current employment in the correctional facility, in terms of both time spent with inmates and the area or areas of the facility to which she is regularly assigned.

The last six questions of the survey, questions 39 through 44, are more personal demographic questions, gathering data such as age, sex, race, educational attainment, marital status, and the reason each respondent reports for taking a job in corrections.

Comparative data.

The survey questions aimed at gathering comparative data are not as localized as those included for descriptive purposes. In most cases, the comparative questions are presented in similar form to the predictive questions, but pertain to sexual behavior perpetrated by supervisors or co-workers or that behavior perpetrated by female inmates, rather than that behavior perpetrated by male inmates. The purpose of these comparative questions is to determine whether female officers' perceptions of sexual harassment as perpetrated by male inmates differs from such harassment perpetrated by supervisors, co-workers, or female inmates. In addition, I included two questions which refer to non-sexual behaviors committed by inmates against correctional staff in order to compare officers' perceptions of non-sexual behaviors to their perceptions of sexual harassing behaviors perpetrated by inmates. These comparative questions are found throughout the questionnaire.

Predictive data.

The survey questions intended to collect predictive data pertain to the male inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female correction officers. These predictive questions are presented in several formats, including matrix questions, contingency questions, and open-ended questions. Since the nature of the current research is primarily exploratory, the predictive questions cover a range of subjects including the frequency of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment, officers' responses to such harassment, departmental training regarding the management of sexual behavior by inmates, and officers' opinions relevant to the impact of inmate-perpetrated harassment in the correctional facility. The data gathered through the predictive question are divided into four categories – *Prevalence and Nature*, *Recognition*, *Effects*, and *Management* – which represent the subjects of each of the four research questions relevant to the current study.

The results gathered through the data collection method described herein are presented in the following two chapters. Chapter Four discusses the quantitative results of the survey and Chapter Five supplements the quantitative results with analyses of the qualitative data collected in the current study.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

Because the research design is formulated into four distinct hypotheses regarding inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female corrections officers, the results of the questionnaire will be presented in this chapter according to each of the hypotheses. The section titles for each hypothesis reflect the subject of each individual research question. The first hypothesis refers to the *Prevalence and Nature* of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment as reported by responding officers. The second hypothesis explores female officers' *Recognition* of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment. Hypothesis Three pertains to the *Effects* that inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment has on female officers. Lastly, the final hypothesis speculates on officers' *Management* of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment in the correctional setting.

This chapter presents the quantitative results of the research questionnaire. As previously stated, in exploratory research, the quantitative data serves to supplement the qualitative responses gathered through the survey process. (Stebbins, 2001, p. 6) Thus, the quantitative analysis that follows presents the survey data in terms of frequencies and percentages in an effort to provide a foundation for the theoretical analysis that follows in Chapter Five.

Prevalence and Nature

H_1: Female correction officers are subject to persistent and daily instances of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment.

The prevalence of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against the responding female officers was measured with Question 7, which asks "How often have you

experienced the following behaviors from male inmates in the last 12 months at Lafayette Parish Correctional facility?" The question was presented in matrix format asking officers to indicate the frequency (never, seldom, one to three times per month, more than once a week, or everyday) with which they experienced each of eight sexual harassment behaviors (unwelcome sexual comments, indecent exposure, display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures, unwelcome physical contact, threats of sexual assault, actual or attempted sexual assault or rape, unwelcome sexual flirtation, and sexually offensive comments). For comparative purposes, the following analysis also discusses the results of Questions 6 and 8, which ask officers to report the frequency with which they experience each of the eight sexual behaviors, by co-workers or supervisors and female inmates, respectively. The data collected from Questions 6 through 8 are outlined in Table 1.

With the exceptions of threats of sexual assault and actual or attempted sexual assault or rape, twenty percent or more of all responding officers reported that they experienced each of the eight forms of sexual harassment by male inmates in the past twelve months. Twenty-seven percent of officers reported being subject to some form of sexual harassment by male inmates on a daily basis, and more than half of responding officers reported some form of this behavior occurs more than once a week. Fifty-two percent of officers (eleven respondents) reported experiencing unwelcome sexual comments from male inmates in the past twelve months. Six officers (29 percent) indicated they were subject to unwelcome sexual comments more than once a month. One of the responding officers said she experienced this type of behavior daily.

Table 1
Reported Frequency of Sexual Comments and Behavior Perpetrated by Male Inmates, Co-Workers and Supervisors, and Female Inmates

	Never	*Seldom*	*1-3 Times per month*	*More than once a week*	*Everyday*
Unwelcome sexual comments	**10 (47.6)**	**5 (23.8)**	**3 (14.3)**	**2 (9.5)**	**1 (4.8)**
	13 (61.9)	8 (38.1)	0	0	0
	14 (66.7)	*6 (28.6)*	*1 (4.8)*	*0*	*0*
Indecent exposure	**6 (28.6)**	**7 (33.3)**	**1 (4.8)**	**3 (14.3)**	**3 (14.3)**
	21 (100)	0	0	0	0
	16 (76.2)	*5 (23.8)*	*0*	*0*	*0*
Display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures	**12 (57.1)**	**2 (9.5)**	**3 (14.3)**	**3 (14.3)**	**1 (4.8)**
	18 (85.7)	3 (14.3)	0	0	0
	19 (90.5)	*2 (9.5)*	*0*	*0*	*0*
Unwelcome physical contact	**16 (76.2)**	**4 (19.0)**	**1 (4.8)**	0	0
	21 (100)	0	0	0	0
	20 (95.2)	*1 (4.8)*	*0*	*0*	*0*
Threats of sexual assault	**18 (85.7)**	**3 (14.3)**	**0**	**0**	**0**
	21 (100)	0	0	0	0
	20 (95.2)	*1 (4.8)*	*0*	*0*	*0*
Actual or attempted sexual assault or rape	**21 (100)**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
	21 (100)	0	0	0	0
	21 (100)	*0*	*0*	*0*	*0*
Unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance, or proposition	**14 (66.7)**	**2 (9.5)**	**2 (9.5)**	**1 (4.8)**	**1 (4.8)**
	19 (90.5)	1 (4.8)	1 (4.8)	0	0
	18 (85.7)	*2 (9.5)*	*1 (4.8)*	*0*	*0*
Sexually offensive comments	**15 (71.4)**	**3 (14.3)**	**1 (4.8)**	**2 (9.5)**	**0**
	19 (90.5)	2 (9.5)	0	0	0
	19 (90.5)	*2 (9.5)*	*0*	*0*	*0*

The figures – raw numbers (percentages) – presented in bold font refer to behavior perpetrated by male inmates; those presented in regular font refer to co-workers and supervisors; and those presented in italic font refer to female inmates.

Comparatively, 62 percent (13 officers) and 67 percent (14 officers) reported that they never experienced unwelcome sexual comments from either co-workers or supervisors or female inmates, respectively. Of those who reported being subject to

unwelcome sexual comments by co-workers and supervisors – 38 percent, or eight responding officers – all indicated the behavior seldom occurred. Similarly, officers reported that behavior perpetrated by female inmates occurred seldom (six officers, 29 percent) or only one to three times per month (one officer, five percent).

With respect to indecent exposure, only 29 percent – six responding officers – reported never experiencing such behavior by male inmates. However, no officer reported experiencing indecent exposure by co-workers and supervisors, and 76 percent, 16 officers, reported never experiencing such behavior by female inmates. The remaining five officers, 24 percent, indicated indecent exposure by female inmates occurred on a seldom basis. Of the 67 percent of officers who reported experiencing some indecent exposure by male inmates in the past twelve months, one-third (seven officers) indicated the behavior was seldom, one officer reported this exposure occurred one to three times a month, 14 percent (three officers) reported it occurred more than once a week, and 14 percent (three officers) experienced indecent exposure by male inmates daily.

While only 14 percent (three officers) reported ever experiencing the display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures from co-workers or supervisors, 43 percent (nine officers) indicated they had experienced such behavior perpetrated by male inmates. Furthermore, the three officers who indicated they had experienced such behavior by co-workers or supervisors all reported the behavior seldom occurred, while seven of the officers (33 percent) who reported experiencing the display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures from male inmates indicated this behavior occurred at least once a month. Three officers reported the behavior occurred more than once a week and one reported

she experienced the display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures by male inmates daily. Officers reported the same behavior perpetrated by female inmates occurred either never or seldom, 90 percent and 10 percent respectively.

Twenty-nine percent of responding officers reported being subject to unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance, or proposition and to sexually offensive comments by a male inmate in the past twelve months, while 91 percent of these officers reported never experiencing such behaviors by co-workers or supervisors in the same time period. Only one officer indicated that she was subject to unwelcome sexual flirtation from co-workers or supervisors one to three times per month, and one reported she seldom experienced such behavior from co-workers or supervisors. No officer in the present study reported experiencing either type of behavior from co-workers or supervisors more regularly than one to three times a month. On the other hand, six officers reported experiencing unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance, or proposition or sexually offensive comments from male inmates in the past twelve months, with ten percent of the female officers indicating both types of behavior occurred more than once a week.

With respect to the more physically threatening types of sexual harassment, reported rates of occurrence dropped in all cases. Only 14 percent – three officers – reported having ever experienced a threat of sexual assault by a male inmate. All three officers indicated the behavior seldom occurred within the past twelve months. No officer reported a threat of sexual assault by a co-worker or supervisor, and only one officer reported such behavior by a female inmate. Most officers reported they had never experienced unwelcome physical contact by a male inmate (77 percent), a co-worker or supervisor (100 percent), or a female inmate (95 percent). Of those that had reported

experiencing unwelcome sexual contact by a male inmate, four (19 percent) reported the behavior seldom occurred and one indicated she had experienced such behavior one to three times a month in the past year. The only officer that reported unwelcome physical contact by a female inmate indicated the behavior seldom occurred. No officer surveyed in the present research reported ever having experienced actual or attempted sexual assault or rape by an inmate, co-worker, or supervisor, male or female, in the past twelve months.

For comparative purposes, I included Question 30 in the survey which asks officers to report the frequency with which they had experienced non-sexual behaviors by inmates in the past twelve months. The question is formatted in a similar matrix design as Question 6a, but concerns the following non-sexual behaviors of inmates: pushing, spitting, throwing objects, striking or attacking with a weapon, striking or attacking without a weapon, actual or attempted assault by more than one inmate, and verbal assault. For each behavior, officers were asked to indicate how frequently (never, seldom, one to three times per month, more than once a week, or everyday) they experienced this non-sexual behavior from inmates in the past twelve months. Though unnecessary to discuss each type of behavior individually, it is interesting to note that, with the exception of verbal assault, less than ten percent of responding officers indicated they experienced any of the aforementioned non-sexual behaviors more frequently than seldom. On the other hand, more than 14 percent of all responding officers reported experiencing the five following sexual behaviors by inmates once a month or more frequently: unwelcome sexual comments (29 percent), indecent exposure (33 percent), display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures (33 percent), unwelcome sexual

flirtation, advance, or proposition (19 percent), and sexually offensive comments (14 percent). Furthermore, with the exception of verbal assault, no officer reported experiencing any of the relevant non-sexual behavior by inmates on a daily basis. However, five percent reported experiencing unwelcome sexual comments, display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures, and unwelcome sexual flirtation everyday, and 14 percent experienced indecent exposure everyday in the twelve months prior to the current research.

While the small number of available responses does not allow for advanced statistical analysis of the data, a simple comparison of the data relevant to the prevalence and nature of sexual harassment in the correctional setting presents some important preliminary findings. First, sexual harassment perpetrated by male inmates is more prevalent than such harassment either by co-workers and supervisors or by female inmates. This holds true for seven of the eight types of sexual harassment referenced in the current study's survey instrument. The only exception is for instances of actual or attempted sexual assault or rape of which no responding officer reported experiencing from any of the three groups. The responding officers reported both a greater frequency and a more varied occurrence of sexual harassment perpetrated by male inmates than such harassment from either co-workers and supervisors or female inmates. Secondly, with the exceptions of both threats of sexual assault and actual or attempted sexual assault, the prevalence of sexual behaviors is greater than that of non-sexual behaviors perpetrated against female officers by male inmates. Based on the available data, this research concludes that the female correction officers participating in this study are

subject to a significant amount of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment in the correctional setting.

Recognition

H_2: Female correction officers do not label or identify most instances of inmate-perpetrated sexual comments and behavior as sexual harassment.

Quantitative support for this hypothesis was gathered from the data collected in four of the survey questions. These questions address officer perceptions of behaviors that constitute sexual harassment, their perception of being victim to sexual harassment, and their opinions regarding the punishment of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment. In all, the data collected in these four questions indicate some confusion and disagreement regarding the definition of sexual harassment.

I attempted to gauge officers' perceptions of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment with Question 18, which reads "Which of the following behaviors of inmates do you consider sexual harassment?" Respondents were instructed to circle each of the following behaviors they considered sexual harassment when perpetrated by an inmate: unwelcome sexual comments, indecent exposure, display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures, unwelcome physical contact, threats of sexual assault, actual or attempted sexual assault or rape, unwelcome sexual flirtation, and sexually offensive comments. Most officers, 71 percent, considered all eight behaviors to be sexual harassment when committed by an inmate. Interestingly, only twelve of the respondents, 57 percent, believed all of the behaviors should be considered sexual harassment when perpetrated by a co-worker or supervisor. Just over half of all responding officers (52 percent) reported

that they considered all forms of the aforementioned behavior to be sexual harassment regardless of whether it be perpetrated by either an inmate or a co-worker or supervisor.

Of the respondents who reported one or more of the behaviors should not be considered sexual harassment when perpetrated by either a co-worker or supervisor or an inmate, most indicated the less threatening forms of sexual behavior are not forms of sexual harassment. One-third of responding officers reported unwelcome sexual comments and the display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures by co-workers or supervisors are not considered forms of sexual harassment. Four officers (19 percent) reported believing unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance, or proposition and sexually offensive comments should not be considered sexual harassment when perpetrated by co-workers or supervisors. Few officers did not consider unwelcome physical contact (14 percent), indecent exposure (10 percent), or threats of sexual assault (5 percent) to be sexual harassment.

Those officers who indicated a belief that one or more of the behaviors should not be considered sexual harassment when perpetrated by an inmate reported similar results as those outlined above. Nineteen percent reported believing an unwelcome sexual comment by an inmate is not an example of sexual harassment; fourteen percent reported as such for the display of sexually suggestive objects and gestures. Only ten percent reported believing indecent exposure or unwelcome flirtation by inmates should be classified as sexual harassment and less than five percent consider unwelcome physical contact to be sexual harassment when perpetrated by an inmate. Despite a few differences, officers' perceptions of what types of behavior constitute sexual harassment are comparable for both male and female inmate behavior.

As a measure of officers' perceptions of the severity of sexual behaviors perpetrated by inmates, I included two questions that attempt to gauge officer beliefs regarding the punishment of such behaviors. Question 14 asks officer whether they believe inmates should be punished for any of the eight behaviors discussed. Most officers – 81 percent – reported inmates should be punished for committing any of the sexual behaviors. Only ten percent believed inmates should not be punished, and two officers indicated that punishment should depend on the circumstances of the act. One officer reported that punishment should depend on whether the behavior was intentional, such as in the case of indecent exposure, and the other officer felt that such behavior should only be punished when the officer subjected to it feels threatened in some way.

Question 27 attempts to elicit greater detail in officers' perceptions of appropriate punishment by asking respondents to indicate how, if at all, inmates should be punished for each of the relevant behaviors. In a matrix design, Question 27 asks officers to report whether they believe an inmate should be charged in disciplinary court, as a criminal offense, or not at all for each of the following behaviors: unwelcome sexual comments, indecent exposure, display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures, unwelcome physical contact, threats of sexual assault, actual or attempted sexual assault or rape, unwelcome sexual flirtation, and sexually offensive comments. Eighteen respondents – 86 percent – reported believing that unwelcome sexual comments by inmates should be disposed through the correctional facility's internal disciplinary court. One officer reported believing unwelcome sexual comments should not be punished at all. For inmates accused of indecent exposure against a corrections officer, two-thirds of respondents believe their cases should be heard in disciplinary court, while 29 percent

believe they should be charged with a criminal offense. Eighty-one percent of respondents reported the display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures by inmates should be a disciplinary matter, ten percent a criminal matter, and five percent reported the offense should not be punished at all. Three officers – 14 percent – reported believing both unwelcome sexual flirtation and sexually offensive comments by inmates should be charged in the criminal court. While most respondents believed that flirtation and sexually offensive comments by inmates were matters for the disciplinary court, 76 percent and 72 percent respectively, one officer believed unwelcome flirtation should not be punished in either court, and two believed as such for sexually offensive comments. With respect to the more physically threatening types of behaviors, most officers believed each should be punished as a criminal offense, and not one officer indicated these behaviors should go unpunished. The majority of respondents indicated unwelcome physical contact (57 percent), threats of sexual assault (67 percent), and actual or attempted sexual assault or rape (91 percent) should be handled in the criminal courts.

The final measure of officers' recognition of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment employed in the current research asks officers whether they believe they have ever been the victim of sexual harassment by male inmates at the Lafayette Parish Correctional Center. Seven officers – 33 percent – reported that they felt they had been the subject of sexual harassment perpetrated by male inmates, while an overwhelming majority, 67 percent, believed they had not. It is interesting that two-thirds of respondents believe they have never been a victim of sexual harassment by male inmates since only 19 percent of all respondents indicated they had never been subject to any of the relevant behaviors by male inmates in the last twelve months. Thus, almost half of

the respondents to the current survey indicated they had experienced one or more of the aforementioned behaviors perpetrated by a male inmate in the past twelve months, but maintain that they have never been a victim of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment.

The hypothesis relevant to the *Recognition* of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment by female correction officers has mixed support in the data. The majority of responding officers reported believing all of the investigator-defined examples of sexual behavior should be considered sexual harassment when perpetrated by a male inmate. In fact, the officers were more inclined to believe this behavior constituted sexual harassment when perpetrated by an inmate than when perpetrated by a co-worker or supervisor. The few officers who reported believing one or more of the behaviors relevant to this study should not be labeled as sexual harassment pointed to the less threatening forms of behavior – unwelcome sexual comments, the display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures, unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance, or proposition – as not constituting such harassment. From these data, it appears that the participating officers are likely to label or identify most instances of sexual behavior perpetrated by inmates as forms of sexual harassment. However, an overwhelming majority of the responding officers reported believing they had never been a victim of sexual harassment by male inmates. Given the reported prevalence of such behavior discussed in the first section of this chapter, and the general conception of sexual harassment among the participating officers discussed earlier in this section, it seems incongruent that these officers do not identify themselves as victims of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment. On the surface, there appears a definite inconsistency in the identification and labeling of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment among female correction officers. This issue will

be furthered explored in the following chapter analyzing the qualitative data gathered in this research.

Effects

H_3: Female correction officers experience fear and decreased job satisfaction as a result of persistent inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment.

While there are several survey questions that provide support for this hypothesis, only one is purely quantitative. Because of the nature of some consequences of sexual harassment, I expect qualitative data to be more useful in supporting this hypothesis. Nevertheless, Question 36 asks officers to indicate to what extent – on a scale of 1 to 6, where 1 equals *strongly agree* and 6 equals *completely disagree* – she agrees or disagrees with the following statement: "Inmates' sexual comments or behaviors directly affect my job satisfaction." Most officers – 48 percent – suggested inmates' sexual comments or behavior have no impact on their job satisfaction, indicating, with a response of 6 on the scale, that they completely disagree with the statement. Twenty-four percent of responding officers circled a response of 5, strongly disagreeing with the statement. More than a quarter of responding officers reported slight agreement or slight disagreement with the statement, 14 percent each. No responding officers indicated that she strongly or completely agrees inmates' sexual comments and behavior directly affect her job satisfaction.

From a quantitative perspective, the hypothesis relevant to the *Effects* of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment has little foundation in the research data. Only a small percentage of officers indicated such harassment has any impact on their job satisfaction. Unfortunately, the data collected on the reported effects of inmate-perpetrated sexual

harassment is scarce in the current study. Nevertheless, the quantitative analysis of the data suggests no support for this hypothesis.

Management

H_4: Female correction officers employ a variety of methods to manage inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment but rarely confide in other female or male officers.

This research study employed several questions intending to measure female officers' management of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment. Question 10, in matrix format, asks officers to indicate what they believe to be the most appropriate response to each of the relevant sexual behaviors when perpetrated by an inmate. For each of the eight sexual behaviors, officers responded with one of the five following responses: ignore the behavior or avoid the person, ask or tell the person to stop, threaten to tell a co-worker or friend, file a complaint or tell a supervisor, or *other* response. The results for this question contradict my expectations since almost all officers reported believing the more proactive options are the best responses to all of the relevant sexual behaviors. In fact, by comparison, officers seemed to react more proactively against this behavior perpetrated by inmates than that perpetrated by co-workers or supervisors. Question 9, formatted identically to Question 10, asks officers to report what they believe is the most appropriate response to each of the eight sexual behaviors when perpetrated by co-workers or supervisors. The results of both questions are outlined below in Table 2.

With the exception of indecent exposure, only one officer responded that she believed ignoring the behavior or avoiding the person was the most appropriate response to any of the sexual behaviors when perpetrated by an inmate. Only two officers – about 10 percent – indicated they believed this was the most appropriate response to indecent

exposure. In most cases, officers responded similarly for that behavior perpetrated by a co-worker or supervisor, though the responding officers were slightly more likely to ignore the behavior or avoid the person when the behavior involved unwelcome sexual comments (14 percent), the display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures (14 percent), or sexually offensive comments (10 percent).

Overall, officers were more likely to ask or tell the person to stop in most cases of sexual comments and behaviors by both inmates and co-workers or supervisors. Fifty-seven percent and 67 percent of officers believed this is the most appropriate response to unwelcome sexual comments when perpetrated by an inmate or a co-worker or supervisor, respectively. For unwelcome sexual comments made by inmates, only one-third of responding officers felt the most appropriate response to be filing a complaint or telling a supervisor, while 19 percent believed this to be appropriate for such behavior by co-workers or supervisors.

Officers were much more likely to indicate they should file a complaint or tell a supervisor when they experienced indecent exposure, unwelcome physical contact, threats of sexual assault, or actual or attempted sexual assault by either an inmate or co-worker or supervisor. For each type of behavior, more than half of responding officers indicated they believed filing a complaint or telling a supervisor was the most appropriate response against both inmates and co-workers and supervisors.

Table 2
Reported Appropriate Responses to Sexual Comments and Behavior
by Male Inmates, and Co-Workers and Supervisors

	Ignore the behavior/ Avoid the person	*Ask or tell the person to stop*	*Threaten to tell a co-worker or friend*	*File a complaint/ Tell a supervisor*	*Other*
Unwelcome sexual comments	**1 (4.8)** 3 (14.3)	**12 (57.1)** 14 (66.7)	**0** 0	**7 (33.3)** 4 (19.0)	**1 (4.8)** 0
Indecent exposure	**2 (9.5)** 2 (9.5)	**6 (28.6)** 1 (4.8)	**0** 2 (9.5)	**12 (57.1)** 16 (76.2)	**1 (4.8)** 0
Display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures	**1 (4.8)** 3 (14.3)	**8 (38.1)** 8 (38.1)	**0** 1 (4.8)	**10 (47.6)** 8 (38.1)	**2 (9.5)** 0
Unwelcome physical contact	**1 (4.8)** 1 (4.8)	**4 (19.0)** 3 (14.3)	**0** 0	**12 (57.1)** 17 (81.0)	**3 (14.3)** 0
Threats of sexual assault	**1 (4.8)** 1 (4.8)	**2 (9.5)** 0	**0** 0	**16 (76.2)** 20 (95.2)	**2 (9.5)** 0
Actual or attempted sexual assault or rape	**1 (4.8)** 1 (4.8)	**1 (4.8)** 0	**0** 0	**17 (81.0)** 19 (90.5)	**2 (9.5)** 1 (4.8)
Unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance, or proposition	**1 (4.8)** 1 (4.8)	**7 (33.3)** 9 (42.9)	**0** 0	**11 (52.4)** 10 (47.6)	**2 (9.5)** 0
Sexually offensive comments	**1 (4.8)** 2 (9.5)	**2 (9.5)** 11 (52.4)	**0** 0	**10 (47.6)** 8 (38.1)	**2 (9.5)** 0

The figures – raw numbers (percentages) – presented in bold font refer to behavior perpetrated by male inmates and those presented in regular font refer to co-workers and supervisors.

In Questions 12 and 13, I asked officers to indicate whether they had ever reported one or more types of sexual harassment perpetrated either by a co-worker or supervisor or by an inmate to a department manager or supervisor. Interestingly, only three responding officers reported ever having making such a report against an inmate, and only one officer admitted ever doing so against a co-worker or supervisor. More

importantly, despite the fact that two-thirds of the responding officers indicated they had experienced indecent exposure by male inmates in the past twelve months, only two officers – 10 percent – indicated they had reported this behavior to a supervisor or department manager. This is an interesting discrepancy considering more than half – 57 percent – of responding officers indicated they believed filing a complaint or telling a supervisor would be the most appropriate response to this behavior perpetrated by an inmate. The results are similar for both unwelcome physical contact and unwelcome sexual flirtation. While 24 percent of officers reported experiencing unwelcome physical contact in the past year, and 29 percent unwelcome sexual flirtation, only one officer indicated making a report for either of these behaviors by an inmate to a supervisor or department manager. Again, this is despite the fact that over half of responding officers believed filing a complaint or telling a supervisor to be the most appropriate response to either unwelcome physical contact or unwelcome sexual flirtation by an inmate.

In exploring officers' *Management* of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment, it appears that the officers intend to respond to such harassment with more aggressive techniques, but in reality, rarely act aggressively against the harasser. This finding offers both supportive and contradictive evidence to the research hypothesis. First, from a theoretical standpoint, the responding officers appear to utilize a variety of responses to inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment, including ignoring the behavior, asking the perpetrator to stop, telling a co-worker, and filing a complaint. However, given the prevalence with which the officers believe filing a complaint or telling a supervisor is the most appropriate response, the second half of the hypothesis – officers rarely confide in other officers – appears untrue. Nevertheless, in their actual responses to inmate-

perpetrated sexual harassment, the female officers participating in the current study rarely report such behaviors in reality, a fact that supports the latter half of the research hypothesis. The quantitative data, thus, provides some foundation for the validity of this final hypothesis.

Discussion

Quantitative analysis of the research data shows mixed support for each of the four research hypotheses applicable to the current study. These data provide support for the significant prevalence of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment, the reluctance among female correction officers to label sexual behaviors as harassment, and the variety and nature of the methods employed by these officers to manage inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment. The sole dissention from the supportive evidence is in the case of the third hypothesis predicting the presence of fear and decreased job satisfaction among female officers as a result of sexual harassment perpetrated by male inmates. The quantitative data suggest inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment has little impact on the job satisfaction of the responding correction officers.

While the findings presented in this chapter provide some insight in the nature of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment, they are intended only to provide a foundation for the qualitative analysis presented in the following chapter. In most cases, the qualitative analyses supplement the data previously explored and establish the groundwork for a thematic analysis of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female correction officers.

CHAPTER FIVE

Analysis

This chapter presents the qualitative data gathered from the open-ended questions of the study questionnaire. In the following sections, I discuss the themes uncovered in the current research relevant to the sexual harassment of female correction officers by male inmates. In following the format of the previous chapter, the qualitative results in this chapter are presented in terms of the four distinct research questions outlined in the study.

Though the quantitative data suggests the *Prevalence and Nature* of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female correction officers to be persistent, many of the responding officers report a dispassionate view of the behavior. In their *Recognition* of sexually-motivated behavior, the responding officers seem reluctant to either define inmate-perpetrated sexual behaviors as sexual harassment or to identify themselves as victims of such harassment. The *Effect* of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment on female correction officers exists in the officers' tendencies to minimize or ignore the behavior. Lastly, in their *Management* of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment, the responding female officers appear much more assertive and proactive in theory than in actuality.

This chapter concludes with a discussion of the themes emerging in the qualitative data. The analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data in the current study suggests a disjunction in the process by which female correction officers label their experiences with sexual behavior perpetrated by male inmates. That is, the female officers who experience the types of behavior relevant to the current study appear at least reluctant, if not

resistant, to apply the label of sexual harassment to such encounters with male inmates. The concluding section of this chapter discusses evidence of this labeling disjunction in the current study as well as other research efforts finding a similar phenomenon in various other populations of female targets of sexual harassment.

Prevalence and Nature

The quantitative data presented in the previous chapter indicate that inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female correction officers is a significant and persistent occurrence in the correction facility under study. For each of the eight categories of sexual behaviors and comments – with the exceptions of threats of sexual assault and actual or attempted sexual assault or rape – at least 20 percent of all responding officers indicated they had been subject to these behaviors in the past twelve months. Indecent exposure was the most commonly reported sexual behavior, with almost two-thirds of responding officers reported being subject to indecent exposure by male inmates in the past twelve months. Almost half of those officers further indicated being exposed to such behavior on at least a weekly basis. Unwelcome sexual comments and the display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures follow as the most commonly reported occurrences, with 52.4 percent and 42.9 percent of officers respectively, reporting being subject to such behavior from inmates at some point in the past twelve months. Similar to indecent exposure, a large percentage of these officers reported that such behaviors occur on a weekly or daily basis. Several officers also reported experiencing unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance or proposition, sexually offensive comments, and unwelcome physical contact from male inmates in the past twelve months. For each of the categories of sexual behavior and comments, responding officers

reported a greater frequency of such behavior perpetrated by male inmates than by either co-workers or supervisors or female inmates.

To supplement the quantitative data, officers were asked to describe the behaviors they reported experiencing from male inmates. Several themes emerged in the analysis of these open-ended responses. First, several of the responding officers described the sexual behavior of male inmates as simply a natural occurrence in the population. It seems these officers view sexual behavior and comments by male inmates to be typical male behavior. In describing the instances of inmate-perpetrated sexual behavior they had reported experiencing in the past twelve months, the responding officers discuss these events with an almost indifferent attitude:

> Male inmates are very flirtatious and often expose themselves to female deputies.
>
> Men generally make remarks towards women. [There is] no specific situation [to describe].
>
> Males will always make comments. You just have to get beyond it and not let it affect your job.
>
> Some inmates have a habit of walking around with there (sic) pants hanging down. One inmate likes to masturbate while the deputies are around.

One officer, who reported experiencing indecent exposure by male inmates more than once a week, indicated the majority of this behavior occurs while inmates are getting out of the shower. Later in the survey, when asked if she believes inmates should be punished for any of the eight types of behaviors relevant to the study, the officer responded that punishment should depend:

> [An inmate should be punished] if it was intentionally done, such as getting out of [the] shower. Most are not doing this to disrespect a deputy.

A second theme that emerges suggests that female correction officers believe sexual harassment from male inmates is an inevitable aspect of their jobs. In some responses, the female officers seem to view inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment as more of a typical inmate behavior than a typical male behavior. In these cases, the female officers reported a belief that sexual harassment, in a sense, comes with the correctional territory:

> You hear sexual comments everyday. You just have to ignore them and not let it interfere with your daily job.
>
> Ignorant inmates say stupid comments to see if they can get a rise out of you. You can either just ignore it or confront them.
>
> It's just the nature of the job. You subject yourself [to inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment] when taking a job inside <u>any</u> (her emphasis) jail.

The nature of these officers' responses suggests that they do not consider inmate-perpetrated sexual behavior to be abnormal. This attitude appears consistent with other populations of women often exposed to sexual harassment on the job. Studies of the sexual harassment of nurses in various occupational settings has found that many do not "label their experiences as sexual harassment because the frequency of sexual harassment in the health care setting has made it normative and therefore invisible" (Mcguire, et al., 2006, p. 427). In fact, in her study of the sexual harassment of nurses, Hanrahan (1997) suggested many of the nurses she interviewed were "resigned to 'taking' the harassment behaviors despite their discomfort" (p. 54) because they felt their responsibilities as nurses outweighed their rights as targets of sexual harassment. In this sense, the nurses in Hanrahan's study have accepted the sexual behavior and actions to which they are subject because they believe it is the nature of their job and of the sexualized environment in which they work.

Similarly, Hughes and Tadic (1998) found that women in the service industry often reported a complacent attitude toward harassment perpetrated by their customers (p. 217). Their research concludes that such indifference to customer-perpetrated sexual harassment is "potentially damaging for women's work performance" (p. 217), in that it hinders these women's abilities to establish and maintain relationships with both harassing and non-harassing customers.

Gutek and Morasch (1982) suggest that sexual harassment may be underreported among certain populations of women when that behavior seems more commonplace (p. 65). In such populations, women subject to sexual behavior and activity in the workplace are less likely to "view and report sexual harassment as a problem at work, because it's 'part of the job'" (p. 65).

The two themes that emerged from the questions relevant to the prevalence and nature of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment – sexual harassment is a normal behavior among the male population and sexual harassment is a normal behavior in the correctional setting – have implications for a general understanding of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment in the correctional facility. First, as Gutek and Morasch (1982) have suggested, the perceived normalcy of this behavior might contribute to a lower rate of reported instances of sexual harassment among female correction officers. Second, assuming this perceived normalcy of sexual harassment may also contribute to a reluctance to label such experiences as sexual harassment among female correction officers, additional issues relating to the recognition, effects, and management of these experiences may also be present in the correctional environment.

Recognition

Based on the quantitative data, the responding officers seem reluctant to recognize their experiences as sexual harassment or to identify themselves as victims of sexual harassment. Only one-third of the responding officers answered in the affirmative to the following question, "Do you believe you have ever been a victim of sexual harassment by male inmates?" Despite the fact that the majority – 71.4 percent – of responding officers believed all eight categories of sexual behavior and comments should be classified as sexual harassment and less than one-fifth of officers claimed never to have experienced any of those behaviors by male inmates, most of the responding officers reported that they had never been a victim of sexual harassment by male inmates.

It is possible that this disparity is related to the officers' perceptions of the sexualized event. A few officers explained their opinions relating to the punishment of sexual harassment offenders in the correctional setting. When asked if male inmates should be punished for committing any of the eight types of sexual behaviors relevant to the study, two officers replied that punishment should depend on the nature of the behavior:

> [An inmate should be punished] if it was intentionally done . . . Most are not doing this to disrespect a deputy.
>
> [The inmate should be punished] if I feel threatened by the inmate.

It is interesting that these female correction officers allow some excuse for inappropriate inmate behavior based on the intent or consequences of the inmates' actions. The above comments seem to minimize the officers' experiences and, in a sense, allow for a justification of the behavior. Again, this attitude toward sexual harassment is similar to the reported experiences of nurses. In Patricia Hanrahan's research (1997) on the sexual

harassment of nurses, the nurses' definitions of sexual harassment relied on two characteristics: a threat or implied threat and an ongoing nature (p.53). Hanrahan attributes this definitional trend to the notion that women often rely on popular conceptions of an issue to inform their own perceptions. She points to the fact that all of the nurses surveyed in her study referred to the Antia Hill and Clarence Thomas and/or Tailbrook incidents in relating their own conceptions of what behavior constitutes sexual harassment (p 53). Since the work-related experiences of female correction officers are not often made public, and the interactions between female officers and male inmates being even less publicized, female correction officers are unlikely to have such popular incidents with which to relate. Without a clear conception of the issue, the self-perception of sexual harassment by female correction officers is surely varied and misrepresentative of the true nature of the problem.

While the majority of the responding officers reported believing most, if not all, of the sexual behaviors relevant to the study were examples of sexual harassment, very few reported believing that they themselves had been a victim of such harassment. Like these officers, most of the nurses in Hanrahan's research (1997) readily identified unwanted sexual events as examples of sexual harassment, however "they were unwilling to say that in those particular instances they were in fact sexually harassed" (p. 54). The nurses were reluctant to either label their experiences as sexual harassment or identify themselves as victims of sexual harassment when that behavior was perpetrated by their patients. In fact, the reluctance to identify one's experiences as sexual harassment is fairly commonplace among female targets of sexual harassment in general (Fitzgerald,

Swan, et al., 1997). This trend in labeling appears consistent with the correction officer data of the current study.

This reluctance to identify one's experiences as sexual harassment or oneself as a victim of such harassment relates back to the themes discussed in the previous section. Such reluctance may be the result of the perceived normalcy of sexual behavior and activity in the correctional setting. In a sense, the responding officers concede that such behavior may be considered sexual harassment when it occurs to another person in another situation. However, in their circumstances, the female correction officers in this study, like the nurses in Hanrahan's research (1997), are unwilling to "label the offensive acts directed at them as sexual harassment because they were part of how they normally expected to be treated" (p. 56).

In some cases, the organizational policies and practices may contribute to a female target's unwillingness to label her experiences as sexual harassment. The organizational climate could affect self-labeling in two aspects. First, if the organization's sexual harassment policies do not explicitly prohibit sexual harassing behaviors and comments, female employees may be less likely to identify their experiences with such behavior as sexual harassment. Secondly, an organization's overall attitude toward sexual behavior in the workplace may have an impact on the tendency to label such behavior as sexual harassment among both harassers and targets.

It is also possible the apparent reluctance among the female respondents to label their experiences as sexual harassment relates to the personal costs of identifying oneself as a victim. Fitzgerald, Swan, and Magley (1997) suggest there are "undeniable psychological costs attached to identifying oneself as a victim" (p. 21), including a

perceived loss of control and the stigma associated with such a label (Koss, 1990). In fact, identification of oneself as a victim may accompany a perceived lack of control over the situation or the harm that resulted from the experience (Holstein & Miller, 1990). Especially in the correctional setting, this association could have damaging implications for a female officer responsible for the supervision and control of male inmates. Nevertheless, regardless of whether a woman identifies her own experiences as sexual harassment, "it is clear that it need not be so labeled to be experienced as stressful or offensive or to have negative consequences" (Fitzgerald, Swan, et al., 1997, p. 20).

Effects

Despite the various psychological, emotional, physical, and work-related effects of sexual harassment documented in the existing literature, the current research uncovered little direct effect of sexual harassment reported by the responding female correction officers. The quantitative data suggests only a minimal impact of sexual harassment on an officer's job satisfaction. Only 14.3 percent of officers reported slightly agreeing with the statement, "Inmates' sexual comments or behaviors directly affect my job satisfaction." Most of the responding officers – 47.6 percent – reported inmates' sexual comments or behaviors had no impact on their job satisfaction. The remaining officers either strongly disagreed – 23.8 percent – or slightly disagreed – 14.3 percent – with the aforementioned statement. Furthermore, when asked to recount a specific experience related to inmates' sexual behavior or comments, only one officer reported any symptoms related to that experience.

When asked to explain how inmate-perpetrated sexual comments and behavior affected their job satisfaction, most of the respondents minimized such effects:

> Males will always make comments. You just have to get beyond it and not let it affect your job.
>
> I don't let inmates get under my skin.
>
> I love my job and do not allow inmate's behavior to take my satisfaction away.
>
> It does not affect my job very much, I am used to it.
>
> It's just the nature of the job. You subject yourself [to inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment] when taking a job inside any (her emphasis) jail.

A few of the respondents described some effect of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment to their job satisfaction or emotional or psychological well-being:

> It might make a person feel uncomfortable with their job.
>
> It's annoying to be around that behavior constantly.
>
> It would make you feel uneasy to have someone do this while you are trying to perform your job.
>
> [Such behavior may] give you a sense of lower self-worth.

It is interesting to note that the previous responses seem withdrawn from the respondent. There appears to be a form of distancing associated with these responses from the actual experience of inmate-perpetrated sexual comments and behavior. Distancing is in fact a type of strategy documented in existing research that targets often employ as "a natural reaction" to sexual harassment (Mcguire, et al., 2006, p. 439). In their study of the sexual harassment of nurses by their patients, Mcguire and her colleagues conclude that "[n]urses consistently respond to sexual harassment and its related forced closeness by attempting to create distance between themselves and their patients" (p. 436). According to the researchers, distancing can occur in two forms: discursive distancing and physical distancing. Discursive distancing is a method of "creating emotional space" between the target and the harasser. Physical distancing can

include such reactions as leaving the site of the harassment, terminating contact with the harasser, or refusing to return to the site of the harassment or to the care of the harasser (pp. 438-439). These strategies of distancing may have significantly negative consequences for the female correction officer's role in the surveillance of inmate behavior.

In the final section of the current study's questionnaire, the officers were presented with three experience-related sets of questions relevant to incidents of a sexual nature perpetrated by male inmates. In this section, officers were asked to recount their *most unforgettable*, *most recent*, and *most frightening* experience with an inmate that involved sexual behavior or comments. For each of these reported experiences, the officers were asked to indicate any emotional or psychological symptoms (nausea/vomiting, headaches, sleeplessness, irritability, nervousness/anxiety, uncontrolled anger, weight loss, uncontrolled crying), as well as any work-related symptoms (loss of concentration, absenteeism/missing work, desire to quit, fear to go to work, fear to be alone with inmates, distrust of co-workers, need for therapy/medical attention, avoid uncomfortable areas within the facility) they suffered as a result of this event. Lastly, the respondents were asked whether they believe the experience they described was sexual harassment and whether they believed the inmate involved would have acted the same way toward an officer of the opposite sex. Though few respondents completed this section of the questionnaire, the results gathered relevant to these experiences are important in the officers' perceived recognition of such behavior as sexual harassment. Three officers described their most unforgettable experience:

Male inmate called me a dyke bitch.

> Inmate threatened to rape me.
>
> An inmate asked me for my phone number then told me I was beautiful. Then [he] jumped out in from of me naked when I went to his pod later that day.

No officer described a frightening experience, and only one officer described her most recent experience with male inmate-perpetrated sexual behavior or comments:

> Male inmate rubbed his foot up my leg.

All officers reported believing that the inmate involved in the experience they described would not have acted in the same manner toward a male officer. Furthermore, all reported believing that the experience they described is sexual harassment. The officer who described being asked for her phone number and then being subject to indecent exposure later in the day further explains that, though she feels the event was sexual harassment, she does not think it is an extreme example. She also indicated that the experience caused her to avoid certain uncomfortable areas within the facility. She was, however, the only one of the four respondents to report any emotional, psychological, or work-related symptoms associated with the experience.

Though this particular section of the questionnaire yields little support for the research hypothesis due to the limited data gathered, I believe the results present two interesting themes that deserve more attention. First, with the wealth of research dedicated to a variety of symptoms associated with experiences of sexual harassment, it seems significant that no officer reported any substantial effects relevant to their experiences. Especially since the officers surveyed were women, it is surprising that none reported any feelings of vulnerability or insecurity due to the repeated sexual events they reported experiencing in the correctional setting. One study of sexual harassment even suggested that "sexual harassment **should** (my emphasis) invoke feelings of sexual

vulnerability and ultimately symbolize particular environments as dangerous and threatening" (Macmillan, et al., 2000, p. 309). It would be interesting to research the reported symptoms of sexual harassment specific to female correction officers in a more concentrated study. Secondly, all officers reported believing the experience they described would not have transpired similarly with a male officer. This seems to indicate that female officers believe they are subject to different experiences and behavior than their male counterparts. Again, I believe further study into this perspective would provide useful insight into the nature of the female correction officer's work-related experiences.

Management

The quantitative data relevant to the management of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment suggests that female officers are aggressive and proactive in their responses to such behavior in theory, but not so in actuality. For each of the eight categories of sexual comments and behaviors perpetrated by male inmates, the majority of female respondents indicated the most appropriate responses involved asking or telling to inmate to stop or filing a complaint with a supervisor. No more than 10 percent of officers believed that ignoring the behavior or avoiding the person were the most appropriate responses to any of the relevant behaviors. This is contradictory to sexual harassment literature which indicates the "women generally give fairly nonassertive responses to their harassers" (Gruber & Smith, 1995, p. 544). In fact, Gruber (1989) found, in his review of sexual harassment studies, that only 10 percent to 15 percent of sexual harassment targets respond proactively, and that most respond with avoidance of the harassment or of the harasser. Though Gruber and Smith (1995) suggest the

preponderance of nonassertive responses among female targets of sexual harassment may be related to the higher prevalence of the less severe forms of sexual harassment (p. 546), the female participants of the current study report believing all types of sexual harassment perpetrated by male inmates should be punished with sanctions of similar degrees of severity. When asked what they think is the most appropriate punishment for inmates that make unwelcome sexual or sexually offensive comments, indecently expose themselves, display sexually suggestive objects or gestures, or make unwelcome flirtation, advance or proposition, the officers' responses are categorically severe:

> Lockdown.
>
> Disciplinary write-up.
>
> At least 45 days lockdown.
>
> Loss of privileges or lock down if the behavior doesn't stop after the first time of being told to stop.
>
> Disciplinary action.
>
> Permanent lockdown.
>
> Lockdown time, sexual harassment class, and criminal charges.

The responses are equally severe for the more physically-threatening forms of sexual behavior including unwelcome physical contact or threats of assault. All responding officers indicated that some period of lockdown time, internal disciplinary action, or criminal charges were warranted for violations of this nature.

Nevertheless, despite their apparent attitude toward sexual harassment in theory, few officers appear so aggressive in their actual responses to such behavior when perpetrated by an inmate. While 17 of the 21 survey respondents reported experiencing one or more of the eight types of sexual behavior by male inmates in the past twelve

months, only three officers reported ever having filed a complaint against an inmate for such behavior. Furthermore, seven of those 17 officers reporting some form of sexual behavior perpetrated by male inmates indicated they had experienced one or more of the more physically-threatening forms of that behavior.

The trends in this data related to the management of sexual harassment tend to relate back to the issues of labeling behavior as sexual harassment and of labeling oneself as a victim. It is possible that the disparity between attitudes towards sexual comments and behavior and officers' reported actions against such comments and behavior may be related to a reluctance to define such behavior as harassment when it occurs to oneself in the correctional environment. Hanrahan (1997) made a similar observation regarding the sexual harassment of nurses by their patients. She found that "sexual behavior is not generally viewed as important or potentially problematic, particularly when considered alongside the claim made by several of the nurses that they have other, more serious concerns that merit their attention" (pp. 52-53). Among these nurses, as I believe is also the case with the female correction officers in the current study, "the strategies employed to manage workplace sexual behaviors operate to keep sexual issues from being seen as central" (p. 53).

Thematic Analysis

The thematic analysis suggests several distinctive traits of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment relevant to the nature, recognition, effects, and management of such harassment. Inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female correction officers in the correctional setting is a unique form of sexual harassment, the elements of which provide insight into a general understanding of sexual harassment.

The previous analysis identified four major themes in the occurrence of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment as reported by female correction officers. The first relates to the officers' perceptions of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment as a normal behavior either to the population of male inmates or to the correctional setting. Many of the officers' qualitative responses to the current questionnaire indicate they believe much of the sexual behavior they experience in the male inmate population is the nature of the correction officer's job and therefore normal to the correctional setting.

The second theme which emerged in the analysis is a general reluctance among the reporting officers to define or label their experiences as sexual harassment. The responding officers in this study indicated a prevalence of sexual harassing behaviors among the inmate population. More than one-fifth of the participating officers reported experiencing, in the twelve moths prior to completing the study questionnaire, the following behaviors within the male inmate population: unwelcome sexual comments, indecent exposure, display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures, unwelcome physical contact, unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance or proposition, and sexually offensive comments. Furthermore, only 19 percent of responding officers reported never witnessing such behavior among the male inmates of the institution. Nevertheless, over two-thirds of responding officers reported believing they had never been the victim of sexual harassment by male inmates.

Third, when the responding officers reported instances of sexual behavior perpetrated against them by members of the male inmate population, their accounts of the situations often included language that tended either to distance themselves from the event or to minimize the importance of the event. This distancing from or minimization

of sexually harassing events in the male inmate population has support in both direct and indirect analysis of the research data. The language used by several officers in describing sexual experiences in the correctional setting indicates evidence of distancing and minimization. Furthermore, consistent with the second theme previously discussed, the reluctance to label their experiences as sexual harassment may relate to a desire among the female correction officer population to distance themselves from or to minimize the importance of sexual behaviors perpetrated by the male inmate population.

Finally, in discussing their responses to male inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment, most of the responding officers reported believing such harassment deserves more proactive and assertive reactions, such as telling the person to stop or threatening to tell a supervisor or file a complaint. Nevertheless, this aggressive attitude toward inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment appears to exist only in theory as only three of the responding officers recounted ever having reported such an incident to a supervisor.

The culmination of the themes emerging from the data in this study suggests the presence of a labeling disjunction among the female correction officer population relevant to their experiences relevant to types of sexual harassing behaviors perpetrated by male inmates. That is, the officers participating in the current study do not identify their sexually harassing experiences with members of the male inmate population as events of sexual harassment. Though these officers readily describe events that conform to the definition of sexual harassment in the workplace, they are reluctant to define their experiences as such. Furthermore, when asked to indicate which behaviors they would consider to be sexual harassment if perpetrated by a male inmate, 71.4 percent of responding officers indicated all behaviors relevant to the current study were forms of

sexual harassment. Therefore, there is a clear disjunction between the experience of sexually harassing events by the participating female officers and the labeling of such events as sexual harassment. The data indicate most officers believe the types of sexual behaviors discussed in the current research are forms of sexual harassment, however only a minority of officers would define their personal experiences with these types of behaviors as sexual harassment.

This trend is consistent with the findings of other recent research endeavors. Studies indicate that while between 50 and 66 percent of working women experience sexual harassment at some point in their careers (e.g. Fitzgerald, Drasgow, Hulin, Gelfand, & Magley, 1997; Fitzgerald, Magley, Drasgow, & Waldo, 1999; Rosen & Martin, 1998), very few actually used the label sexual harassment to describe their experiences. In fact, only 20 to 30 percent of women victimized by sexual harassment identify their experiences as such (Magley, Hulin, Fitzgerald, & DeNardo, 1999; Rosen & Martin). This disjunction, which roughly parallels the results of the current study, addresses the apparent difference between one's ability to describe a phenomenon and his or her capacity to relate to that phenomenon on a personal level. That is, the women in this study can readily identify instances of sexual harassment, but are less able to label their own experiences as indicative of sexual harassment.

The labeling of sexual harassment is rooted in its social construction as a social problem. As briefly discussed in the *Literature Review* section of this dissertation, the social construction of a social problem is the process by which a social issue is defined as a problem by the people that it affects. Referring to Dale Spender's research (1984), Julia Wood (1994) notes "that naming is the fundamental symbolic act and, conversely,

that not to name something negates it, makes it invisible, and denies that it exists" (p. 18). Brooks and Perot (1991) coined the failure to identify sexual harassment as "the silent reaction to sexual harassment" (p. 45) and suggest this type of reaction may perpetuate the existence of such harassment. Dziech and Weiner (1990) further note "[t]he offending individual interprets silence as assent or even encouragement to continue his behavior" (p. 84).

It is possible that silence among targets of sexual harassment derives from an uncertainty among these women regarding the conventional definition of sexual harassment. There is some evidence to suggest that women who are more knowledgeable in the legal definition of sexual harassment are less likely to label their own experiences as sexual harassment (Magley & Shupe, 2005, pp. 185-186). Such research asserts the possibility that women who have received organizational training on sexual harassment may be less likely to label their experiences as sexual harassment due to their understanding of "the stricter legal definition of harassment" (p. 186). In addition, in recalling past experiences with sexual misconduct, female targets may be reluctant to label their experiences as sexual harassment if they did not take any action against the perpetrator at the time. In the course of its identification as a social problem, the concept of sexual harassment entails an expectation of action. Robert Emerson and Sheldon Messinger (1977) argue that "[n]aming something a problem has implications, prefiguring some solutions and removing others" (p. 123). Therefore, it is reasonable to consider this assertion in the inverse – because discussions of sexual harassment often involve solutions, a failure to act against an instance of sexual harassment may create reluctance within the target to label her experience as sexual harassment. In this sense,

the definition of sexual harassment is too narrow to allow for alternate conceptions of the behavior.

Originally, the term sexual harassment emerged to describe the sexual mistreatment of women in the workplace. In years following its inception as a concept, claims-makers and legislatures adopted sexual harassment as a term to describe a form of unlawful sex discrimination. Because the term remains intrinsically linked to legal action against the perpetrators, the concept of sexual harassment is less likely associated with instances of such behavior that are not as clearly actionable under the law. Thus, the officers in the current study may be reluctant to label inmates' sexual misconduct as sexual harassment if they either (1) did not directly act in response to the behavior; or (2) do not consider such behavior enforceable under sexual harassment law.

This view of the definitional aspect sexual harassment provides an explanation of the themes derived from the responses of the female officers in the current study. The themes discussed at the start of this section are, briefly, (1) the perceived normalcy of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment; (2) the reluctance to label the sexual misconduct of inmates as sexual harassment; (3) the distancing from or minimization of inmate sexual misconduct; and (4) the preponderance of aggressive responses to inmate sexual misconduct in theory only. If the officers in this study believe that inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment is not enforceable under the law – or the policies of the correctional institution as the case may be – they would be both more likely to perceive that behavior as normal and less likely to identify themselves as victims of sexual harassment. Similarly, if the officers failed to act in response to inmate sexual misconduct, they may feel more inclined to minimize the behavior or distance themselves from the behavior.

Furthermore, the disparity between the theoretical assertiveness toward inmate sexual misconduct and the actual indifference toward such behavior could be explained by confusion regarding the definition of sexual harassment. That is, the women who responded to the questionnaire in this study clearly understand that sexual harassment deserves proactive responses, but they are unsure of how to define and respond to the specific type of harassment perpetrated by inmates.

Conclusion

The current study suggests a labeling disjunction exists in female officers' perceptions of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment. The data presented in the previous chapters describe the nature of sexual misconduct these officers experience, the management strategies these officers employ, and ultimately, the attitude of these officers relevant to labeling inmate sexual misconduct as sexual harassment. Our understanding of sexual harassment has surpassed the traditional legal conception of such behavior.

Based on the social construction approach to social problems, the findings herein suggest a need for a claims-making process to occur in corrections with respect to inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment. Before this type of sexual harassment can be treated as a problem, it has to first be identified as a problem. The current view of sexual harassment implies the presence of accepted solutions to the problem. That concept is problematic here since the women surveyed seem not to have a clear appreciation for the implementation of solutions pertaining to inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment. Furthermore, because the behavior is considered normal in the correctional setting and among male inmates, the label of sexual harassment does not apply equitably to that behavior perpetrated by male inmates. The following chapter will discuss

recommendations for future research and policy development that attempt to bridge the gaps between the legal definition of sexual harassment and the occurrence of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment.

CHAPTER SIX

Conclusions and Implications

The purpose of the current research has been to explore the nature of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female correction officers. While the study yielded fewer responses than expected, the available data presented some significant results relevant to this specific form of sexual harassment in the workplace. Most notably, the labeling of sexual harassment among the female correction officer population emerged as integral to all aspects relevant to the perception and management of sexual harassment perpetrated by male inmates in the correctional setting. The issue of labeling – or a reluctance to label – inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment was a common thread among the themes gathered in the data comprising the current research.

The analysis in the present study demonstrates the existence of a labeling disjunction in the participating female officers' conceptions of sexual harassment as perpetrated by male inmates. That is, despite identifying the qualities of sexually harassing behaviors among the male inmate population, the responding female officers were reluctant to use the label sexual harassment to describe their own experiences. Nevertheless, "unwanted sexual attention has the same negative psychological and physiological effects, regardless of the label used to describe the act" (Dougherty, 2006, p. 496). It is important then that the individual – and organizational – definition of sexual harassment encompass all such behavior so as to identify and reduce the detrimental consequences to both parties.

The final step of this study is to identify areas relevant to research and policy that relate to the current findings. The conclusions gathered from this research have

implications for both future research and correctional policy. These are outlined in the following sections.

Future Research

This section presents suggestions for future research based both on gaps in the present study and by issues arising from the data. As with any research endeavor, the process by which the conclusions were gathered in this study revealed issues that could have received more attention. Because of the exploratory nature of the current study, the questionnaire was designed to elicit as much information relevant to inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment from the participants as possible. Based on the responses, more concerted studies into specific issues would be warranted. There are three such areas that deserve mention here.

First, the current study relied solely on an investigator-fixed definition of sexual harassment. That is, sexual harassment for purposes of the current study was defined as a collection of sexual behaviors and activities. In retrospect, allowing the participants to elaborate on their own conceptions of sexual harassment in an open-ended manner could have provided valuable data for comparison. Especially since there appeared to be a great discrepancy between the behaviors officers reported experiencing and had identified as examples of sexual harassment and their perceptions of having been the victim of sexual harassment, individual-defined conceptions of such behavior could have been useful to the current study. Furthermore, the language officers use to define sexual harassment may offer insight into the apparent disparity between the prevalence of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment and the rate at which officers identified themselves as victims of such harassment. In hindsight, use of the term *victim* should have been

eliminated from the study questionnaire. There may be an implied loss of control or stigma associated with 'victim' that might have contributed to the perceived reluctance to label one's experiences as sexual harassment. It is at least possible to imagine the officers' responses may have differed if the survey questions contained less potentially sensitive terminology.

Another issue that could have yielded interesting results is the officers' perceptions of inmate motivation in the perpetration of sexual harassment. The current study focused solely on the instance of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment from the perspective of the female participants. Exploration of officers' perceptions of inmate motives could have guided an explanation for the disparity in officers' theoretical and actual responses to inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment. It is possible that the officers' theoretical responses were under the assumption of ill-intent motivating the inmate sexual harassment. Officers' perceptions regarding inmates' actual intentions could have provided an interesting comparative variable to the current study.

Lastly, with respect to the instrument design, questions relating to the effects of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment may have suffered due simply to their placement within the questionnaire. All of the survey questions regarding the psychological and job-related consequences of sexual harassment are found in the final pages of the survey instrument. Unfortunately, these final pages were not completed by the majority of the survey respondents. In hindsight, if these questions had been positioned throughout the survey, they may have gathered more data useful to the current analysis.

In addition to the possible improvements to the current study, the findings presented here lay a foundation for future research into the sexual harassment of female

correction officers by male inmates. This study concludes that much of the perceived nature and management of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment relies heavily on the labeling process employed by the affected female correction officers. Additional studies concentrating on this labeling process could further clarify the issues relevant to this research. While the current study attempted to elicit some information regarding the labeling of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment, such data is difficult to gather through survey research. It had been the intention of this study to conduct interviews with at least some of the participating officers. However, despite repeated efforts to recruit volunteers for the interview process, no officers agreed to participate in this phase of the study. I believe that interview responses would have contributed valuable details to the analysis of the research data.

One area of research not considered by the current study is the impact of an officer subculture on the self-labeling and perception of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment. Previous research suggests that an officer subculture exists in corrections which consists of "three fundamental custodial principles of prison work: security and control are paramount; maintain social distance from inmates; and be tough, be knowledgeable, and be able to handle inmates" (Freeman, 1999, p. 60; see also Welch, 1996, p. 143). The third principle of the officer subculture, an ability to handle the inmates, may contribute to some female officers' reluctance to identify their experiences as sexual harassment. Labeling themselves as victims of sexual harassment might have the implication of being unable to manage inmate behavior. Fitzgerald and her colleagues (1997) suggest women may be reluctant to identify their experiences as sexual harassment because the term victim involves a sense of a loss of control (p. 21). In the

code of the correction officer subculture, a loss of control may be equated with an inability to perform one's job. Analysis of the impact of officer subculture on the tendency to identify instances of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment could contribute valuable insight into the findings of the current study.

More detailed research efforts could be conducted to examine the factors that might predict self-labeling. Studies of this nature have focused on the sexual harassment in the military (Magley & Shupe, 2005) and in academia (Brooks & Perot, 1991). These studies identified several characteristics as predictive of a target's likelihood to label her experiences as sexual harassment, including age, marital status, perceived offensiveness of the behavior, frequency of harassment, organizational climate, and expectations or perceived outcomes of reporting. It would be interesting to explore the nature of self-labeling and reporting with respect to inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female officers and to compare the predictive characteristics of such labeling to those of other populations. Furthermore, since self-labeling is most often a precondition to filing a sexual harassment complaint, research on the labeling of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment could have important implications for the correctional organization and its sexual harassment policy.

Future research comparing inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment to other non-traditional forms of harassment may offer explanatory usefulness to the current topic. Most notably, contrapower harassment, "sexual harassment [that] occurs when the victim has formal power over the abuser" (Benson, 1984, p. 517), may have elements similar to those found in inmate-perpetrated harassment against female corrections officers. Some research suggests women in male-dominated occupations may be more susceptible to

contrapower harassment due to the perceived threat of the woman's presence in certain masculinized work environments. (De Coster, Estes, & Mueller, 1999; Grauerholz, 1989). In many instances of contrapower harassment – such as the harassment of female faculty members by male students in the university setting – "sexual harassment functions to reinforce gender status by negating organizational status for women targets" (Rospenda, Richman, & Nawyn, 1998, p. 56). Research examining inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment in light of the concept of contrapower harassment may provide insight into inmate motivations and possible remedies for managing this type of inmate behavior.

A second topic for future research concerns the experiences of male officers in the correctional setting. The current study attempted to elicit survey responses from the populations of both male and female officers; however, the response rate among the male officers was too low for any meaningful analysis. Furthermore, the qualitative responses from the returned questionnaires of male officers were even scarcer than those from the female officers. Despite the current study's inability to examine the perceptions of male officers in the correctional setting, the available data suggested two areas relevant to the male experience that deserve more attention.

First, in the final section of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to identify their most unforgettable, most recent, and most frightening experiences with an inmate involving sexual behavior or comments. In this section, the respondents were asked of each experience they reported whether they believed the inmate involved in the situation would have behaved similarly with an officer of the opposite sex. All of the female officers reporting a specific experience ultimately concluded that the inmate involved would not have acted in the same way toward a male officer. This suggests that female

officers believe they are subject to different experiences than their male counterparts. A future study of male officers' perceptions of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment could clarify this supposition.

A second finding of the current study relates to the officers' perceptions of their co-workers' support, or lack thereof, regarding a sexual harassment complaint made against a male inmate. Question 24 asks respondents how they think their male co-workers would react to or feel about a complaint filed by a female officer against an inmate for sexual harassment. Eight of the 21 total respondents indicated they were unsure of how their male co-workers would react. Of the remaining 13 officers who answered the open-ended question, seven indicated their male co-workers would be supportive of a female officer filing a sexual harassment complaint against a male inmate. The other six respondents reported varying expectations:

> It wouldn't matter how he (the male co-worker) felt. He (the inmate) should not have conducted himself in that manner.
>
> (They) shouldn't feel anything. She did her job.
>
> I think if it is a legitimate complaint she would get support.
>
> They would feel she was being overly sensitive or they would understand – about 50/50.
>
> They would not be happy.
>
> (They would feel) upset, angry, embarrassed.

These responses of these six officers suggest three additional categories of perceptions among the female respondents regarding male officer support of their female co-workers. The first two narratives indicate a feeling of resentment toward male officers. The female officers' words in these responses suggest they harbor some

sensitivity to the notion that their male co-workers opinions are relevant. The second perception among the female respondents indicates some wariness of the legitimacy of sexual harassment complaints against male inmates. It is interesting that these officers allow for exception to the validity of such a complaint. The final grouping suggests the female officers expect little support from their male co-workers regarding sexual harassment complaints against inmates. In sum, there are five themes relevant to female officers' perceptions of their co-workers' reactions to sexual harassment complaints: full support, no support, uncertainty, resentment toward male co-workers, and wariness of the legitimacy of the complaint.

Future research should examine these perceptions among female correction officers. Do male officers respond similarly regarding their perceptions of sexual harassment complaints filed by female officers against inmates? Would their perceptions of female officers' complaints against inmates differ if the inmates' behaviors are physical rather than sexual? It may also be interesting to explore the role, if any, that sexual harassment training plays in these officers' expectations. Since such a significant proportion of the responding officers reported being unsure of their fellow officers' likely reactions to a sexual harassment complaint, it seems at least possible that deficient education or training on sexual harassment in the workplace may be a contributive factor to the variety of responses.

The last recommendation in this section is not relevant to future topics of study, but rather to an observation regarding research design. In an effort to gather the greatest amount of exploratory data, the current study utilized a rather lengthy survey instrument. During the compilation of data, two issues arose from the use of this instrument. First, it

appears several respondents suffered fatigue while completing the survey. Only four officers completed the final section of the survey and the length of the survey may have contributed to the overall low response rate. In addition, responses to open-ended questions appeared to have tapered toward the final pages of the questionnaire. While it was expected at the outset of this research that some respondents would not complete all pages of the questionnaire, the structure of the survey had unforeseen consequences. Most notably, all of the questions relating to the emotional and physiological effects of sexual harassment were placed in the final pages of the questionnaire and therefore gathered few responses. Also, the segment of the survey requesting volunteers for the interview process was attached to the end of the questionnaire. Since no officer volunteered to participate in an interview, it is possible that some potential participants were unaware of the interview process because they did not continue through the final pages of the questionnaire. Though the survey instrument design was successful in gathering a wide variety of information from the respondents, it would be prudent for future research endeavors to take the importance of order into consideration when designing an exploratory survey instrument.

Policy Implications

The findings in this study have important implications for policy relevant to sexual harassment in general and the correctional environment specifically. The convergence of the recency of both the entrance of female correction officers into male institutions and the development of sexual harassment as a social problem undoubtedly contributes to the underappreciated nature of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment against female officers in the correctional environment. The policy implications derived

from the current study then are two-fold: the definition of sexual harassment should expand as to incorporate alternate conceptions of this behavior and correctional management should make greater efforts to adjust its institutional policies to maximize female officers' understanding of and recourse against inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment.

The results of the current study suggest a discrepancy between the prevailing legal definition of sexual harassment and the types of sexual behavior to which female correction officers are subject. Though many of the participants in the study appeared to have a clear conception of the behavior that constitutes sexual harassment in the abstract, they were overwhelmingly reluctant to apply that label to the behavior they experienced themselves in the workplace. From a legal standpoint, if these women fail to identify their treatment as sexual harassment, they would not be considered to have been harassed at all. However, the consequences of sexual harassment exist for both the individual target and the organization at large regardless of how the individual labels the behavior.

Prior studies have similarly found a discrepancy between reported instances of sexual harassment and the labeling of such experiences as sexual harassment (Brooks & Perot, 1991; Fitzgerald, et al., 1988; Hanrahan, 1997). The researchers in these studies suggest a need to educate women on the behaviors comprising sexual harassment. The current study offers a similar suggestion while further urging an expansion on the concept of sexual harassment so as to include the unique form of harassment experienced by female correction officers by male inmates.

I would like to propose a model which sees violence, and more specifically the threat of violence, as a mechanism for social control. It is used to control

> women's access to certain jobs; to limit job success and mobility; and to compensate men for powerlessness in their own lives. (Bularzik, 1978, p.26)

Though Mary Bularzik was referring specifically to the type of sexual harassment perpetrated by male supervisors and co-workers, the same sentiment applies to the current research. Even as one of the earliest studies of sexual harassment in the workplace, Bularzik's findings concur with those emerging from this study. In her research, Bulrazik discovered an "inability of women to speak directly to their experiences" (p. 40) regarding sexual behavior in the workplace, a fact which demands a greater understanding of sexual harassment. Since this issue is also central to the type of sexual harassment under study in the current research, the need for a greater understanding of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment is warranted.

Because of the absence of the traditional concepts of power and control, the type of sexual harassment perpetrated by male inmates in the correctional setting does not fall into the popular rubric of sexual harassment. "Sexual harassment, most broadly defined, refers to the unwanted imposition of sexual requirements in the context of a relationship of unequal power" (MacKinnon, 1979, p. 1). This *relationship of unequal power* usually involves some association of subordinates, peers, and supervisors within the organizational structure of the work environment. Therefore, the power of the harasser over the target depends on the target's dependence on the harasser.

The concept of power in the occurrence of sexual harassment in the correctional setting is not as straightforward as it may be in more traditional environments and situations. Nevertheless, power is an integral aspect of male inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment of female correction officers. Though inmates, in the realm of corrections,

"do not lie within the traditional organizational chart delineating the chains of command and levels of authority" (Mcguire, et al., 2006, p. 442), they could seek to derive or maintain power over female correction officers with sexual harassment.

Absent a broader conception of sexual harassment that allows for the acceptance of inmate-perpetrated sexual behavior, the impact of such behavior may remain unappreciated by both the individual targets and the organizations affected by inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment. Hanrahan (1997) argues that, despite progress made in expanding the legal definition of sexual harassment, individual workers have not yet recognized and internalized these advancements in their understandings of sexually harassing behavior (p. 58). Furthermore, many organizational sexual harassment policies derived from the prevailing legal guidelines regarding this behavior are

> exceedingly inadequate only offering limited, though necessary safeguards to a few women who have been harassed, leaving the bulk of the problem, the vast majority of women workers, and the economic and social context in which it occurs relatively untouched. (Schneider, 1985, p. 94)

It is the equal responsibility then of both the legislature and the correctional institution to expand the concept of sexual harassment to include the unique type of harassment experienced by female correction officers by male inmates. Without such a revised definition, the female targets of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment will continue to suffer in silence.

The second strain of policy implications derived from the current study concerns the correctional institution's responsibility for recognizing and educating its officers on the dynamics of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment. The results of this study show

that such harassment is both prevalent and contrarily interpreted by the female officers exposed to it. Correctional managers must take a proactive approach to understanding the unique form of sexual harassment perpetrated against their female employees. In their approach, correctional administrators should consider training protocol revisions and policy development applicable to both the unique correctional environment and the gender-specific experience of female correction officers.

Correctional administrators must be responsible for considering the impact of the officer subculture on the perceptions and management of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment. Since previous research suggests the presence of an officer subculture, correctional policy should reflect the conditions of such a subculture in its approach to managing inmate-perpetrated harassment. Within the officer subculture of corrections, research finds an emphasis on the individual officer's ability to manage the inmates (Freeman, 1999; Welch, 1996). Correctional policy must recognize the influence and importance of the officer subculture on officer behavior.

> The prison officer subculture may be as strong and significant as the inmate subculture. . . . the only difference being that officers are socialized into holding (or at least expressing) different values, observing a different – but probably no less stringent – "code," and following different behavior patterns. (Kauffman, 1981, p. 272)

In addition to the influence of the officer subculture, the impact of the female-specific experience in corrections may have important implications for correctional policy. In her research in the early 1980s, Lynn Zimmer (1986) explored the interactions between female correction officers and male inmates, concluding that "[c]ontacts

between female guards and male inmates are always sex-bound" (p. 101). She found the sexual nature of such interactions to be so pervasive that "[e]ven if corrections officials were to develop policies of equality for male and female guards, male inmates would not treat them identically" (p. 101). It was Zimmer's contention then, that correction officials implement training protocols and policies specific to the experience of female officers with male inmates. The findings of the current study echo this sentiment with the following implications for correctional policy.

Correctional training academies are often assumed inadequate for the preparation of new correctional recruits, both male and female (Lombardo, 1981, pp. 34-36; Zimmer, 1986, p. 100). Many correctional employees suffer from minimal training, staff shortages in the academy, contradictory instruction based on multiple goals of corrections, and poorly structured training programs (Jurik, 1985, pp. 382-383). As such, the typical correction-based academy leaves new recruits ill-prepared for interacting with inmates (Zimmer, p. 100). Though the effects of inadequate training are significant for both male and female recruits, deficiencies in training have more important consequences for women, in that it is sometimes the only preparation they receive.

While all new correctional recruits are subject to formal training, it is the informal instruction they receive on the job that is critical to their integration. Zimmer (1986) suggests "[a]dequate on-the-job socialization is especially important for new prison guards to adapt successfully because the formal rules cannot cover even a modest sample of the situations that might arise" (p. 84). Though male officers may have inferior experiences with on-the-job socialization, many women cite this as a serious obstacle to their integration into corrections. Because women generally enter corrections with less

"anticipatory socialization" – fewer experiences in corrections or similar fields, such as the military, which may assist in preparing new correctional recruits (Jurik, 1985, p. 382) – on-the-job training opportunities are even more crucial to their adjustment. However, because most informal training is the responsibility of supervisors, positions which are less likely held by women, new female recruits are often not given gender-specific socialization into the issues most often faced by female correction officers. Male officers simply cannot provide new female recruits with the socialization skills needed to confront instances of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment since they cannot appreciate the gender-specific experience of these female officers.

It is the responsibility of the correctional authorities that training curricula – both formal and informal – be designed to incorporate problems unique to female correction officers. New female recruits would benefit not only from "special training in dealing with inmate sexual advances and sexual misconduct" (Zimmer, 1986, p. 186), but also from gender-specific socialization while on the job. Mcguire and her colleagues (2006), in their study of the sexual harassment of nurses by their patients, suggested the implementation of an informal training program that utilizes storytelling "in which experienced nurses share instances of sexual harassment by patients, their response to this behavior, and how they wished they had responded" (p. 443). This method has two advantages: first, it does not mandate appropriate reactions to sexual harassment, instead offering experienced-based alternatives to ignoring the behavior, and; secondly, such training in itself, prepares new employees for the possibility of such harassment. A similar design for training new female officers may be useful in the correctional setting.

In addition to enhanced training incorporating the issues experienced by female correction officers, correctional administrators should consider the development of policy aimed at assisting female officers in managing sexual misconduct among the male inmate population. Such policies are rare among correctional organizations. Zimmer (1986) cited a 1980 Federal Bureau of Prisons report which suggests that "a consistent policy regarding the proper response of female staff to exhibitionism, pinching, sexual slurs, etc., should be developed at the executive staff level" (p. 230). Primary to the importance of policy development is the education of both female and male officers on the nature of male-inmate perpetrated sexual harassment: both the behaviors constituting sexual harassment and the potential consequences of repeated sexual harassment on an officer's mental health and job satisfaction. Correctional authorities – in addition to offering such education – should establish policies that determine the types of sexual misconduct for which officers may – or should – seek recourse, and that outline the possible remedies available to officers experiencing inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment.

Many female officers struggle with determining the proper response to inmate sexual misconduct (Zimmer, 1986, pp. 102-103). Though correction officers have a range of options for managing all types of inmate behavior, some female officers "are unable to develop any technique for coping with this behavior [sexual misconduct of inmates] or for bringing it within the general disciplinary system" (p. 103). While the officers in the current study appear confident of their option to seek disciplinary recourse against inmates' sexual misconduct, such a response may not be the most realistic in all situations. For instance, in cases of more common or less threatening instances of sexual misconduct, many officers may not feel the need to execute formal punishment against

the inmate offenders. Zimmer found that many women ignore most instances of sexual misconduct among inmates, reserving punishment for only the most extreme cases (p. 187). This manner of inmate treatment is common. In fact, in his 1956 article, Sykes termed the technique of ignoring inmates' minor infractions as *the corruption of authority* in correctional institutions. Although a common practice in America's correctional institutions, the corruption of an officer's authority can be harmful to his or her ability to control more serious inmate behavior. When allowing inmates to escape responsibility for seemingly harmless infractions, "[t]he guard, the dominant symbol of law-abiding society in the daily life of the prison inmate, becomes a figure to be manipulated, coerced, and hoodwinked" (Sykes, p. 262).

Because of the possible escalation of offensive behavior as a result of ignoring less serious inmate infractions, correctional authorities should establish policies for their officers which demand that action be taken against certain types of inmate misconduct. Especially since direct strategies for dealing with sexual harassment are considered generally more effective at putting a stop to the unwanted behavior (Gutek & Koss, 1996, p. 44), officers should be discouraged from ignoring or avoiding certain types of inmate sexual misconduct. Furthermore, when female officers feel unable to cope with inmate sexual misconduct, they may "either quit the job or retreat from the situation by removing themselves, as much as possible, from direct contact with inmates" (Zimmer, 1986, p. 103). This reaction poses a unique threat to the security of the correctional institution. Since control in corrections depends on the surveillance of inmates, any distance that an officer may create between herself and male inmates could present a risk to the institution's safety.

The data gathered in the current study suggest a significant level of confusion regarding the nature of inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment among the female officers subjected to this behavior. For the welfare of both its employees and its security, it is the responsibility of the correctional organization to remedy this confusion in order to provide female officers with a solid foundation from which to understand the nature of inmate sexual misconduct. Along with the development of new policies relevant to the interpretation and management of such misconduct, the authorities must also establish a plan for implementing the policies that reflects the value and autonomy of all of its officers.

> The only guarantee of change lies in the most amorphous aspect of change . . . A proliferation of new procedures for preventing problems, ensuring accountability, and imposing penalties is not enough in isolation. Any new procedure must be meaningful for those subject to them. They must be meaningful in that they must work not only on paper, and not only from the top down. They must also work from the bottom up, and radiate from the middle out. Procedures must offer not only women, but also men, more than a modicum of dignity and respect. (McMahon, 1999, p. 111)

Though popular sentiment demands absolute gender equality in the workplace, blind strictness to this standard is unreasonable for the treatment of female correction officers. Zimmer (1986) found, among the correctional departments she surveyed, that "in their effort to treat male and female guards equally" these agencies avoided developing training programs or policies that pertained specifically to the issues faced by women in corrections (p. 102). Such a perspective offers little dignity and respect to the

women or men employed in corrections. Gender-specific training is necessary for both the confidence of female officers' in their ability to perform their jobs and for the safety of all employees – male and female – of the correctional institution. It is time to recognize the existence of the gender-specific experience of female correction officers and to equip these officers with the knowledge and support they need to handle their interactions with male inmates more effectively.

Appendix A
Informed Consent Document

Please read this form before deciding if you are willing to participate. This form outlines the purposes of the study and describes your rights as a participant.

This study explores the self-reported experiences of correction officers working with male and female inmates. The survey consists of questions related to your personal experiences with inmates at the Lafayette Parish Correctional Center. Specifically, I am interested in your perceptions of sex-related comments and behaviors by inmates. This information will be used to better understand the experience of correction officers.

I am asking all correction officers at LPCC to participate in this research study by completing a survey. There will be no job-related risk to you in participating since you will not be required to provide your name and no one will know who completed a survey. **Participation is voluntary**. There is no reward for your participation. There will be no penalty if you choose not to participate.

If you do agree to participate, your confidentiality will be protected. The last page of the survey, *Identifying Information*, is optional. You may fill out this page if you would like to participate in a related interview or receive research results. On this page, you will be asked to provide your name and contact information. If you choose to provide this information, the *Identifying Information* page should be removed from the remainder of the survey and returned separately in the white envelope provided. No attempt will be made to match identifying information with survey responses. Your survey will be identified by a code number that is not associated with your name or other identifying information.

Please complete the following survey to the best of your ability. You may refuse to answer any question or choose to end your participation at any time. The survey should take between 15 and 20 minutes to complete. Please do not provide your name on any page of the survey. I will not attempt to identify you based on your responses. The answers you provide are completely confidential.

There may be minor psychological risks of participation because of the nature of some of the questions. If you do experience any emotional upset and would like to talk about it, feel free to contact Acadiana EAP at 337-988-0001.

If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact CUNY researcher, Sarah Billingsley, at **sarah.billingsley@gmail.com** or 917-494-7360. You may also contact CUNY faculty advisor, Jayne Mooney, at **jmooney@jjay.cuny.edu** or 212-237-8676.

If you have any questions about your rights as a volunteer, please contact Martin Wallenstein, Chair of the CUNY IRB at **mwallenstein@jjay.cuny.edu** or 212-237-8364.

Please place the completed survey in the brown envelope and return it to the blue locked box in the briefing room at LPCC. If you chose to complete the final page of the survey – the *Identifying Information* page – you may remove that page from the rest of the survey and return it separately to the blue box in the white envelope provided.

Your decision to complete the attached survey will serve as your consent to participate in the research study. You may keep this page for your reference. Thank you for your participation in this research study.

APPENDIX B

Characteristics of Study Respondents

Table # 1
Demographics Characteristics

	Frequency	Percentage
Age (in years)		
18-25	9	42.9
26-35	5	23.8
36-45	2	9.5
46 or more	3	14.3
Unknown	2	4.8
Race		
White	11	52.4
African-American	6	28.6
American Indian	0	0
Latino/a	0	0
Asian	0	0
Other	1	4.8
Unknown	3	14.3
Last Grade of School Completed		
Never attended high school	0	0
Some high school	0	0
High school graduate	3	14.3
Some College	12	57.1
Business or trade school graduate	1	4.8
College graduate	3	14.3
Graduate work	0	0
Unknown	2	9.5
Current Marital Status		
Married	7	33.3
Widowed	0	0
Divorced	3	14.3
Separated	0	0
Never Married	9	42.9
Unknown	2	9.5

Table # 2
Job Characteristics

	Frequency	Percentage
Rank		
Deputy	17	81.0
Corporal	0	0
Sergeant	2	9.5
Lieutenant	1	4.8
Unknown	1	4.8
Time Spent Interacting with Inmates		
Most (About 75-100% of the time)	15	71.4
About half (About 40-74% of the time)	5	23.8
Some (About 20-39% of the time)	0	0
Very Little (About 1-19% of the time)	1	4.8
None	0	0
Primary Reason for Taking Job		
Interest in human service work/inmate rehabilitation	8	38.2
Entry-level position for other jobs in the department	6	28.6
Salary	3	14.3
Interest in security work	3	14.3
No other work available	0	0
Job security	0	0
Fringe benefits	0	0
Other	1	4.8

Appendix B
Survey Instrument

1. What is your official position at the Lafayette Parish Correctional Center?
   a. Deputy
   b. Corporal
   c. Sergeant
   d. Lieutenant
   e. Other (please indicate position title) _____

2. How long have you been working at LPCC?
   Years _____ Months _____

3. If you have you ever worked as a full-time, uniformed correctional officer at a facility other than LPCC, please list the dates or length of employment for each previous corrections job?

   Facility name/location _____Length of employment_____
   Facility name/location _____Length of employment_____
   Facility name/location _____Length of employment_____

   Please describe your work-related duties with Lafayette Parish Correctional Center during an average shift.

   _____

   _____

4. During an average shift, how much of your time would you estimate is spent interacting with inmates?
   a. Most (about 75-100% of the time)
   b. About half (about 40-74% of the time)
   c. Some (about 20-39% of the time)
   d. Very little (about 1-19% of the time)
   e. None

5. To which areas of the facility are you regularly assigned (Circle all that apply)?
   a. The Annex
   b. Kitchen
   c. Pods/Control area
   d. Holding cells/Intake
   e. Property
   f. Transportation
   g. Other (please specify) _____

6. How often have you experienced the following behaviors *from co-workers or supervisors* (male or female) in the last 12 months at Lafayette Parish Correctional facility?

	Frequency of Behavior in Past 12 Months				
	Never	**Seldom**	**1-3 times per month**	**More than once a week**	**Everyday**
a. Unwelcome sexual comments					
b. Indecent Exposure					
c. Display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures					
d. Unwelcome physical contact (touching, grabbing)					
e. Threats of sexual assault					
f. Actual or attempted sexual assault or rape					
g. Unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance, or proposition					
h. Sexually offensive comments (ex: homosexuality/masculinity)					
i. Other (please specify) _____ _____ _____ _____					

6b. Please describe the experiences you have reported having in Question # 6. Do not include names. Give as much detail as you like, including where, when, and how often you are subjected to any of the comments or behavior described above.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. How often have you experienced the following behaviors from *male inmates* in the last 12 months at Lafayette Parish Correctional facility?

	Frequency of Behavior in Past 12 Months				
	Never	**Seldom**	**1-3 times per month**	**More than once a week**	**Everyday**
a. Unwelcome sexual comments					
b. Indecent Exposure					
c. Display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures					
d. Unwelcome physical contact (touching, grabbing)					
e. Threats of sexual assault					
f. Actual or attempted sexual assault or rape					
g. Unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance, or proposition					
h. Sexually offensive comments (ex: homosexuality/masculinity)					
i. Other (please specify) _____ _____ _____ _____					

7b. Please describe the experiences you have reported having in Question # 7. Do not include names. Give as much detail as you like, including where, when, and how often you are subjected to any of the comments or behavior described above.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. How often have you experienced the following behaviors from *female inmates* in the last 12 months at Lafayette Parish Correctional facility?

	Frequency of Behavior in Past 12 Months				
	Never	**Seldom**	**1-3 times per month**	**More than once a week**	**Everyday**
a. Unwelcome sexual comments					
b. Indecent Exposure					
c. Display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures					
d. Unwelcome physical contact (touching, grabbing)					
e. Threats of sexual assault					
f. Actual or attempted sexual assault or rape					
g. Unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance, or proposition					
h. Sexually offensive comments (ex: homosexuality/masculinity)					
i. Other (please specify) _____ _____ _____ _____					

8b. Please describe the experiences you have reported having in Question # 8. Do not include names. Give as much detail as you like, including where, when, and how often you are subjected to any of the comments or behavior described above.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. What do you think is the most appropriate response to the following behaviors when perpetrated by a *co-worker or supervisor*?

	Ignore the behavior/ Avoid the person	Ask or tell the person to stop	Threaten to tell a co-worker or friend	File a complaint/ Tell a supervisor	Other
a. Unwelcome sexual comments					
b. Indecent Exposure					
c. Display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures					
d. Unwelcome physical contact (touching, grabbing)					
e. Threats of sexual assault					
f. Actual or attempted sexual assault or rape					
g. Unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance, or proposition					
h. Sexually offensive comments (ex: homosexuality/masculinity)					
i. Other (please specify) _____					

10. What do you think is the most appropriate response to the following behaviors when perpetrated by an *inmate*?

	Ignore the behavior/ Avoid the person	Ask or tell the person to stop	Threaten to tell a co-worker or friend	File a complaint/ Tell a supervisor	Other
a. Unwelcome sexual comments					
b. Indecent Exposure					
c. Display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures					
d. Unwelcome physical contact (touching, grabbing)					
e. Threats of sexual assault					
f. Actual or attempted sexual assault or rape					
g. Unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance, or proposition					
h. Sexually offensive comments (ex: homosexuality/masculinity)					
i. Other (please specify) _____					

11. Have you ever reported any of the behaviors mentioned in Questions 6 through 10 to a supervisor or department manager while employed at the Lafayette Parish Correctional Center? (If No, skip to Question #14)
    a. Yes
    b. No

12. If yes, which of the following behaviors perpetrated by *co-workers or supervisors* have you reported to a supervisor or department manager? (Circle all that apply)
    a. Unwelcome sexual comments
    b. Indecent exposure
    c. Display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures
    d. Unwelcome physical contact (touching, grabbing)
    e. Threats of sexual assault
    f. Actual or attempted sexual assault
    g. Unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance, or proposition
    h. Sexually offensive comments (ex: accusations of homosexuality/masculinity)
    i. Other (Please specify) _____

13. Which of the following behaviors perpetrated by *inmates* have you reported to a supervisor or department manager? (Circle all that apply)
    a. Unwelcome sexual comments
    b. Indecent exposure
    c. Display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures
    d. Unwelcome physical contact (touching, grabbing)
    e. Threats of sexual assault
    f. Actual or attempted sexual assault
    g. Unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance, or proposition
    h. Sexually offensive comments (ex: accusations of homosexuality/masculinity)
    i. Other (Please specify) _____

14. Do you think inmates should be punished for any of the behaviors mentioned in Question #13?
    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. It depends (on what?) _____

    _____

15. What do you think is the most appropriate punishment for inmates that commit any of the non-physically threatening behaviors (unwelcome sexual comments, indecent exposure, display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures, unwelcome sexual flirtation, sexually offensive comments)?

_____

_____

16. What do you think is the most appropriate punishment for inmates that commit any of the potentially threatening behaviors (unwelcome physical contact or threats of sexual assault)?

_____

_____

17. Which of the following behaviors of *co-workers or supervisors* do you consider sexual harassment? (Circle all that apply)
    - **a.** Unwelcome sexual comments
    - **b.** Indecent exposure
    - **c.** Display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures
    - **d.** Unwelcome physical contact (touching, grabbing)
    - **e.** Threats of sexual assault
    - **f.** Actual or attempted sexual assault
    - **g.** Unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance, or proposition
    - **h.** Sexually offensive comments (ex: accusations of homosexuality/masculinity)
    - **i.** Other (Please specify) _____

18. Which of the following behaviors of *inmates* do you consider sexual harassment? (Circle all that apply)
    - **a.** Unwelcome sexual comments
    - **b.** Indecent exposure
    - **c.** Display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures
    - **d.** Unwelcome physical contact (touching, grabbing)
    - **e.** Threats of sexual assault
    - **f.** Actual or attempted sexual assault
    - **g.** Unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance, or proposition
    - **h.** Sexually offensive comments (ex: accusations of homosexuality/masculinity)
    - **i.** Other (Please specify) _____

19. Have you received training on how to manage any one or more of the behaviors described in Question #17 by *co-workers or supervisors* at the Lafayette Parish Correctional Center?
    - **a.** Yes
    - **b.** No
    - **c.** Don't Know

20. If yes, please briefly describe the key points you were taught during this training.

_____

_____

21. Have you received training on how to manage any one or more of the behaviors described in Question #18 by *inmates* at the Lafayette Parish Correctional Center?
    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. Don't Know

22. If yes, please briefly describe the key points you were taught during this training.

    _____

    _____

23. Have you ever filed a complaint against an inmate for any of the following behaviors?

	No	**Yes, disciplinary action was taken against the inmate**	**Yes, but no action was taken against the inmate**	**Yes, the complaint has not been settled yet**
a. Unwelcome sexual comments				
b. Indecent Exposure				
c. Display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures				
d. Unwelcome physical contact (touching, grabbing)				
e. Threats of sexual assault				
f. Actual or attempted sexual assault or rape				
g. Unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance, or proposition				
h. Sexually offensive comments				
i. Other (please specify) _____				

24. How do you think your male co-workers would react to or feel about a complaint filed by a female officer against an inmate for sexual harassment?

    _____

    _____

25. How do you think your female co-workers would react to or feel about a complaint filed by another female officer against an inmate for sexual harassment?

_____

_____

26. How would you react to or feel about a complaint filed by another female officer against an inmate for sexual harassment?

_____

_____

27. Do you believe inmates should be charged and/or punished for any of the following behaviors committed while incarcerated at LPCC?

	Yes, by disciplinary court	Yes, as a criminal offense	No
a. Unwelcome sexual comments			
b. Indecent Exposure			
c. Display of sexually suggestive objects or gestures			
d. Unwelcome physical contact (touching, grabbing)			
e. Threats of sexual assault			
f. Actual or attempted sexual assault or rape			
g. Unwelcome sexual flirtation, advance, or proposition			
h. Sexually offensive comments			
i. Other (please specify) _____			

28. Are there any specific areas within the facility in which you feel inmates are more likely to commit any one or more of the behaviors described in Question #27 against you? (Circle all that apply)
    a. The Annex
    b. Pods/Control area
    c. Holding cells/Intake
    d. Property
    e. Other (Please specify) _____

29. Are there any areas within the facility that you avoid because of the likelihood that inmates will commit any one or more of the behaviors described in Question #27? (Circle all that apply)
    a. The Annex
    b. Pods/Control area
    c. Holding cells/Intake
    d. Property
    e. Other (Please specify) _____

30. How often have you experienced the following behaviors from *inmates* in the last 12 months at Lafayette Parish Correctional facility?

	Frequency of Behavior in Past 12 Months				
	Never	**Seldom**	**1-3 times per month**	**More than once a week**	**Everyday**
a. Pushing					
b. Spitting					
c. Throwing objects					
d. Striking or attacking with a weapon					
e. Striking or attacking without a weapon (ex. biting, punching)					
f. Actual or attempted physical assault by more than one inmate					
g. Verbal assault					
h. Other _____ _____					

31. What do you think is the most appropriate response to the following behaviors when perpetrated by an *inmate*?

	Ignore the behavior/ Avoid the person	**Ask or tell the person to stop**	**Threaten to tell a co-worker or friend**	**File a complaint/ Tell a supervisor**	**Other**
a. Pushing					
b. Spitting					
c. Throwing Objects					
d. Striking or attacking with a weapon					
e. Striking or attacking without a weapon (ex. biting, punching)					
f. Actual or attempted physical assault by more than one inmate					
g. Verbal assault					
h. Other _____ _____					

32. Do you believe that you have ever been a victim of sexual harassment by *male inmates* at the Lafayette Parish Correctional Center?
    a. Yes
    b. No

33. Do you believe that you have ever been a victim of sexual harassment *by female inmates* at the Lafayette Parish Correctional Center?
    a. Yes
    b. No

34. Would you prefer to work in an all-female inmate facility?
    a. Yes
    b. No
    c. Don't Know

35. Explain why or why not.

    _____

    _____

36. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement? (Circle one number)

    Inmates' sexual comments or behaviors directly affect my job satisfaction.

    Strongly Agree **1** **2** **3** **4** **5** **6** Completely Disagree

37. Please explain how inmate-perpetrated sexual comments or behaviors affects your job satisfaction.

    _____

    _____

38. What administrative measures do you think can be implemented to assist female officers with the effects of inmate-perpetrated sexual comments or behavior? (Circle all that apply)
    a. Access to disciplinary action against inmates
    b. Training in the management of sexual harassment for female officers
    c. Education about inmate-perpetrated sexual harassment for all officers
    d. Counseling
    e. No administrative measures needed
    f. Other (Please explain) _____

    _____

39. How old are you?
   a. 18 – 25
   b. 26 – 35
   c. 36 – 45
   d. 46 or older

40. Are you:
   a. Male
   b. Female

41. Which of the following best describes your race?
   a. White
   b. African-American
   c. American Indian
   d. Latino/a
   e. Asian
   f. Other (Please specify) _____

42. What was the last grade of school you completed?
   a. Never attended high school
   b. Some high school
   c. High school graduate
   d. Some college
   e. Business or trade school graduate
   f. College graduate
   g. Graduate work

43. What is your current marital status?
   a. Married
   b. Widowed
   c. Divorced
   d. Separated
   e. Never Married

44. Which of the following is your primary reason for taking a job as a correctional officer at LPCC?
   a. Interested in human service work or in inmate rehabilitation
   b. It was an entry-level position for other jobs in the department
   c. Salary
   d. Interest in security work
   e. No other work available
   f. Job security
   g. Fringe benefits, such as health insurance
   h. Other (Please explain) _____

45a. Please describe your most *unforgettable* experience with an inmate that involved sexual behavior or comments. Please include the sex of the inmate and any other details, such as location and time/date, you feel comfortable disclosing.

_____

_____

_____

_____

45a. Did you suffer from any of the following emotional or physical symptoms as a result of the experience you have described? (Circle all that apply)

a. Nausea/Vomiting
b. Headaches
c. Sleeplessness
d. Irritability
e. Nervousness/Anxiety
f. Uncontrolled Anger
g. Weight Loss
h. Uncontrolled Crying
i. Other (Please specify) _____

45b. Did you suffer any of the following work-related symptoms as a result of the experience you have described? (Circle all that apply)

a. Loss of Concentration
b. Absenteeism/Missing Work
c. Desire to Quit
d. Fear to go to work
e. Fear to be alone with inmates
f. Distrust of co-workers
g. Need for therapy/medical attention
h. Avoid certain uncomfortable areas within the facility
i. Other (Please specify) _____

45c. Do you believe that the experience you have described is sexual harassment?

a. Yes
b. No

45d. Do you believe that the inmate involved in this experience would have behaved the same way toward an officer of the opposite sex?

a. Yes
b. No

46. Please describe your most *recent* experience with an inmate that involved sexual behavior or comments. Please include the sex of the inmate and any other details, such as location and time/date, you feel comfortable disclosing.

_____

_____

_____

_____

46a. Did you suffer from any of the following emotional or physical symptoms as a result of the experience you have described? (Circle all that apply)

a. Nausea/Vomiting
a. Headaches
b. Sleeplessness
c. Irritability
d. Nervousness/Anxiety
e. Uncontrolled Anger
f. Weight Loss
g. Uncontrolled Crying
h. Other (Please specify) _____

46b. Did you suffer any of the following work-related symptoms as a result of the experience you have described? (Circle all that apply)

a. Loss of Concentration
b. Absenteeism/Missing Work
c. Desire to Quit
d. Fear to go to work
e. Fear to be alone with inmates
f. Distrust of co-workers
g. Need for therapy/medical attention
h. Avoid certain uncomfortable areas within the facility
i. Other (Please specify) _____

46c. Do you believe that the experience you have described is sexual harassment?

a. Yes
b. No

46d. Do you believe that the inmate involved in this experience would have behaved the same way toward an officer of the opposite sex?

a. Yes
b. No

47. Please describe your most *frightening* experience with an inmate that involved sexual behavior or comments. Please include the sex of the inmate and any other details, such as location and time/date, you feel comfortable disclosing.

_____

_____

_____

_____

47a. Did you suffer from any of the following emotional or physical symptoms as a result of the experience you have described? (Circle all that apply)

a. Nausea/Vomiting
b. Headaches
c. Sleeplessness
d. Irritability
e. Nervousness/Anxiety
f. Uncontrolled Anger
g. Weight Loss
h. Uncontrolled Crying
i. Other (Please specify) _____

47b. Did you suffer any of the following work-related symptoms as a result of the experience you have described? (Circle all that apply)

a. Loss of Concentration
b. Absenteeism/Missing Work
c. Desire to Quit
d. Fear to go to work
e. Fear to be alone with inmates
f. Distrust of co-workers
g. Need for therapy/medical attention
h. Avoid certain uncomfortable areas within the facility
i. Other (Please specify) _____

47c. Do you believe that the experience you have described is sexual harassment?

a. Yes
b. No

47d. Do you believe that the inmate involved in this experience would have behaved the same way toward an officer of the opposite sex?

a. Yes
b. No

Thank you very much for your participation in this survey. If you have any concerns or comments that you were not able to express in answering this survey, please write them in the space provided.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Any comments you make on this questionnaire will be kept confidential, and no follow-up action will be taken in response to any specifics reported. If you want to report a harassment problem, information about how to do so is available through Lafayette Parish Sheriff's Office human resources department.

Identifying Information

Thank you very much for your participation. These final questions are OPTIONAL. If you choose you can reveal your own name and/or contact information. In providing your name and a telephone number or e-mail address (however you wish to be contacted), you may be contacted to participate in a follow-up interview regarding your experience as a correctional officer. I will also provide you with a copy of the research results if you are interested and provide your address.

Please be aware that I will not attempt to identify you based on your survey responses. If you do wish either to participate in the interview or to receive a copy of the research results, the identifying information you provide on this page will not be matched with the survey you return. If you choose to complete this page, please detach this page and return it in the white envelope provided.

Again, thank you for your time and participation.

If you would like to participate in an interview at a later date, please provide:

(1) Your name: _____

(2) Your telephone number: _____

- and/or -

Your e-mail address: _____

If you would like to receive a summary of the results from this survey, please provide:

(1) Your e-mail address: _____

- and/or -

Your mailing Address: (Name) _____
(Address) _____ (Apt #) ____
(City) _____ (State) _____ (Zip) _____

References

Arvey, R. D. & Cavanaugh, M. A. (1995). Using surveys to assess the prevalence of sexual harassment: Some methodological problems. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51, 39 – 52.

Babbie, E. (2003). *Practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Bartol, C. R., Bergen, G. T., Volckens, J. S., & Knoras, K. M. (1992). Women in small-town policing: Job performance and stress. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 19, 240 – 259.

Belknap, J. (1995). Women in conflict: An analysis of women correctional officers. In B. R. Price & N. J. Sokoloff (Eds.), *The criminal justice system and women: Offenders, victims, and workers* (2nd ed., pp. 404 – 420). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Benson, K. (1984). Comments on Croker's "An analysis of university definitions of sexual harassment." *Signs*, 9, 516 – 519.

Bondurant, B. & White, J. W. (1996). Men who sexually harass: An embedded perspective. In D. K. Shrier (Ed.), *Sexual harassment in the workplace and academia: Psychiatric issues* (pp. 59 – 78). Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Press, Inc.

Brooks, L., & Perot, A. (1991). Reporting sexual harassment: Exploring a predictive model. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 31 – 47.

Bularzik, M. (1978). Sexual harassment at the workplace: Historical notes. *Radical America*, 12(4), 25 – 43.

Childress, R., Talucci, V., & Wood, J. (1999). Fighting the enemy within: Helping officers deal with stress. *Corrections Today*, 61(7), 70 – 72.

Conlon, K. & Voigt, C. (1997). Sexual harassment: An American judicial perspective. *Labor Law Journal*, 48(1), 41 – 49.

Crouch, M. A. (2001). *Thinking about sexual harassment: A guide for the perplexed*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Crull, P. (1982). Stress effects of sexual harassment on the job: Implications for counseling. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 52, 539 – 544.

Dansky, B. S. & Kilpatrick, D. G. (1997). Effects of sexual harassment. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research and therapy* (pp. 152 – 174). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Davis, G. J. III. (1984). Work group cohesion and job stress among police officers. *Dissertaion Abstracts International*, 45 (05), 1535. (UMI No. 8416698)

De Coster, S., Estes, S. B., & Mueller, C. W. (1999). Routine activities and sexual harassment in the workplace. *Work and Occupations*, 26, 21 – 49.

Doerner, W. G. (1995). Officer retention patterns: An affirmative action concern for police agencies? *American Journal of Police*, XIV(3/4), 197 – 210.

Dougherty, D. S. (2006). Gendered constructions of power during discourse about sexual harassment: Negotiating competing meanings. *Sex Roles*, 54, 495 – 507.

Dziech, B. W. & Weiner, L. (1990). *The lecherous professor*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Ellison v. Brady, 924 F.2d 872 (1991).

Emerson, R. M. & Messinger, S. L. (1977). The micro-politics of trouble. *Social Problems*, 25, 121 – 134.

Erez, E. & Tontodonato, P. (1992). Sexual harassment in the criminal justice system. In I. L. Moyer (Ed.), *The changing role of women in the criminal justice system* (pp. 227 – 252). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Feinman, C. (1986). *Women in the criminal justice system* (2nd ed.). New York: Praeger Publishers.

Finn, P. (2000). *Addressing correctional officer stress: Programs and strategies*. (National Institute of Justice Publication No. 183474). Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Drasgow, F., Hulin, C. L., Gelfand, M. J. & Magley, V. J. (1997). The antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: A test of an integrated model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 578 – 589.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Magley, V. J., Drasgow, F., & Waldo, C. R. (1999). Measuring sexual harassment in the military: The SEQ-DoD. *Military Psychology*, 11, 243 – 263.

Fitzgerald, L. F. & Shullman, S. L. (1993). Sexual harassment: A research analysis and agenda for the 1990s. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 42, 5 – 27.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Shullman, S. L., Bailey, N., Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., Ormerod, M., & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 32, 152 – 175.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Swan, S., & Fischer, K. (1995). Why didn't she just report him? The psychological and legal implications of women's responses to sexual harassment. *Journal of Social Issues*, 51, 117 – 138.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Swan, S., & Magley, V. J. (1997). But was it really sexual harassment? Legal, behavioral, and psychological definitions of the workplace victimization of women. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research and therapy* (pp. 5 – 28). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Freeman, R. (1999). *Correctional organization and management: Public policy challenges, behavior, and structure*. Boston: Butterworth/Heinemann.

Fuller, R. C. & Myers, R. R. (1941). The natural history of a social problem. *American Sociological Review*, 6(3), 320 – 329.

Grauerholz, E. (1989). Sexual harassment of women professors by students: Exploring the dynamics of power, authority, and gender in a university setting. *Sex Roles*, 21, 789 – 801.

Gruber, J. E. (1989). How women handle sexual harassment: A literature review. *Sociology and Social Research*, 74, 3 – 9.

Gruber, J. E. (1997). An epidemiology of sexual harassment: Evidence from North America and Europe. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research and therapy* (pp. 84 – 98). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Gruber, J. E. & Bjorn, L. (1982). Blue-collar blues: The sexual harassment of women autoworkers. *Work and Occupations*, 9, 271 – 298.

Gruber, J. E. & Bjorn, L. (1986). Women's responses to sexual harassment: An analysis of sociocultural, organizational, and personal resource models. *Social Science Quarterly*, 67, 814 – 825.

Gruber, J. E. & Smith, M. D. (1995). Women's responses to sexual harassment: A multivariate analysis. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 543 – 562.

Gutek, B. A. & Koss, M. P. (1996). How women deal with sexual harassment and how organizations respond to reporting. In D. K. Shrier (Ed.), *Sexual harassment in the workplace and academia: Psychiatric issues* (pp. 39 – 57). Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Press, Inc.

Gutek, B. A. & Morasch, B. (1982). Sex ratios, sex-role spillover, and sexual harassment of women at work. *Journal of Social Issues*, 38(4), 55 – 74.

Hanrahan, P. (1997) "How do I know if I'm being harassed or if this is part of my job?": Nurses and definitions of sexual harassment. *National Women's Studies Association Journal*, 9(2), 43 – 64.

Heidensohn, F. (1992). *Women in control: The role of women in law enforcement*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hemmens, C., Stohr, M. K., Schoeler, M., & Miller, B. (2002). One step up, two steps back: The progression of perceptions of women's work in prisons and jails. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 473 – 489.

Hicks v. Gates Rubber Co., 833 F,2d, 1413 (1987).

Holstein, J. A. & Miller, G. (1990). Rethinking victimization: An interactional approach to victimology. *Symbolic Interaction,* 13, 103 – 122.

Horne, P. (1985). Female correctional officers: A status report. *Federal Probation*, 49, 46 – 54.

Hughes, K. D. & Tadic, V. (1998). 'Something to deal with': Customer sexual harassment and women's retail service work in Canada. *Gender, Work, and Organization*, 5, 207 – 219.

Jacobs, J. B. & Kraft, L. J. (1978). Integrating the keepers: A comparison of black and white prison guards in Illinois. *Social Problems*, 25, 304 – 318.

Jenne, D. L. & Kersting, R. C. (1996). Aggression and women correctional officers in male prisons. *The Prison Journal*, 76, 442 – 460.

Jenne, D. L. & Kersting, R. C. (1998). Gender, power, and reciprocity in the correctional setting. *The Prison Journal*, 78, 166 – 185.

Johnson, L. B. (1991). Job strain among police officers: Gender comparisons. *Police Studies*, 4, 12 – 16.

Jurik, D. L. (1988). Striking a balance: Female correction officers, gender role stereotypes, and male prisons. *Sociological Inquiry*, 58, 291 – 305.

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 – 388.

Jurik, N. C. & Halemba, G. J. (1984). Gender, working conditions and the job satisfaction of women in a nontraditional occupation: Female correctional officers in men's prisons. *Sociological Quarterly*, 25, 551 – 566.

Jurik, N. C. & Martin, S. E. (2001). Femininities, masculinities, and organizational conflict: Women in criminal justice occupations. In C. M. Renzetti & L. Goodstein (Eds.), *Women, crime, and criminal justice* (pp. 264-281). Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing.

Kauffman, K. (1981). Prison officers' attitudes and perceptions of attitudes: A case of pluralistic ignorance. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 18, 272 – 294.

Kirby, S. L., Greaves, L., & Hankivsky, O. (2002). Women under the dome of silence: Sexual harassment and abuse of female athletes. *Canadian Woman Studies*, 21, 132 – 137.

Kissel, P. J. & Katsampes, P. L. (1980). The impact of women correctional officers on the functioning of institutions housing male inmates. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation*, 4, 213 – 231.

Koss, M. P. (1990). Changed lives: The psychological impact of sexual harassment. In M. Paludi (Ed.), *Ivory power: Sexual harassment in academia and the workplace* (pp. 73-92). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Lawrence, R. & Mahan, S. (1998). Women correctional officers in men's prisons: Acceptance and perceived job performance. *Women and Criminal Justice*, 9, 63 – 86.

Lee, D. (2001). Bully for men. *Trouble & Strife- The Radical Feminist Magazine*, 42, 48 – 50.

Lombardo, L. X. (1981). *Guards imprisoned: Correctional officers at work*. New York: Elseiver.

Lovell, D. & Jemelka, R. (1996). When inmates misbehave: The costs of discipline. *The Prison Journal*, 76, 165 – 179.

Loy, P.H. & Stewart, L.P. (1984). The extent and effect of sexual harassment of working women. *Sociological Focus*, 17, 31 – 43.

MacKinnon, C. (1979). *Sexual harassment of working women*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Macmillan, R., Nierobisz, A., & Welsh, S. (2000). Experiencing the streets: Harassment and perceptions of safety among women. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 37, 306 – 322.

Magley, V. J., Hulin, C. L., Fitzgerald, L. F., & DeNardo, M. (1999). Outcomes of self-labeling sexual harassment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 390 – 402.

Magley, V. J., & Shupe, E. I. (2005). Self-labeling sexual harassment. *Sex Roles*, 53, 173 – 189.

Maguire, K. & Pastore, A. L. (Eds.). (2003). *Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics 2002*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Martin, S. E. (1992). The changing status of women officers: Gender and power in police work. In I. Moyer, (Ed.), *The changing roles of women in the criminal justice system: Offenders, victims, and professionals* (pp. 281 – 305). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Maypole, D. (1986). Sexual harassment of social workers at work: Injustice within? *Social Work*, 31, 29 – 34.

Mcguire. T., Dougherty, D. S., & Atkinson, J. (2006). Paradoxing the dialect: The impact of patients' sexual harassment in the discursive construction of nurses' caregiving roles. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 19, 416 – 450.

McMahon, M. (1999). *Women on guard: Discrimination and harassment in corrections*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Moran, J. (2002*). Sexual harassment policy and discipline at the department of corrections* (OLR Research Report #2002-R-0658). Retrieved December 1, 2002, from http://www.cga.state.ct.us/2002/olrdata/lab/rpt/2002-R-0658.htm

O'Connor, M. & Vallabhajosula, B. (2004). Sexual harassment in the workplace: A legal and psychological framework. In B. J. Cling (ed.), *Sexualized violence: A psychology and law perspective* (pp. 115 – 147). New York: The Guilford Press.

O'Donohue, W., Downs, K., & Yeater, E. A. (1998). Sexual harassment: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 3, 111 – 128.

O'Farrell, B. & Harlan, S. L. (1982). Craftworkers and clerks: The effect of male co-worker hostility on women's satisfaction with non-traditional jobs. *Social Problems*, 29, 252 – 265.

O'Hare, K. R. (1976). *In prison.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Petersen, C. B. (1982). Doing time with the boys: An analysis of women correction officers in all male facilities. In B. R. Price & N. J. Sokoloff (Eds.), *The Criminal Justice System and Women* (pp. 437 – 460). New York: Clark Boardman Company, Ltd.

Pogrebin, M. R. & Poole, E. D. (1997). The sexualized work environment: A look at women jail officers. *The Prison Journal*, 77, 41 – 57.

Pogrebin, M. R. & Poole, E. D. (1998). Women deputies and jail work. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 14, 117 – 134.

Pollock, J. M. (1986). *Sex and supervision: Guarding male and female inmates*. New York: Greenwood Press.

Pryor, J. B. (1987). Sexual harassment proclivities in men. Sex Roles, 17, 269 – 290.

Pryor, J. B., & Whalen, N. J. (1997). A typology of sexual harassment: Characteristics of harassers and the social circumstances under which sexual harassment occurs. In W. O'Donohue (Ed.), *Sexual harassment: Theory, research and therapy* (pp. 130 – 151). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Rosen, L. N., & Martin, L. (1998). Incidence and perceptions of sexual harassment among male and female U.S. Army soldiers. *Military Psychology*, 10, 239 – 257.

Rospenda, K. M., Richman, J. A., & Nawyn, S. J. (1998). Doing power: The confluence of gender, race, and class in contrapower sexual harassment. *Gender and Society*, 12, 40 – 60.

Rowan, J. R. (1996, April). Who is safer in male maximum security prisons? *Corrections Today*, 58, 186 – 188.

Sbaraga, T. P. & O'Donohue, W. (2000). Sexual harassment. *Annual Review of Sex Research*, 11, 258 – 287.

Schneider, B. (1985). Approaches, assaults, attractions, affairs: Policy implications of the sexualization of the workplace. *Population Research and Policy Review*, 4, 93 – 113.

Skaine, R. (1996). *Power and gender: Issues in sexual dominance and harassment*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, Inc.

Slate, R. N. & Vogel, R. E. (1997). Participative management and correctional personnel: A study of the perceived atmosphere for participation in correctional decision making and its impact on employee stress and thoughts about quitting. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25, 397 – 408.

Spector, M. & Kitsuse, J. I. (1977). *Constructing social problems*. Menlo Park, CA, Cummings.

Spender, D. (1984). Defending reality: A powerful tool. In C. Kramarae, M. Schultz, & W. O'Barr (Eds.), *Language and power* (pp. 9 – 22). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Stalder, R. L. (Ed.). (2005). Department of public safety and corrections – Corrections services: Local facilities bedspace and projections. In *Statistics – Briefing book* (Section I: Projected Expansion). Retrieved April 18, 2005, from http://www.corrections.state.la.us/Statistics/PDF_BB/01-Projected%20Expansion/1a.pdf

Stebbins, R. A. (2001). Exploratory research in the social sciences. *Qualitative Research Methods*, 48.

Stohr, M. K., Mays, G. L., Beck, A. C., & Kelley, T. (1998). Sexual harassment in women's jails. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 14, 135 – 155.

Strickland, T. (1999, April). Correctional officers: American's unsung heroes. *Corrections Today,* 61(2), 152 – 153.

Sykes, G. M. (1956). The corruption of authority and rehabilitation. *Social Forces*, 34, 257 – 262.

Terpstra, D. E. & Baker, D. D. (1989). The identification and classification of reactions to sexual harassment. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 10, 1 – 14.

Thompson, R. (2002). It doesn't go with the territory. *Herizons*, 15, 22 – 26.

Toplitt, S. C. (1999). Establishing and enforcing your sexual harassment policy. *Police Department Disciplinary Bulletin*, 7, 2 – 3.

U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board. (1995). Sexual harassment in the federal workplace: Trends, progress, and continuing challenges. Washington, D.C., U.S. Government Printing Office.

Welch, M. (1996). *Corrections: A critical approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Welsh, S. (2000). The multidimensional nature of sexual harassment: An empirical analysis of women's sexual harassment complaints. *Violence Against Women*, 6, 118 – 141.

Wood, J. T. (1994). Saying it makes it so: The discursive construction of sexual harassment. In S. G. Bingham (Ed.), *Conceptualizing sexual harassment as discursive practice* (pp. 17 – 30). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Zimmer, L.E. (1986). *Women guarding men*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Zimmer, L. E. (1987). How women reshape the prison guard role. *Gender and Society*, 1, 415 – 431.

Zupan, L. L. (1992). The progress of women correctional officers in all-male prisons. In I. L. Moyer (Ed.), *The changing role of women in the criminal justice system* (pp. 323 – 343). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.