

Gender and Racial Differences in Perceptions of Career Opportunities and the Work Environment in a Traditionally White, Male Occupation

Correctional Workers in the Federal Bureau of Prisons*

*Disclaimer: The contents of this paper reflect the views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position of either the Department of Justice or the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

Pp. 258-277 in *Contemporary Issues in Criminal Justice: Shaping Tomorrow's System*, Nicky Ali Jackson, ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1995).

by
Scott D. Camp, Ph.D.
Federal Bureau of Prisons
and
Thomas L. Steiger, Ph.D.
Indiana State University

The 1972 amendment to Title VII opened the door for women and minorities to enter nontraditional jobs in corrections—that is, jobs that were previously not at all available or available only under limited circumstances. Prior to that, corrections was basically a white male world, especially for anyone interested in upward mobility or a career path (Graham 1992:116; Feinman 1994: Chapter 6). Clearly, women have served in corrections since the 1800s. Women have always worked in all capacities at women’s prisons, but at the more numerous male facilities, women worked in the more traditional, and generally lower paying, jobs, such as clerical and support jobs. Minority male correctional workers typically have worked with inmates who were also minorities. These practices resulted in placing limitations on the job experiences of women and minorities and, hence, limited their opportunities for career advancement.

In the past 20 years, the legal barriers to full participation by women and minorities working in corrections have become less of a factor. In fact, through affirmative action policies, women and minorities have been encouraged to enter nontraditional areas. But other barriers, typically more subtle ones, soon became apparent. Ad hoc discrimination against women and minorities has been documented at both the personal and organizational levels in some organizations, making it difficult for women and minorities to advance. The recognition that simply removing formal, legal barriers does not eliminate all barriers facing women and minorities means that it is necessary to conduct research to examine the quality of the work experiences of women and minorities working in nontraditional areas.

This study is an attempt to assess the working experiences of women and minorities employed as nonsupervisory correctional officers in the Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP). Of all of the jobs in a prison, the one that has longest been closed to women in particular is that of correctional officer, especially in male facilities. Using survey data, we attempt to assess two

aspects of the working experiences of staff at the BOP, namely, perceptions of chances for job advancement and evaluations of the formal work environment. This paper endeavors to discover how men and women comparatively view these aspects. The same types of comparisons for white, black, and staff of other racial minorities are also made.

Review of the Literature

Several studies have found that occupational and job segregation, especially by gender, are no longer as pervasive as was once the case (Tomaskovic-Devey 1993). However, even these authors typically point out that jobs are still segregated with incumbents who are majority members striving to develop barriers that keep minority and female workers out. In addition, once a job or occupation becomes associated with a minority group or women, the job tends to become devalued in that less status and extrinsic rewards are associated with the job in comparison to similar jobs requiring comparable skills and responsibilities that are filled by white men.

The position of correctional officer at the Federal Bureau of Prisons is still dominated by white males, though the percentages of minorities and women are increasing. The Bureau of Prisons has in place an active affirmative action program to recruit minorities and women for all jobs, including that of correctional officer. What type of work environment minorities and women face, though, in their jobs as correctional officers is unclear.

On the one hand, there is reason to expect that white men may work to protect their advantages through informal means such as denying critical information to women and minority members about the specifics of the job of correctional officer as practiced in specific institutions or assigning women and minorities to jobs with little future for skill development or advancement. Jurik (1985) found this to be the case for the women she studied. Specifically, she found that

work assignments and performance evaluations were more negative for women, and these factors had a negative impact upon later decisions affecting job advancement. Bartol et al. (1992) found that even though a large majority (90%) of female police officers felt that they were accepted by their peers as good officers, only 60% felt they had the same opportunities for promotion in their department. Jurik and Winn (1987) found that minority staff tend have more negative views of their supervisors than white staff. As such, women at the Bureau of Prisons may give negative evaluations of the work environment if indeed these types of barriers exist.

On the other hand, the perceptions of the work environment may be influenced more by actual requirements of the position and not necessarily by how male or majority coworkers respond to female and minority employees. McIlwee (1982), in her study of women in nontraditional jobs (none of whom were correctional officers), found that by the second year on the job, women evaluated their jobs using criteria similar to those of men performing the same jobs. In the first year on the job, their sources of satisfaction had been based more on their struggles to survive and succeed in a nontraditional job. Also, McIlwee argues that women's evaluations of their jobs were made not only in comparison to male workers doing similar tasks, the evaluations of their jobs took account of what other women would be doing in traditional, female jobs. As such, the evaluations of female and minority correctional officers may not be all that different from male or white correctional officers.

Wright and Saylor (1991), in a study of male and female staff at the Federal Bureau of Prisons, found that if anything, women provide more favorable evaluations of the work environment than men. The Wright and Saylor (1991) study is based upon a 1988 survey of staff at the Federal Bureau of Prisons. There have been significant changes since 1988. In particular,

jobs of correctional officer at all institutions were opened to women in 1992. Also in 1992, Kathleen Hawk became the first female Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, a position she continues to hold. And, the number of women employed at the BOP have risen in absolute and relative terms. In 1988, females occupied 3,231, or 23.1% of the 14,113 staff positions at the BOP.¹ By 1994, the number of staff positions at the BOP had nearly doubled to 26,452, and the number of women staff members had increased to 6,976, or 26.6% of the total.

Finally, it is possible that the affirmative action policies of the Federal Bureau of Prisons have created a positive work environment and eliminated most types of barriers formerly faced by female and minority correctional officers. In this case, we would also expect that there would be no gender or racial differences in evaluations of the work environment.

Data and Variables

The Prison Social Climate Survey (PSCS) has been administered annually to BOP staff working at detention facilities since 1988. A stratified proportional probability sampling scheme is used to draw potential respondents, who respond to one of four versions of the PSCS. Overall, 88% of the 9,228 BOP staff selected for the 1994 PSCS participated. The sample respondents accurately reflect the population from which they are drawn with only minor deviations. Females, for example, are slightly underrepresented among the 1994 PSCS respondents. Females make up 26.3% of all BOP staff in 1994, but only 24.7% of the sample respondents. Blacks are also slightly underrepresented. Blacks make up 18.4% of BOP staff in 1994 and 15.5% of the 1994 PSCS respondents. Conversely, whites are overrepresented. More complete descriptions of the PSCS can be found in Saylor (1984), Wright and Saylor (1991), and Camp (1994).

Dependent Variables

Two of the versions of the 1994 survey contain the full complement of items on job advancement opportunities and the work environment that provide the data for the present study. Of the total number of respondents to versions 2 and 4 of the PSCS, 1,265 are nonsupervisory correctional officers, the focus of this study. Four questionnaire items are used to assess evaluations of the opportunities for job advancement. Two of the items ask the respondents to rate, on a seven point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree, their own chances of promotion. The items are INOPPME (short for INstitution has OPPortunities for ME), “There are job advancement opportunities in this facility for me,” and BOPOPPME (BOP has OPPortunities for ME), “There are job advancement opportunities in the BOP for me.” The other two items on job advancement opportunities ask the respondents to evaluate, again on a seven point scale, job advancement opportunities for minorities. The items are INOPPMIN (INstitution has OPPortunities for MINorities), “There are job advancement opportunities for minorities in this facility,” and BOPOPMIN (BOP has OPportunities for MINorities), “There are job advancement opportunities for minorities in the BOP.” Taken together, the items allow us to examine differences in how respondents evaluate their own as well as minority opportunities at their own institution and in the BOP overall.

Seven scales which measure different aspects of the work environment at BOP facilities are examined. The scales measure organizational commitment to the BOP (BOPCOM, BOP COMmitment), organizational commitment to the institution (INSCOM, INStitutional COMmitment), job satisfaction (JOBSAT, JOB SATisfaction), satisfaction with supervision (SUPSAT, SUPervisory SATisfaction), the perceived effectiveness of institutional operations

(INSTOP, INSTitutorial OPerations), efficacy in dealing with inmates (EFFICACY), and changes in cynicism created by working in corrections (CYNIC). The items that comprise the scales are presented in Appendix 1. All scales have alpha reliability coefficients greater than .75.²

Independent Variables

Race and gender are the primary explanatory variables of interest in the present study. Race is coded as an effects vector for white (RaceW), black (RaceB), and other (RaceO). Other is the excluded variable in the actual models, but with effects coding the value of the variable is easily computed as is the standard error of the coefficient.³ Gender is coded as a dummy variable, with 1 representing female.

In addition, individual and contextual control variables are included in the models. Individual-level controls are included for age, tenure, education, transfer status, and family income.⁴ Age and tenure are known to influence all kinds of perceptions and outcomes. It seems reasonable to expect that they would influence both perceptions of job advancement opportunities and evaluations of the work environment.

Increasingly, the BOP has been hiring more staff who have at least a bachelor's degree. There has been some research conducted on the effects of hiring correctional officers with college degrees. On the one hand, it is argued that college educated staff make better correctional officers because of their advanced training. On the other hand, it has been written that college educated staff are more likely to be dissatisfied with the job conditions of correctional officer. Because of both types of arguments, education is entered as a control in the form of a dummy variable indicating whether or not the respondent has at least a bachelor's degree (Coll_Ed).

Promotion and advancement in the BOP is often tied to transferring to different facilities. A dummy variable is included in the models to indicate whether the respondent has ever transferred from one BOP facility to another (Transfer). Yearly family income, categorized in \$10,000 increments from under \$10,000 to over \$70,000, is included as a control (YearSaly).

Independent variables are also included in the models that reflect the characteristics of the institutions, or the context, in which the respondents work. Controls for the security level of the institution in which the respondents work and BOP region are included. BOP security designations range from minimum, to low, to medium, to high depending upon the types of inmates held and the security measures built into the design of the institution. There is also an administrative designation for special purpose institutions, such as medical facilities. Security level is coded as an effects vector with the corresponding variables of SLMIn, SLLo, SLMed, SLHi, and SLAdm. The operational management of the BOP is divided into 6 regions with regional offices reporting to a central office in Washington, D.C. These regions, and corresponding effects vector variable names, are the Mid-Atlantic Region (RgMXR), the North Central Region (RgNCR), the Northeast Region (RgNER), the South Central Region (RgSCR), the Southeast Region (RgSER) and the Western Region (RgWXR).

Contextual variables are also included that control for changes between the 1993 and 1994 fiscal years in the percentages of institution promotions going to female staff (C%FmPro) and promotions going to minority staff (C%MnPro). Variables are included for the changes between 1993 and 1994 in the percentage of institution staff who are female (C%FmStf) and the percentage of staff who are minority (C%MnStf). And contextual measures are included for the

changes between 1993 and 1994 in the percentage of supervisors at the institution who are female (C%FmSup) and the percentage who are minority (C%MnSup).

Analysis and Results

Table A presents the bivariate results between the dependent variables and gender. As can be seen there, males and females differ on three of the four job advancement opportunity variables. Only for opportunities at the institution is there no statistically significant difference between males and females. As for job advancement opportunities in the larger BOP, women more strongly agree than men that they have opportunities. Men, on the other hand, more strongly agree than women that minorities have opportunities for advancement at the institution and in the BOP generally.

As seen in Table A, men and women differ on only three of the seven work environment scales. Women tend to rate their job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervision, and efficacy in dealing with inmates more highly than males.

Table B presents the bivariate results between the dependent variables and race. For the opportunity variables, whites evaluate their opportunities for advancement at the institution and in the BOP less favorably than blacks. On the other hand, white staff rate the chances of minority advancement at the institution and in the BOP much more highly than either blacks or the other racial group.

Table B also demonstrates some interesting relationships between race and the work environment scales. While whites give more favorable evaluations than blacks to institutional commitment, they evaluate institutional operations and efficacy in dealing with inmates lower than blacks, and they tend to agree that they have become more cynical while working in corrections.

The bivariate results are interesting, and suggest that there are quite important differences between the evaluations of men and women and the different racial groups, especially for perceptions of job advancement opportunities. It is necessary to see if these relations remain significant with the introduction of appropriate controls in ordinary least squares regression models. The multivariate results are presented in Tables C and D.

Table C presents the multivariate ordinary least squares (OLS) results for the job advancement opportunity dependent variables. As can be seen there, gender does *not* have a statistically significant effect on any of the job advancement opportunity variables when race and the other control variables are entered into the models. Race, though, continues to make a difference. Whites provide significantly lower evaluations of opportunities for job advancement both at the institution and in the BOP overall. Blacks, on the other hand, give more favorable evaluations of their perceived opportunities for job advancement both at the institution and in the BOP generally. The coefficients for the other racial group are not significantly different in the models for institutional opportunities for me and BOP opportunities for me from the overall means for all racial groups.⁵

The results in Table C also demonstrate that whites give much more favorable evaluations to the opportunities for minority job advancement than do blacks and other racial minorities. The effect of race in both models, institutional opportunities for minorities and BOP opportunities for minorities, is quite strong as seen in the respective coefficients. The R^2 for the model predicting institutional opportunities for minorities is 25.8%. This model explains a fairly respectable amount of the variance, especially for predicting individual-level perceptions. A model with race as the *only* independent variable predicting institutional opportunities for minorities, not reported here,

explains 17% of the variance. A model with race alone as an independent variable, also not reported here, predicts 11% of the variance when the dependent variable is BOP opportunities for minorities.

While not the focus of this study, the effects of the other control variables on perceptions of job advancement opportunities are presented in Table C. For the most part, the contextual variables do not exert statistically significant effects in any of the models. Most of the other individual-level control variables do exert statistically significant effects, at least in some of the models. Age has a significant negative effect in all of the models except the one predicting institutional promotion opportunities for me. Tenure has a negative effect in the models for institutional and BOP job advancement opportunities for me. College educated workers perceive their job advancement opportunities at their institutions and in the BOP more negatively than workers without college degrees. These findings about the effects of having a college degree are somewhat surprising, but they may reflect the higher job aspirations held by college educated workers, aspirations that may have become frustrated. Individuals who have transferred with the BOP evaluate their own and minority job advancement opportunities at their institution less favorably than coworkers who have never transferred. And yearly family income has a positive effect in all of the models except the one for institutional job advancement opportunities for me.

Table D presents the multivariate OLS results for the work environment dependent variables. The results for gender presented here are more congruent with the bivariate results discussed earlier than was the case with the job opportunity dependent variables. Gender continues to exert an influence in the models of job satisfaction and satisfaction with supervision. Females are more satisfied with their job and supervisors than men. These findings are congruent

with the results presented by Wright and Saylor. However, where females rate themselves as more efficacious in dealing with inmates in the bivariate results, this relationship is not significant in the multivariate model. And, as was the case in the bivariate results, gender is not important in perceptions of BOP commitment, institutional commitment, institutional operations, and cynicism.

The multivariate results for the work environment dependent variables also generally reflect the patterns for race uncovered in the bivariate results. Black staff report significantly less commitment to the institution, more favorable evaluations of institutional operations, and less cynicism. White staff provide lower evaluations of satisfaction with supervision, institutional operations, and efficacy in dealing with inmates. Other racial minorities provide a significantly more favorable evaluations of institutional commitment, job satisfaction, and satisfaction with supervision.

The multivariate results for the work environment variables show that the contextual variables have more effect in these models than was the case for the job opportunity variables. The finding of an effect for security level in some of the models is not really surprising. For example, respondents who work in high security and medium security institutions with the most dangerous inmates in the BOP report feeling less efficacious in dealing with inmates, where respondents working in minimum security institutions with the least dangerous BOP inmates report feeling more efficacious. Some of the other findings for the contextual variables are more puzzling. For example, it is not clear why there should be regional effects in some of the models, even though the results do demonstrate that region generally does not have an effect. Likewise, it is not clear why the two variables indicating that the respondents work at institutions with an increase in the percentage of minority staff and the percentage of female supervisors provide more

favorable evaluations of BOP commitment. The same is true for the findings for institutional commitment. It is not clear why there is a positive relationship between the change in the percentage of promotions going to females and institutional commitment and a negative relationship between the change in the percentage of promotions going to minorities and institutional commitment.

The findings for the other individual-level control variables presented in Table D are fairly consistent with the effects these variables had on job advancement opportunities presented in Table C. Tenure has a negative effect on evaluations of BOP commitment, job satisfaction, satisfaction with supervision, institutional operations, and efficacy. On the other hand, tenure is positively associated with a more cynical attitude. Age is only related to job satisfaction and cynicism. Older workers, somewhat surprisingly, are more satisfied with their jobs, and older workers provide lower scores on the cynicism scale.

Having a college degree only has a significant effect in the models for job satisfaction and cynicism. Respondents with a college degree report less job satisfaction and higher levels of cynicism. The effect of having had a transfer is only significant in the model for institutional commitment where, not surprisingly, it lowers the level of institutional commitment. Yearly family income is significantly related only to BOP commitment. Workers from families with higher family incomes are more committed to the BOP.

Discussion

The results presented above suggest that apparent gender differences in perceptions about job advancement opportunities, seen in the bivariate results, are due to other factors. That there is no difference between male and female correctional officers at the Bureau of Prisons in their

perceptions of job advancement opportunities is somewhat surprising, and quite possibly speaks well of the BOP affirmative action program toward women. On the other hand, it is also possible that our measures are too crude to elicit from respondents information about subtle barriers placed in the paths of women, or information about class ceilings that women may encounter in their career development.

Even though male and female correctional officers provide similar evaluations of their opportunities for career advancement, it is still the case that men and women tend to perform different types of jobs at the Bureau of Prisons. The data in Table E present a breakdown of the departments that men and women identify as their work site at the Bureau of Prisons. For men, the largest number, 41%, work in Correctional Services. The nonsupervisory correctional officers analyzed here work in Correctional Services. For women, only 14% work in Correctional Services. For women, the largest concentration, 33.3%, work in administrative departments (Financial Management, Human Resources, Inmate Systems, Research, Institution Executive Staff, Facilities, Information Systems, and Legal). Conversely, only 12.7% of males are employed in the administrative departments. If we compute an index of dissimilarity for this table, we find a value of 41.55. This can be interpreted as meaning that it would take 41.55% of the persons in Table E to change departments to produce equity between males and females in terms of the departments they work in.

The multivariate results presented for the relationships between gender and the work environment measures provide additional support for the notion that female correctional officers are generally as satisfied with their work experiences as male correctional officers. In the only two multivariate regression models where gender takes on a statistically significant value, women are

actually more positive in their evaluations of the work environment, rating job satisfaction and satisfaction with supervision higher than men. Taken together with the lack of significance of gender in the models of job advancement opportunities, it seems clear that the survey results presented here do not point to any obvious or gross problems faced by female correctional officers at the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Again, we do recognize that the questionnaire items analyzed here are being used in a post hoc fashion to examine gender differences.

The analysis presented does demonstrate that there are race differences in perceptions of job advancement opportunities, but the differences are not of the type we initially expected. It is not white staff members who give the most favorable evaluations of their opportunities for job advancement, it is black staff. But when asked about the job advancement opportunities for minority staff, white staff give much higher evaluations of the opportunities for minorities than do either black staff or staff who are of other racial minorities. While these results suggest that the affirmative action program at the BOP has created recognized opportunities for minority staff, the results also suggest that white staff have an exaggerated view of the opportunities available for minority staff, at least in comparison to the evaluations of minority promotion opportunities provided by black staff and staff who are members of other racial minorities.

Conclusion

The findings presented here suggest that two further types of analysis are necessary for a fuller understanding of the work experiences of male and female correctional officers and correctional officers of different racial backgrounds. First, an analysis of the informal processes and structure of the BOP is needed to explore the possibilities that women and minorities face barriers in the informal structure that they do not apparently encounter in the formal structure of

the BOP. The questionnaire items that are used in this analysis all seem to ask respondents about the formal structure and policies of the BOP, but there is little that asks about the daily, informal interactions between workers that can be so important to career development, such as mentoring opportunities on and off of the job. In fact, we are already planning such an analysis where we will conduct focus group interviews with BOP staff.

The other type of study that we feel is necessary, and in fact we also plan to conduct, involves examining the objective career development of cohorts of male and female correctional officers (and other job categories) as reflected in their official personnel records. This will provide us with an objective base against which to evaluate perceptions of the job advancement opportunities available to minorities and nonminorities. The findings of this study, in conjunction with the findings presented in this study, could have important policy implications for the BOP. In particular, it could provide better insight into the gross discrepancy between white and minority staff perceptions of the job advancement opportunities available to minority staff at the BOP.

In conclusion, we have to provisionally accept that there appear to be no gross discrepancies between male and female correctional officers' evaluations of their work experiences at the Federal Bureau of Prisons, a finding also reflected in the earlier study by Wright and Saylor (1991). We also have to conclude that black correctional officers see their promotional opportunities as being more favorable than white officers see theirs. While these conclusions are not what we might have expected, they seem to speak well of the affirmative action efforts at the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

Endnotes

1. Staff figures for the BOP are taken from the Key Indicators/Strategic Support System for the month during which the Prison Social Climate Survey was administered. For 1988, the PSCS was administered in November. In 1994, the PSCS was administered in September.
2. More information about the initial construction of the scales and yearly evaluations with confirmatory factor analysis is available from the authors upon request.
3. All statistics for this analysis were produced with SPSS for Windows Version 6.1. With effects or indicator coding, the coefficient for the excluded category, other race in this case, is computed as: $\beta_{\text{RaceO}} = -(\beta_{\text{RaceW}} + \beta_{\text{RaceB}})$. The standard error of the coefficient is given as the square root of the following equation: $\text{VAR}(\beta_{\text{RaceO}}) = \text{VAR}(\beta_{\text{RaceW}}) + \text{VAR}(\beta_{\text{RaceB}}) + 2\text{COV}(\beta_{\text{RaceW}}, \beta_{\text{RaceO}})$.
4. Both age and tenure are transformed by a logarithmic transformation to normalize their distributions.
5. In models not reported here, the interaction between gender and race was entered into the models. In all cases, the interaction was nonsignificant, so the final models were estimated without this interaction included.

References

- Bartol, C. R., Bergen, G. T., Volckens, J. S., & Knoras, K. M. (1992). "Women in Small-Town Policing." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 19(3), 240-259.
- Camp, S. D. (1994). "Assessing the Effects of Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction on Turnover: An Event History Approach." *The Prison Journal*, 74(3), 279-305.
- Feinman, C. (1994). *Women in the Criminal Justice System*. (Third Edition). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Graham, S. J. (1992). "Sound Advice for Succeeding in a Nontraditional Career." *Corrections Today*, August, 114-117.
- Jurik, N. C. (1985). "An Officer and a Lady: Organizational Barriers to Women Working as Correctional Officers in Men's Prisons." *Social Problems*, 32(4), 375-388.
- Jurik, N. C., & Winn, R. (1987). "Describing Correctional Security Dropouts and Rejects: An Individual or Organizational Profile." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 14(1), 5-25.
- McIlwee, J. S. (1982). "Work Satisfaction Among Women in Nontraditional Occupations." *Work and Occupations*, 9(3), 299-335.
- Saylor, W. G. (1984). "Surveying Prison Environments." Research Report, Federal Bureau of Prisons.
- Tomaskovic-Devey, D. (1993). *Gender & Racial Inequality at Work: The Sources & Consequences of Job Segregation*. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Wright, K. N., & Saylor, W. G. (1991). "Male and Female Employees' Perceptions of Prison Work: Is There a Difference?" *Justice Quarterly*, 8(4), 506-524.

Table A
 Mean Scores of Job Advancement Variables and Work Environment Scales by Gender,
 Line Staff Correctional Officers

	Female Mean	Male Mean	Female-Male Difference	p	N
INOPPME*	3.09	2.92	—	.2464	1,239
BOPOPPME	4.27	3.93	0.34	.0059	1,244
INOPPMIN	4.06	4.45	-0.39	.0022	1,240
BOPOPMIN	4.57	4.85	-0.28	.0067	1,238
BOPCOM	4.05	3.91	—	.1800	1,247
INSCOM	3.32	3.27	—	.6659	1,245
JOBSAT	3.54	3.23	0.31	.0021	1,245
SUPSAT	3.43	3.10	0.33	.0020	1,247
INSTOP	3.28	3.16	—	.2097	1,248
EFFICACY	3.73	3.52	0.21	.0137	1,237
CYNIC	2.17	2.26	—	.3830	1,237

*INOPPME, institutional opportunity for me; BOPOPPME, BOP opportunity for me; INOPPMIN, institutional opportunity for minorities; BOPOPMIN, BOP opportunities for minorities; BOPCOM, BOP commitment; INSCOM, institutional commitment; JOBSAT, job satisfaction; SUPSAT, supervisory satisfaction; INSTOP, institutional operations; EFFICACY, efficacy in dealing with inmates; CYNIC, feeling of CYNICISM

Table B
Mean Scores of Job Advancement Variables and Work Environment Scales by Race,
Line Staff Correctional Officers

	White Mean	Black Mean	Other Mean	W-B* Diff.	W-O Diff.	O-B Diff.	N
INOPPME [†]	2.82	3.28	3.09	-0.46	—	—	1,251
BOPOPPME	3.89	4.19	4.11	-0.30	—	—	1,257
INOPPMIN	4.89	3.16	3.51	1.73	1.38	—	1,253
BOPOPMIN	5.11	4.06	4.25	1.05	0.86	—	1,251
BOPCOM	3.92	3.98	3.93	—	—	—	1,260
INSCOM	3.33	2.99	3.37	0.34	—	0.38	1,258
JOBSAT	3.24	3.24	3.59	—	-0.35	-0.35	1,258
SUPSAT	3.07	3.31	3.40	—	-0.33	—	1,260
INSTOP	3.09	3.43	3.30	-0.34	—	—	1,261
EFFICACY	3.45	3.80	3.75	-0.35	-0.30	—	1,250
CYNIC	2.37	1.96	2.04	0.41	0.33	—	1,250

* Multiple means comparisons adjusted with Bonferroni correction. Only means significantly different at p#.05 listed.

[†]INOPPME, institutional opportunity for me; BOPOPPME, BOP opportunity for me; INOPPMIN, institutional opportunity for minorities; BOPOPMIN, BOP opportunities for minorities; BOPCOM, BOP commitment; INSCOM, institutional commitment; JOBSAT, job satisfaction; SUPSAT, supervisory satisfaction; INSTOP, institutional operations; EFFICACY, efficacy in dealing with inmates; CYNIC, feeling of CYNICISM

Table C
OLS Models of Perceptions of Job Advancement Opportunities

<i>Explanatory Variables</i>	<i>INOPPME</i>	<i>BOPOPPME</i>	<i>INOPPMIN</i>	<i>BOPOPMIN</i>
	\$	\$	\$	\$
<i>Gender</i>	0.1518	0.2189	-0.2243	-0.1836
<i>RaceB</i>	0.2668*	0.1837*	-0.6789*	-0.3493*
<i>RaceW</i>	-0.3401*	-0.1753*	0.9713*	0.5830*
<i>RaceO</i>	0.0733	-0.0084	-0.2924*	-0.2340*
<i>L_Age</i>	-0.1373	-0.7152*	-0.6613*	-0.6065*
<i>L_Tenure</i>	-0.4538*	-0.4192*	0.0581	0.0875
<i>Coll_Ed</i>	-0.3333*	-0.3103*	-0.0194	-0.0589
<i>Transfer</i>	-0.4039*	-0.1430	-0.5265*	-0.1983
<i>YearSaly</i>	0.0371	0.0819*	0.0955*	0.0888*
<i>SLHi</i>	0.3406*	0.0079	0.0019	0.0680
<i>SLMed</i>	0.0296	-0.0052	0.0094	0.0155
<i>SLLo</i>	-0.0860	-0.2138*	-0.1097	-0.1286
<i>SLMin</i>	-0.2057	0.0996	0.0481	0.1017
<i>SLAdm</i>	-0.0785 [†]	0.1115 [†]	0.0503 [†]	-0.0566 [†]
<i>RgMXR</i>	0.0445	0.0448	0.0505	0.0034
<i>RgNCR</i>	-0.1147	-0.1161	-0.0144	-0.0408
<i>RgNER</i>	-0.0531	-0.0529	0.1088	0.0947
<i>RgSCR</i>	0.0158	0.1249	-0.1690	-0.0009
<i>RgSER</i>	-0.0914	-0.0268	-0.1272	-0.0929
<i>RgWXR</i>	0.1989 [†]	0.0261 [†]	0.1513 [†]	0.0365 [†]
<i>C%FmPro</i>	-0.0028	0.0069	0.0083	0.0120*
<i>C%MnPro</i>	-0.0073	-0.0047	-0.0011	-0.0079
<i>C%FmStf</i>	0.0048	-0.0066	-0.0554	-0.0381
<i>C%MnStf</i>	-0.0112	0.0068	0.0237	0.0290
<i>C%FmSup</i>	0.0063	0.0034	0.0282*	0.0135
<i>C%MnSup</i>	-0.0122	-0.0186	0.0158	0.0019
<i>R²</i>	8.8%	9.3%	25.8%	16.1%

* T significant at p # .05

[†] Significance of coefficient not tested.

Table D
OLS Models of Perceptions of the Work Environment

<i>Explanatory Variables</i>	<i>BOPCOM</i> \$	<i>INSCOM</i> \$	<i>JOBSAT</i> \$	<i>SUPSAT</i> \$
<i>Gender</i>	0.1451	0.0568	0.2998*	0.3207*
<i>RaceB</i>	0.0371	-0.2136*	-0.1303	0.0455
<i>RaceW</i>	-0.0696	-0.0116	-0.1188	-0.2437*
<i>RaceO</i>	0.0386	0.2252*	0.2491*	0.1982*
<i>L_Age</i>	0.0558	0.5690	1.1452*	0.1686
<i>L_Tenure</i>	-0.2673*	0.0377	-0.2666*	-0.1363*
<i>Coll_Ed</i>	-0.1062	0.0418	-0.2245*	-0.0577
<i>Transfer</i>	-0.1338	-0.7477*	-0.0886	-0.0465
<i>YearSaly</i>	0.0562*	0.0418	0.0509	0.0512
<i>SLHi</i>	-0.0271	0.2276*	-0.1955	-0.1758
<i>SLMed</i>	-0.0329	-0.1420	-0.0767	-0.1807*
<i>SLLo</i>	-0.0342	-0.1307	-0.0294	0.0509
<i>SLMin</i>	-0.0355	0.0732	0.1386	0.2121
<i>SLAdm</i>	0.1297 [†]	-0.0288 [†]	0.1630 [†]	0.0935 [†]
<i>RgMXR</i>	0.1296	-0.1018	0.1804	0.0266
<i>RgNCR</i>	-0.0186	0.2324*	-0.0306	-0.0936
<i>RgNER</i>	-0.0400	-0.1624	0.1280	0.1514
<i>RgSCR</i>	-0.1368	-0.0923	-0.2076*	-0.1923*
<i>RgSER</i>	0.1795	0.1634	-0.0448	-0.0124
<i>RgWXR</i>	-0.1137 [†]	-0.0393 [†]	-0.0254 [†]	0.1203 [†]
<i>C%FmPro</i>	0.0027	0.0142*	-0.0112	-0.0005
<i>C%MnPro</i>	-0.0100	-0.0277*	0.0087	-0.0055
<i>C%FmStf</i>	-0.0271	-0.0089	-0.0187	0.0102
<i>C%MnStf</i>	0.0575*	0.0220	0.0396	0.0349
<i>C%FmSup</i>	0.0272*	0.0160	0.0129	0.0009
<i>C%MnSup</i>	0.0039	0.0114	-0.0069	0.0102
<i>R²</i>	5.8%	10.2%	7.4%	5.7%

* T significant at p # .05

[†] Significance of coefficient not tested.

Table D—Continued
OLS Models of Perceptions of the Work Environment

<i>Explanatory Variables</i>	<i>INSTOP</i> \$	<i>EFFICACY</i> \$	<i>CYNIC</i> \$
<i>Gender</i>	-0.0076	0.1174	0.0222
<i>RaceB</i>	0.1769*	0.1006	-0.1799*
<i>RaceW</i>	-0.2297*	-0.1625*	0.2677*
<i>RaceO</i>	0.0528	0.0619	-0.0878
<i>L_Age</i>	0.4058	0.4281	-0.5069*
<i>L_Tenure</i>	-0.2649*	-0.1742*	0.4663*
<i>Coll_Ed</i>	-0.0676	0.0682	0.2335*
<i>Transfer</i>	-0.0872	-0.0482	0.0319
<i>YearSaly</i>	0.0125	0.0311	-0.0324
<i>SLHi</i>	-0.1571	-0.3909*	0.2379*
<i>SLMed</i>	-0.0328	-0.1370*	0.0792
<i>SLLo</i>	-0.0139	-0.0035	-0.1476
<i>SLMin</i>	0.0273	0.3316*	0.0027
<i>SLAdm</i>	0.1765 [†]	0.1998 [†]	-0.1722 [†]
<i>RgMXR</i>	0.1035	0.1384	-0.0854
<i>RgNCR</i>	-0.0548	-0.0652	0.0059
<i>RgNER</i>	0.0898	0.1183	-0.0518
<i>RgSCR</i>	-0.1256	-0.1388	0.1842*
<i>RgSER</i>	-0.0436	0.1126	-0.1123
<i>RgWXR</i>	0.0307 [†]	-0.1653 [†]	0.0594 [†]
<i>C%MnPro</i>	0.0007	-0.0026	0.0030
<i>C%MnPro</i>	-0.0060	0.0089	0.0074
<i>C%MnStf</i>	-0.0121	0.0003	0.0156
<i>C%MnStf</i>	0.0355	0.0053	-0.0278
<i>C%MnSup</i>	0.0077	0.0078	-0.0064
<i>C%MnSup</i>	0.0079	-0.0058	0.0015
<i>R²</i>	6.6%	9.3%	13.1%

* T significant at p # .05

[†] Significance of coefficient not tested.

Table E
Department Affiliations of Female and Male Staff

	% of Women Working in:	% of Men Working in:
Correctional Services	14.0	41.0
Unit Management	15.9	8.4
Mechanical Services	2.0	10.4
UNICOR (Prison Industries)	2.0	5.7
Public Health Service	3.0	2.8
Health Services	14.6	5.2
Food Services	2.7	5.1
Education/Recreation	9.8	6.9
Administrative	33.3	12.7
Other	2.8	1.8

About the Authors

Scott D. Camp is a social science research analyst with the Office of Research and Evaluation at the Federal Bureau of Prisons. He is the author of *Worker Response to Plant Closings: Steelworkers in Johnstown and Youngstown* (Garland Publishing, 1995). He continues to work with the coauthors to research employee perceptions of job advancement opportunities, and he has started work, again with the coauthors, on gender and race differences in histories of job advancement. He is also involved in a project to examine organizational performance differences in publicly and privately managed correctional facilities. He earned a Ph.D. in sociology at The Pennsylvania State University in 1991.

Thomas L. Steiger is Associate Professor of Sociology at Indiana State University. His research interests focus on the labor process and gender relations in the workplace. Recent publications include "Employment and Gender in the Service Sector" (*Social Problems*, 1995), and he is coeditor of a forthcoming book, *Labor and Monopoly Capital in the Twentieth Century: Braverman and Beyond* (SUNY Press, 1995). He continues his research on occupational sex-segregation, the lives of women at work, and forms of the labor process and labor's share of value.