A Comparative Study of the Selection of Bases of Power by Correctional Officers in Male and Female Institutions

by

Tamara S. Engle

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

Master of Science

in the

Criminal Justice Program

Richard J. Bellak 7-14-94

Advisor Date

Peter J. Kasinec 7/18/94

Dean of the Graduate School Date

Youngstown State University

August, 1994

ABSTRACT

A comparative study of the selection of bases of power by correctional officers in male and female institutions

T.S. Engle

Master of Science

Youngstown State University, 1994

This is a comparative study of the selection of bases of power by correctional officers in male and female institutions. This study assesses if the gender of the inmate influences the selection of power bases that correctional officers use to gain compliance from them. Subjects were fifty-five correctional officers from Trumbull Correctional Institution and fifty-nine correctional officers from The Ohio Reformatory for Women. A self-administered questionnaire was developed to measure power base selections. No significant differences were found between the two samples with regard to the selection of bases of power based on the gender of the inmate. Additional findings found a significant correlation between female correctional officers and their selections of power bases. A comparison of findings to another study that was done to assess the selection of power bases is difficult to measure because of the differences in the structures of the response categories used to measure power base selections.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Richard J. Billak, thesis committee chairman, who gave unselfishly of his valuable time providing guidance and assistance toward this project. I also wish to thank Dr. James Conser and Dr. Michael A. Heilman for their advice and comments during the preparation of this research project. Sincere thanks also goes to Ms. Sheila Williams for her assistance with data entry and computer analysis. This project would not have been completed without her assistance. Finally, I wish to thank my mother, Marjorie Engle, for her encouragment and patience she had shown to me during the completion of this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I: Introduction

Few studies are found in the literature that assess the means that correctional officers use to gain compliance from inmates. While most studies focus on the professional orientations of correctional officers such as job satisfaction and custody/rehabilitation orientations, any systematic analysis of French and Raven's power base orientations that correctional officers use to gain compliance from inmates within the literature is lacking (Hepburn, 1985).

Several variables have been suggested to be associated with the nature of the correctional officers control over inmates. Lombardo (1981) suggested that background characteristics of the officer influences control strategies, while Poole and Regoli (1980) suggested attitudes toward work influences the choice of power base. Crouch and Alpert (1982) stated attitudes toward inmates influences the choice of power bases. Poole and Regoli (1981) stated that the work behavior of the correctional officer is in part determined by inmates.

Need

While research has been conducted on background characteristics of the officer, attitudes toward work, and attitudes toward prisoners to determine the selection of bases of power that correctional officers use to gain

compliance from inmates (Hepburn, 1985), gender differences between inmates that might influence the selection of these bases of power have been omitted.

Analysis of inmates suggest there are personality and behavioral characteristic gender differences (Pollock-Byrne, 1990). Additional research indicates possible differences in male and female patterns of thinking (Hoffman, 1977). The literature even suggests that the perceptions of male and female inmates are different when interpreting aggressive situations. Female inmates tend to score higher on empathy scales than male inmates, and may regard face-to-face insults more aggressively than male inmates would. Female inmates may also tend to shy away from physical aggression and face-to-face verbal aggression more than male inmates would (Frodi, et al., 1977, p. 654).

In light of these findings, a need exists to determine if gender differences influences the selection of bases of power that correctional officers use to gain compliance from them.

The significance of this study may yield several implications if correctional officers' choice of power base is determined by the gender of the inmate. With continuously rising prison populations, the timeliness of this study could help determine if additional training may be needed to educate correctional officers about the differences between male and female inmates, and which bases

of power effectively produce compliance and which produce disciplinary problems. Possible screening procedures could be implemented to detect ineffective power base orientations of prospective correctional officers who will be working with either female or male populations.

Purpose

This study extends Hepburn's (1985) study on power base selections that correctional officers use to gain compliance from inmates. Hepburn examined three factors that may influence correctional officers selection of bases of power. These included background characteristics of the officer, attitudes toward work, and attitudes toward inmates. This study assesses if the gender of the inmate has any influence on the selection of bases of power that correctional officers use to gain compliance from inmates.

Hypothesis

The selection of bases of power used by correctional officers to gain compliance from inmates is compared between a male and a female institution. Specifically, differences are expected to be found in the selection of bases of power of correctional officers based on the gender of the inmate.

Conceptual Definitions

Conceptual definitions used throughout the study are enumerated below.

1. Correctional officer: A prison guard whose primary duties involve custody, security, and discipline (Poole

and Regoli, 1981, p. 252).

2. Bases of Power: These shall include French and Raven's (1959) five original bases of power: legitimate, coercive, reward, expert, and referent. Each will be defined as used in Hepburn's (1985, pp. 250-253) study.

   A. Legitimate power: Correctional officers have formal authority because of the structural position they occupy. That is, the correctional officer has the right to use power over inmates because of the structural relationship between the position of the correctional officer and the inmate.

   B. Coercive power: Correctional officers have this power based on the inmates perception that correctional officers have the ability to punish disobedience. Along with this perception is the use of coercive compliance such as physical violence, segregation, and intimidation to achieve goals.

   C. Reward power: Correctional officers have influence over inmates when prisoners believe correctional officers have the ability to issue rewards. Tactics may include recommendations for parole based on good-time, and assignments of work duties to specific areas.

   D. Expert power: Compliance may be obtained if prisoners perceive correctional officers have some

special skill, knowledge, or expertise. Examples would include therapeutic decisions concerning inmates.

E. Referent power: Correctional officers have power over inmates to the extent inmates respect and admire the correctional officer. Examples of this are when inmates perceive correctional officers to be fair and evenhanded and who display a degree of respect to inmates.

3. Inmate: Any person who is incarcerated in an institution usually having been convicted of a felony (Clear and Cole, 1994, p. 240).

4. Gender: male or female inmates

Underlying Theory

French and Raven's (1959) bases of power stem from their theory of social influence and power. According to the theory, social power may be defined as "potential influence" (Raven, 1992, p. 4). This influence may be seen as producing changes in a person's cognition, attitudes, or behavior, and which originates from another person or group (Raven, 1971, p. 173).

Five bases of power, as outlined in the previous section, may be used to produce these influences. These bases of power include: (1) legitimate power, based on a perception by a person that a social agent has a legitimate right to mediate behavior for him; (2) coercive power, based

on a person's perception that a social agent has the ability to dispense punishments; (3) reward power, which is based on a person's perception that a social agent has the ability to dispense rewards for him; (4) expert power, which is based on the perception that a social agent has special expertise or knowledge; and (5) referent power, which is based on a person's identification with a social agent (French and Raven, 1959, pp. 156-163). A sixth base of power, informational power, was added later in subsequent papers (Raven, 1971, p. 173).

Informational power, or persuasion, is based on the information that the influencing agent presents to the target in order to implement change (Raven, 1992, p. 9). Cognitive change is the critical factor. The target understands why he is behaving or believing different, and this reason is related to the nature of the act or belief rather than to the agent (Raven, 1971, p.173; 1976, p. 207).

Since informational power produces changes in the target independent from the agent, this power base has not been included in this study. Only the five original bases of power have been included to measure power base selections of correctional officers.

The bases of power that will be used to influence or to gain compliance are considered to fall within two dimensions: (a) social dependence on the agent, and (b) the importance of surveillance of the influencing agent (Raven,

1992, p. 5). Two bases of power, reward and coercive, are seen as being socially dependent on the agent and surveillance is important for its effectiveness (Raven, 1976, p. 208). Expert, referent, and legitimate power are socially dependent, and surveillance is unimportant for its effectiveness (Raven, 1976, p. 212). Informational power is seen as being socially independent and surveillance is unimportant (Raven, 1992, p. 6).

Additional changes and developments to French and Raven's original bases of power have extended the model. Initially seen as existing independent of one another, now the bases are thought to have interaction between themselves and exist in differing combinations and configurations. Furthermore, one base may be more dominant in one situation while another base of power is more dominant in a different situation (Raven, 1971, p. 180; 1976, p. 223).

Raven (1992, pp. 15-16) further elaborated and differentiated the bases of power. Coercive power and reward power have been extended beyond rewards and physical threats. Personal approval from someone we like and rejection or disapproval from someone we like can serve as a basis for reward and coercive power, respectfully. Legitimate power has been extended beyond one's formal position to recognize other subtle forms of power which draw on social norms. These may include reciprocity, equity, and responsibility norms. Expert power and referent power were

originally examined only in positive forms; this base has now been extended to incorporate negative forms of compliance. Targets may do the opposite of what the agent desires them to do.

Further developments include a power/interaction model to examine the motivation of the agent in exerting influence. Raven (1992, pp. 13-14) felt agents assess available power bases, assess the costs of the attempted influence, and assess the effects of influence. Applications of this model have also been extended to the perspective of the target of influence.

Overview of Thesis

The thesis topic has been introduced in this chapter. The need and purpose for this study have also been discussed. Additionally, the hypothesis was broadly stated and key terms were conceptually defined. Theoretical considerations were examined and discussed.

The focus of chapter two will be a review of prior research findings pertaining to the selection of bases of power by correctional officers, and research findings of personality differences between male and female inmates. The methodology of the study is presented in chapter three where the testable hypothesis is stated, the sample and settings are described, and measures employed to collect data and to analyze the data are discussed.

Chapter II: Review of the Literature

As previously noted, little research has been conducted on the selection of bases of power that correctional officers use to gain compliance from inmates. The focus of this chapter will be to present: (a) a summary of the findings of a study conducted to determine power base orientations of correctional officers, (b) indicate strengths and weaknesses of the study, and (c) provide a general review of selected studies that directly relate to personality differences between male and female prison inmates.

Selection of Bases of Power by Correctional Officers

While recent studies have assessed power base selections in various settings such as hospital infection control (see Raven, Freeman, & Haley, 1982), cross-cultural comparisons (see Schmidt & Raven, 1985), and assessing the power of political figures (see Gold and Raven, 1992), Hepburn's (1985) study was one of the first that empirically assessed the selection of bases of power in correctional settings.

Hepburn (1985) distributed self-administered questionnaires to correctional officers in five prisons which housed male felons to assess power base orientations. Power base selections were ranked one through five according to their importance.

Hepburn (1985) examined three factors that were thought to influence these power base selections: background characteristics of the officers, which he based on Lombardo's (1981), Crouch's (1980), and Irwin's (1980) research; attitudes toward work, which he based on Kanter's (1977), Jacob's (1977), Poole and Regoli's (1980a) and Lombardo's (1981) research; and attitudes toward prisoners, which he based on Cartwright's (1965), Poole and Regoli's (1980b), and Crouch and Alpert's (1982) research.

Background characteristics consisted of length of experience as a correctional officer, the level of formal education, and the level of formal contact. Attitudes toward work were measured by a role strain scale, job satisfaction scale, and an institutional control scale. Attitudes toward prisoners were measured using a social distance scale and custody and punishment orientation scales.

Findings indicated that the greater the length of experience a correctional officer has, the greater the importance was given to the selection of expert power and the lower the importance was given to the selection of coercive and legitimate powers. No support was offered for the level of contact with inmates and the ranking of power. The level of education appeared to only have an effect on the importance given to the selection of expert power (Hepburn, 1985, p. 261).

Hepburn (1985, pp. 261-262) also reported that attitudes toward work did not appear to be associated with power base rankings; while attitudes toward inmates did appear to have a significant effect on the importance of selecting referent and coercive power rankings. The greater the custody orientation, the lower the importance of selecting referent power was found, and a greater level of importance was found on selecting coercive power. A greater punitive orientation indicated a greater importance of selecting coercive power; while a greater social distance orientation indicated a lower importance of selecting referent power.

Reported findings indicated that legitimate and expert power are thought to be the most important reasons to correctional officers why inmates comply. Referent power was ranked third, followed by coercive and reward power (Hepburn, 1985, p. 261) The major conclusions drawn were that the bases of power were uniformly ranked across prisons. Some variance was indicated and thought to be due to one "outlier" for each base of referent, coercive, and legitimate powers (Hepburn, 1985, p. 257).

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Study

Hepburn's methodology that assessed power base orientations has inherent weaknesses and strengths. The use of single-item ranking scales are, at best, problematic and produce ipsative measures that are not independent of each

other. Ipsative measurements do not show intercorrelations between variables (Guilford, 1954, p. 528). The power bases are thought to exist in interaction with each other (Raven, 1971, p. 180) and when single-item ranking scores are used they give prominance to one power base at the expense of another. Likert or other interval level categories would allow measures of interaction (Podsakoff and Schreisheim, 1985, p. 406; Schriesheim et al., 1991, p. 107). Additionally, in relation to this study, Hepburn did not address if the gender of the officer influenced the selection of bases of power.

A strength of Hepburn's (1985) study was that the scales yielded moderate to high alpha reliability coefficients. The role strain scale and institutional control scale both had alpha reliability coefficients of .80. The custody orientation and social distance scale both yielded alpha reliability coefficents of .63. The punishment orientation scale produced an alpha reliability coefficient of .67, while the job satisfaction scale produced an alpha reliability coefficient of .76. However, no reliability coefficients were given for the items to assess power base orientations.

While Hepburn's methodology did not measure the interaction between bases of power, the scales used to determine what influenced these selections yielded moderate to high alpha reliability coefficients.

Personality Differences Between Male and Female Inmates

Since the work behavior of the correctional officer is in large part determined by the inmate (Poole and Regoli, 1981, p. 255), it is most appropriate to review studies that have found personality differences between male and female inmates. These differences may influence the work behavior of the correctional officer with regard to power base selections. While these studies have been conducted to assess personality differences between male and female inmates, it should be noted that they do not assess if these differences influence power base selections of correctional officers.

Significant differences have been found between male and female inmates on diagnostic scales using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). Females were found to be more deviant on the Si (introversion) scale than males (Joesting et.al, 1975, p. 471; Panton, 1974, p. 334). This suggests that female inmates are more inclined to withdraw from social intercourse and experience feelings of being less confident than males in their ability to cope with socioeconomic demands of society (Panton, 1974, pp. 334-335). Female inmates were also higher on the Ap (prison adjustment) scale (Joesting et al., 1975, p. 473). This sub-scale indicates hostile acting out responses to custodial stress and confinement marked by deliberate violations of prison rules (Panton, 1975, p. 34). Joesting

et al. (1975, p. 473) also reported that females were significantly higher on the K validity scale which measures defensiveness against personality weaknesses (Panton, 1975, pp. 4-5).

Joesting et al. (1975, p. 473) reported that males had higher scores on Dc (defect of inhibition control) and Pd (psychopathic) sub-scales than females. Panton (1975, p. 47) stated that higher scores on the Dc scale denote impulsivity with behavior likely to be aggressive and poorly directed. High scores on the Pd scale (Panton, 1975, pp. 11-13) indicate that male inmates tend to be more resistant to authority, indifferent to the sufferings of others, and likely to ignore social mores more than female inmates. Male inmates also scored higher than females on the D (depression) scale. Higher scores suggest that male inmates are more pessimistic and are more inclined toward irritability and emotional immaturity (Panton, 1974, p. 337).

Joesting et al. (1975) and Panton (1974) reported different findings between male and female inmates on some of the MMPI scales. Discrepancies exist on the Pd (psychopathic deviant) and Pa (paranoia) scales. Joesting et al. (1975, p. 473) reported that male scores were significantly higher than females on the Pd scale, while Panton (1974, p.336) reported that mean scores appeared equal on the surface. However, upon closer examination of

responses, males answered items denoting authority conflict, which is characterized by resentment of social demands and conventions, more frequently than females did (Joesting et. al., 1975, p. 472; Panton, 1974, p. 336). Female inmates responded more frequently with items that imply feelings of isolation and a lack of gratification in social relationships (Panton, 1974, p. 336).

On the Pa scale, Joesting et al. (1975, p. 473) reported that male inmates scores were significantly higher than females, while Panton (1974, p. 335) reported that female inmates had higher mean scores than male inmates did. A higher score implies a greater sensitivity of feeling, a tendency to be overly subjective, and feeling different and not easily understood by others.

Although there are some differences between findings on some of the scales on both studies, the general overall findings seem to suggest there are personality differences between male and female inmates. Most of the scales yielded similar results. For those that didn't, differences may be accounted for because some inmates had partial MMPI protocals resulting from inconsistencies in administration (Joesting et al., 1975, p. 471).

Summary

The literature review focused on two aspects important for the study: (a) a study done that assessed power base selections by correctional officers, and (b) studies that

showed personality differences between male and female inmates.

Hepburn's (1985) study provides the only empirical research that assessed power base selections in correctional settings. Findings suggested that the background characteristics of correctional officers seem to influence some selections of bases of power. Attitudes toward inmates did appear to have a significant effect on selecting power base orientations. Attitudes toward work did not appear to be associated with any power base orientations. The major conclusions drawn were that bases of power were uniformly ranked across prisons.

Problems associated with Hepburn's methodology included his use of a ranking system that assessed power base orientations, and no reliability coefficients were given for items that assessed these orientations. However, the other scales used in his study yielded moderate to high alpha reliability coefficients.

Studies have been conducted on male and female inmates to assess personality differences. MMPI scores demonstrated that significant differences between male and female inmates on some scales were found. Some discrepancies were found on two scales between the two studies, but this may be a result of partial MMPI protocols resulting in inconsistencies of administration.

Discussion

Hepburn's study found significant differences on the selection of bases of power based on attitudes toward inmates. His anova results suggest that the higher the custody orientation of correctional officers, the less importance they will place on referent power and the more importance will be placed on coercive power. These attitudes appear to be contingent upon custody/punishment orientations and social distance orientations held by the correctional officer. Perhaps additional variables also influence the selection of bases of power. As studies have shown personality differences between male and female inmates, perhaps the selection of power base orientations are contingent upon these differences, and these differences may help to influence attitudes that correctional officers have toward inmates.

Chapter III: Research Methodology

Differences between the selection of bases of power that correctional officers use to gain compliance from female and male inmates were examined.

Sample and Setting

The research population consisted of correctional officers employed at Trumbull Correctional Institution and The Ohio Reformatory for Women. Permission to gain access was granted through the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections Human Subjects Review Committee.

The sample obtained from Trumbull Correctional Institution consisted of fifty-five correctional officers; while the sample from The Ohio Reformatory for Women consisted of fifty-nine correctional officers. A retest sample from Trumbull consisted of thirty-five correctional officers.

Trumbull Correctional Institution is a close-security level facility which houses male offenders. Although classified as a close-security institution, all custody levels are housed there. Trumbull Correctional Institution is located in Leavittsburg, Ohio.

The Ohio Reformatory for Women is classified as a medium security level institution. All custody levels are housed there as well. The institution is located in Marysville, Ohio.

To ensure comparability, the settings were chosen because of their similar custody levels of inmates, and their geographic proximity to each other.

Design and Procedures

Survey research was the methodology that was used in this study. Data collection began at Trumbull Correctional Institution on April 29, 1994 and May 6, 1994 for The Ohio Reformatory for Women. A retest was given at Trumbull and additional data were collected on May 13, 1994. Self-administered questionnaires were distributed during the beginning of roll call during all shifts to correctional officers present. The questionnaires were completed and returned before the start of each shift. This procedure was chosen because of its high response and return rate, and to ensure that sampling bias would not occur.

The principal investigator was present during the administration of the questionnaires to answer any questions or concerns respondents might have had. It was explained that participation in the study was voluntary; respondents would remain anonymous; and the data collected were confidential and would be coded by the principal investigator. It was further explained that the findings would be sent to the institutions for correctional officers to review. An informed consent form was attached to the outside of the questionnaires that explained these procedures and where to locate the principal investigator

should additional concerns or needs arise (refer to appendix A). Correctional officers were then instructed to remove the informed consent form from the questionnaire and to retain it for the above mentioned purposes.

Some problems were encountered during data collection and should be noted. There was some confusion over the issuing of the gate passes at one of the institutions. A gate pass to enter the institution for the third shift roll call was not found. The correctional officer on duty tried to get clearance from the immediate supervisor but clearance was denied until the pass was located at another department within the institution. Additional problems encountered were the reluctance of some correctional officers to answer the questionnaires. Many reluctantly completed the questionnaires voicing their suspicions about the real purpose of the survey. Many felt it was just another psychological examination given by the administration to test the competency of officers. Final problems encountered were that some of the answers on the questionnaires were incomplete and the instructions were not followed on some sections of some questionnaires.

Instrumentation

The written questionnaire was developed to measure the power base orientations of correctional officers. Items 9-13 directly assessed correctional officers' power base orientations. These items measured legitimate authority,

referent, reward expert, and coercive power bases respectively. Items 14-18 measured correctional officers' perceptions of why they think inmates comply. These items assessed if the gender of the inmate influenced the selection of certain power bases that officers used to gain compliance from them. These items measured inmate referent, inmate reward, inmate coercive, inmate legitimate authority, and inmate expert power, respectively. Items 21-25 were also reflective of power base orientations. Only those officers who have worked at both male and female institutions answered these items. These items asked respondents to indicate if they perceived differences between male and female inmates with regard to responding differently when officers used different bases of power to gain compliance.

All of the items followed the Likert scaling format. This scaling format allowed respondents to indicate their degree of agreement with the item, and assessed if the bases of power are independent of one another or if they are inter-related. French and Raven's bases of power, taken from their theory of social power, are thought to have interaction between themselves and exist in differing combinations (Raven, 1971, p. 180; 1976, p. 223). Ranking responses would not show if inter-correlations exist between variables (Guilford, 1954, p. 528). This scaling technique asked respondents to indicate their answers by selecting

strongly agree, agree, uncertain, disagree, and strongly disagree. The scoring ranged from 1-5 with the items counter balanced to avoid response bias.

Demographic and other background information was elicited from subjects such as their age, sex, and educational level. Questions also asked if respondents had worked at other institutions besides the one they are employed at now, their length of employment, and the degree of formal contact they had with inmates. The responses for age, how long they worked for the Ohio Department of Corrections, how long they worked for The Ohio Reformatory for Women/Trumbull, and the time spent in direct routine contact with inmates, were categorized in ranges which ensured anonymity and arranged the data in group form.

One part of the survey asked respondents to indicate which topics should be given more or less emphasis in training. This list included items such as disciplinary procedures, report writing, classification, and differences between male and female inmates. The responses were categorized more, less, or the same. This list was taken from subsequent research that was conducted on correctional officers' attitudes by Hepburn. The principal investigator contacted Hepburn during the proposal stages of this study and received a questionnaire which was developed by Hepburn for research that was conducted subsequent to the 1985 study. This section was taken from that study with

exception to the item asking respondents if differences between male and female inmates should receive more, less, or the same amount of training they had received.

The last part of the survey, also taken from Hepburn's subsequent research on correctional officers' attitudes, asked respondents to indicate the value of the in-service training they received. Categories ranged from very valuable to not valuable at all.

Alpha reliability coefficients for the items were determined by a test-retest of the questionnaire over a two week period. However, the results of these coefficients have not been included in this study. Many respondents purposely answered demographic and other items differently from the first test. When administering the re-test, many correctional officers asked why they had to answer the same questionnaire again. It was explained that the re-test was to assess if responses matched the first test. During administration of the re-test, correctional officers joked among themselves about certain demographic questions, namely sex. Upon completion of the questionnaires, one respondent indicated a question mark when asked if he/she was female or male. Since the reliability of an instrument is established with repeated re-tests, it was determined that presenting the alpha reliability coefficients of this re-test would not adequately establish the instruments reliability. Additionally, misrepresentations of demographic and other

item responses suggests that the reliability of the instrument cannot be established, and this reliability is contingent upon the truthfulness of the responses of the correctional officers.

There is a limitation to the questionnaire regarding the validity of items measuring power base orientations. Due to the exploratory nature of this study, items were developed similar to Hepburn's (1985) items to compare findings. Hepburn's items were not chosen because of the nature of the statements. The statements reflected which bases of power correctional officers could use; while the developed items assessed which power bases are being used. Also, a pilot study could not be done due to the nature of the population that was measured. Thus, factor analysis was not done to determine if the items reflect social power constructs.

There is another limitation to the questionnaire with regard to item eight which asked respondents how much time they spend in direct routine contact with inmates. Most of the correctional officers rotate duties with the exception of officers who are assigned to special duty. These latter officers remain in their duties (e.g., visitation, mail, transportation), and do not rotate duties as do the former correctional officers. When completing the questionnaires, the former correctional officers asked which range they should respond to because at various times they may spend

more or less time in direct routine contact with inmates. It was explained to mark the range that corresponded with the degree of contact they would encounter with their assignment that day.

Testable Hypothesis

The null and research hypothesis are shown below.

H (0) There is no significant difference between correctional officers selection of bases of power based on the gender of the inmate.

H (R) There is a significant difference between correctional officers selection of bases of power based on the gender of the inmate.

Analysis

Survey responses were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, (SPSS). Subjects occasionally failed to respond to specific questions correctly, or they failed to respond to certain items at all. These incorrect responses and missing data were excluded from analysis. This included items 19-23. Respondents who did not answer item six, but also answered items 19-23 were excluded from the analysis. Coding instructions that were used to enter data are included in appendix c.

A series of t-tests were used to assess differences between the two sample means. Each power base item from sample one (Trumbull) was compared to its corresponding

power base item in sample two (Marysville). The means of each power base items were not assessed against each other within each group or between groups, thus eliminating the need to run an analysis of variance.

Finally, assumptions required for parametric analysis and statistical inference were assumed to have been met (Levin and fox, 1991, p. 225-226). These include:

1. A comparison between two means. The means of each power base items from both samples were compared with each other.

2. Interval data. Likert scaling is considered interval level categories (Podsakoff & schreisheim, 1985, p. 406).

3. Random sampling. Sampling procedures drew subjects performing similar duties from both samples.

4. A normal distribution. The t ratio for small samples requires that the sample characteristic measured be normally distributed in the underlying population. The t ratio for larger samples is not much affected by failure to meet this assumption.

Finally, two-tailed tests of significance were employed for this study.

Summary

The focus of chapter three was to address issues pertaining to the research methodology and its limitations. Topics discussed included: subjects, settings, research

design and procedures, instrumentation, hypothesis, and appropriate statistical tests. The methodology that will be used will determine power base orientations, if interactions exist between them, and if gender differences of inmates influence these selections.

Chapter 1V: Research Findings

Results of the study found no significant differences between the two sample means with respect to the selection of bases of power by correctional officers based on the gender of the inmate.

Hypothesized Findings

The t-test was used to measure significant differences of the research hypothesis. The alpha level was set at .05 ($p < .05$) with a two-tailed test of significance.

H (o) There is no significant difference between correctional officers' selection of bases of power based on the gender of the inmate.

H (r) There is a significant difference between correctional officers' selection of bases of power based on the gender of the inmate.

Findings relevant to this hypothesis are presented in tables 1-10. No significant differences were found between the two samples regarding power base selections of the officers or their perceptions of why inmates comply. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Table 1
Comparison of Correctional Officers' selection of legitimate authority power base

	Trumbull			Marysville				
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	T	P*
Leg. Authority	2.31	1.10	55	2.48	1.10	59	-.81	NS**

* two-tailed p < .05
** NS=not significant

Table 2
Comparison of Correctional Officer's selection of referent power base

	Trumbull			Marysville				
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	T	P*
Ref.	3.15	1.15	55	3.07	1.19	59	.35	NS**

* two-tailed p < .05
** NS=not significant

Table 3
Comparison of Correctional Officer's selection of reward power base

	Trumbull			Marysville				
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	T	P*
reward	3.95	1.28	55	3.98	1.27	59	-.16	NS**

* two-tailed p < .05
** NS= not significant

Table 4
Comparison of Correctional Officers' selection of expert power base

	Trumbull			Marysville				
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	T	P*
expert	2.8	1.11	55	3.19	1.06	59	-1.90	NS**

* two-tailed p < .05
** NS=not significant

Table 5
Comparison of Correctional Officers' selection of coercive power base

	Trumbull			Marysville				
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	T	P*
coer.	1.89	1.18	55	1.53	.94	59	1.84	NS**

* two-tailed p < .05
** NS=not significant

Table 6
Comparison of Correctional Officers'perceptions of inmate referent power base

	Trumbull			Marysville				
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	T	P*
Inmate Ref.	1.96	.86	55	1.66	.78	59	1.97	NS**

* two-tailed p < .05
** NS=not significant

Table 7
Comparison of Correctional Officers' perception of inmate reward power base

	Trumbull			Marysville				
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	T	P*
Inmate reward	1.69	.79	55	1.56	1.01	59	.77	NS**

* two-tailed p < .05
**NS=not significant

Table 8
Comparison of Correctional Officers' perception of inmate coercive power base

	Trumbull			Marysville				
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	T	P*
Inmate coercive	2.93	1.10	55	2.83	1.16	59	.46	NS**

* two-tailed p < .05
** NS=not significant

Table 9
Comparison of Correctional Officers' perception of inmate legitimate authority power base

	Trumbull			Marysville				
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	T	P*
Inmate legitimate authority	2.65	1.09	55	2.48	1.05	59	.85	NS**

* two-tailed $p < .05$
** NS=not significant

Table 10
Comparison of Correctional Officers' perception of inmate expert power base

	Trumbull			Marysville				
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	T	P*
Inmate expert	2.04	1.03	55	2.07	.94	59	-.17	NS**

* two-tailed $p < .05$
** NS=not significant

Additional Findings

A distribution of all correctional officers' ratings of bases of power by frequencies and percentages is presented in table 11. A similar distribution of all correctional officers' ratings of their perceptions of inmate compliance is found in table 12.

Table 11
Distribution of all correctional officers' ratings of bases of power by frequencies and percentages

	Expert		Coercive		Reward		Leg. Aut.		Ref.	
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
SD	10	(8.8)	63	(55.3)	8	(7.0)	21	(18.4)	10	(8.8)
D	34	(29.8)	9	(34.2)	13	(11.4)	56	(49.1)	33	(28.9)
U	20	(17.5)	2	(1.8)	6	(5.3)	5	(4.4)	14	(12.3)
A	46	(40.4)	3	(2.6)	35	(30.7)	29	(25.4)	49	(43.0)
SA	4	(3.5)	7	(6.1)	52	(45.6)	1	(.9)	8	(7.0)
missing							2	(1.8)		

SD=strongly disagree
D=disagree
U=uncertain
A=agree
SA=strongly agree

Table 12
Distribution of all correctional officers' ratings of their perceptions of inmate compliance by frequencies and percentages

	Inmate reward		Inmate coercive		Inmate leg.aut.		Inmate expert		Inmate ref.	
	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P	F	P
SD	62	(54.4)	6	(5.3)	11	(9.6)	31	(27.2)	42	(36.8)
D	43	(37.7)	53	(46.5)	61	(53.5)	61	(53.5)	60	(52.6)
U	3	(2.6)	13	(11.4)	12	(10.5)	9	(7.9)	6	(5.3)
A	2	(1.8)	33	(28.9)	24	(21.1)	8	(7.0)	4	(3.5)
SA	4	(3.5)	9	(7.9)	1	(.9)	1	(.9)	2	(1.8)
Missing					1	(.9)	1	(.9)		

SD=strongly disagree
D=disagree
U=uncertain
A=agree
SA=strongly agree

A distribution of ratings of bases of power by percentages of collapsed strongly agree and agree is found in table 13. Additionally, a distribution of ratings of

bases of power by percentages of collapsed strongly disagree and disagree is found in table 14.

When the categories are collapsed, reward power had the highest percentage of responses answering that they strongly agree and agree with the statement. Referent power was second, with expert power third and coercive and legitimate authority fourth and fifth, respectively. When the strongly disagree and disagree categories were collapsed, coercive power had the highest percentage of respondents answering this category followed by legitimate authority, expert power, referent power, and reward power.

Table 13
Distribution of ratings of bases of power by percentages of collapsed strongly agree and agree

	P
Reward	76.3
Referent	50.0
Expert	43.9
Coercive	8.7
Legitimate	.9
Missing	1.8

Table 14
Distribution of rating of bases of power by percentages of collapsed strongly disagree and disagree

	P
Coercive	89.5
Legitimate	67.5
Expert	38.6
Referent	37.7
Reward	18.4

A comparison to Hepburn's (1985) findings is difficult due to the differences in response categories. While this study used likert response categories, Hepburn used ranking categories. When comparing the collapsed "strongly agree and agree" categories with Hepburn's, differences in the selection of power bases of correctional officers are found. Findings of Hepburn's study ranked legitimate authority as the number one power base used by correctional officers, followed by expert and referent power. Reward and coercive powers were tied at the fourth and fifth rankings.

Cross-tabulations were run to measure the relationship between the gender of correctional officers and the

selections of bases of power. These distributions may be found in tables 15-17. Although not formulated into a hypothesis, it is important to determine if this variable could contaminate the findings. Although no significant differences were found between correctional officers' selection of bases of power based on the gender of the inmate, some significant differences were found based on the gender of the correctional officer. It should be noted that the response categories were collapsed to ensure that at least five responses would fall within each cell. Strongly agree and agree were collapsed to form agree. Strongly disagree and disagree were collapsed to form disagree. The category of uncertain remained unchanged. With the collapsed categories, the tabulations formed a two by three table, thus necessitating the statistic Cramer's V to assess the degree of association between the gender of the correctional officer and the power base.

No significant relationships were found between any selection of power bases by male correctional officers at either Trumbull or Marysville. There were found significant relationships between some of the power base selections of female correctional officers at Trumbull and Marysville. A significant moderate relationship was found between females and the selection of legitimate authority ($V = .34$, $p < .05$). A significant moderate relationship was also found between females and inmate referent power base ($V = .35$, $p < .05$).

Additionally, a significant moderate relationship was found between females and inmate legitimate power base (V= .33, $p < .05$).

Table 15
Cross-tabulations of female correctional officers by site and legitimate authority by column percents

Legitmate authority	Trumbull	Marysville
Agree	83.3	64.3
Uncertain	8.3	.0
Disagree	8.3	35.7

* Cramer's V=.34
** p < .05

Table 16
Cross-tabulation of female correctional officers by site and inmate referent by column percents

Inmate referent	Trumbull	Marysville
Agree	76.9	93.0
Uncertain	.0	4.7
Disagree	23.1	2.3

*Cramer's V=.35
** p < .05

Table 17
Cross-tabulation of female correctional officers by site and inmate legitimate by column percents

Inmate legitimate	Trumbull	Marysville
Agree	61.5	76.2
Uncertain	23.1	2.4
Disagree	15.4	21.4

*Cramer's V=.33
** p < .05

To assess if the power bases were independent of each other or inter-related, correlation matrixes were constructed and are presented in tables 18-20. Correlation coefficients taken of the power bases did find some significant relationships between the power bases.

Legitimate authority and referent power bases showed a weak significant relationship (.26, $p < .01$). Legitimate authority and expert power bases showed a moderate significant relationship (.33, $p < .01$). Referent power base and inmate referent power base showed a weak significant relationship (-.24, $p < .05$). Reward power base and inmate referent power base showed a weak significant relationship (-.26, $p < .01$), while reward power and inmate expert power base showed a weak significant relationship (-.21, $p < .05$). Coercive and inmate reward power bases showed a weak significant relationship (.27, $p < .01$). Inmate referent and inmate reward showed a moderate significant relationship (.43, $p < .01$), while inmate referent and inmate expert showed a moderate significant relationship (.31, $p < .01$). Inmate reward and inmate expert showed a weak significant relationship (.21, $p < .05$), while inmate expert and inmate legitimate showed a moderate significant relationship (.30, $p < .01$).

Table 18
Correlation Matrix of Correctional Officers' Power bases

Correlation Coefficients

	Leg.	Ref.	Reward	Expert	Coer.
Legitimate	1.00	.27**	.03	.33**	-.03
Referent	.27**	1.00	.13	.12	.03
Reward	.03	.13	1.00	.08	.06
Expert	.33**	.12	.08	1.00	-.04
Coercive	-.03	.03	.06	-.04	1.00

** significant at p < .01, two-tailed

Table 19
Correlation Matrix of Correctional Officers' Power Bases and Their Perceptions of Inmate Compliance

Correlation Coefficients

	Inmate Leg.	Inmate Ref.	Inmate Reward	Inmate Expert	Inmate Coer.
Legitimate	.03	-.08	-.06	.02	.02
Referent	-.18	-.24*	-.05	-.18	-.03
Reward	-.02	-.26**	-.06	-.21*	-.02
Expert	-.12	-.18	.04	-.12	-.07
Coercive	.03	.04	.27**	.03	-.01

* significant at p < .05, two-tailed
** significant at p < .01, two-tailed

Table 20
Correlation Matrix Of Correctional Officers' Perceptions of Inmate Compliance

Correlation Coefficients

	Inmate Ref.	Inmate Reward	Inmate Coer.	Inmate Leg.	Inmate Expert
Inmate Ref.	1.00	.43**	.18	.07	.31**
Inmate Reward	.43**	1.00	.01	.12	.21*
Inmate Coer.	.18	.01	1.00	-.00	.09
Inmate Leg.	.07	.12	-.00	1.00	.30**
Inmate Expert	.31**	.21*	.09	.30**	1.00

* significant at p < .05, two-tailed
** significant at p < .01, two-tailed

Some interesting demographic differences emerged from the two samples. These differences are illustrated in tables 21-26. The highest percentage of ages of respondents from Trumbull fell in the 26-31 response category (29%). The highest percentage of ages of respondents from Marysville fell in the 38-43 response category (22%). When asked the sex of the respondent, (74.5%) of the respondents at Trumbull were male. The highest percentage of respondents at Marysville were female (72.9%). The highest degree earned at Trumbull was the response category "some college but no degree" 36.4%, while the highest response rate at Marysville was "high school diploma" (39.0%). The highest percentage of length of time worked for the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections for Trumbull was the response category "2-5 years" (52.7%). The highest percentage at Marysville was "0-1 year" (35.6%). When asked if respondents were interested in transferring to another institution, 54.5% at Trumbull responded yes. The respondents at Marysville replied no (59.3%). When asked how much time spent in direct routine contact with inmates, respondents at both institutions chose the "seven or more" category.

Additional findings of correctional officers indicating which areas of training should receive more, same or less emphasis in are found in appendix d. Attitudes toward the

value of the in-service training are found in appendix e.

Table 21
Distribution of age differences of correctional officers by site by frequencies and percentages

Age	Trumbull F	Trumbull P	Marysville F	Marysville P
20-25	9	(16.4)	4	(6.8)
26-31	16	(29.1)	11	(18.6)
32-37	10	(18.2)	9	(15.3)
44-49	4	(7.3)	13	(22.0)
50-55	4	(7.3)	8	(13.6)
Other	3	(5.5)	5	(8.5)

Table 22
Distribution of sex of correctional officers by site by frequencies and percentages

Sex	Trumbull F	Trumbull P	Marysville F	Marysville P
Male	41	(74.5)	16	(27.1)
Female	13	(23.6)	43	(72.9)
Missing	1	(1.8)		

Table 23
Distribution of highest degree of correctional officers by site by frequencies and percentages

Highest degree	Trumbull F	Trumbull P	Marysville F	Marysville P
Did not finish	2	(3.6)	1	(1.7)
H.S. diploma	11	(20.0)	23	(39.0
Some college	20	(36.4)	16	(27.1)
A.A. degree	7	(12.7)	5	(8.5)
Bachelors	7	(12.7)	3	(5.1)
Some Grad.	1	(1.8)	4	(6.8)
Masters	1	(1.8)	2	(3.4)
Other	1	(1.8)	2	(3.4)
Missing	5	(9.1)	3	(5.1)

Table 24
Distribution of length of time worked for ODRC of correctional officers by site by frequencies and percentages

Length of time	Trumbull F	Trumbull P	Marysville F	Marysville P
0-1 year	21	(38.2)	21	(35.6)
2-5 years	29	(52.7)	13	(22.0)
6-10 years	5	(9.1)	14	(23.7)
11-15 years	0	(0.0)	6	(10.2)
16-20 years	0	(0.0)	4	(6.8)
Other	0	(0.0)	1	(1.7)

Table 25
Distribution of correctional officers' interest in transferring to another institution by site by frequencies and percentages

Transfer	Trumbull F	Trumbull P	Marysville F	Marysville P
Yes	30	(54.5)	20	(33.9)
No	23	(41.8)	35	(59.3)
Missing	2	(3.6)	4	(6.8)

Table 26
Distribution of correctional officers' time spent in direct routine contact with inmates by site by frequencies and percentages

Time	Trumbull F	Trumbull P	Marysville F	Marysville P
Less than 1	9	(16.4)	1	(1.7)
1-2 hours	4	(7.3)	6	(10.2)
3-4 hours	7	(12.7)	3	(5.1)
5-6 hours	8	(14.5)	5	(8.5)
7 hours +	25	(45.5)	44	(74.6)
Missing	2	(3.6)	0	(0.0)

Summary

Findings of this study accepted the null hypothesis, thus indicating no significant differences between the selection of bases of power by correctional officers and the gender of the inmate. Additional findings did support moderate correlations for the gender of the correctional officer, namely female correctional officers, and the selection of bases of power. Differences were also found between samples on demographic and other items. Correlation coefficients found significant weak and moderate relationships between the bases of power. A summary of the study, a discussion and a recommendation section are presented in the next chapter.

Chapter V: Summary, Discussion, and Recommendations

The selection of power bases used by correctional officers to gain compliance from inmates has been the focus of much of this study. Specifically, it was believed that the gender of the inmate might influence these selections. The power base selections relevant to this study stem from French and Raven's (1959) theory of social influence and power.

French and Raven's social power theory includes five power bases which may be used to produce changes in a person's cognition, attitudes, or behavior. These include: reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, and expert power. A sixth power base was added later but not included in this study. Further additions include a power/interaction model to examine the motivation of the agent, and extensions of the power bases. These bases of power are also thought to fall within two dimensions: (a) social dependence, and (b) surveilance.

One study that was conducted to determine power base selections of correctional officers was Hepburn's (1985) study. While Hepburn assessed if background characteristics of the officer, attitudes toward work, and attitudes toward prisoners influenced the selection of bases of power, he did

not assess if the gender of the inmate might influence these selections. Hepburn's findings suggest that legitimate and expert power are the most important reasons to correctional officers why inmates comply. Referent power was third, followed by coercive and reward power.

To establish the need to assess if the gender of the inmate might influence the selection of power bases, personality differences that have been found between male and female inmates on diagnostic scales using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) have been included in this study. Significant differences were found on the Si, Ap, K, Dc, and Pd scales between male and female inmates. Some discrepancies were noted on the Pd and Pa scales. This study based its expectations about differences between the two institutions based on these findings.

Subjects of the study consisted of fifty-five correctional officers from Trumbull Correctional Institution and fifty-nine correctional officers from The Ohio Reformatory for Women (Marysville). Self-administered questionnaires were distributed during roll call at all shifts. The instrument was developed for this study, while borrowing certain sections from subsequent research Hepburn conducted.

Findings of the study did not find any significant differences between the two sample means with regard to

power base selections based on the gender of the inmate. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted. Additional findings indicate some significant associations between the gender of the officer and power base selections. Significant associations were found for female correctional officers at Trumbull and Marysville regarding the selection of legitimate authority (V=.34, p <. 05). A significant moderate relationship was also found with females and inmate referent power (V=.35, p < .05). Lastly, a significant moderate relationship was found between females and inmate legitimate (V=.35, p <. 05).

Additional findings of the study found significant correlations between the bases of power. These findings suggest some of the bases of power are inter-related. Legitimate authority and referent power bases showed a weak significant relationship (.26, p <. 01). Legitimate authority and expert found a moderate significant relationship between the two bases of power (.33, p <. 01). Inmate referent power and referent power showed a weak but significant correlation (-.24, p <. 05). Inmate legitimate authority and inmate expert power bases found a moderate significant relationship (.42, p < .01). Reward and inmate referent found a weak significant relationship (-.26, p < .01), while reward and inmate expert found a weak significant relationship (-.21, p < .05). Coercive power and inmate reward found a weak significant relationship

between the two bases of power (.27, $p < .01$). Inmate referent and inmate reward found a moderate significant relationship (.43, $p < .01$), while inmate referent and inmate expert found a moderate relationship between the two bases of power (.31, $p < .01$). Inmate reward and inmate expert found a weak significant relationship between the two bases of power (.21, $p < .05$), while inmate expert and inmate legitimate power bases found a moderate significant relationship between the two bases of power (.30, $p < .01$).

Differences were also found between the two samples on demographic and other items. Additional findings of correctional officers indicating which areas of training should receive more, the same, or less emphasis in are found in appendix d. Attitudes toward the value of the in-service training they received are found in appendix e.

Comparisons of findings of this study to Hepburn's is difficult due to the structure of response categories. When comparing collapsed categories of this study with Hepburn's, differences in the selection of power bases of correctional officers are found. Reward power had the highest percentage of respondents agreeing with the item followed by referent power, expert power, coercive power, and legitimate authority. Hepburn's study ranked legitimate authority as the number one power base selected by correctional officers followed by expert, referent, reward and coercive power bases.

Discussion

Discussion begins with an exploration of the hypothesized findings. Although gender differences between inmates have been shown to exist in previous studies, no significant differences were found between the two samples of this study with regard to power base selections of correctional officers based on the gender of the inmate. Additional findings suggest that significant differences exist between the gender of the correctional officer, namely female correctional officers, and the selection of bases of power.

A possible explanation to support the significant findings of the selection of bases of power by female correctional officers is the occupational socialization process females undergo while working within a prison structure. Findings of Crouch and Alpert's (1982) study suggest that male and female officers differ on measures of punitiveness and aggressiveness after approximately six months of being on the job. Male correctional officers seem to become more punitive, while female correctional officers become less punitive.

With additional findings of this study showing that more female correctional officers are working at The Ohio Reformatory for Women, perhaps the inmate culture of the prison reflects female correctional officers adaptation strategies that female correctional officers use to gain

compliance from inmates. Women prisons are generally viewed as a less serious threat to personal authority or to security than male prisons. This occupational socialization process within the prison may set the ground rules for daily officer-inmate interactions (Crouch and Alpert, 1982, p. 172). Perhaps this process explains why female correctional officers in this study rely more on legitimate authority to gain compliance from inmates than their male counterparts would. Additional studies (see Kinsell and Shelden, 1981) support the findings of this study with regard to female correctional officers selections of inmate referent and inmate authority power bases. Kinsell and Shelden reported that the female correctional officers believed that they get along better with inmates than male officers do, and the inmates are more appreciative of their work than they are of the other staff.

A second explanation to support the significant findings of the selection of bases of power by female correctional officers is ascribed characteristics of females. Differences in physical size and strength between male and female correctional officers may preclude female correctional officers to select orientations that gain compliance from inmates more effectively than would punitive or aggressive measures. Perhaps there also exists gender differences between correctional officers with regard to personality behavioral characteristics. Significant

differences may be found between male correctional officers and female correctional officers on diagnostic scales using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.

Additional findings do support French and Raven's social power theory that some of the bases of power are inter-related with correctional officers using more than one power base routinely. This suggests that correctional officers must adapt strategies to meet daily inter-actions between inmates. Different situations or encounters may require the use of more than one power base to gain compliance. Perhaps correctional officers assess the availability, the costs, and the effects of power bases used to produce influence as French and Raven have suggested.

Recommendations

To address problems with the reliability of this instrument, future recommendations would include developing additional items that reflect each power base. Once validity of the items to social power constructs have been established, one administration of the instrument could be done using a split-half method to establish reliability. This would eliminate untruthful responses that were found in the study.

Further research is recommended to assess if a relationship exists between the gender of the correctional officer and the selection of bases of power. Although some significant associations were found in this study, future

research in this area is recommended. The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory test could be administered to both male and female correctional officers. A subsequent instrument could be administered to assess the selection of bases of power based on these findings and determine if the gender of the correctional officer influences these selections.

Appendix A: The Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent Form

I freely agree to be a participant in the **CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS STUDY** knowing that I will be asked to fill out a questionnaire. I realize that I am under no obligation whatsoever to take part in this study either before, during, or after it takes place. The answers will be anonymous and will only be used in group form. I understand that there will be a debriefing after my participation and that the results of the study will be made available to me when completed, if I so desire. Feel free to contact me if any questions or concerns should arise.

Tamara S. Engle
Youngstown State University
Criminal Justice Department

Appendix B: The Survey Instruments

Survey of Correctional Officers at
The Ohio Reformatory for Women

Questionnaire for research conducted by
Tamara S. Engle at Youngstown State University

DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON ANY OF THESE PAGES

Part I. This first section asks questions to get some information about the persons participating in the study.

1. How old are you?
   ___ 20-25
   ___ 26-31
   ___ 32-37
   ___ 38-43
   ___ 44-49
   ___ 50-55
   ___ other

2. What is your sex?
   ___ male ___ female

3. What is the highest degree you have earned?
   ___ Did not finish high school
   ___ High school diploma or GED certificate
   ___ Some college but no degree
   ___ Associate of Arts degree
   ___ Bachelors degree
   ___ Some graduate work
   ___ Masters degree
   ___ Other

Now we want to ask some questions about your work with the Ohio Department of Corrections.

4. How long have you worked for the Ohio Department of Corrections?
   ___ 0-1 Year
   ___ 2-5 Years
   ___ 6-10 Years
   ___ 11-15 Years
   ___ 16-20 Years
   ___ Other

5. How long have you worked for Marysville?
   ___ 0-1 Year
   ___ 2-5 Years
   ___ 6-10 Years
   ___ 11-15 Years
   ___ 16-20 Years
   ___ Other

6. Besides Marysville, have you worked at any other institutions in Ohio? Please list all you have worked at. If you have not worked at any other institutions, please go to question 7.

---

7. Are you interested in leaving Marysville and transferring to another institution with in the Ohio Department of Corrections?

___yes ___no

8. On a typical day, about how much time do you spend in direct routine contact with inmates (supervising, talking with, counting, etc.)?

____ less than 1 hour
____ 1-2 hours
____ 3-4 hours
____ 5-6 hours
____ 7 hours or more

Part II. The following items call for your opinion. We are not interested in how you think others might feel; we want only your personal opinion. Please use the responses below to answer the following statements. Be sure to use the numbers and place them on the blank lines provided at the beginning of each statement.

1=STRONGLY DISAGREE
2=DISAGREE
3=UNCERTAIN
4=AGREE
5=STRONGLY AGREE

9. ____ I know that the authority granted to me as a correctional officer will make inmates cooperate with me.

10. ____ Because of the way I get along with inmates, I can get them to comply because they want to do what will get my respect and admiration.

11. ____ I will not give special help or benefits to inmates to get them to cooperate with me.

12. ____ The training I received has given me the competency and skills to know what is best for the inmates and I rely on this to get compliance from them.

13. ____ I apply pressure and threaten to punish inmates to gain compliance from them.

14. ____ Inmates will not cooperate with me because they do not admire or respect me.

15. ____ Inmates will only cooperate with me if they receive special priviledges.

16. ____ The inmates do not comply when they are threatened with punishments or disciplinary action.

17. ____ The only reason inmates listen to me is because they know they have to.

18. ____ The inmates do not respect my decision-making capabilities.

Part III. If you have worked at both a male and a female institution, please answer the following questions. If you have only worked at Marysville, please proceed to part IV. As before, please indicate the extent to which you agree with the statement.

1=STRONGLY DISAGREE
2=DISAGREE
3=UNCERTAIN
4=AGREE
5=STRONGLY AGREE

19. ____ Female inmates respond better than male inmates if you offer them priviledges and rewards to get them to cooperate with you.

20. ____ I have a better rapport with the female inmates than I did with the male inmates.

21. ____ Female inmates respect my authority better than the male inmates did.

22. ____ I have to use pressure and threats to gain cooperation more on female inmates than I did on male inmates.

23. ____ The female inmates respect my decision-making capabilities better than the male inmates did.

Part IV. Based on your experience indicate which of the following should be given more or less emphasis in training new officers at the academy so that their training would be more in line with actual job demands. Check whether each subject listed should receive more, the same, or less emphasis it now receives.

	More	Same	Less
Employee rules and regulation	___	___	___
Treatment programs	___	___	___
Inmate rights	___	___	___
Legal responsibilities of officers	___	___	___
Classification	___	___	___
Handling difficult inmates	___	___	___
Standards for use of force	___	___	___
Self defense	___	___	___
Interpersonal relations skills	___	___	___
Report writing	___	___	___
Disciplinary procedures	___	___	___
Employee benefits	___	___	___
Differences between male and female inmates	___	___	___

How valuable was the in-service training you received here?

---- very valuable
---- somewhat valuable
---- uncertain
---- not very valuable
---- not valuable at all

Thank you for completing this survey.

Survey of Correctional Officers at
Trumbull Correctional Institution

Questionnaire for research conducted by
Tamara S. Engle at Youngstown State University

DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ON ANY OF THESE PAGES

Part I. This first section asks questions to get some information about the persons participating in the study.

1. How old are you?
   ___ 20-25
   ___ 26-31
   ___ 32-37
   ___ 38-43
   ___ 44-49
   ___ 50-55
   ___ other

2. What is your sex?
   ___ male ___ female

3. What is the highest degree you have earned?
   ___ Did not finish high school
   ___ High school diploma or GED certificate
   ___ Some college but no degree
   ___ Associate of Arts degree
   ___ Bachelors degree
   ___ Some graduate work
   ___ Masters degree
   ___ Other

Now we want to ask some questions about your work with the Ohio Department of Corrections.

4. How long have you worked for the Ohio Department of Corrections?
   ___ 0-1 Year
   ___ 2-5 Years
   ___ 6-10 Years
   ___ 11-15 Years
   ___ 16-20 Years
   ___ Other

5. How long have you worked for Trumbull?

   ___ 0-1 Year
   ___ 2-5 Years
   ___ 6-10 Years
   ___ 11-15 Years
   ___ 16-20 Years
   ___ Other

6. Besides Trumbull Correctional Institution, have you worked at any other institutions in Ohio? Please list all you have worked at. If you have not worked at any other institutions,please go to question 7.

---

7. Are you interested in leaving Trumbull and transferring to another institution with in the Ohio Department of Corrections?

___yes ___no

8. On a typical day, about how much time do you spend in direct routine contact with inmates (supervising, talking with, counting, etc.)?

____ less than 1 hour
____ 1-2 hours
____ 3-4 hours
____ 5-6 hours
____ 7 hours or more

Part II. The following items call for your opinion. We are not interested in how you think others might feel; we want only your personal opinion. Please use the responses below to answer the following statements. Be sure to use the numbers and place them on the blank lines provided at the beginning of each statement.

1=STRONGLY DISAGREE
2=DISAGREE
3=UNCERTAIN
4=AGREE
5=STRONGLY AGREE

9. ____ I know that the authority granted to me as a correctional officer will make inmates cooperate with me.

10. ____ Because of the way I get along with inmates, I can get them to comply because they want to do what will get my respect and admiration.

11. ____ I will not give special help or benefits to inmates to get them to cooperate with me.

12. ____ The training I received has given me the competency and skills to know what is best for the inmates and I rely on this to get compliance from them.

13. ____ I apply pressure and threaten to punish inmates to gain compliance from them.

14. ____ Inmates will not cooperate with me because they do not admire or respect me.

15. ____ Inmates will only cooperate with me if they receive special priviledges.

16. ____ The inmates do not comply when they are threatened with punishments or disciplinary action.

17. ____ The only reason inmates listen to me is because they know they have to.

18. ____ The inmates do not respect my decision-making capabilities.

Part III. If you have worked at both a male and a female institution, please answer the following questions. If you have only worked at Trumbull, please proceed to part IV. As before, please indicate the extent to which you agree with the statement.

1=STRONGLY DISAGREE
2=DISAGREE
3=UNCERTAIN
4=AGREE
5=STRONGLY AGREE

19. ____Male inmates respond better than female inmates if you offer them priviledges and rewards to get them to cooperate with you.

20. ____ I have a better rapport with the male inmates than I did with the female inmates.

21. ____ Male inmates respect my authority better than the female inmates did.

22. ____ I have to use pressure and threats to gain cooperation more on male inmates than I did on female inmates.

23. ____ The male inmates respect my decision-making capabilities better than the female inmates did.

Part IV. Based on your experience, indicate which of the following subjects should be given more or less emphasis in training new officers at the academy so that their training would be more in line with actual job demands. Check whether each subject listed should receive more, the same, or less emphasis it now receives.

	More	Same	Less
Employee rules and regulation	___	___	___
Treatment programs	___	___	___
Inmate rights	___	___	___
Legal responsibilities of officers	___	___	___
Classification	___	___	___
Handling difficult inmates	___	___	___
Standards for use of force	___	___	___
Self defense	___	___	___
Interpersonal relations skills	___	___	___
Report writing	___	___	___
Disciplinary procedures	___	___	___
Employee benefits	___	___	___
Differences between male and female inmates	___	___	___

How valuable was the in-service training you received here?

---- very valuable
---- somewhat valuable
---- uncertain
---- not very valuable
---- not valuable at all

Thank you for completing this survey.

Appendix C: Coding Instructions

Coding Instructions

Variable Labels	Column(s)	Code
Case ID	1-3	
AGE	4	1=20-25 2=26-31 3=32-37 4=38-43 5=44-49 6=50-55 7=other 9=missing
SEX	5	1=male 2=female 9=missing
HIDEG	6	1=Did not finish high school 2=High school or GED 3=Some college, no degree 4=A.A. degree 5=Bachelor's degree 6=Some graduate work 7=Master's degree 8=other 9=missing
ODCORR	7	1=0-1 year 2=2-5 years 3=6-10 years 4=11-15 years 5=16-20 years 6=other 9=missing
TCIMRY	8	1=0-1 year 2=2-5 years 3=6-10 years 4=11-15 years 5=16-20 years 6=other 9=missing

Coding Instruction Cont.

Variable Labels	Column(s)	Code
WORKED	9	1=worked in same sex prison only 2=worked in other sex prison 3=worked in other than prison 9=missing
LEAVE	10	1=yes 2=no 9=missing
TIME	11	1=less than 1 hour 2=1-2 3=3-4 4=5-6 5=7 or more 9=missing
AUTHOR TO MDECIS		1=Strongly disagree 2=Disagree 3=Uncertain 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree 9=missing
AUTHOR	12	
RESPEC	13	
HELP	14	
SKILLS	15	
THREAT	16	
DISRPC	17	
PRIV	18	
PUNISH	19	
HAVETO	20	
DECISN	21	
REWARD	22	

Coding Instruction Cont.

Variable Labels	Column(s)	Code
RAPPOR	23	
MAUTH	24	
PRESUR	25	
MDECIS	26	
RULES TO SEX DIF		1=more 2=same 3=less 9=missing
RULES	27	
TXPROG	28	
RIGHTS	29	
LEGAL	30	
CLASS	31	
HANDLE	32	
USEFOR	33	
DEFENS	34	
IRS	35	
WRITE	36	
DSCPLN	37	
BENE	38	
SEX DIF	39	
VALU	40	1=very valuable 2=somewhat valuable 3=uncertain 4=not very valuable 5=not valuable at all
SITE	41	1=Trumbull 2=Marysville

Appendix D: Distributions of correctional training officers' attitudes toward training

Distributions of Trumbull correctional officers attitudes toward training

	More		Same		Less	
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Employee rules	31	56.4	23	41.8	0	0
Treatment programs	27	49.1	21	38.2	6	10.9
Inmate rights	23	41.8	22	40.0	9	16.4
Legal responsibilities	42	76.4	11	20.0	0	0
Classification	28	50.9	24	43.6	1	1.8
Handling difficult inmates	47	85.5	6	10.9	1	1.8
Standards for use of force	43	78.2	11	20.0	0	0
Self defense	47	85.5	6	10.9	1	1.8
Interpersonal relations	32	58.2	20	36.4	2	3.6
report writing	28	50.9	24	43.6	2	3.6
Disciplinary procedures	36	65.5	17	30.9	1	1.8
Employee benefits	34	61.8	20	36.4	0	0
Differences between male female inmates	23	41.8	21	38.2	4	7.3

* some missing values were found

Distribution of Marysville correctional officers' attitudes toward training

	More		Same		Less	
	F	P	F	P	F	P
Employee rules	26	44.1	26	44.1	4	6.8
Treatment programs	23	39.0	26	44.1	6	10.2
Inmate rights	21	35.6	27	45.8	8	13.6
Legal responsibilities	38	64.4	17	28.8	1	1.7
Classification	24	40.7	26	44.1	5	8.5
Handling difficult inmates	42	71.2	13	22.0	0	0
Standards for use of force	26	44.1	29	49.2	0	0
Self defense	30	50.8	21	35.6	3	5.1
Interpersonal relations	28	47.5	27	45.8	1	1.7
Report writing	18	30.5	35	59.3	3	5.1
Disciplinary procedures	27	45.8	26	44.1	3	5.1
Employee benefits	27	45.8	27	45.8	2	3.4
Differences between male female inmate	25	42.4	28	47.5	3	5.1

* some missing values were found

Appendix E: Distribution of correctional officers' attitude toward the value of in-service training

Distribution of Marysville correctional officers' attitudes toward the value of in-service training they received

	F	P
Very valuable	18	30.5
Somewhat valuable	24	40.7
Uncertain	6	10.2
Not very valuable	8	13.6
Not valuable at all	1	1.7
Missing	2	3.4

Distribution of Trumbull correctional officers' attitudes toward the value of in-service training they received

	F	P
Very valuable	7	12.7
Somewhat valuable	21	38.2
Uncertain	2	3.6
Not very valuable	14	25.5
Not valuable at all	8	14.5
Missing	3	5.5

Reference List and Bibliography

Cartwright, D. (1965). Influence, leadership, control. In James March (Ed.), Handbook of Organization. Chicago: Rand- McNally.

Champion, D.J. (1993). Research methods for criminal justice and criminology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Regents/Prentice Hall.

Clear, T.R., & Cole, G.F. (1994). American corrections (3rd ed.). Belmont,CA: Wadsworth.

Crouch, B. (1980). The keepers. Springfield,IL: Thomas.

Crouch, B., & Alpert, G. (1982). Sex and occupational socialization among prison guards. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 9 (2), 159-176.

French, J.R.P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power (pp.150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Frodi, A. Macaulay, J., & Thome, P. (1977). Are women always less aggressive than men? A review of the experimental literature. Psychological Bulletin, 84,634-660.

Gold, G.J., & Raven, B.H. (1992). Interpersonal influence strategies in the Churchill-Roosevelt bases for destroyers exchange. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 7, 245- 272.

Guilford, J.P. (1954). Psychometric methods (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hepburn, J.R. (1985). The exercise in coercive organizations: A study of prison guards. Criminology, 23 (1), 249-265.

Hoffman, M. (1977). Sex differences in empathy and related behaviors. Psychological Bulletin, 84, 712-722.

Irwin, J. (1980). Prisons in turmoil. Boston: Little, Brown.

Jacobs,J. (1977). Stateville: The penitentiary in mass society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bibliography Cont.

Joesting, J., Joesting, R., & Jones, N. (1975). Male and female prison inmates differences on MMPI scales and revised Beta IQ. Psychological Reports, 37, 471-474.

Kanter, R. (1977). Men and women in the corporation. New York: Basic Books.

Levin,J., & Fox, J.A. (1991) Elementary statistics in social research. (5th ed.) New York: Harper Collins Pub.

Lombardo, L. (1981). Guards imprisoned correctional officers at work. New York: Elsevier.

Panton, J.H. (1974). Personality differences between male and female prison inmates measured by the MMPI. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 1 (4),332-339.

Panton, J.H. (1975), Interpretive handbook for the MMPI in correctional classification and diagnostic services. Raleigh, NC: Research and Planning. North Carolina Department of Corrections.

Podsakoff, P.M. & Schriesheim, C.A. (1985). Field studies of French and Raven's bases of power: Critique, Reanalysis, and suggestions for future research. Psychological Bulletin, 97 (3), 387-411.

Pollock-Byrne, J.M. (1990). Women, prison, & crime. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole publishing.

Poole, E., & Regoli, R. (1980a). Examining the impact of professionalism on cynicism, role conflict, and work alienation among prison guards. Criminal Justice Review, 5, 57-65.

Poole, E., & regoli, R. (1980b). Role stress, custody orientation, and disciplinary actions: A study of prison guards. Criminolgy, 18, (2), 215-226.

Poole, E., & Regoli, R. (1981). Alienation in prison: An examination of the work relations of prison guards. Criminology, 19, (2), 251-270.

Raven, B.H. (1971). The comparative analysis of power and power preference. In J.T. Tedischi (Ed.), Perspectives on social power. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.

Raven, B.H. (1976). Social psychology: People in groups. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Bibliography Cont.

Raven, B.H., Freeman, H.E., & Haley, R.W. (1982). Social power and compliance in hospital infection control. In A.W. Johnson, O. Gresky, & Raven, B.H. (Eds.), Contemporary health services:Social science perspectives. Boston: Auburn House. (pp. 139-176).

Raven, B.H. (1992). The bases of power origins and recent developments. A presentation in honor of John R.P. French on the occasion of his receiving the Kurt Lewin award. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington.

Schmidt, A., & Raven, B.H. (1985). Children's cognitions of persuasion strategies and compliance. Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Toronto.

Schriesheim, C.A.,Podsakoff, P.M., & Hinkin, T. (1991). Can ipsative and single-item measures produce erroneous results in field studies of French and Raven's (1959) five bases of power? An empirical investigation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76 (1), 106-114.