

AD-A091 387

AIR FORCE INST OF TECH WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB OH  
THE EFFECT OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT ON THE JOB SATISFACTION LE--ETC(U)  
1979 R W BAKER  
AFIT-CI-79-178T

F/G 5/9

UNCLASSIFIED

NL

For  
MSA-



END  
DATE  
FILMED  
12-80  
DTIC

UNCLASS

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER 79-0722	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. — ADA091387	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) The Effect of Educational Attainment on the Job Satisfaction Level of Correctional Officers.		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED ⑭ AFIT-CI-79-1787
7. AUTHOR(s) Robert William Baker		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s) ⑨ Master's thesis,
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS AFIT Student at: Washington State University		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS ⑫ 69
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS AFIT/NR WPAFB OH 45433		12. REPORT DATE 1979
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 60
		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) UNCLASS
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

AD A 091387

6. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this report)  
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)  
APPROVED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE AFR 190-17.

*Fredric C. Lynch*  
FREDRIC C. LYNCH, Major, USAF  
Director of Public Affairs

23 SEP 1980

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES  
Approved for public release: IAW AFR 190-17  
Air Force Institute of Technology (ATC)  
Wright-Patterson AFB, OH 45433

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Attached

DDG FILE COPY

80 10 14 22

THE EFFECT OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT ON THE JOB  
SATISFACTION LEVEL OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

ABSTRACT

by Robert William Baker, M.A.  
Washington State University, 1979

Chairperson: Mervin F. White

The primary objective of this study was to ascertain the relationship between the educational attainment of correctional officers and their job satisfaction levels. A secondary objective was to ascertain the effect of one's educational attainment on his or her work alienation level. While there has been a general movement to upgrade the education level of correctional officers in order to "professionalize" them, there has been very little research conducted on the possible effects of such an educational change on their job attitudes.

The study was conducted at two state penitentiaries and an effort was made to contact all of the correctional officers employed at each institution. Questionnaires were completed by 131 officers which constituted an overall response rate of 57%. The data obtained were then analyzed to ascertain the officers' general level of job satisfaction and work alienation and the relationship of these variables to officers' educational attainment.

The findings suggest that correctional officers are relatively satisfied with their jobs and exhibit little work alienation. While no relationship was found between their educational attainment and their work alienation levels, an inverse relationship between their educational attainment and

→ next  
page

v  
their job satisfaction levels was found to exist under certain conditions.

This relationship was particularly prevalent in the response patterns of the younger and better-educated line correctional officers. The relationship did not hold among officers older than forty-five or among officers in supervisory positions.

It is concluded that increasing the educational attainment of correctional officers without modifying their job skill requirements accordingly will most likely result in a lower level of job satisfaction. This is likely to be particularly true among the younger and better-educated officers. As a result, such officers will likely leave the corrections field and aggravate the existing high rate of personnel turnover. The findings of this study are consistent with the conclusion of the National Manpower Survey of the Criminal Justice System in 1978 that line correctional officers may not need a higher education to perform their present duties.

Accession For	
MTIS CRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
PTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A	

79-178T

THE EFFECT OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT ON THE JOB  
SATISFACTION LEVEL OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

By

ROBERT WILLIAM BAKER

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY  
Department of Criminal Justice

1979

80 10 14 227

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to publicly recognize the continuous encouragement that I received from my loving wife, Mary, and our children, Robert, Donna, and Julie. Without their love and forbearance, this arduous task would have been a thousand times more difficult.

I wish to also thank my thesis committee: Dr. Mervin F. White, Dr. Thomas A. Johnson, and Mr. Raymond N. Fjetland for their thoughtful commentary and guidance during the course of this study.

Finally, the prison administrators and the individual correctional officer who voluntarily participated in this study deserve a special note of thanks. Only through their cooperation was this study possible.

THE EFFECT OF EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT ON THE JOB  
SATISFACTION LEVEL OF CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

ABSTRACT

by Robert William Baker, M.A.  
Washington State University, 1979

Chairperson: Mervin F. White

The primary objective of this study was to ascertain the relationship between the educational attainment of correctional officers and their job satisfaction levels. A secondary objective was to ascertain the effect of one's educational attainment on his or her work alienation level. While there has been a general movement to upgrade the education level of correctional officers in order to "professionalize" them, there has been very little research conducted on the possible effects of such an educational change on their job attitudes.

The study was conducted at two state penitentiaries and an effort was made to contact all of the correctional officers employed at each institution. Questionnaires were completed by 131 officers which constituted an overall response rate of 57%. The data obtained were then analyzed to ascertain the officers' general level of job satisfaction and work alienation and the relationship of these variables to officers' educational attainment.

The findings suggest that correctional officers are relatively satisfied with their jobs and exhibit little work alienation. While no relationship was found between their educational attainment and their work alienation levels, an inverse relationship between their educational attainment and

their job satisfaction levels was found to exist under certain conditions. This relationship was particularly prevalent in the response patterns of the younger and better-educated line correctional officers. The relationship did not hold among officers older than forty-five or among officers in supervisory positions.

It is concluded that increasing the educational attainment of correctional officers without modifying their job skill requirements accordingly will most likely result in a lower level of job satisfaction. This is likely to be particularly true among the younger and better-educated officers. As a result, such officers will likely leave the corrections field and aggravate the existing high rate of personnel turnover. The findings of this study are consistent with the conclusion of the National Manpower Survey of the Criminal Justice System in 1978 that line correctional officers may not need a higher education to perform their present duties.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iii
ABSTRACT . . . . .	iv
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	viii
Chapter	
1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM . . . . .	1
Occupational Prospectives . . . . .	1
Research Rationale . . . . .	3
Review of Literature . . . . .	6
Job Satisfaction . . . . .	6
Education Level and Job Satisfaction . . . . .	8
Job Skill Requirements . . . . .	12
Summation . . . . .	13
Research Hypotheses . . . . .	14
2. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY . . . . .	16
Introduction . . . . .	16
The Survey Instrument . . . . .	17
The Research Population . . . . .	18
The Penitentiary in the Southwestern State . . . . .	19
The Penitentiary in the Rocky Mountain State . . . . .	19
Methodology . . . . .	21
Direct Distribution . . . . .	22
Indirect Distribution . . . . .	23
Overall Distribution and Response Rate . . . . .	25
Analytical Procedures . . . . .	25

Chapter	Page
3. RESEARCH FINDINGS . . . . .	27
Demographic Profile . . . . .	27
Sex and Age . . . . .	27
Organizational Position and Seniority . . . . .	29
Education Levels . . . . .	30
Hypotheses Testing . . . . .	31
Work Alienation . . . . .	32
Discussion of Work Alienation Findings . . . . .	33
Job Satisfaction . . . . .	37
Discussion of Job Satisfaction Findings . . . . .	44
4. RESEARCH SUMMARY . . . . .	48
Summary of Findings . . . . .	48
Study Limitations and Recommendations . . . . .	50
Conclusions . . . . .	52
NOTES . . . . .	55
REFERENCES . . . . .	56
APPENDIX . . . . .	60

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Age Frequencies of Respondents . . . . .	28
2. Organizational Position . . . . .	29
3. Job Seniority . . . . .	30
4. Respondents' Educational Levels . . . . .	31
5. Respondents' Work Alienation Levels . . . . .	32
6. Education versus Work Alienation . . . . .	34
7. Respondents' Job Satisfaction Levels . . . . .	37
8. Education versus Job Satisfaction . . . . .	38
9. Education versus Job Satisfaction Controlling Age . . . . .	40
10. Education versus Job Satisfaction Controlling Rank . . . . .	42
11. Education versus Job Satisfaction Controlling Length of Service . . . . .	43
12. Education versus Job Satisfaction Controlling Career Intentions . . . . .	45

## CHAPTER 1

## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Occupational Prospectives

The occupation of correctional officer, formerly known as prison guard, has historically been considered a very menial one requiring little intelligence or formal education. Prison guards were frequently portrayed in literature as being uneducated, unmotivated, and brutal individuals. At times, they were the scapegoats of prison administrators and professional treatment specialists whose rehabilitation programs failed to live up to expectations. At best, the occupation was systematically ignored during the reform movements in American corrections (Wicks, 1974; State, 1967; Brodsky, 1974; Jacobs and Retsky, 1975).

During the past decade, the role played by the correctional officer has changed significantly. This officer has been asked to shoulder more and more of the responsibility for the rehabilitation of the inmates. This expansion of their role was precipitated by the belated recognition by "professionals" in corrections of the extent of the correctional officer's influence on inmates' attitudes and behavior. This influence derives from the officer's daily interaction with inmates in a variety of circumstances. This role expansion has created both individual role conflicts and organizational problems. These conflicts arise from superimposing the treatment role on the traditional security role played by the correctional officers when the two roles are basically incompatible. It is often claimed that one way of decreasing this conflict is by increasing the educational level

of correctional officers (Kassebaum et al., 1964; Wicks, 1974; Jacobs and Retsky, 1975).

Thus, the call for upgrading the educational level of correctional officers has been steadily increasing. Although none of the major studies of correctional manpower recommend that a college education be a prerequisite for being employed as a correctional officer, they all strongly imply that a college education would certainly benefit such officers. The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (1973:467) stressed the need for additional education of correctional personnel as follows:

A critical point in corrections is lack of education among its personnel. . . . The need for educated personnel increases with the changes in corrections. Educational standards of the 1960's will not suffice in the 1970's.

They also propose various financial inducements to increase the number of colleges offering courses in corrections and to provide tuition assistance for correctional employees wishing to attend such courses. They further suggest that such educational achievement by correctional employees should be considered in career actions such as promotion and salary increases (Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Inc., 1969; National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1973).

One cannot help but notice the similarity between the earlier moves to upgrade police education and those to upgrade the educational level of correctional officers. Both movements came about as a result of the findings of national commissions. Both are receiving extensive financial support from the Federal government through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Finally, both consider the upgrading of the educational standards of the occupations as a prelude to "professional status."

However, there exist very little, empirical research with which to evaluate this "need" for higher education in order to "professionalize"

correctional officers. This is particularly true of research focusing on the relationship of a correctional officer's educational attainment to his job satisfaction level. In his introduction to a pilot study of Illinois prison guards, Professor James B. Jacobs (1978a:185), one of the pioneer researchers in correctional officer demography, states:

Countless studies report prisoner's attitudes about themselves, fellow inmates, prison staff, and society in general. However, there is not a comparable body of research on the demography, attitudes, values, and ideology of correctional officers, as prison guards have come to be known since World War II.

Notwithstanding the paucity of research on the correctional officer occupation, there appears to be a general assumption that more education will somehow "improve" or "benefit" such officers in some way. Commenting on a similar assumption in police work, Charles R. Swanson (1977:313) concluded that in the "pell-mell pursuit of higher education" for police officers the possibility that such a rise in education could have some adverse side effects has been "virtually unconsidered."

#### Research Rationale

This research will provide insight into the relationship between one's educational background and one's satisfaction with one's occupation. Specifically, it will deal with the effects of higher education on the level of job satisfaction reported by correctional officers. The works of Berg (1971) and Ritzer (1972) in the area of occupational sociology form the foundation for this research project.

Berg (1971:108-109) conducted extensive research on the relationship of a worker's educational background to his/her job satisfaction. He began by examining the results of some 450 worker attitude surveys conducted between 1934 and 1963. Of these 450 surveys, he found that only "a small fraction of these studies contain sufficient information to permit a review of the

linkages between worker's educational achievements and the attitudes toward work . . . ." However, they do "document the association of personal expectations with job attitudes . . . ." He reasons that the educational background of "workers" may be a major determinant of their occupational expectations and hence of their satisfactions. Based on this reasoning, he hypothesizes that "attitudes toward work would be more favorable among better-educated workers as their occupational skills increase." He concludes after examining the two dozen or so studies that afford the opportunity to test his hypothesis that "it is probably valid." However, he cautions that the true nature of the relationship between education level and worker satisfaction is still in doubt. He cites (1971:110) the 1957 review of thirteen relevant studies by Professors Herzberg, Mausner, and Peterson (1957:15-16) as evidence of the inconclusiveness of research findings in this area. Their review revealed that:

. . . Five [studies] show no difference in job attitudes among workers differing in education; three show an increase in morale with increased education; another five show that the higher these workers educational level, the lower their morale. . . . The three studies showing increased morale with education are in no case very conclusive . . . ; they were carried out either with groups having a restricted range of education, or with groups in unusual circumstances (e.g., retarded workers).

In his own study of 2,139 male industrial workers in sixteen different occupations in 1971, Berg found that as the educational achievement of an employee became aligned with his job skill requirements, the employee's job satisfaction increased. However, as the educational achievement of employees exceeded their job skill requirements, the employee's job satisfaction decreased. Berg concludes that education is a major contributor to employee dissatisfaction in occupations where the job skill requirements are exceeded by the educational achievements of the employee.

Ritzer's (1972) work also supports the hypothesis that a workers' educational level is related to their attitude towards their job. In his book entitled Man and His Work: Conflict and Change, Ritzer summarizes and categorizes the findings of most of the major ethnographic studies of various occupations in an attempt to construct testable hypotheses which could form the basis for a general theory of work. He categorized occupations into four general groupings: professionals; managers, officials, and proprietors; middle level occupations, and low level occupations.

By relating the various findings of the ethnographic occupational studies to these occupational groupings, Ritzer was able to identify a number of characteristics relating to investment in training, salary, social status, and so on which seem to typify each of his occupational groupings. The low level occupations seem to be characterized by their highly restrictive career patterns, low pay, low social status, poor training, and simple recruitment methods. Persons engaged in such occupations tended to exhibit high work alienation levels. Ritzer (1972:9) defines work alienation as a general feeling of "powerlessness and of self-estrangement in the sense that workers are unable to utilize their skills and knowledge in their work." Ritzer hypothesizes that increasing the education of persons engaged in such occupations will only increase their level of work alienation. Commenting on the general trend towards more education in our society, Ritzer (1972:36) cautions:

We are in danger of becoming an over educated society. Positions which formally required only a high school education now require bachelor's or even master's degrees. The problem is that many of the positions have not been altered to fit the new occupant.

The occupation of correctional officers clearly falls into Ritzer's "low level" category. Many authorities have pointed out the low status of the occupation in literature (Sykes, 1956; State, 1967; President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967). "Not only does the



prison guard occupy a low social status in the outside community, he also experiences disdain and sometimes open contempt of prison officials" (Jacobs and Retsky, 1975:54). The low pay, poor training, and lack of education of correctional officers in general has been pointed out by several distinguished commissions reviewing the state of correctional personnel and facilities within the United States (Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Inc., 1969; National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1973).

Both Berg and Ritzer emphasize the importance of the workers' level of educational achievement "fitting" with the level of skill and knowledge required by their jobs. If the worker's education level is far lower than that level required to perform their job tasks, they will likely become increasingly frustrated at their inability to perform the tasks and become alienated or dissatisfied with their job. If the workers' education level is far higher than that level required to perform their job tasks, they also will soon become alienated or dissatisfied with their jobs as they see their skills and knowledge as being under utilized or wasted. The optimum "fit" would be one in which the job skill requirements are such that they allow the workers to fully utilize the skills and knowledge they have obtained as a result of their educational experiences.

### Review of Literature

#### Job Satisfaction

Notwithstanding the voluminous literature and numerous empirical studies involving the job satisfaction level among various workers and its resultant effects on their productivity, there is no standard or precise definition of job satisfaction (Brayfield and Rother, 1954; Bullock, 1952;

Crites, 1969). One may find any number of "literary" or "operational" definitions for job satisfaction in the literature. One of the earliest and perhaps the most realistic definition of job satisfaction is that of Hoppock in 1935. He (1935:47) defined the concept of job satisfaction as "any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that causes a person to say I am satisfied with my job." While this definition may seem to be superficial, it is both comprehensive and realistic. While it does not attempt to identify all the factors involved in an individual's level of satisfaction with his/her job, it clearly recognizes the multiplicity of such factors. Further, it clearly indicates the heavy reliance placed on the worker's perception and articulation of his/her satisfaction level that is present in most job satisfaction research. Ginzberg et al. (1951, as cited by Crites 1969:471), offer a somewhat more elaborate conceptualization of job satisfaction. They suggest that there are actually three different types of job satisfactions which an individual derives from his/her work. First, there are the "intrinsic" satisfactions derived from workers' sense of accomplishment and their pleasure in doing the job. Next, there are the "concomitant" satisfactions derived from workers' feelings about their physical and psychological conditions in their work place. Finally, there are the "extrinsic" satisfactions derived from the tangible rewards that workers receive for their work. In their analysis, the absolute amount of these satisfactions is not as important as their relationship to the workers' expectations. Bullock's (1952) conceptualization of job satisfaction was less elaborate than Ginzberg et al's, but again Bullock stressed workers' perceptions of the contributions that their jobs were making toward the achievement of their personal goals or objectives. According to Crites (1969:47), Bullock saw the concept of job satisfaction as simply the summation of one's likes and dislikes in relation to his or her job.

Crites (1969:472-473) suggests that one way of narrowing the definition of job satisfaction is to describe its relationship to other similar concepts such as job attitudes, job morale, and vocational satisfaction. Job attitudes are usually seen as positive or negative worker reactions to a specific aspect of one's work, e.g., salary. Job satisfaction, on the other hand, is seen as a summation or composite of job attitudes. Job morale is even a broader concept than job satisfaction generally dealing with worker attitudes toward all aspects of his/her job, particularly his/her work group and employing organization. Most job morale studies include the administration of some type of job satisfaction index as one part of the study. Job satisfaction also differs from vocational satisfaction. Whereas job satisfaction deals with the level of a worker's satisfaction with a particular job and is short term in nature, vocational satisfaction deals with the level of a worker's satisfaction with his or her life's work and is long term in nature.

While we may be able to differentiate between these various concepts in literature, it becomes an extremely difficult if not an impossible task in empirical settings. Regrettably, one must conclude that the term job satisfaction is a rather abstract term depending for definition on the orientation of its user to a large extent. In this study, job satisfaction will be defined as a worker's sense of personal fulfillment with his or her job as inferred from the individual's score on the Brayfield and Rothe (1951) Job Satisfaction Index as explained in Chapter 2.

#### Education Level and Job Satisfaction

Berg's (1971) hypothesis that the educational background of a worker is a prime determinant of the worker's occupational expectations and hence his or her job satisfaction level is supported by the earlier work of Vollmer and Kenney (1955). They (1955:39-41) conducted a major study of Federal

government employees in an attempt to determine the effect of educational level on job satisfaction. They surveyed 2,220 workers at various Department of Army Facilities throughout the United States. Two of their major findings are particularly relevant to this study. First, "the higher the worker's educational level, the more likely he is to report dissatisfaction with his job; conversely, the lower the worker's educational level, the more likely he is to report high satisfaction with his job." Second, "the younger they are, the more likely they are to report dissatisfaction with their jobs." Vollmer and Kinney interpret these findings as indicative of the different life expectations created by one's educational background. They suggest that "if the key factor in job satisfaction is what workers expect of their jobs, it can be expected to show up markedly in those occupational fields which are least likely to meet the expectations of younger and more highly educated workers." To test their interpretations, they re-examined the data collected focusing on lower-grade Wage Board (blue-collar) workers. They found that the highest percentage of dissatisfied workers is among high school graduates or above.

Vollmer and Kinney (1955:43) further suggest that personnel administrators must pay careful attention to the age and education level of job applicants to preclude placing such applicants in jobs which fail to meet their occupational expectations. Vollmer and Kinney emphasize that administrators, who are interested in satisfied workers, must determine whether or not the expectations of younger and more highly educated applicants are likely to be in line with the working conditions and rewards of the work for which they apply.

In his review of Mann's 1953 study of the relationship of educational background to workers' job satisfaction, which also supports Berg's (1971) hypothesis, Crites (1969:513) states:

Mann (1953; p. 902) tested the hypothesis that "satisfactions of non-supervisory employees with certain aspects of their occupational status are inversely related to the level of education they have attained, when type of work, job skill level, length of service, and sex are held constant." Here the reasoning is that, other things being equal (i.e., time on the job and sex), within a given work and skill class those workers with more education will be less satisfied. In other words, educational level becomes an index of vocational aspiration and thus would vary negatively with satisfaction, which is largely what Mann found. For blue-collar men, amount of education was inversely associated with (1) overall satisfaction with company and job (2) satisfaction with job responsibility; and (3) satisfaction with promotional opportunities. . . . Thus, although some of the expected relationships between education and satisfaction were confirmed, they appear to be specific to the status and sex of the worker.

The literature on the police occupation (an allied occupation with that of correctional officer) offers some hints as to the probable effects of higher educational achievement on the job satisfaction of the correctional officer. Swanson (1977:312) in reviewing the various studies allegedly demonstrating the value of college education in police work found them to be "bent on sustaining the notion that education for the police is good, rather than offering empirical evidence . . ." that such is the case. He argues that upgrading the educational requirements of police officers without considering the organizational climate in which they operate is unrealistic. He also points out that evidence gathered from research in industrial settings clearly indicates that college educated employees are much more prone to dissatisfaction when their job requirements or advancement opportunities are limited than are their less-educated coworkers. He suggests that much more research in this area is necessary before any valid conclusions concerning the benefits of higher education in police work can be made. Griffin et al. (1978) conducted research in a large police department on the relationship between officers' educational achievement and their job satisfaction. Their measure of job satisfaction was the score of the individual officers on a five-point Likert scale question asking: "To what extent do you feel satisfied with your job

as a police officer?" They then separated the responding officers into three groups based on their level of educational achievements. These groups were designated as "those with a high school diploma or less," "those with some college but no degree," and "those with a four year college degree." The average job satisfaction score for each group was 4.24, 4.23, and 4.28, respectively. Griffin et al. concluded that their finding tends to refute the hypothesis that job satisfaction decreases as education level of the employee increases. However, no control for rank or age of their respondents was reported in the study.

The meager literature currently available on correctional officers seldom focuses on the relationship of their educational attainment to their job satisfaction. Only two relatively recent empirical studies address this relationship specifically. The first systematic attempt to collect demographic data on correctional officers on a nationwide basis was made by pollster, Louis Harris, under the auspice of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Inc. (Jacobs, 1978a:185). However, the survey was flawed by the small size of the sample taken and the lack of discrimination among the various type of correctional workers included in the survey. Only 189 "line workers" were surveyed nationwide. In addition, no differentiation was made between "line correctional workers" employed in adult prisons as guards and those employed in juvenile facilities as cottage parents, child care staff, and so on. Therefore, no true demographic picture of the "average" prison guard emerged from this survey (Jacobs, 1978a:185). Nevertheless, on the basis of this survey, the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Inc. (1969:14) concluded:

As a group, correctional workers are relatively satisfied with their jobs. . . . Unfortunately, line workers (the people who are most in contact with offenders) expressed the least amount of job satisfaction.

Interestingly enough the "line workers" also had the lowest average educational attainment. Sixty-eight percent of the line workers had only a high school education or lower; while only 18% of the supervisory officers had a high school education or lower (Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Inc., 1969:22).

Perhaps the most extensive empirical study of correctional officers to date was conducted by Professor James B. Jacobs, one of the pioneer researchers in this occupational area. During 1974-73, Jacobs administered questionnaires to 929 prison guards at Illinois' Correctional Training Academy. The results of his survey confirmed the previous findings of the Joint Commission of Correctional Manpower and Training, Inc. Over 90% of those surveyed reported they were "very happy" or "somewhat happy" with their job (Jacobs, 1978a:186). After further evaluation of the extensive data collected, Jacobs subsequently reported finding no significant correlation between the level of educational attainment of the guards and their level of job satisfaction (Jacobs, 1978b).

#### Job Skill Requirements

In 1935, Roucek (1935:146) evaluated the job skill requirements of a prison guard in these words:

In fact, in most cases, the job of a prison guard is such that it does not tax the intellectual capabilities of these men--unless they are assigned to certain technical positions. With the exception of those in the higher ranks the tasks of the guards are very simple, limited in most cases to supervising inmates, whose level of intelligence is in most cases below the average.

Unfortunately, Roucek's evaluation of the job skill requirements of a prison guard is still a valid evaluation of the job skill requirements of many of today's correctional officers. Despite the recent movement to expand the role of correctional officer, they have remained primarily as "gate keepers" assigned relatively simple and strictly regulated tasks. The heavy emphasis

on the custody function in most institutions appears to manifest itself in such job requirements. In a recent recruiting flyer distributed by the Colorado State Department of Corrections,<sup>1</sup> the duties of a correctional officer are described as follows:

The duties of a correctional Officer are varied; but primarily it is a position of supervising people incarcerated in one of the facilities in the Colorado State Penitentiary. The duties may include supervising inmates in the living areas, work details, recreational and leisure time activities. Security is one of the primary functions of all correctional workers consequently the Correctional Officer will conduct search and escort duties, perimeter surveillance in a tower or patrol unit as well as physical search of persons, property, and areas.

Thus, the job skill requirements of correctional officers for the most part are very minimal as evidenced by their short training periods and low educational prerequisites.

#### Summation

The research conducted to date on the relationship of one's educational attainment to his or her job satisfaction offers no strong evidence that the two variables are related. However, it does suggest that: (1) individuals who are better educated than their coworkers tend to report lower levels of job satisfaction, (2) an individual's educational attainment appears to influence his or her job expectations, and (3) an individual's level of job satisfaction depends to some degree on the alignment of the individual's knowledge and skills with those required by his or her job.

The literature suggests the following theoretical argument regarding the relationship between educational attainment and job satisfaction. A worker's education level strongly influences the level of his or her job expectations. These expectations focus largely on the worker's sense of personal fulfillment from his or her job. This sense of fulfillment apparently is derived from the perception that the worker has of the opportunity to



fully utilize his or her knowledge and skills on the job. If the worker's job expectations are not met by the job, the worker is likely to become frustrated. This frustration manifests itself in the degree of alienation the worker feels from the job and in the worker's level of job satisfaction. Thus, a worker whose educational level coincides or is only slightly less than that required by the job will be less frustrated and have a higher level of job satisfaction. If the job requires far more or far less education than the worker has, he or she may become frustrated and develop a low level of job satisfaction. If a worker's job expectations are met or exceeded by his or her job, he or she will likely express a high level of job satisfaction. If not, an expression of a low level of job satisfaction is likely. This argument assumes that the causal variable is educational attainment which forms the foundation of job expectations which, in turn, directly influences the worker's job satisfaction level.

#### Research Hypotheses

In the present research, the hypothesis that a worker's level of job satisfaction is a function of his or her education level as it relates to his or her job expectation and job skill requirements will be explored. It has been hypothesized that in low skilled occupations, such as that of correctional officer, as education achievement rises the level of job satisfaction will decrease and the work alienation level will increase.

This research will only examine the relationship between educational attainment and job satisfaction level among in-service correction officers employed in adult prisons. As used in this study, the terms job satisfaction, work alienation, and educational attainment will be operationally defined as follows:

Job satisfaction.--This term is defined as the employee's sense of personal fulfillment with his/her job. The degree of such fulfillment is inferred from his/her attitude towards various aspects of his/her job environment as measured by the Job Satisfaction Index developed by Brayfield and Rothe (1951).

Work alienation.--This term is defined as the employee's feelings of powerlessness and estrangement in his work situation. The intensity of such feelings among the employees will be inferred from their scores of the Work Alienation Scales developed by Pearlin (1962).

Educational attainment level.--This term is defined as the number of years of formal education completed by the respondents.

Based on the literature previously discussed and the findings of earlier research, the following hypotheses were developed concerning the background variables of correctional officers and their job satisfaction and work alienation levels:

Hypothesis 1. As an occupational group, correctional officers will have a high level of work alienation.

Hypothesis 2. Correctional officers with more education will report a higher level of work alienation than their less educated coworkers.

Hypothesis 3. As an occupational group, correctional officers will have a high level of job satisfaction.

Hypothesis 4. Correctional officers with more education will report a lower level of job satisfaction than their less educated coworkers.

Hypothesis 5. When the influence of age, rank, job seniority, and career intentions are held constant, the inverse relationship between the correctional officers' educational attainment and their job satisfaction levels will persist.

## CHAPTER 2

### RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

#### Introduction

The primary purpose of this research is to ascertain the nature of the relationship between the educational achievement of correctional officers and their level of job satisfaction. Several secondary relationships are also explored. These relationships include the relationships of educational attainment and aspirations to one's job expectations and his or her work alienation level. Based on the available literature and the research of Berg (1971) and Ritzer (1972) it was hypothesized that a strong negative correlation exists between the level of educational attainment of a correctional officer and his or her level of reported job satisfaction. Secondly, a strong positive correlation exists between the educational attainment of a correctional officer and his/her work alienation level.

The independent variables are the level of educational attainment of the correctional officers and their educational aspirations as self-reported by the survey population. The dependent variables are the levels of job satisfaction and work alienation reported by the survey population. In addition to these variables, the influence of a number of background variables such as age, rank, and employment experience will be controlled.

The research consisted of developing a comprehensive self-administered survey instrument, distributing it to correctional officers at two state penal institutions in June 1978, and analyzing the results for evidence to support or refute the research hypotheses detailed in Chapter 1.

### The Survey Instrument

The survey instrument utilized in this research consisted of self-administered questionnaire incorporating an existing Job Satisfaction Index (Brayfield and Rothe, 1951) and Work Alienation Scale (Pearlin, 1962). A copy of the entire questionnaire is included in the Appendix. Although it consists of fifty-eight questions, only those questions discussed below are relevant to this research project.

Two prime prerequisites for any questions incorporated in the instrument were that they be easily understood and concise. The questions employed in both the Job Satisfaction Index and the Work Alienation Scale met both of these prerequisites. In addition, the Job Satisfaction Index has demonstrated high reliability and validity (Robinson et al., 1969). The Worker Alienation Scale also appears to have high reliability but not supporting evidence exists of its validity (Robinson et al., 1969). Finally, both the Job Satisfaction Index and the Worker Alienation Scale are easily administered and scored.

The questionnaire includes a number of items soliciting background information on the respondents such as their age, sex, job seniority, organizational position (rank), and current level of educational attainment. Four items constitute Pearlin's (1962) Worker Alienation Scale. These items ask the respondents to reply to questions such as: "How much say or influence do people like you have on the way this prison is run?" or to agree or disagree with statements such as: "Around here it's not important how much you know, it's who you know that really counts." A respondent may score from a low of zero to a high of four on the Scale. A score of zero is indicative of little or no work alienation; while a score of four is indicative of high work alienation. In this study, the level of a respondent's work alienation

will be inferred from the respondent's score on the Work Alienation Scale as follows: 0-1, low alienation; 2--moderate alienation; and 3-4 high alienation.

A series of fourteen items adapted from Brayfield and Rothe's (1951) Job Satisfaction Index is included to measure the respondent's job satisfaction level. Each item consists of a statement about the respondent's job which he or she is asked to agree or disagree with. The series consists of statements such as: "I consider my job rather unpleasant," "I find real enjoyment in my job," "Most days I am enthusiastic about my job," and so on. The possible scores on the Index range from a low of fourteen to a high of seventy representing very high job satisfaction. In the present study, the Index scores will be broken down into three general levels of job satisfaction as follows: 14-49, low job satisfaction; 50-56, moderate job satisfaction; and 57-70, high job satisfaction. One item is included solely as a cross check on the validity of the respondent's subsequent replies to the items adapted from the Job Satisfaction Index. This item asks the respondents to rate their degree of happiness with their present working conditions on a scale of one to seven. One being labelled "very unhappy" and seven being labelled "very happy."

#### The Research Population

The respondents in this survey were all employed as Correctional Officers at either the penitentiary in a Southwestern state or in the penitentiary in a Rocky Mountain state. Correctional officers at these two institutions were chosen as the research population for several reasons. First, they appeared to be similar to correctional officers in other state institutions based on recruitment criteria.<sup>2</sup> This criteria generally requires applicants for Correctional Officer positions to be a minimum of twenty-one

years of age and have a high school education or its equivalent. Second, they work in organizational atmospheres that are common to most state prisons. That is, the organizational structure tends towards the authoritarian model regardless of whether military ranks or other occupational grades are utilized. Third, and perhaps the paramount reason for the selection of officers employed at these two institutions, was the willingness of the prison administrators concerned to participate in this research. All of the prison administrators concerned agreed not only to respect the confidentiality of the respondents' replies but to also permit the questionnaires to be distributed and completed while the officers were on duty.

#### The Penitentiary in the Southwestern State

The basic requirements for employment as a correctional officer at this penitentiary are that the applicant be (1) at least eighteen years of age,<sup>3</sup> (2) be in good physical condition, and (3) be a high school graduate or possess a GED certificate. All recruits are required to successfully complete three weeks of training conducted at the city police academy and undergo one week of orientation training at the penitentiary prior to acceptance as a correctional officer. The starting salary for a correctional officer is 680 dollars per month. The occupational hierarchy is very rigid and patterned after the military hierarchy including the rank designations. This penitentiary employs 158 correctional officers (both males and females) and houses 1,138 inmates.

#### The Penitentiary in the Rocky Mountain State

The basic requirements for employment as a correctional officer at this penitentiary are that the applicant be (1) a minimum of twenty-one years of age, (2) able to pass a written and oral entrance examination, and

(3) in good physical shape. There is no minimum level of education required. The level of an applicant's educational attainment is considered only in concert with his/her work experience and performance on both the written and oral examinations. All recruits are required to complete forty hours (five days)<sup>4</sup> of pre-service training conducted in-house. Subsequently, they must also complete forty hours (five days) of in-service training in crises intervention techniques. The starting salary for a correctional officer at this penitentiary is 660 dollars per month.

The occupational hierarchy is more flexible than those found in most correctional organizations, but is still largely authoritarian in character. The flexibility comes about as a result of a unique career progression and personnel classification system. Essentially, this system allows correctional officers a number of options or areas of emphasis in their job. The major options are the Security Option and the Treatment Option. As their names imply, each option allows an individual officer to pursue his or her particular interest and still progress throughout his or her career. Career progression in any option selected follows advancement through five position levels with each requiring more education or experience and involving more responsibilities and, consequently, more pay. These position levels for both career options are designated Correctional Officer, Correctional Specialist, Correctional Technician, Correctional Supervisor, and Correctional Manager. Although these designations were meant to replace the traditional military ranks previously used, the correctional officers still use "their ranks" among themselves.<sup>5</sup> As a result, the use of military ranks will be reinstated in the near future.<sup>6</sup> However, the options and career patterns will remain the same. This penitentiary actually consists of three geographically separated facilities: the Maximum Security Unit, the Medium Security Unit, and the

Women's Correctional Institute. However, all of the facilities are centrally directed and are physically located in or around the same city in the state. This penitentiary employs 286 correctional officers (both males and females) and houses 1,1416 inmates.

### Methodology

Two separate methodologies, designated direct and indirect, were employed in conducting the present research. These different methodologies were dictated largely by time restraints, security considerations, and respondent availability. The initial plan was to conduct a random survey of correctional officers at the participating institutions during a specific time frame. The questionnaires would be handed out personally to the correctional officers and subsequently recovered by the researcher. The alternative method of mailing the questionnaires to the homes of the correctional officers was not practical considering the short duration of the survey and the restricted access to the home addresses of the correctional officers due to privacy legislation. In addition, mail surveys usually have a low initial response rate and require a number of follow-up mailings to elicit the maximum response. Such a procedure was not financially feasible in the instant study.

While the initial plan of the researcher personally distributing the questionnaires (Direct Distribution) within a twenty-four hour time frame<sup>7</sup> was largely followed at the Maximum Security Unit of the penitentiary in the Rocky Mountain state, it was not possible to pursue this method at the two remaining units of the penitentiary or at the penitentiary in the Southwestern state. An alternative method (Indirect Distribution) wherein the questionnaires were given to prison administrators, who distributed them, was then employed at these facilities. In addition to the reasons previously



set forth for the use of two different methodologies, the desires of the concerned penitentiary administrators were necessarily a primary concern. Thus, the wishes of those administrators who expressed the desire to distribute the questionnaires to their employees through the penitentiary staff were respected.

#### Direct Distribution

The Direct Distribution Method was employed only at the Maximum Security Unit of the penitentiary in the Rocky Mountain state. This method was considered the most reliable and productive as it allowed for direct contact between the researcher and members of the research population. It also allowed contact with the maximum number of potential respondents during the twenty-four hour survey period. This time frame was utilized due to the employment of correctional officers on rotating eight-hour shifts on a twenty-four hour basis.

The potential respondents were briefed by the researcher at the "roll call" preceding each shift. They were told of the general nature of the research, the voluntariness of their participation, and the confidential nature of their individual responses. Two points were stressed during the briefings. First, the research conducted thus far on correctional officers usually relied on the observations of sociologists or inmates. Second, the confidentiality of their individual responses was assured as there was no way to determine the identity of individual respondents. These two points were emphasized in an effort to increase the interest and candidness of the potential respondents.

The potential respondents were also informed that the administration had authorized the completion of the survey forms on duty. After completing the questionnaires, they were instructed to deposit them in a marked drop

box located at the primary exit point of the penitentiary. At the conclusion of the briefings, the questionnaires were personally distributed to all the correctional officers present.

At the close of each shift, the researcher was present in the proximity of the drop box. The rationale behind his presence was that it would jog the memory of the officers exiting the penitentiary if they had forgotten their questionnaire. While it is possible that his presence may have inhibited some officers from depositing their questionnaires, it is highly unlikely as the officers had to pass the drop box prior to seeing the researcher. It is more likely that the original intent of his presence was achieved.<sup>8</sup>

During the survey period, ninety-nine questionnaires were directly distributed to the correctional officers assigned to the Maximum Security Unit. Forty-eight of the questionnaires were completed and returned. Subsequently, thirteen additional completed questionnaires were mailed to the researcher by penitentiary officials who explained that they had been deposited in the drop box after the researcher's departure. The drop box had been left in place for two days after the researcher's departure for just such an eventuality. Thus, a total of sixty-one completed questionnaires were received from the Maximum Security Unit. The sixty-one questionnaires represent a response rate of 61.6%.

#### Indirect Distribution

The Indirect Distribution Method was employed at the Medium Security Unit and the Women's Correctional Institute of the penitentiary in the Rocky Mountain state. Further, this method was employed exclusively at the penitentiary in the Southwestern state. As previously stated, this method was necessitated by the desires of the prison administrators concerned and

and time constraints involved in the study. This method was not considered as reliable or productive as the Direct Distribution Method previously employed as it did not allow for face-to-face contact between the researcher and the potential respondents.

The same time frame was utilized as in the Direct Distribution Method based on the shift rotation of the officers. However, the potential respondents were not personally briefed by the researcher prior to receiving the questionnaires. Instead, they were briefed by their shift supervisors who also distributed the questionnaires. Prior to implementing this procedure, the researcher briefed the responsible prison administrators on the need to protect the identity of the individual respondents and to insure that all the potential respondents were advised of the voluntary nature of the survey. All the administrators assured the researcher that they would make sure that the shift supervisors stressed both the confidential and voluntary nature of the survey.

The retrieval procedure followed in this method of distribution was ill suited for this type of survey as it tended to permit the compromise of the respondent's identity. However, the researcher had no control over this aspect of the survey. The method utilized by the shift supervisors was to have the respondents hand in their completed questionnaires. They, in turn, gave them to the prison administrator who released them to the researcher the following day.

During the survey period, forty-two questionnaires were indirectly distributed to correctional officers assigned to the remaining two units of the penitentiary in the Rocky Mountain state. Thirty-two of these questionnaires were completed and returned. The thirty-two completed questionnaires represent a response rate of 76.5% for these two units. Thus, a

total of ninety-three questionnaires were completed and returned by the correctional officers employed at the penitentiary in the Rocky Mountain state. These ninety-three questionnaires represent a response rate of 65.9% for this penitentiary.

Eighty-seven questionnaires were indirectly distributed to correctional officers employed at the penitentiary in the Southwestern state. Thirty-eight questionnaires were completed and returned. These thirty-eight questionnaires represent a response rate of 43.6% for this penitentiary.

#### Overall Distribution and Response Rate

A total of 228 questionnaires were distributed to the research population. One hundred and eighteen questionnaires were initially returned for an overall response rate of 51%. Subsequently, thirteen additional questionnaires were returned increasing the total number of responses to 131 for a response rate of 57%. Considering the survey environment, the time constraints, and the financial limitations inherent to this study, the response rate is considered to be an acceptable one.

#### Analytical Procedures

The data collected in this research will be analyzed and displayed in several different ways. First, the data are analyzed to determine frequency distributions and measures of central tendency. The results are reported graphically for better comprehension and presentation. Next, the frequency distribution of several variables within the survey population are analyzed and presented in a similar manner. These variables include the respondents' ages, organizational positions (rank), educational levels, work alienation levels, and job satisfaction levels. Finally, the levels of association between the independent variables and the dependent variables predicted in

the hypotheses are tested using various methods of statistical analysis which are appropriate for the levels of measurement concerned. No attempt will be made to control for more than one variable at any one time due to the small size of the sample.

## CHAPTER 3

### RESEARCH FINDINGS

The findings of this study are reported, analyzed, and interpreted in two parts. The first part focuses on the demographic characteristics of the survey population such as sex, age, organizational position and seniority, and educational attainment. The second part focuses on the hypotheses previously developed in Chapter 1 and testing their validity within the survey population.

#### Demographic Profile

##### Sex and Age

The respondents in this study are predominantly male, as might be expected, with 84% of them being male and 14.4% being female. Two respondents (1.6%) did not report their sex. The relatively low percentage of female correctional officers corresponds with the earlier findings of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Inc. (1969). The Commission found only 12% of the respondents in their nationwide survey of correctional personnel were women. They attributed this low rate of employment of women in corrections to unwarranted exclusion of females from meaningful work roles in corrections (1969:14). The present findings suggest that either women are continuing to be discriminated against in the correctional officer recruitment process or women are not seeking employment as correctional officers in any significant number.

The mean age of the correctional officers in this survey is 38.4 years. The ages ranged from a low of 19 years to a high of 62 years. Slightly more than 25% of the respondents were under 30 years of age;<sup>9</sup> while slightly more than 14% were over 50 years of age. The modal age is 31 years; while the median age is 36.9 years. Table 1 reports the actual age frequencies for the entire survey population. These data indicate that the respondents are slightly younger in age than those correctional personnel surveyed by the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Inc. (1969) and those correctional officers surveyed by Jacobs in 1978.<sup>10</sup>

Table 1. Age Frequencies of Respondents

Age Intervals (years)	Absolute Frequency	Cumulative Frequency <sup>a</sup> (percentage)
59-62	5	100.0
55-58	5	95.9
51-54	8	91.8
47-50	2-0	85.2
43-46	11	68.8
39-42	7	59.8
35-38	13	54.0
31-34	18	43.4
27-30	16	28.6
23-26	12	15.5
19-22	7	5.7

<sup>a</sup>These percentages are corrected for three missing respondents who did not report their age.

However, the study data still support the Commission's finding (1969: 13) that young people are missing from corrections. Only 15.5% of the respondents were under the age of 27 years. This is not surprising considering the requirements for employment as a correctional officer in most states. In both of the states visited during this study, age was one of the major considerations in recruiting correctional officers. In the Rocky Mountain state, applicants for correctional officer positions must be a minimum of twenty-one years of age. In the Southwestern state, applicants for correctional officer positions must be a minimum of eighteen years of age. However, personnel officials at the penitentiary in the Southwestern state candidly admitted that they seldom hire anyone under the age of twenty-one years for correctional officer positions. Thus, the absence of young people in the field of corrections is likely to continue in the future.

#### Organizational Position and Seniority

Respondents were asked to classify themselves as either Supervisory Officers or Line Officers. The respondents were predominantly Line Officers as reflected in Table 2. Only 32% classified themselves as Supervisory Officers.

Table 2. Organizational Position

Position	Frequency	Relative Percentage <sup>a</sup>
Supervisory Officer	40	32.0
Line Officer	84	67.2

<sup>a</sup>Only one respondent failed to report his rank.



Remarkably, 29.3% of the population had been on the job less than one year; while 26.8% had been on the job for more than ten years, as shown in Table 3. Over half of the respondents (56.9%) had been employed for five years or less. In a recent survey of Illinois Correctional Officers, 16% of the officers were found to have been on the job less than two years; while 23% had over ten years on the job (Jacobs, 1978a:186). Thus, there appears to be a higher turnover rate among the correctional officers in this study than those in Jacobs' study. High personnel turnover rates have been a continuing problem in corrections, especially in line positions, due to the undesirable working conditions, low pay, poor promotions, and social stigmatization incurred (Roucek, 1935; Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Inc., 1969; National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1973).

Table 3. Job Seniority

Length of Service	Number	Relative Percentage
Less than one year	36	29.3
One to five years	34	27.6
Five to ten years	20	16.3
More than ten years	33	26.8

#### Education Levels

The level of educational attainment of the respondents as a whole was relatively high compared to that found in an earlier nationwide study<sup>11</sup> of correctional personnel. Only six respondents (4.8%) reported having less than a high school education; while thirteen respondents (10.4%) reported having at least a baccalaureate degree. Over half (55.2%) of the respondents

reported having completed some college education, as shown in Table 4. However, only 20% of those respondents reporting some college education reported attaining more than two years of college. Thus, 55.2% of the respondents had some exposure to college level education ranging from one course to two years. However, the low percentage of respondents currently holding baccalaureate degrees or higher suggest that this incidence of higher education within the population is of relatively recent origin. If not, most of the correctional officers who have started a college education have either failed to complete it or have completed it and left their positions as correctional officers as indicated by the extremely low percentage of respondents actually holding a four-year college degree or higher.

Table 4. Respondents' Educational Levels

Level	Number	Percentage
Less than high school education	6	4.8
High school diploma or its equivalent	50	40.0
Some college (less than two years)	40	32.0
Associate degree (two-year degree)	4	3.2
More than two years college (no degree)	12	9.6
Bachelors degree obtained	8	6.4
Some graduate work (no advanced degrees)	5	4.0
Graduate degree obtained	0	0

#### Hypotheses Testing

In Chapter 1, a number of hypotheses were developed concerning work alienation and job satisfaction among correctional officers. In addition, hypotheses were developed concerning the relationship of a correctional

officer's level of educational attainment to each of these variables. Each of these hypotheses is reiterated below along with the pertinent survey findings.

#### Work Alienation

Hypothesis 1. As an occupational group, correctional officers will have a high level of work alienation.

The level of work alienation within the survey population was generally low based on the frequency of low scores on Pearlin's (1962) Work Alienation Scale which was incorporated in the survey instrument. The Scale permits the respondent to score from zero (low) to four which indicates a high level of work alienation. Slightly less than three-quarters of the respondents (73.6%) scored either moderate or low on the Scale. Twenty-eight respondents (22.4%) received the minimal score (zero) indicating little or no work alienation; while no respondents received the maximum score (four) indicating the highest level of work alienation. However, thirty-three (26.4%) of the respondents received a score of three indicating a relatively high level of work alienation. Thus, the data summarized in Table 5 do not support our Hypothesis 1.

Table 5. Respondents' Work Alienation Levels

Levels <sup>a</sup>	Percentage
Low	44.0
Moderate	29.6
High	26.4

<sup>a</sup>Levels of alienation are inferred from the respondents' scores which are categorized as follows: 0-1, low alienation; 2, moderate alienation; 3-4, high alienation. See Chapter 2 for an explanation.

Hypothesis 2. Correctional officers with more education will report a higher level of work alienation than their less educated coworkers.

Statistical analysis of the data, shown in Table 6, reveal a chi square of 2.91,  $p = .57$  indicating no statistically significant relationship exists between the two variables of educational attainment and work alienation. Gamma equals .06 confirming that there is no relationship between the two variables. Significantly, respondents with more than two years of college reported high levels of work alienation much more frequently than respondents with a high school education or less. While 41.7% of the respondents with more than two years of college reported high work alienation levels; only 33.3% of the respondents with a high school education or less reported similar levels of work alienation. However, the lowest percentage (28.1%) of respondents reporting high levels of work alienation were those respondents with less than two years of college. These data indicate a slight trend in the direction predicted by the hypothesis. However, as indicated by the results of the statistical tests, this trend is small enough to have occurred by chance. Thus, the data do not support our Hypothesis 2.

#### Discussion of Work Alienation Findings

The data collected in the present study failed to support either of the hypotheses formulated concerning the work alienation level among correctional officers or its relationship to the correctional officers educational attainment. The vast majority of the correctional officers reported work alienation levels ranging from low to moderate as opposed to the high level of work alienation predicted. Analysis of the data failed to show any consistent positive relationship between the correctional officers' levels of educational attainment and their levels of work alienation.

Table 6. Education versus Work Alienation

Educational Attainment <sup>a</sup>	Work Alienation Levels (percentage) <sup>b</sup>			
	Low	Moderate	High	
High school or less	29.2	37.5	33.3	(48)
College (two years or less)	25.0	46.9	28.1	(32)
College (more than two years)	29.4	23.5	47.1	(17)

$\chi^2 = 2.91.$   
 $p = .57.$   
Gamma = .06.

<sup>a</sup>Levels of attainment were necessitated to some extent by the small sample size. College graduates are included in the more than two-year category.

<sup>b</sup>Percentages corrected to exclude 28 respondents who failed to complete scale.

One possible explanation for these findings is that the correctional officers in the survey did not fall in Ritzer's (1972) characterization of individuals engaged in low level occupations as expected. While the literature on correctional officers would certainly lead one to believe otherwise, this may well have been the case in the present study. In some respects, the survey population did appear to be atypical of the correctional officers portrayed by national commissions and in correctional literature.

Ritzer characterized low level occupations as those in which the pay is low, the career patterns are highly restrictive, the social status is low, and the training is extremely poor. The correctional officers in this study made an average wage in their respective geographic areas and they had received pay raises across the board in the past year. While the career patterns of the officers employed at the penitentiary in the

Southwestern state could be characterized as quite restrictive, this was not true of the career patterns of the officers employed at the penitentiary in the Rocky Mountain state. In that correctional institution, a rather innovative career selection and advancement program was in effect. This program allowed the individual officer to choose from a number of job options. In addition, it allowed the individual officer to advance to various levels of responsibility, with appropriate pay adjustments, based on a combination of work experience and education. The operation of this program may help explain the lack of any significant relationship between the educational attainment of the correctional officers in the study and their education levels. Such a program would certainly seem to offer the correctional officers effected broad opportunities to utilize their individual skills and education which, in turn, may have decreased their work alienation level. In this respect, it is significant that 70.4% of the sample respondents were employed in the penitentiary system utilizing this innovative personnel program.

Interestingly enough, the social status of the correctional officers in this study does not appear to be low in the communities surrounding the penitentiaries. Both of the institutions were located in geographic areas where jobs are not plentiful and many of the correctional officers are long-time local residents. Their family ties in the local community coupled with the community's acceptance of the penitentiary as an economic resource, appear to put the correctional officers in a relatively good social position in their local communities.

In addition to these apparent contradictions of Ritzer's model of individuals engaged in low level occupations, the training programs for correctional officers at both institutions are being upgraded and seem to be well aligned with job skill requirements. Thus, the correctional officers

in the study do not appear to fit Ritzer's characterization in some ways. As a result, their work alienation levels could be expected to differ markedly from those predicted based on Ritzer's (1972) work.

Another possible explanation for these findings, is that they were distorted by the high number of missing respondents. Twenty-eight respondents (22.4%) returned the questionnaire with the Work Alienation Scale either not completed or only partially completed. Their actual reasons for failing to complete this part of the questionnaire are unclear. However, we speculate that one possible explanation is that they feared some sort of repercussions from prison officials if they answered the questions truthfully. Indeed, some of the questions on the Work Alienation Scale could be construed as critical of the prison administration. For example, one item asked the respondent to agree or disagree with the following statement: "Around here it's not important how much you know, it's who you know that really counts." Another possible explanation is that some of those who were alienated felt it socially undesirable to say so and did not report their true feelings or reported them inaccurately.

At the onset of the study, the sensitivity of some of the questions was recognized and attempts were made to insure the respondent's anonymity. However, much of this anonymity was compromised due to a change in questionnaire distribution method, explained in Chapter 2, which was necessitated by the wishes of the involved prison administrators. Considering that this change possibly reduced respondent anonymity, one may logically conclude that those respondents with very high work alienation levels may have been reluctant to complete those items that could be interpreted as critical of prison officials. While both of these explanations are speculative in nature, they may well help explain the unexpected findings regarding work alienation.

## Job Satisfaction

Hypothesis 3. As an occupational group, correctional officers will have a high level of job satisfaction.

The respondents tended to score high on the fourteen-item Job Satisfaction Index incorporated in the survey instrument. Sixty-eight percent of the respondents had scores indicating a moderate or high level of job satisfaction, as shown in Table 7. While 33.6% of the respondents had scores indicating a high level of job satisfaction, only 17.6% of the respondents had scores indicating a low level of job satisfaction. The median score of the respondents was 53.5 on the seventy-point Index. The mean score was 51.2 indicating a few extremely low scores negatively skewed the distribution of scores. Three respondents had scores of twenty or lower on the Index which has a minimal score of fourteen. The moderately high level of job satisfaction among these respondents is somewhat lower than that reported by other major studies of correctional personnel.<sup>12</sup> However, the data from this study do support our Hypothesis 3.

Table 7. Respondents' Job Satisfaction Levels

Level <sup>a</sup>	Number	Percentage
Low	40	32.0
Moderate	43	34.4
High	42	33.6

<sup>a</sup>Levels of satisfaction were assigned as follows: 14-49, low satisfaction; 50-56, moderate satisfaction; 57-70, high satisfaction.



Hypothesis 4. Correctional officers with more education will report a lower level of job satisfaction than their less educated coworkers.

Statistical analysis of the data, set forth in Table 8, reveal a chi square of 13.16,  $p = .01$  indicating a statistically significant relationship between these two variables. The contingency coefficient of .308 indicates a moderately strong relationship between the two variables. Gamma of  $-.03$ , while extremely weak, does reflect the relationship as negative as predicted. Significantly, 48% of the respondents with more than two years of college reported a low level of job satisfaction; while only 25% of the respondents with a high school education or less reported a similar level of job satisfaction. However, this pattern does not hold true for respondents reporting high levels of job satisfaction. Only 25% of those with a high school education or less reported a high level of job satisfaction; while 32% of those respondents with more than two years of college reported a like level of job satisfaction. These findings suggest that education may be more of a dissatisfier than a satisfier. The data obtained in the study tend to support our Hypothesis 4.

Table 8. Education versus Job Satisfaction

Educational Attainment	Job Satisfaction Levels (percentage)			
	Low	Moderate	High	
High school or less	25.0	50.0	25.0	(56)
College (two years or less)	31.8	22.7	45.5	(44)
College (more than two years)	48.0	20.0	32.0	(25)
	$\chi^2 = 13.16; 4 \text{ d.f.}$			
	$p = .01.$			
	$CC = .308.$			
	$\text{Gamma} = -.03.$			

Hypothesis 5. When the influence of age, rank, job seniority, and career intentions are held constant, the inverse relationship between the correctional officers' educational attainment and their job satisfaction levels will persist.

Statistical analysis of the data, reported in Table 9, reveal that the inverse relationship between the respondents' educational levels and their levels of job satisfaction holds in all age categories except over forty-five years. In the under thirty years of age category, the chi square is 11.51,  $p = .02$  with a contingency coefficient of .497 which indicates a strong relationship between the two variables in this age category. A gamma of  $-.10$  confirms the negative relationship between the two variables, although the gamma statistic suggests a weak association. While only 33.3% of those respondents with a high school education or less reported a low level of job satisfaction; 60% of those respondents with more than two years of college reported a like level of job satisfaction.

In the age category of thirty-one to forty-five years, the chi square is 16.65,  $p = .002$ , with a contingency coefficient of .519 indicating also a strong relationship between these variables. A gamma of  $-.07$ , again, confirms the predicted negative relationship. The data in Table 9 indicate that while 28.6% of the respondents with a high school education or less reported a low level of job satisfaction; 70% of the respondents with more than two years of college reported a like level of job satisfaction.

In the over forty-five year age category, the chi square is 1.10,  $p = .89$  with a contingency coefficient of .160 indicating no significant relationship between the two variables in this age category. Gamma equals  $-.04$  which again suggests a negative relationship, although extremely weak. These findings support this portion of the hypothesis. However, they also indicate that education and job satisfaction are not related among the older correctional officers.

Table 9. Education versus Job Satisfaction Controlling Age

Education Levels	Respondents Reported Level of Job Satisfaction (percentage)			
	Low	Moderate	High	
Thirty Years and Under				
High school or less	33.3	55.6	11.1	(18)
College (two years or less)	58.3	0	41.7	(12)
College (more than two years)	60.0	20.0	20.0	( 5)
	$\chi^2 = 11.51; 4 \text{ d.f.}$ $p = .02.$ $CC = .497.$ $\text{Gamma} = -.10.$			
Thirty-One to Forty-Five Years				
High school or less	28.6	71.4	0	(14)
College (two years or less)	28.6	28.6	42.9	(21)
College (more than two years)	70.0	10.0	20.0	(10)
	$\chi^2 = 16.65; 4 \text{ d.f.}$ $p = .002.$ $CC = .519.$ $\text{Gamma} = -.07.$			
Forty-Five Years or Over				
High school or less	13.0	34.8	52.2	(23)
College (two years or less)	9.1	36.4	54.5	(11)
College (more than two years)	25.0	25.0	50.0	( 8)
	$\chi^2 = 1.10; 4 \text{ d.f.}$ $p = .89.$ $CC = .160.$ $\text{Gamma} = -.04.$			

Statistical analysis of the data, reported in Table 10, reveal that inverse relationship between the respondents' educational levels and their levels of job satisfaction holds among line officers but not among supervisory officers. In the line officer category, the chi square is 23.71,  $p = .0001$ , with a contingency coefficient of .469 indicating a strong relationship between the variables in this category of respondents. A gamma of  $-.06$  confirms that the relationship remains a negative one. Inspection of the data in Table 10 indicates that while 26.3% of the respondents with a high school education or less reported a low level of job satisfaction, 76.9% of the respondents with more than two years of college reported a like level of job satisfaction. In the supervisory category, the chi square is 2.91,  $p = .57$  indicating no significant relationship between the two variables in that category. Gamma equals .02 confirming no relationship. Inspection of the relevant data reveals that while 22.2% of the respondents with a high school education or less reported a low level of job satisfaction, only 18.2% of the respondents with more than two years of college reported a like level of job satisfaction.

Analysis of the data, reported in Table 11, reveal that the inverse relationship between the respondents' educational levels and their levels of job satisfaction only holds among those respondents with short lengths of service. No significant relationship between the two variables is found among respondents having over one year of service. Among the respondents having less than one year of service, the chi square is 14.40,  $p = .006$  with a contingency coefficient of .534 indicating a strong relationship between the two variables in that age category. A gamma of  $-.25$  confirms the predicted negative relationship between the two variables. Further, inspection of the data in Table 11 reveals that while 13.3% of the respondents with a high

school education or less reported a low level of job satisfaction, 71.4% of the respondents with more than two years of college reported a like level of job satisfaction. Among those respondents in the one to five and in the five or more years of service categories, no significant relationship between the two variables is noted.

Table 10. Education versus Job Satisfaction Controlling Rank

Education Levels	Respondents Reported Level of Job Satisfaction (percentage)			
	Low	Moderate	High	
Line Officer				
High school or less	26.3	55.3	18.4	(38)
College (less than two years)	27.3	24.2	48.5	(33)
College (more than two years)	76.9	0	23.1	(13)
$\chi^2 = 23.71; 4 \text{ d.f.}$ $p = .0001.$ $CC = .469.$ $\text{Gamma} = - .06.$				
Supervisor				
High school or less	22.2	38.9	38.9	(18)
College (less than two years)	45.5	18.2	36.4	(11)
College (more than two years)	18.2	36.4	45.5	(11)
$\chi^2 = 2.91; 4 \text{ d.f.}$ $p = .57.$ $CC = .260.$ $\text{Gamma} = .02.$				

Table 11. Education versus Job Satisfaction Controlling Length of Service

Education Levels	Reported Level of Job Satisfaction (percentage)			
	Low	Moderate	High	
Less than One Year				
High school or less	13.3	66.7	20.0	(15)
College (less than two years)	35.7	14.3	50.0	(14)
College (more than two years)	71.4	14.3	14.3	( 7)
	$\chi^2 = 14.40; 4 \text{ d.f.}$			
	$p = .006.$			
	$CC = .534.$			
	$\text{Gamma} = - .25.$			
One to Five Years				
High school or less	40.0	45.0	15.0	(20)
College (less than two years)	39.1	17.4	43.5	(23)
College (more than two years)	45.4	18.2	36.4	(11)
	$\chi^2 = 6.33; 4 \text{ d.f.}$			
	$p = .17.$			
	$CC = .323.$			
	$\text{Gamma} = .12.$			
Five Years or More				
High school or less	21.1	26.8	42.1	(19)
College (less than two years)	0	57.1	42.9	( 7)
College (more than two years)	28.6	28.6	42.9	( 7)
	$\chi^2 = 2.57; 4 \text{ d.f.}$			
	$p = .63.$			
	$CC = .269.$			
	$\text{Gamma} = .02.$			

Analysis of the data, reported in Table 12 reveal that the inverse relationship between the respondents' levels of education and their levels of job satisfaction does not hold in any of those categories of respondents. There is no statistically significant relationship between the two variables regardless of the respondent's career or non-career intentions. Quite obviously, career intentions intervenes the relationship between educational attainment and job satisfaction.

#### Discussion of Job Satisfaction Findings

The findings of the present study support our hypothesis that the level of job satisfaction among correctional officers would be high. Sixty-eight percent of the officers surveyed reported either a moderate or high level of job satisfaction. These findings are consistent with Berg's (1971) assertion that when an individual's educational attainment level is well aligned with his or her job skill requirements, the individual's job satisfaction level will tend to be high. Obviously, we believe that the current educational attainment level of the majority of correctional officers is well aligned with their current job knowledge requirements. Thus, the relatively high level of job satisfaction among our respondents.

The findings of the present study also tend to support our hypothesis that the educational attainment of correctional officers is inversely related to their job satisfaction levels. However, the relationship appears to be a conditional one. The age of the correctional officer significantly effected the relationship between the two variables. Generally the younger the officer, the more likely the relationship predicted. While the relationship appeared to be strong among the younger officers (age categories under thirty years and thirty to forty-five years), it disappeared among the older officers (age category over forty-five years). This finding coincides with that of

Table 12. Education versus Job Satisfaction Controlling Career Intentions

Education Levels	Reported Level of Job Satisfaction (percentage)			
	Low	Moderate	High	
Intends to Make Corrections Career				
High school or less	10.0	56.7	33.3	(30)
College (less than two years)	13.3	30.0	56.7	(30)
College (more than two years)	21.4	21.4	57.1	(14)
	$\chi^2 = 7.11; 4 \text{ d.f.}$			
	$p = .12.$			
	$CC = .269.$			
	$\text{Gamma} = .19.$			
Does Not Intend to Make Corrections Career				
High school or less	54.5	36.4	9.1	(11)
College (less than two years)	100.0	0	0	( 5)
College (more than two years)	80.0	20.0	0	( 5)
	$\chi^2 = 3.91; 4 \text{ d.f.}$			
	$p = .41.$			
	$CC = .396.$			
	$\text{Gamma} = - .61.$			
Undecided on Corrections as Career				
High school or less	35.7	42.9	21.4	(14)
College (less than two years)	55.6	11.1	33.3	( 9)
College (more than two years)	83.3	16.7	0	( 6)
	$\chi^2 = 6.14; 4 \text{ d.f.}$			
	$p = .18.$			
	$CC = .418.$			
	$\text{Gamma} = - .42.$			



Vollmer and Kinney (1955) in which younger employees were found to be more likely to report job satisfaction than older employees. One possible explanation of this finding is that older employees or correctional officers tend to resign themselves to their position and job in life regardless of their education levels.

Significantly, the inverse relationship between the two variables again appeared strongly among those officers with less than one year of service. However, it disappeared among those officers with more than one year of service. One explanation would be the one offered to explain the absence of the relationship among older correctional officers. Another possible explanation is that those officers with less than one year of service tend to be more interested in obtaining a satisfactory level of job satisfaction than in job security. Also, such officers would tend to be younger than those with a number of years of employment.

The organizational position (rank) of the officer also appeared to influence the relationship between the two variables significantly. While the inverse relationship remained strong among line officers, it disappeared among supervisory officers. This finding suggests that the better-educated line officers perceived little or no opportunity to utilize their education in their daily work, while the better-educated supervisory officers did perceive such an opportunity. Regardless of the respondent's career intentions, the inverse was not noted. Thus, career intentions intervened the relationship between educational attainment and job satisfaction.

Finally, we may note that the negative relationship between educational attainment and job satisfaction appears to occur among correctional officers who are of less than supervisory rank and who have been on the job for less than one year. It will be recalled that approximately 29% of the respondents

in this study had been on the job for less than one year. This finding combined with these latter ones tends to suggest that there is a large turnover rate among these employees and that it is likely the case that those persons who are better educated and who are dissatisfied with their jobs are likely to leave them. Others who remain, are likely to be promoted into supervisory jobs and be relatively satisfied with their work.

## CHAPTER 4

## RESEARCH SUMMARY

Summary of Findings

Our investigation of the relationship between the educational attainment of correctional officers and their respective levels of job satisfaction and work alienation resulted in a number of significant findings. Our study found that the level of job satisfaction among correctional officer was relatively high and their level of work alienation correspondingly low. We interpret these findings to mean that the present educational attainment level of the majority of correctional officers coincides well with the knowledge requirements of their job. While the percentage of the officers reporting a moderate or high level of job satisfaction was somewhat lower than that reported by correctional officers in other studies,<sup>12</sup> 68% of the officers reported job satisfaction levels in the moderate to high range. This difference may be, in part, due to the fact that the officers in this study tended to be both younger and better educated than those in previous studies.

Our study also found a moderately strong negative relationship to exist between a correctional officer's level of educational attainment and his or her level of job satisfaction under certain conditions. When we controlled for age, we found that the inverse relationship between the two variables remained except in the response pattern of those officers over forty-five years of age. In that age category, the relationship disappeared indicating that age tends to influence job satisfaction more than education among the older officers. However, the strength of the relationship remained

high among the younger officers. When we controlled for the officer's career intentions, we found that the inverse relationship disappeared indicating that career intentions intervened the relationship.

While the results of our study did not show a consistent relationship between the two variables in all ranges of job satisfaction when we controlled for possible antecedent and intervening variables, they did show a relatively consistent inverse relationship between the officers' educational attainment and their job satisfaction in the response patterns of those officers reporting a low level of job satisfaction regardless of their age or length of service. This inverse relationship was also evident among those officers reporting low levels of job satisfaction who claimed to be career officers or to be undecided concerning their career intentions. As one would expect, the relationship was not evidenced in the response patterns of those officers reporting a low level of job satisfaction who had decided to leave corrections in the future or those officers who were currently serving in a supervisory capacity. Officers in these categories apparently perceived opportunities to use their knowledge in future employment outside of corrections or in their current supervisory positions within corrections.

Our study also found that work alienation level among correctional officers was relatively low and did not correlate with their educational attainment in any statistically significant manner. These findings tend to contradict Ritzer's (1972) theoretical explanation of work alienation and its incidence in "low level" occupations. Ritzer predicts that the work alienation level in such occupations will be very high. He also claims that increasing the level of educational attainment of persons engaged in such occupations will only increase their level of work alienation. Analysis of the data in this study failed to support either of these hypotheses.

Another significant finding of our study is that both women and young people are still under represented in corrections particularly in the category of line correctional officers. Only slightly more than 14% of the officers surveyed were female; while only 25% of the officers surveyed were under thirty years of age. These findings tend to correspond with those of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Inc. and support their conclusion that both women and young people are unjustifiably being excluded from meaningful jobs in corrections (1969:13-14).

#### Study Limitations and Recommendations

The findings of this research are necessarily limited in their application. These limitations are due to the vast differences in the characteristics of correctional officers nationwide and the environments in which they are employed. While the survey population may be representative of some of these correctional officers, particularly those with similar employment requirements and organizational structures, it is not claimed that it is typical of all such populations. In fact, it may have been atypical in some respects as reported in Chapter 3.

Another difficulty in generalizing these research findings to correctional officers as a whole is the small size of the sample and its focus on correctional officers in state institutions. The National Manpower Survey of the Criminal Justice System (1978:2) estimated that there were some 70,000 correctional officers employed in adult correctional institutions nationwide. A large number of these officers are employed by the Federal government which has significantly different recruitment standards than the state governments. Thus, the background characteristics of the state employed correctional officers would be expected to differ significantly from those of the federally employed correctional officers.

As in many studies, a number of methodological problems were encountered which might be avoided in future studies if the following recommendations are followed. It is recommended that the number of items on the survey instrument be reduced to a more manageable number and that the questions concerning educational attainment level be more specific. In the present study, the author found that the large number of items included on the questionnaire, fifty-eight in all, created a cumbersome survey instrument and caused unnecessary difficulties in data collection, coding, and analysis. The author also found that the answer categories for some items used to differentiate the respondents' levels of educational attainment were far too broad. For example, the educational attainment level of a respondent who reported having less than two years of college could range anywhere from one college course to a full two years of college work. Such a wide range in the response categories made meaningful analysis of the data with regard to the hypothesized relationship between educational attainment and job satisfaction difficult.

Finally, it is strongly recommended that more safeguards be included to insure respondent anonymity. In the present study, the change in distribution method, necessitated by the wishes of the prison administrators concerned, coupled with the short period of time allowed for data collection may have seriously compromised the anonymity of many of the respondents. This may have, in turn, significantly effected the outcome of the study as suggested in Chapter 3. Anonymity of the respondents in future studies could be greatly enhanced by the researcher insuring prior to the data collection phase that the respective prison officials are agreeable to the researcher personally distributing the survey instrument, expanding the time period allowed for the collection of data, and providing plain envelopes to the respondents with instructions to enclose their completed questionnaires in the envelopes when returning them.

Despite these limitations, this research will help fill the void of knowledge concerning the demographic characteristics of correctional officers and their job-related attitudes. Moreover, the findings of this research may offer some hint as to the unanticipated consequences of arbitrarily increasing the educational requirements for correctional officers without considering their job skill requirements. Perhaps most importantly, this research will hopefully encourage more empirical research on correctional officers nationwide particularly in the area of educational requirements and job compatibility.

### Conclusions

There is a pressing need for more additional studies of the relationship of one's educational attainment to all aspects of his or her occupational adjustment. This is particularly true in light of the rising educational level in the general population and its possible implications in the work place. Commenting on this problem, Lawler (1976:228) states:

We do know . . . that a number of things are changing in society which seem to have implications for job and organizational design. For example, the changes in our educational system which are taking place seem to suggest that people are changing. Not only is the education level of the average man (woman) increasing but he (she) is receiving an education that is based on the principles of self control, autonomy, and individualization. Given that educational level correlates with the nature of people, it seems logical that jobs must alter to keep up with the changes in people that are probably taking place.

Thus, if we are unwilling to alter the job skill requirements in a particular occupation to coincide with the education level of individuals engaged in that occupation, one might expect somewhat higher levels of job dissatisfaction within that occupation.

In the case of correctional officers, very little is known about the effects of upgrading their educational level without correspondingly

upgrading their job skill requirements. However, we may conclude from the results of the present study that the movement to "professionalize" correctional officers by upgrading their educational levels is likely to have some serious drawbacks along with its assumed benefits. The most important of these drawbacks is the likelihood that the level of job satisfaction among young correctional officers who attain this higher level of education will drop significantly. With this drop in job satisfaction among the better-educated younger correctional officers, we may well anticipate an increase in the turnover rate among such officers. Such an increase will only aggravate the existing problem of high personnel turnover among correctional officers (Lunden, 1965; Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Inc., 1969).

This problem could perhaps be avoided or at least minimized by a meaningful expansion of the job tasks and responsibilities of such correctional officers. While job enrichment has been suggested as a means of retaining correctional officers, especially those who have higher level needs which tend to be satisfied by the intrinsic satisfactions of the job (Brief et al., 1976), there has been no general movement in corrections towards this goal. This may in part be due to the strong traditional role of the correctional officers coupled with the authoritarian organizational structure which typifies their work environment.

However, perhaps we should ask an even more fundamental question about the occupation of correctional officer. Does such an occupation really require a college education? Recently, the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice addressed this question in its 1978 National Manpower Survey (NMS). The primary objective of the NMS was "to assess training and educational needs in law enforcement and criminal justice occupations. . ." (NMS, 1978:1). In discussing financial support for higher education for



criminal justice personnel, the survey authors concluded that the basic promise that higher education is a necessary condition for upgrading the performance of criminal justice personnel is not empirically supported. They emphasize that "NMS assessments have not confirmed the need for mass higher education for all line law enforcement or correctional officer. . ." (NMS, 1978:9). The findings of our study are consistent with this conclusion, especially for line correctional officers.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>The recruiting flyer consisted of two undated mimeographed pages in which the duties and career benefits of correctional officers employed by the Colorado State Department of Corrections are discussed.

<sup>2</sup>The recruitment standards are similar to those identified in the report issued by the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Inc., A Time to Act (1969), hereinafter cited as JCCMT, A Time to Act.

<sup>3</sup>In practice, applicants under the age of twenty-one years are seldom hired according to personnel officials.

<sup>4</sup>Effective 1 July 1978, all recruits were required to complete eighty hours (ten days) of pre-service training.

<sup>5</sup>Prior to the actual survey, a number of correctional officers were interviewed. Several officers stated that military ranks were still used among the correctional officers themselves regardless of their new job titles. Personal observations during the period of the survey confirmed this information.

<sup>6</sup>Plans are to reinstate the military rank system in the near future while retaining the new job descriptions and pay scales according to personnel officials.

<sup>7</sup>The twenty-four hour time period was chosen because of the researcher's limited availability and the prison officials' desires to avoid any work disruption.

<sup>8</sup>Several correctional officers subsequently told the researcher that they had forgotten their questionnaires at their duty stations and had returned to retrieve them after their memory was jogged by the researcher's presence near the penitentiary exit.

<sup>9</sup>JCCMT, A Time to Act (1969:13), found that 26% of the correctional personnel in their nationwide study were under thirty-four years of age. Thus, supporting their argument that young people are missing from corrections.

<sup>10</sup>JCCMT, A Time to Act (1969:12) reported a median age of 42.8 years, Jacobs (1978:186) reported a median age of forty-five years.

<sup>11</sup>JCCMT, A Time to Act (1969:22) found that 16% of the line correctional officers in their survey had less than a high school education; while only 3% of the line officers had bachelor's degrees.

<sup>12</sup>JCCMT, A Time to Act (1969:14), found that correctional officers as a group were relatively satisfied with their jobs, Jacobs (1978:180) found that 90% of the correctional officers that he surveyed reported being "happy" or "somewhat happy" with their jobs.

## REFERENCES

- American Correctional Association  
1966 Manual of Correctional Standards. Washington, D.C.
- Berg, Ivar  
1971 Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Brayfield, Arthur H. and Harold F. Rothe  
1951 "An index of job satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology 35: 307-311.
- Brayfield, Arthur H., Richard V. Wells, and Marvin W. Strate  
1957 "Interrelationships among measures of job satisfaction and general satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology 41:201-205.
- Brief, Arthur P., Jim Munro, and Ramon J. Aldag  
1976 "Correctional employees' reactions to job characteristics: A data based argument for job enlargement." Journal of Criminal Justice 4:223-230.
- Brodsky, Stanley L.  
1974 "Bill of rights for the correctional officer." Federal Probation 38:38-40.
- Bullock, Robert P.  
1952 Social Factors Related to Job Satisfaction: A Technique for the Measurement of Job Satisfaction. Ohio: Ohio State University.
- Carney, Louis P.  
1974 Introduction to Correctional Science. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Cheatwood, A. D.  
1974 "Staff in correctional settings: An empirical investigation of frying pans and fires." Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency 11:173-179.
- Chearns, Albert  
1976 "Social change and work." in Personal Goals and Work Design. Peter Warr (ed.), London: John Wiley and Sons.
- Colorado, Department of Corrections  
U.D. "A career as a correctional officer." (mimeographed)
- Crites, John O.  
1969 Vocational Psychology: The Study of Vocational Behavior and Development. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

- Cromier, Bruno M.  
1975 The Watcher and the Watched. Plattsburgh, New York: Tundra Books.
- Duffee, David  
1974 "Correctional officer subculture and organizational change." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 11:155.
- 1975 Correctional Policy and Prison Organization. New York: Halsted Press.
- Fox, Vernon  
1977 Introduction to Corrections. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Griffin, Gerald R., Roger L. M. Dunbar, and Michael E. McGill.  
1978 "Factors associated with job satisfaction among police personnel." Journal of Police Science and Administration 6:77-85.
- Hoppock, Robert  
1935 Job Satisfaction. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Jacobs, James B. and Harold G. Retsky  
1975 "Prison guard." Pp. 49-65 in R. G. Leger and J. R. Stratton (eds.), The Sociology of Corrections: A Book of Readings. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Jacobs, James B. and Samuel B. Magdovitz  
1977 "At LEEP'S end?: A review of the law enforcement education program." Journal of Police Science and Administration 5:1-18.
- Jacobs, James B. and Laurence J. Kraft  
1978 "Intergrating the keepers: A comparison of black and white prison guards in Illinois." Social Problems 25:304-318.
- Jacobs, James B.  
1978a "What prison guards think: A profile of the Illinois force." Crime and Delinquency 24:185-197.
- 1978b Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. Interview, 12 June 1978.
- Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Inc.  
1969 A Time to Act. Lebanon, Pennsylvania: Sowers Printing Co.
- Kassebaum, C. G., D. A. Ward, and D. M. Wilner  
1964 "Correlates of staff ideology in the prison." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 1:96-109.
- Lawler, Edward E. III  
1976 "Conference review: Issues of understanding." in Personal Goals and Work Design. Peter Warr (ed.), London: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lunden, Walter A.  
1965 The Prison Warden and the Custodial Staff. Springfield, Illinois: Thomas.

- National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.  
1973 Corrections. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.  
1978 The National Manpower Survey of the Criminal Justice System:  
Executive Summary.
- Pearlin, Leonard I.  
1962 "Alienation from work: A study of nursing personnel." Personnel  
27:14-32/
- President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.  
1967 The Task Force Report: Corrections. Washington, D.C.: Government  
Printing Office.
- Price, James L.  
1977 The Study of Turnover. Iowa: The Iowa State University Press.
- Rich, H. E.  
1977 "Liberalizing influence of college: Some new evidence." Adolescence  
12:199-211.
- Ritzer, George  
1972 Man and His Work: Conflict and Change. New York: Meredith  
Corporation.
- Robinson, John P., Robert Athanasion, and Kendra B. Head.  
1969 Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics:  
Appendix A to Measures of Political Attitudes. Survey Research  
Center, Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Roucek, J.  
1935 "Sociology of the prison guard." Sociology and Social Research  
20:145-151.
- Showalter, S.  
1975 "Questions and answers: A growing problem." American Journal of  
Corrections 37:36-37.
- Smith, Patricia Cain, Lorne M. Kendall, and Charles L. Hulin.  
1969 The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement: A Strategy  
for the Study of Attitudes. Illinois: Rand McNally and Company.
- State, Donald L.  
1967 Disciplinary Attitudes of Correctional Officers: Regarding Inmates  
Misconduct in a Federal Penitentiary. Washington: Washington State  
University, MA Thesis, Police Science.
- Sykes, Graham M.  
1956 Crime and Society. New York: Random House.
- Swanson, Charles R.  
1977 "An uneasy look at college education and the police organization."  
Journal of Criminal Justice 5:311-320.

Vollmer, Howard M. and Jack A. Kinney

1955 "Age, education, and job satisfaction." *Personnel* 32:38-43.

Weiner, Norman L.

1974 "The effect of education on police attitudes." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 2:317-328.

Wicks, R. J.

1974 "Is the corrections officer a second class citizen?" *American Journal of Corrections* 36:32.

**APPENDIX**

## APPENDIX

Job Questionnaire

For anyone, some jobs are more interesting and satisfying than others. We would like to know how you feel about your job in particular. Please follow the directions for each part of this questionnaire carefully so that your comments will be accurately recorded. We urge you to be completely frank in your answers as they will be strictly confidential. You will in no way be identifiable by questionnaire. DO NOT write your name or in any way indicate your identity on any part of this form! YOUR cooperation and honesty are greatly appreciated in this attempt to learn more about your feelings about your job.

Background Information

Please circle the letter indicating your response.

1. What is your current position?
 

A. Supervisor (Sergeant or above)	B. Line Officer
C. Treatment Staff	
  
2. What is your sex?
 

A. Male	B. Female
---------	-----------
  
3. How long have you been employed as a Correctional Officer?
 

A. 3 months or less	B. More than 3 months, less than 1 year
C. 1 to 5 years	D. More than 5 years, less than 10 years
E. 10 to 15 years	F. 15 years or more
  
4. What is your age? \_\_\_\_\_ (fill in)
  
5. What is your current education level?
 

A. Less than high school education	B. High school graduate (includes GED)
C. Some college (less than 2 years)	D. Associate Arts degree (2 years of college)
E. More than 2 years, but no Bachelor degree	
F. Bachelor's Degree in _____	(specify)
G. Some graduate work, no advanced degree	
H. Advanced Degree in _____	(specify)



6. What type of employment did you hold prior to your present position?
- |   |                           |
|---|---------------------------|
| A. Military                               | D. Unemployed             |
| B. Student                                | E. Law Enforcement        |
| C. Education                              | F. Sales/private business |
| G. Corrections (specify former job) _____ |                           |
| H. Other (specify) _____                  |                           |
7. How much education do you hope to obtain?
- |                                 |                         |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| A. No further education planned | B. Complete high school |
| C. Some college                 | D. College degree       |
| E. Graduate                     |                         |

### Your Opinions on Job Issues

Circle letter indicating your response.

8. How often do you do things in your work that you wouldn't do if it were up to you?
- |               |                    |                 |
|---------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| A. Never      | B. Once in a while | C. Fairly often |
| D. Very often |                    |                 |
9. How often do you tell (your supervisor) your own ideas about things you might do in your work?
- |               |                    |                 |
|---------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| A. Never      | B. Once in a while | C. Fairly often |
| D. Very often |                    |                 |
10. Around here it's not important how much you know, it's who you know that really counts.
- |          |             |
|----------|-------------|
| A. Agree | B. Disagree |
|----------|-------------|
11. How much say or influence do people like you have on the way the prison is run?
- |          |         |                |
|----------|---------|----------------|
| A. A lot | B. Some | C. Very little |
| D. None  |         |                |
12. What in your opinion are the three main advantages of being a correctional officer?
- |                                |                         |                 |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|
| A. Interesting work            | B. Money                | C. Job Security |
| D. No advantages               | E. Promotion advantages | F. Easy work    |
| G. Non-prison related reasons. |                         |                 |
13. Does your job pay as well as you expected that it would?
- |        |       |
|--------|-------|
| A. Yes | B. No |
|--------|-------|
14. Is your job as personally rewarding as you hoped it would be?
- |        |       |
|--------|-------|
| A. Yes | B. No |
|--------|-------|
15. Do you intend to make corrections your life time career?
- |        |       |              |
|--------|-------|--------------|
| A. Yes | B. No | C. Undecided |
|--------|-------|--------------|
16. Would you recommend your job to a friend?
- |        |       |
|--------|-------|
| A. Yes | B. No |
|--------|-------|

- 17. Does your job offer you as much opportunity to use your knowledge and skills as you thought it would?  
A. Yes   B. No
- 18. If the salary were equal, would you accept another job outside of corrections if offered one?  
A. Yes   B. No   C. Undecided
- 19. Has your job advancement been as fast as you expected it to be?  
A. Yes   B. No
- 20. To what extent are you happy with the present working conditions at the prison?  
Very             1    2    3    4    5    6    7             Very     (Circle number indicating  
Unhappy   Happy     your feelings)

Working Conditions

Circle letter indicating your response.

Strongly Agree = SA  
Agree = A

Undecided = U  
Disagree = D

Strongly Disagree = SD

- |  |    |   |   |   |    |
|--|----|---|---|---|----|
| 21. I am happy with the working environment of the prison.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 22. Things would be much better here, if the staff had more to say in the decisions about policies and planning.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 23. There is a real need for more communication between the administration and the staff regarding work schedules and working conditions.  | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 24. I think it is right that the decisions regarding work schedules and working conditions are made by the administration.   | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 25. I feel that it is essential for the administration to consult with the staff and their representatives in making decisions and policies about work schedules and working conditions. | SA | A | U | D | SD |

\*\*\*\*\*

The following series of statements may or may not be true for your job at the penitentiary. For each item, please answer as it applies to you and your job at the penitentiary. Circle number.

	Definitely True	More True Than False	More False Than True	Definitely False
26. First, I feel that I am my own boss in most matters.	1	2	3	4
27. A person can make his own decisions here without checking with anybody else.	1	2	3	4
28. How things are done around here is left pretty much up to the person doing the work.	1	2	3	4
29. People here are allowed to do almost as they please.	1	2	3	4
30. Most people here make their own rules on the job.	1	2	3	4
31. The employees are constantly being checked on for rule violations.	1	2	3	4
32. People here feel as though they are constantly being watched to see that they obey all the rules.	1	2	3	4
33. There is no rules manual.	1	2	3	4
34. There is a complete written job description for my job.	1	2	3	4
35. Whatever situation arises, we have procedures to follow in dealing with it.	1	2	3	4
36. Everyone has a specific job to do.	1	2	3	4
37. Going through the proper channels is constantly stressed.	1	2	3	4
38. The organization keeps a written record of everyone's job performance.	1	2	3	4

Working Conditions

Continue to circle the number indicating your answer.

	Definitely True	More True Than False	More False Than True	Definitely False
39. Whenever we have a problem we are supposed to go to the same person for an answer.	1	2	3	4
40. A person who wants to make his or her own decisions would be quickly discouraged here.	1	2	3	4
41. There can be little action taken here until a supervisor approves a decision.	1	2	3	4
42. Even small matters have to be referred to someone higher up for a final decision.	1	2	3	4
43. I have to asky my boss before I do almost anything.	1	2	3	4
44. Any decision I make has to have my boss's approval.	1	2	3	4

\* \* \* \* \*

Job Satisfaction

Circle the letter indicating your response.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
45. My job is usually interesting enough to keep me from getting bored.	SA	A	U	D	SD
46. It seems that my friends interested in their jobs.	SA	A	U	D	SD
47. I consider my job rather unpleasant.	SA	A	U	D	SD
48. I feel fairly well satisfied with my present job.	SA	A	U	D	SD

Job Satisfaction

Continue to circle the letter indicating your response.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
49. I am often bored with my job.	SA	A	U	D	SD
50. I like my job better than the average worker.	SA	A	U	D	SD
51. I feel that my job is no more interesting than others I could get.	SA	A	U	D	SD
52. I feel that I am happier with my job than most people.	SA	A	U	D	SD
53. I definitely dislike my job.	SA	A	U	D	SD
54. My job is pretty uninteresting.	SA	A	U	D	SD
55. Most days I am enthusiastic about my work.	SA	A	U	D	SD
56. I am disappointed that I ever took this job.	SA	A	U	D	SD
57. I find real enjoyment in my job.	SA	A	U	D	SD
58. I am satisfied with my job for the time being.	SA	A	U	D	SD

## REFERENCES

- American Correctional Association  
1966 Manual of Correctional Standards. Washington, D.C.
- Berg, Ivar  
1971 Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Brayfield, Arthur H. and Harold F. Rothe  
1951 "An index of job satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology 35: 307-311.
- Brayfield, Arthur H., Richard V. Wells, and Marvin W. Strate  
1957 "Interrelationships among measures of job satisfaction and general satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology 41:201-205.
- Brief, Arthur P., Jim Munro, and Ramon J. Aldag  
1976 "Correctional employees' reactions to job characteristics: A data based argument for job enlargement." Journal of Criminal Justice 4:223-230.
- Brodsky, Stanley L.  
1974 "Bill of rights for the correctional officer." Federal Probation 38:38-40.
- Bullock, Robert P.  
1952 Social Factors Related to Job Satisfaction: A Technique for the Measurement of Job Satisfaction. Ohio: Ohio State University.
- Carney, Louis P.  
1974 Introduction to Correctional Science. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Cheatwood, A. D.  
1974 "Staff in correctional settings: An empirical investigation of frying pans and fires." Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency 11:173-179.
- Chearns, Albert  
1976 "Social change and work." in Personal Goals and Work Design. Peter Warr (ed.), London: John Wiley and Sons.
- Colorado, Department of Corrections  
U.D. "A career as a correctional officer." (mimeographed)
- Crites, John O.  
1969 Vocational Psychology: The Study of Vocational Behavior and Development. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

*Enclosure*

- Cromier, Bruno M.  
1975 The Watcher and the Watched. Plattsburgh, New York: Tundra Books.
- Duffee, David  
1974 "Correctional officer subculture and organizational change." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 11:155.
- 1975 Correctional Policy and Prison Organization. New York: Halsted Press.
- Fox, Vernon  
1977 Introduction to Corrections. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Griffin, Gerald R., Roger L. M. Dunbar, and Michael E. McGill.  
1978 "Factors associated with job satisfaction among police personnel." Journal of Police Science and Administration 6:77-85.
- Hoppock, Robert  
1935 Job Satisfaction. New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Jacobs, James B. and Harold G. Retsky  
1975 "Prison guard." Pp. 49-65 in R. G. Leger and J. R. Stratton (eds.), The Sociology of Corrections: A Book of Readings. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Jacobs, James B. and Samuel B. Magdovitz  
1977 "At LEEP'S end?: A review of the law enforcement education program." Journal of Police Science and Administration 5:1-18.
- Jacobs, James B. and Laurence J. Kraft  
1978 "Intergrating the keepers: A comparison of black and white prison guards in Illinois." Social Problems 25:304-318.
- Jacobs, James B.  
1978a "What prison guards think: A profile of the Illinois force." Crime and Delinquency 24:185-197.
- 1978b Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. Interview, 12 June 1978.
- Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Inc.  
1969 A Time to Act. Lebanon, Pennsylvania: Sowers Printing Co.
- Kassebaum, C. G., D. A. Ward, and D. M. Wilner  
1964 "Correlates of staff ideology in the prison." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 1:96-109.
- Lawler, Edward E. III  
1976 "Conference review: Issues of understanding." in Personal Goals and Work Design. Peter Warr (ed.), London: John Wiley and Sons.
- Lunden, Walter A.  
1965 The Prison Warden and the Custodial Staff. Springfield, Illinois: Thomas.

- National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals.  
1973 Corrections. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.  
1978 The National Manpower Survey of the Criminal Justice System:  
Executive Summary.
- Pearlin, Leonard I.  
1962 "Alienation from work: A study of nursing personnel." Personnel  
27:14-32/
- President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.  
1967 The Task Force Report: Corrections. Washington, D.C.: Government  
Printing Office.
- Price, James L.  
1977 The Study of Turnover. Iowa: The Iowa State University Press.
- Rich, H. E.  
1977 "Liberalizing influence of college: Some new evidence." Adolescence  
12:199-211.
- Ritzer, George  
1972 Man and His Work: Conflict and Change. New York: Meredith  
Corporation.
- Robinson, John P., Robert Athanasion, and Kendra B. Head.  
1969 Measures of Occupational Attitudes and Occupational Characteristics:  
Appendix A to Measures of Political Attitudes. Survey Research  
Center, Institute of Social Research, University of Michigan.
- Roucek, J.  
1935 "Sociology of the prison guard." Sociology and Social Research  
20:145-151.
- Showalter, S.  
1975 "Questions and answers: A growing problem." American Journal of  
Corrections 37:36-37.
- Smith, Patricia Cain, Lorne M. Kendall, and Charles L. Hulin.  
1969 The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement: A Strategy  
for the Study of Attitudes. Illinois: Rand McNally and Company.
- State, Donald L.  
1967 Disciplinary Attitudes of Correctional Officers: Regarding Inmates  
Misconduct in a Federal Penitentiary. Washington: Washington State  
University, MA Thesis, Police Science.
- Sykes, Graham M.  
1956 Crime and Society. New York: Random House.
- Swanson, Charles R.  
1977 "An uneasy look at college education and the police organization."  
Journal of Criminal Justice 5:311-320.



Vollmer, Howard M. and Jack A. Kinney

1955 "Age, education, and job satisfaction." Personnel 32:38-43.

Weiner, Norman L.

1974 "The effect of education on police attitudes." Journal of Criminal Justice 2:317-328.

Wicks, R. J.

1974 "Is the corrections officer a second class citizen?" American Journal of Corrections 36:32.