



National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-53798-1

FEMALE CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS IN ALL-MALE FEDERAL
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS: A CANADIAN PERSPECTIVE,
1977-1988

Monica Haydychuk

Thesis presented to the School of Graduate Studies
and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the M.A. degree in Criminology

University of Ottawa

© Monica Haydychuk, Ottawa, Canada, 1988.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i
ABSTRACT	iii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION - AN OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY	1
CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY	13
A. Research Strategy	13
B. Data Survey	15
C. The Sample - the female correctional officers	16
D. The Qualitative Method	17
E. Survey Research: The Interviewing Procedure	19
F. Interpretation of Survey Data	24
G. Issues Concerning Reliability and Validity	24
H. Limitations of this Study	28
CHAPTER 3: THE UNITED STATES EXPERIENCE	30
A. Female Correctional Officers in All-Male Institutions	30
B. Literature Review	39
C. Conclusion	57
CHAPTER 4: THE CANADIAN EXPERIENCE, FROM 1977-1988	61
A. Modern History of Women in the Correctional Service of Canada, Prior to 1977	61
B. A Study of the Existing Sex Restrictions in the Correctional Group	64
C. Report to Parliament, 1977	72

D.	Pilot Projects Introducing Female Correctional Officers in Male Institutions	73
E.	Movement Toward Full Integration	77
F.	Equal Opportunities for Women	85
G.	Affirmative Action in the Correctional Service of Canada	87
H.	Annual Reports and Year End Reviews	92
I.	Correctional Investigator's Reports	100
J.	Privacy and Discrimination Issues	110
K.	Media Attention, Human Rights Tribunal, Federal Court	116
L.	Statistical Representation of Female Correctional Officers in Male Institutions	130
M.	Conclusion	135
 CHAPTER 5: RESULTS OF INTERVIEWS AND DISCUSSIONS		 142
A.	Introduction	142
B.	The Institutional Setting	143
C.	A General Overview of the Female Correctional Officers that were Interviewed	151
D.	Female Correctional Officers' Background and Motivation	152
E.	Future Aspirations and Career Moves	156
F.	Female Correctional Officers' Relationship With Inmates	159
G.	Female Correctional Officers Comment on Male Co-Workers	175
H.	Reactions From Some Male Inmates	183
I.	Conclusion	187
 CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION		 196

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE ONE - Female Officers in Federal Male Institutions	97
TABLE TWO - Summary of Numerical Representation of Male and Female Correctional Officers in Correctional Service of Canada	131
REFERENCES	209
APPENDIX A Correctional Service of Canada Male and Female Representation By Group, 1982-1988	217
APPENDIX B Correctional Service of Canada Male and Female Representation by Group Level, 1988	226

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project was very enlightening and interesting for the researcher, who before meeting the various female correctional officers, did not know much about them, their work, or the environment they work in. One hears and reads stereotypical characterizations about "guards" all the time, especially when one is a student of criminology. In meeting some of them, and seeing the environment they work in, I have tried to understand what it means to be a female correctional officer in a male institution. Personal images that I have of these women include: the concern for their image, their obvious personality strengths, their wanting to do a "good" job, their wanting to be considered a correctional officer and not just a "female" correctional officer, and a reserved willingness to share personal feelings. They also seem to have the ability to approach the job in a casual and accepting fashion, including the male inmates, the environment, their co-workers, and the future. They are trying to maintain an aura of career professionalism, and seem to have a determination to achieve at what they are doing despite problems - women doing a job the best they can in a "man's world".

I wish to thank all those female correctional officers that have assisted in this research. There are also several other persons who should be mentioned, who assisted in the making of this report. These include: Mr. Dennis

Curtis (Regional Communications Officer, Correctional Services of Canada); Ms. France-Marie Trepanier, Ms. S. Leger, and Ms. M. Larocque (Affirmative Action Division of Correctional Service of Canada); Mr. Paul Donnelly, Mr. Don Hutchinson, Mr. Tony White, Mr. Don Head (all of Correctional Service of Canada); Mr. R. L. Stewart (Correctional Investigator); the instructors and librarian of the Kingston Staff Training College; Ms. Terry Goldfinch and Ms. Kate McGregor; and the "Lifer's" group.

I would also like to thank Mr. David Jeffrey for the support and understanding that he extended during the time of my research and the completion of the project.

Professor C. Talbot, my thesis supervisor, has been a motivating factor in my criminology studies at the University of Ottawa for the past three years. His support and encouragement during my first year at the University of Ottawa influenced my return to complete my studies. During the course of this research project, Professor Talbot allowed just the right balance of independent creativity and supportive direction. I therefore would like to thank him for being my thesis supervisor and for being as helpful as he has been.

ABSTRACT

This research project is a descriptive, exploratory study of female correctional officers in all-male institutions. Specifically, the phenomenon of female correctional officers in male institutions is studied in relation to the federal Canadian system. It involves a ten year longitudinal analysis since it has been approximately ten years since the federal government introduced the use of female correctional officers in its male institutions.

Methodology used in the research included an inductive, phenomenological approach that provided qualitative information. The focus was to study the female correctional officers from a Canadian perspective, however because the United States had integrated women guards into its male prisons several years previous to Canada, the United States experience was also described. Most of the literature review was also based on United States studies and research since Canadian information was lacking. The retrospective, longitudinal information that was gathered included various Canadian governmental policies and recommendations, integration projects, annual reports, affirmative action programs, media accounts, human rights commission involvement, and federal court cases. All of this information provided the researcher with a good descriptive survey of how Canadian female correctional officers have progressed over the past ten years in male prisons. However,

in order to gain the most relevant and significant information possible, the researcher also interviewed twenty female correctional officers currently working in three federal all-male institutions in the Ontario Region. The information gathered was through an open-ended semi-structured interviewing process, that allowed for casual conversation, and first-hand experiences and perceptions. There was allowance for flexibility, although there was a standard set of questions provided for each individual interview. All responses were kept anonymous. The three institutions where the female correctional officers work were also toured, in an effort to help describe and understand the working environment and the problems that are inherent in a correctional officer job.

Results of the interviews were significant in that the personal information provided by the respondents closely corresponded to what major research studies have also shown. The female correctional officers were concerned with their public image, discrimination in their working environment, being accepted by their co-workers, and generally felt that their functioning was as good as a male officer's. They do not, for the most part, see a problem concerning inmate privacy. They would like to be accepted by the inmates and their co-workers, and realize that there are varying degrees of this acceptance, as well as various problems associated with their being in all-male institutions. It is also felt that for the most part, women are doing the job of

correctional officer for the same reasons that men do this work. Many also aspire to future employment in other areas, and are doing the job as correctional officer because other employment opportunities are limited. The working environment is characterized as being depressive, hostile, potentially dangerous, and stressful. The women have however, apparently adapted well to their work and the environment, with relatively few major problems.

Although Correctional Service of Canada offers female correctional officers more equality with male correctional officers than most United States jurisdictions (which often restrict women in their duties), there are various problems and concerns that are apparent, both in Canada and the United States. These include the issue of male inmate privacy versus women's right to equal employment, male co-worker attitudes toward female correctional officers, discrimination in the work place, affirmative action programs sponsored by the government, and future uncertainty over female correctional officer deployment. However, in Canada, it is also apparent that there has been a relatively steady increase of female correctional officers in male institutions over the past ten years. In 1978-79 pilot projects, there were 28 female officers in Correctional Service of Canada male institutions; in 1988, there are approximately 632, representing over 14% of all correctional officers. This trend is also expected to continue, in that government policies and targets have been set to further increase the percentage of women in the correctional officer category.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION - AN OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

The Correctional Service of Canada, responsible for federal inmates, began hiring female correctional officers to work in its male prisons in 1978. Prior to this time, the Public Service Commission had authorized the Canadian Penitentiary Service (as Correctional Service of Canada was then called) to restrict recruitment of correctional officers to men only in these institutions. At this same time, Canada's only federal institution for female offenders had only female officers, called "matrons" (with a small number of males working there mainly in administrative and support positions).

The intention of this research project is to study the phenomenon of female correctional officers in all-male federal Canadian institutions. The analysis will cover an approximate ten year period, from 1977 to 1988, since it has now been ten years since the federal government has been hiring females as correctional officers in male institutions. Therefore, it seems to be an appropriate time to trace the history of this relatively new occupational trend, from its inception to the present day. This will include an examination of the various factors which seem to have contributed to the hiring of women in this previously male dominated arena. To this point in time, male correctional

officers have not been accorded the same opportunity rights to work as correctional officers in the living quarters of the Prison for Women, Canada's only federal facility for female offenders. Currently there are approximately eight male correctional officers positioned at the Prison for Women, in other correctional posts. This restriction may also soon change, and will provide for an interesting examination and study in a few years from now.

Women who are correctional officers in male institutions are in a non-traditional occupation, one which until fairly recently has been male dominated. While women have worked in the criminal justice system in various capacities, their entrance into this particular occupation has been recent in Canada. It has also not been without various problems, concerns, and uncertainties. The future is still uncertain, which will be demonstrated in this research analysis, and is discussed further in Chapters four, five, and six.

The federal system was chosen because it is under the authority of Correctional Service of Canada (under the jurisdiction of the Solicitor General Department of Canada), and therefore all of Canada is subject to one authority for sentences of two years or more. Correctional Service of Canada has approximately forty-four major institutions (excluding community correctional centres) across Canada, with female correctional officers working in virtually all of them. Female correctional officers in male institutions are

also employed at the provincial level, however there is greater variety and deployment patterns from province to province. The history of their integration into male institutions in the provinces also varies across the country, and for the purposes of this study, must be left up to other researchers.

Specifically, female correctional officers in both the Correctional Officer-Living Unit Officer (CX-LUF) and Correctional Officer-Custody Officer (CX-COF) group will be studied. Both types work in federal male institutions, however there are some differences. Living unit officers work only in those institutions that have designated "living units". They work on a team concept, are allowed to wear "street" clothing, and work more directly with the inmates who live in that living unit. Their pay scale is also higher than that of a custody officer's. Custody officers work in all institutions, even those with "living units". They wear uniforms and work at a variety of assignments and posts. In institutions where there are no living units, custody officers work both directly with inmates in the cell blocks, and also do other security related posts. In the institutions that do have living units, the custody officers do the overnight shifts in the living units as well as are responsible for all other security functions within the institution. However, they do not have much direct contact with inmates in the living unit institutions, since this is left up to the living unit officers. A discussion of

community correctional centres will be eliminated in this research, since this study only endeavors to examine female correctional officers within traditional penal institutions - that is, the prison setting.

This research study will be descriptive and exploratory, one that will attempt to examine the actual role of female correctional officers in a phenomenological way. That is, not in a way that singles them out as necessarily being different because of the path they have chosen, but in a way which tries to understand the phenomenon of "females guarding males". One could describe this as a form of exploration into a study field, one that seeks to bring a personal, humanistic approach to the advancement of knowledge. In the public's mind, and possibly in the mind of many who work with female correctional officers, there seems to be a great deal of misconception and apprehension concerning the use of female officers in male institutions. This is explored in the review of literature and previous research done, concerning female correctional officers in male institutions, and is discussed further in Chapter Three of this study. Media accounts also provide an analysis of how the public and the male inmates feel about female correctional officers; these are discussed further in Chapter Four. Various issues, concerns, problems, and understandings that emanate from the use of female correctional officers need to be addressed to further social scientific knowledge. These are also discussed in subsequent chapters of the study.

Because this is essentially a Canadian federal prison perspective, the study will include the relationship of female correctional officers to the Canadian social context. In order to do this, an examination of the modern history and use of female correctional officers in all-male institutions in the United States will also be undertaken. The experience of the United States is used because that country began hiring female correctional officers in its male institutions several years before Canada. Therefore, before Canada began its "pilot projects" with female correctional officers, various United States models were examined (in addition to various Canadian provincial systems). Problems with staff and male inmate concerns were studied in order to facilitate an easier transition in the federal system of Canada. Yet there are some differences between the two nations in the use of female correctional officers in male institutions, and these are examined further in this research study. The United States is also much larger than Canada, both in population and incarceration rate, with approximately ten times the population size, and an incarceration rate of 286.8 per 100,000 total population. This is compared to Canada's incarceration rate of 108 per 100,000 total population, and 146 per 100,000 adult population (Correctional Service of Canada, 1986: 8-10). Since the United States has been using female officers within their male institutions for approximately six to eight years before Canada, there is much more literature available on the American experience. This

information is beneficial to anyone that is studying the prison system, since much of it can be generalized to the Canadian scene.

In order to understand the phenomenon of female correctional officers working in all-male institutions, not only must the phenomenon be described, but it must also be related to: the legislative action which has occurred in Canada to facilitate their hiring, the characteristics of the federal prison environment in which the correctional officers work, and the various problems and perceptions of the primary participants (that is, the male co-workers, the male inmates, and the female correctional officers themselves). An understanding of how these various components interact and have impact on the studied phenomenon is essential.

Research strategy for this study included gathering of information from a variety of sources, including: written material that has been published in both the United States and Canada; newspaper articles, magazine articles, and other such media accounts; various governmental department reports, memorandums, task forces, and internal publications; Correctional Investigator's reports; and Federal Court and Human Rights Tribunal decisions. Statistical information from 1978 to 1988, indicating the annual rise in numbers of female correctional officers in male institutions across Canada was also analyzed. The most important data came from personal interviews conducted with twenty female correctional officers currently working in three all-male federal

institutions in the Ontario Region. This area of data collection is perceived as being extremely significant, since it is here where the qualitative and descriptive information lies. It is a departure from relying merely on what has already been written by other researchers, and will hopefully provide the essentially Canadian experience directly from those that are being studied. Tours were also conducted at the three federal institutions where the female officers work, affording some opportunity for observational study of correctional officers' duties and their working environment.

Chapter Two of this study discusses the methodological approach used by the researcher, in more detail. The primary research strategy involved an inductive, qualitative analysis that attempts to understand the phenomenon of female correctional officers working in male institutions. This included covering an approximate ten year period in Canadian history (1977-1988), in which various governmental policies, task forces, and recommendations are examined in order to explore how females were originally restricted and then gradually became integrated into male institutions within the Correctional Service of Canada. As well as examining various archival data that includes statistics, published and unpublished articles, memorandums, and media accounts, research involved actual personal interviews with twenty female correctional officers. These officers are currently working in three federal male

institutions. There were also some interviews done with a small number of male inmates, also currently housed in one of the institutions visited.

Research techniques remained flexible, since this type of research did not lend itself to a rigid, or overly structured format. Qualitative data that was gathered from interviews served to supplement the observational and archival data. Interviews conducted with the female correctional officers, inmates, and government personnel provided the researcher with descriptive and interesting views, furthering the overall analysis of the subject area.

Chapter Three of this study examines the experience that the United States has gone through in its use of female correctional officers in all-male institutions. This chapter also reviews the predominant literature, with the majority of research having also been initiated in the United States. Women's rise in seeking equal opportunities with males began after the United States Civil Rights Act of 1964, however it took an amendment to Title VII of that act in 1972 before sex discrimination in state and local governments was really addressed. There have been considerable problems in the United States because the federal system and each state has its own system of hiring policies, with many jurisdictions restricting the full deployment of women in all-male facilities. Various court cases concerning sexual discrimination in female hiring, and issues of inmate privacy concerns have occurred. Some courts have upheld inmate

rights to privacy and others have upheld women's rights to equal employment opportunities. There have been various interpretations of Title VII and of the "bona fide occupation qualification" exception, which has led to uncertainty across the country. Some of these same concerns have produced court action in Canada as well.

The literature that examines women as correctional officers in male institutions often describes traditional roles of women in society, how men have traditionally perceived women, and how the "women's movement" has advanced the opportunities of women in more non-traditional occupations. The role of correctional officer, or "guard" (especially in all-male institutions) has traditionally been a male dominated occupation. Because of this, women who have become correctional officers have entered the field knowing there is mistrust, confusion on roles, hostility, and fear among both the male co-workers and many male inmates. However, studies have shown that for the most part, the majority of inmates have accepted, like, or are neutral about female guards. The problems have been more abundant with male co-workers, supervisors, and management. It has also been shown that women have basically done the job as well as men, often using different (yet effective) skills. The many fears that were rampant during the introduction of women into male institutions were not substantiated. Women have been projected and treated in a stereotypical way that has been very difficult to change. Men, including inmates, are still

very concerned over traditional values which include protection of women, and placing women in certain roles with which men are more comfortable. Many studies have also shown that female correctional officers have created what is considered to be a more "normal" prison environment, that women take on various roles within the institution, and that women are not unlike men in their need to have financial security.

Chapter Four is a substantial examination of the Canadian experience, with predominant emphasis on the years 1977 to 1988. There is however a brief overview of conditions pre-1977, which includes the Royal Commission on the Status of Women, and barriers that restricted the use of women in all-male institutions in the federal system. This chapter then discusses various recommendations that led to the introduction of women and their full integration as correctional officers in male institutions across Canada. Various governmental programs, such as Affirmative Action, Equal Opportunities for Women, and exclusion orders are discussed. Beginning slowly, with twenty-eight female correctional officers in male institutions in 1978-79, there is soon a rapid increase of women over the next several years. Problems encountered with the use of females in all-male institutions, such as privacy and discrimination issues, are discussed from the view of the media, the inmates, the Correctional Investigator's reports, and Correctional Service of Canada policies. Federal Court and

Human Rights Tribunal cases involving arguments under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms are also addressed. There is an emphasis here of female inmates and male inmates being treated differently, with possible future policy changes within the Correctional Service of Canada reflecting these. Finally, the chapter attempts to show the reader the numerical increase over the years in the numbers of female recruits and graduates from the Staff Training College, Kingston, and the statistical representation of female correctional officers in Correctional Service of Canada. A more detailed statistical representation can also be found in the Appendices of this research study.

Chapter Five provides the qualitative and descriptive substance of this thesis - the results of the interviews held with twenty federal female correctional officers. This information is presented in a casual, conversational style, similar to the way it was presented to the researcher conducting the interviews. The views and impressions have been separated and categorized into subject areas to allow for similar and consensual opinions (as well as opposing views) to be placed together. The information is presented in such a way as to provide anonymity for the respondents. While there was a guideline used to illicit responses to specific questions, the overall intent was to seek as much personal input from the respondents in those subject areas they particularly felt like elaborating on. As well as comments from the main subjects, this chapter also discusses

personal input from several inmates who were incarcerated at one of the institutions the researcher visited. This personal and first-hand information is seen as supplementary to the overall primary study area.

The final chapter is a conclusion to the research project. This chapter examines some of the problems, concerns, and issues which exist because of the use of female correctional officers in all-male institutions. It discusses the "reality" which exists today in the federal system in Canada: that over 700 women are correctional officers, representing 14.2% of all correctional officers, with approximately 632 female officers in all-male institutions. This has been accomplished in a relatively short period of time, and the trend is continuing. This chapter also discusses areas for future research and study, considering that this project has generated a great deal of further study areas to be explored.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

A. Research Strategy

This research attempts to study and describe the phenomenon of female correctional officers in all-male institutions in a qualitative way, specifically from a Canadian perspective. In order to describe the phenomenon and to locate it within today's Canadian context, it was also important to look back to the time when female correctional officers were first being hired - that is, why, where, when, and how. Using the last ten years (longitudinal, retrospective) to indicate how the phenomenon has grown and become entrenched in the Correctional Service of Canada, one can attempt to describe the experiences of female correctional officers, and therefore ultimately come to understand them. The methodology includes an inductive study approach, in a qualitative format, to provide as much knowledge and understanding of the subject as possible.

As Glaser and Straus (1967) have pointed out, it is not necessary to do an ethnographic sociological-type analysis with a "preconceived theory that dictates, prior to the research, 'relevancies' in concepts and hypotheses"; that a researcher may study an area "with a focus, a general question, or problem in mind" (Glaser and Straus, 1967: 33). The research design and technique therefore remained quite

flexible, to allow for questions and further study areas to develop as the research progressed.

This project has tried to follow a similar research strategy as used by Zimmer (1982), who also sought to study and understand the experiences of a female guard in an inductive, phenomenological way. Zimmer's research was primarily based on information gathering through the unstructured open-ended interview, supplemented by written material and other sources of data. This Canadian study however does not intend to replicate Zimmer's research, since Zimmer spent approximately two years conducting in-depth interviews in New York and Rhode Island, United States. Her interviews included male correctional officers, male inmates, and prison administrators as well as female correctional officers. This Canadian perspective uses similar research methodology because of the qualities that this technique has - obtaining personal and first-hand information from the subjects being studied. This research can also be extended in the future, to include information obtained from additional male inmates, male correctional officers, and others.

Permission to conduct the research was initially given by Correctional Service of Canada Regional Communications Officer Mr. Dennis Curtis. A letter was written, outlining the researcher's request to speak with several female correctional officers (both living unit officers and custody officers) that work in all-male federal

institutions. Mr. Curtis, in a very cooperative manner, then acted as liaison between the researcher and "contact" persons at the institutions that were amenable to the research being carried out there.

As mentioned, the research technique had to be flexible to accommodate the requirements of each institution visited. For the most part, the researcher was meeting with female correctional officers who were "at work". Therefore, there had to be consideration for time allotment, and for non-interference in regular duties or regular operation of the institution. During interviewing done while an officer was on duty at her job post, or while the researcher was touring an institution, there were also safety considerations that had to be adhered to.

B. Data Sources

Because this research is an attempt to describe and understand the phenomenon of female correctional officers in all-male institutions over the past ten years, several data sources were utilized. Secondary archival data provided information from published books, articles, newspaper accounts, and previously done research. Federal government documents, in the form of task forces, policy directives, annual reports, publications, internal memorandums, and research papers were also used. Statistical data, which provided a more quantitative approach to an analysis of female correctional officers in the Canadian federal system,

shows the rapid rise in their numbers over the past ten years. Observational data, which occurred during actual tours or interviewing sessions held within various institutions, helped in describing and understanding the environment in which female correctional officers work. Survey research was in the form of face-to-face, open-ended interviews and conversations held with twenty female correctional officers.

Supplementary data was provided by several male inmates at one of the medium security institutions the researcher visited, and discussions with an ex-inmate. There were also various other interested persons, such as those who work for Affirmative Action in Correctional Service of Canada, the Correctional Investigator's Office, and the Staff College in Kingston who shared their views and experiences with the researcher.

C. The Sample - the female correctional officers

The sample consisted of twenty female correctional officers, from three different all-male federal correctional facilities. For the most part the respondents were chosen by the institution, depending on which officers were working on the day that the researcher visited the facility (similar to Zimmer, 1982). The subjects were not randomly chosen by the researcher, and should therefore be considered a biased sample. Some of the total number of correctional officers however did volunteer to provide the researcher with an

interview without having first been contacted by their institution (again, similar to Zimmer, 1982). Although one could consider the sample to be a biased group, their participation in the interview and research was voluntary. The amount of information shared with the researcher was also largely left up to each individual respondent. It was especially important for each respondent to realize that it was her own personal input that would give the overall research its qualitative and descriptive quality. Their responses would serve to enhance the understanding of how female correctional officers have been integrated into Canada's federal correctional system.

D. The Qualitative Method

This research seeks to provide an understanding and appreciation of the phenomenon of female correctional officers in the Correctional Service of Canada, through a ten year review. This includes the responses provided by the actual female officers that were interviewed, supplemented by comments of inmates and others. Some quantitative analysis is presented, largely in the form of numbers of female correctional officers in the various federal institutions. This statistical analysis is an objective view that shows comparisons, and allows the researcher to demonstrate the rise in numbers of female correctional officers in Canada over the years.

The approach preferred in this particular research is qualitative, which includes description, explanation, and analysis of processes. It is a dynamic and inductive approach which provides more in-depth and detailed information concerning the phenomenon. As Schwartz and Jacobs (1979) point out, "in order to understand social phenomena, the researcher needs to discover the actor's definition of the situation - that is, his perception and interpretation of reality and how these relate to his behavior" (Schwartz and Jacobs, 1979: 7). This approach has a subjective element to it, on the part of the researcher who must collect and present the data, and on the part of the respondents who are giving the data. This type of research does however provide stimulating and interesting, first-hand information. It also leads to generation of hypotheses and questions, as the phenomenon is analyzed. The researcher must also be cognizant of the subjective quality of human decision-makers that are involved. The researcher must be aware of her own biases, values, and feelings when becoming involved in such research. The analysis should be presented in a neutral, unbiased, and objective way as much as possible.

The phenomenon of female correctional officers in all-male institutions is a dynamic and changing one, which has an effect on society and women's roles in society. Therefore it is an important area to study and understand, since changes do occur over time, depending on various factors.

E. Survey Research: The Interviewing Procedure

Surveys gauge attitudes, emotions, and experiences, and are essential to providing a good descriptive and phenomenological analysis. These subjective and personal feelings that all persons have, are in part based on their working environment, whom they come in contact with, and how situations are defined and acted upon. The type of survey used in this particular research is the personal and group interview; the procedure included an open-ended and semi-structured interviewing format.

An interview used as a research tool has been described as an "exploratory device to help identify variables and relations, to suggest hypotheses, and to guide other phases of the research" (Kerlinger, 1973: 480) as well as a supplement to other methods. This is what the researcher has attempted to accomplish in this study. The many advantages of this approach include actual face-to-face interaction, allowance for flexibility and coping with unanticipated responses, and provisions built in for subjects' elaboration to questions. Responses were not limited, and each subject had opportunity to explain things in her own manner. A very casual, non-threatening approach was stressed when meeting with the respondents. All respondents were informed of the nature of the research and that their names and the specific institution would be kept confidential.

A written "questionnaire" type format could have provided the researcher with more subjects, however there were too many disadvantages associated with this kind of response. These included the possibility of a low response rate if questionnaires were randomly distributed to various correctional institutions, and the lack of elaboration by subjects on paper, even if the questionnaire was open-ended. During a face-to-face interview, the respondent can more easily be drawn into a conversation or prompted to elaborate on a particular situation. Unanticipated responses would not normally occur in a questionnaire format, and many respondents may not interpret the question at hand the same as the interviewer envisions. Overall, the quality and detail of good descriptive information would be lacking, as many people generally do not want to be "bothered" by impersonal questionnaires or deal with a researcher they cannot meet or face. The flexibility of face-to-face interviews is seen as a definite advantage to what the researcher intended.

The interviews with the female correctional officers were conducted in an open-ended interview format, in an unstructured way that hopefully allowed for maximum amount of personal views and input from the women themselves. To minimize apprehension or mistrust from the subjects, there was no use of tape recorders or note-taking while the interviews were occurring. Information obtained from individual subjects was written down after the interview,

usually between interviews, or at the first available opportunity. Considering that some of the interviews were conducted while being inside institutional walls, and while the women were at their job posts, the researcher was not able to make written notes until after leaving the institution. Mental recollection became important to remembering what the women were saying, as well as to recalling the other conditions of the environment at the time (the use of a co-interviewer at this time may have been helpful to overall reduction of distortion of information). During interviews that were conducted while the female correctional officers were on duty, there were the usual interruptions. These were minimal, in occasional phone calls, other officers in the area or walking through, some inmate movement, etc.

The interviews were built around a set of questions that were standard for each individual interview. However the questions were not necessarily presented in any order to the respondents. Each area of discussion did not receive equal input, since it depended very much on how willing the subject was to talk, and how much elaboration was needed to illicit a particular response. As Zimmer experienced, this particular format depended on how verbal and articulate each female officer was, as well as her willingness to talk openly and freely, with some requiring probing techniques to "draw them out" (Zimmer, 1982: 306). The questions that were discussed included:

- (1) How long have you been a correctional officer?

(2) What is your background? (previous job experience, education, how did you decide to become a correctional officer, etc.)

(3) What is the acceptance by male co-workers? (relationship with male correctional officers, how do you get along with them, comparison with when you first entered the field and now)

(4) What is the relationship with inmates like? (coping skills used with inmates, inmate privacy concerns)

(5) What does the future hold for you? (staying in this field, or what else would you like to do)

(6) Miscellaneous information, depending on how the conversation is going, and what the individual officer cares to discuss or comment on.

Interviews were conducted with twenty female correctional officers, from three different federal, all-male institutions. The format for various sessions differed slightly. There was need to be flexible - that is, one group of ten, from two institutions, was interviewed while they were on the job, affording the interviewer some non-participant observation in the working environment. Most interviews, whether the women were on the job or not, were conducted on an individual basis, with approximately one-half hour to forty-five minutes spent with each individual on the average. Seven interviews were conducted in an office setting provided by the institution. This format appeared to be a little more structured because of this, however the

overall informal tone was maintained, and the atmosphere was one of casual conversation. One group of three female officers was interviewed together as a group, in a very casual unstructured "homey" setting. For comparison purposes, this latter format appeared to demonstrate that when people get together in a focus-group style discussion, the atmosphere is very relaxed and the conversation keeps going with little effort.

Of premier concern was reducing anxiety and yet still obtaining valuable first-hand information. Although there was a trend that was followed in the types of questions asked, much of the conversation was left up to the correctional officers interviewed. If there were certain areas where elaboration was needed, the conversation was directed in that way. Often the women simply led the conversation themselves, and were able to cover all the areas of question. The length of the answers and the amount of information given was greatly left up to each lady. For those who did not seem to feel at ease about talking freely to an "outsider", the purpose of the research was fully explained. It was made clear that no names or individual personalities, or institutions, would be identified in the research paper. The ladies were all told individually, or in a group, that "general" information was being sought, that specific concerns would not be exploited, and that confidentiality would be maintained. The information supplied was indicated as being additional to other

information and research material already collected concerning female correctional officers in the United States and Canada.

F. Interpretation of Survey Data

Notes were made concerning the various discussion areas with each female correctional officer who was interviewed. These notes were then compiled into a format where sub-categories of areas were analyzed, looking for comparisons and similarities in what each officer had said. The various subject areas were then presented in a general, discussion-type summary, as provided in Chapter Five. The summaries are provided predominately in the language and tone used by the respondents, with very little explanation or interpretation needed by the researcher. These discussion summaries from a Canadian perspective, are then related to what other researchers (such as Zimmer, 1982) have found in their studies of female correctional officers in male institutions.

G. Issues Concerning Reliability and Validity

Since the subjects were not personally selected by the researcher (random selection could not be done), one could assume: (a) the female correctional officers were either interested or self-motivated in contributing their input, (b) they felt pressured or coerced by the institution to participate, or (c) they just happened to be working on

shift the day the researcher was there, and were asked by the "contact" person to participate (in which case there was a degree of "random" selection). Which ever reason the respondents had, ultimately it still came down to their own personal level of interaction, openness, and cooperation. It is felt that the greatest majority of the respondents tried to provide the researcher with as much information and personal reflections as possible. The researcher attempted to provide each female officer with the same line of questions and topic areas to discuss, however time and situation could have bearing on variability of responses. That is, some information was gathered in an office setting, some in a group setting, some while the women were working, and some throughout minor work interruptions. Of course, identical information was not being sought or anticipated, although similarities were definitely noted.

To the point that all the respondents were female correctional officers and were the object of this study, what they had to say must be considered reliable, according to how they interpreted the questions discussed. It was assumed that the respondents had nothing to gain by misleading the researcher, although some may have had the tendency to exaggerate an incident or piece of information. This is typical of unstructured, open-ended interviewing formats, and is dependent on human emotions, feelings, and how important that the respondent feels an incident or the information is. In fact, several areas of concensus and consistency were

indicated. Some may criticize that the views expressed by the female officers were not independent views - that they were influenced by various factors such as being federal government employees (and therefore afraid to be candid or "open"). Or it may be said that the respondents were trying to provide the researcher with what she "wanted" to hear. The researcher did not get the impression that this occurred. In fact, most of the women seemed to be very open and willing to express opinions, presumably realizing that no specific reference would be made to any one person, and that information would be anonymous. The discussion areas were also not meant to illicit a great deal of controversy or subject the officer to disclosing "classified" information. The questions were all general areas of concern that left the way open for persons to elaborate or comment on as they themselves chose.

Research attempts to make generalizations that go beyond the specific study. Therefore there should be an attempt to show meaningfulness concerning data, design, and sources. There should also be the attempt to show external validity so that the research can be applied to a larger scale. Alternative sources of data have been used in this study, and much of the literature that has already been published concerning female correctional officers in all-male institutions does support what the respondents have said. Although the sample size is small, it is felt that those who did respond could very well be representative of the larger

population of all female correctional officers working in all-male institutions. There is no reason to believe that those working in the Ontario Region are significantly different from those working in other Canadian regions, however a more extensive research project in the future could possibly lay that subject to rest. There are of course some minor variations in living unit officer roles and custody officer roles, and between institutions of different security levels. However, the concept of what it is to be a female correctional officer in the Correctional Service of Canada, in an all-male institution, remains the same.

Concerning the sample, of twenty female correctional officers from three different institutions, the total number of female officers working at these institutions is approximately eighty-one, representing between 12% and 16.5% of the total number of correctional officers at these institutions (Correctional Service of Canada, 1982-1988). Therefore, overall, the researcher spoke to approximately 25% of all female correctional officers working at these three institutions.

As far as validity is concerned with actual content, the researcher feels that the study does measure what it is supposed to - that is, the personal impressions of various female correctional officers, as these relate to working in all-male institutional environments. The researcher herself, other than the fact she is a woman, has no ulterior interest in the outcome of the study except to further enhance the understanding of the subject area.

H. Limitations of this Study

There are several limitations to this study. Foremost is the fact that the sample size itself is small, and it is concentrated in one area. Although each respondent supplied the researcher with valuable information, there may have been hesitancy in being completely open and trusting. As was mentioned by one respondent, a reporter had once "invaded" their institution seeking information in a surreptitious and misleading manner. This had made the correctional officers feel quite vulnerable and suspicious of the motives of some persons seeking "research" material.

In this kind of research one has to rely on what one is given in the interview. Although various information is substantiated by what previous research and published accounts already have told us, this particular format relies on very subjective qualities. Subjectivity includes the researcher, who may unconsciously lean toward a certain direction or on the part of the respondent, who may be unsure, uncaring, untrusting, etc. In a small sample, even though there is the promise of anonymity and confidentiality, respondents may still feel they could easily be targeted as having spoken with the researcher. This may reduce the confidence to being completely open, critical, or negative in information sharing. The use of direct questions may also create an unwilling or reluctant subject (Kerlinger, 1973). As the interviewing method consisted basically of "direct"

and "quite direct" questions, the researcher needed to gauge the proper moment to probe (for additional or more elaborate information), or allow the subject to carry on.

The length of time spent with each respondent and the situational factors also bear on the limitation of this research. Some situations, especially when officers were working, provided little time for idle conversation. The operational requirements and institutional restrictions came first. The researcher was given considerable accommodation, however was not able to do a great deal of observational research within the institutions. Some interviews could have been longer, while others seemed to have considerable time to discuss many areas in-depth.

As was mentioned to the researcher by two or three of the female correctional officers, it would be advantageous to obtain personal accounts from male correctional officers as well. Due to time restraints and length of this project, this could not be done at this time. Some female officers also felt that it would be beneficial to this kind of study to engage in more observational research (either participant or non-participant) within the correctional setting. This would provide a more concrete analysis of the work that is done, and a better understanding of some of the emotions, stresses, etc. that go along with the role of being a female correctional officer.

CHAPTER THREE

THE UNITED STATES EXPERIENCE

This chapter contains a discussion of female correctional officers in all-male institutions in the United States. It also includes a review of the predominant literature from 1979 to 1987 available on this subject area, including some legal precedents.

A. Female Correctional Officers in All-Male Institutions

Prior to 1972, women that were employed in penal facilities were predominately in female or juvenile institutions. They were not used in male institutions except in specialized roles/occupations such as nurses, teachers, social workers, and clerical support staff. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 disallowed discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex (Petersen, 1982). However the employer's use was voluntary, and there was little enforcement. Also, since the Act did not include state, county, or city government employees, the Act's effects were limited (Feinman, 1980). Attitudes were not changing, and it became clear that more legislative action was necessary. In 1972 there was an amendment to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, which prohibited sex discrimination in state and local governments (including the correctional field). Prior to this amendment, "90% of the

state correctional systems did not initiate the hiring of women in their adult male institutions" (Horne, 1985: 46). This appeared to be due to the prevailing attitudes that correctional administrators had regarding the hiring of women to work directly with male inmates. In 1973, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals also began encouraging the recruitment and hiring of women for all types of corrections work. This included the areas of probation, parole, halfway houses, and correctional centres. Then in 1976, the American Correctional Association came out with the following policy statement: "The American Correctional Association adopts Affirmative Action as a commitment to an ongoing process which will ensure equal employment opportunities and employment conditions for minorities and women in correctional employment" (Morton, 1981: 8).

Despite these declarations that were available to ensure women's entry into previously all-male environments, and despite the broadened powers of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in enforcing the legislation, it was still left up to the individual states as to their method of using women in the correctional officer category (Horne, 1985). Some states tried to integrate women by assigning them only to special or peripheral jobs within the system (such as tower duty, supervision of female visitors, checking perimeters, supervising visiting areas, and clerical duties) but would not allow them direct contact with inmates. Others

allowed semi-direct contact, depending on the facility or job function. And still other states, such as California and Delaware, tried to fully integrate women on an equal basis with male correctional officers. Some states (approximately seventeen by 1979) were not hiring women at all, mainly due to the "bona fide occupational qualification" clause of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, which allows using sex as a hiring criteria if it can be shown that this is necessary to the normal operation of the business. Individual correctional administrators therefore would claim that there are certain limitations that women have that precluded them from doing the job, such as strength, height, and weight (Horne, 1985).

California has often been used as an example in nearly all of the written literature concerning female correctional officers working in all-male institutions. California began using women in male institutions in 1970, but began slowly, first by allowing them only limited access to job assignments. By 1973, all jobs within the state correctional institutions were opened up to women on an equal basis with men (Potter, 1980). California has apparently been able to compromise with the requirements of equal opportunity and the concerns of inmate privacy rights.

California, similar to many other states, has had a court action taken by some of its inmates regarding the issue of privacy, however the Federal Appeals Court (1985) did decide that female officers can work in male institutions. A brief summary of this court case follows (Bailey, ed., 1986).

In 1982, a class action suit was drawn up against the California Corrections Department and San Quentin, charging privacy rights were violated by female officers who conducted "pat down" searches of clothed inmates, and who also saw them showering or using their toilets. The Federal Appeals Court ruled in December of 1985, that female officers could do "pat down" searches and also could watch inmates shower or using toilet facilities without violating rights, because searches are done in a "professional manner and with respect", and that there is a need for internal security which outweighs inmates' privacy rights. At this time, in 1985, San Quentin had 113 female officers, out of a total of 720 correctional officers. This court decision, which was similar to the lower District Court's earlier decision, made it clear that employment rights of women in correctional facilities were being recognized and protected (Bailey, ed., 1983).

The California experience perhaps more than any other state, is comparable to the Canadian situation. This state, and the United States federal system (which will be discussed further in this chapter), were in fact used as a reference point when Canada first began the introduction of female correctional officers in its all-male correctional facilities. California has used "fogged" windows, shower curtains, and modesty barriers around toilets in order to minimize inmate privacy problems. However there is still the recognition that for security measures to be effective, females will be allowed to continue doing "pat down"

searches, and will continue to function at all the same duties that male officers engage in (with the exception of "skin searches" which require strict guidelines) (Horne, 1985; Feinman, 1980).

The policy in many states is still to bar female correctional officers from cell blocks or housing units where there may be problems with inmate privacy. Women who are employed in these states continue to be assigned to specific job duties that limit their full interaction with male inmates. This causes more problems: women cannot advance through the hierarchical system because of a lack of experience at all job posts; co-workers get upset that the women do not have to do all the jobs and are getting preferential treatment (this complaint is often in addition to a general unwillingness to have women working in the all-male environment in the first place); ambiguity and uncertainty over the future; and different methods of interpretation and handling by different states and jurisdictions (Feinman, 1980; Toombs, 1979; Horne, 1985).

A 1982 survey showed that out of forty-two states that responded, forty-one hired female correctional officers in male institutions. However each state determined how these women's job functions were structured within the state system (Etheridge, Hale, et al, 1984).

The deployment of female correctional officers may also change from time to time within the state. This may be due to various inmate lawsuits, or even because of a change

in state correctional administrators. This is shown in the case of Delaware, which began by using female correctional officers in all areas of male institutions, including strip searches. The state followed this policy for five years, beginning approximately in 1975 (Potter, 1980). In 1979, new Delaware legislation came into effect that would remove females from male housing areas of the institution (Potter, 1980). This move was typical of the concerns across the United States. Not only was the "women's movement" concerned with equal opportunity issues, but inmates began using their civil rights options as well (Shawver, 1987).

Probably the most discussed legal case in all of the literature reviewed from the United States experience, is the 1977 Supreme Court case, Dothard vs Rawlinson. This case has been reviewed by a number of researchers, including Shawver (1986), Zimmer (1986), Horne (1985), Feinman (1980), Morris (1987), and Matusewitch (1980). The case has been used to describe future uncertainties for female correctional officers in the United States, it has been used to criticize unwarranted opinions made by some of the Judges, and it has been used to show how the case of female correctional officers in male institutions has been problematic. The case in brief is as follows (Jacobs, 1981).

Diane Rawlinson graduated from the University of Alabama with a degree in correctional psychology. She applied to the Alabama Board of Corrections as a correctional officer, but was rejected because she was five pounds under

the minimum weight requirement for the job (even though she did have a superior educational background). After Rawlinson was refused employment, she filed a sex discrimination charge with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. She charged that the state's height and weight qualifications violated Title VII, and she also challenged the state's ruling on "contact positions" in men's maximum security prisons. The district court, composed of three judges, agreed with Rawlinson in both challenges. It also said that there was no evidence that women could not work successfully in a male institution. However when the case went to the United States Supreme Court, the decision differed. Although these judges upheld the elimination of height and weight requirements, they also reversed the invalidation of the "no contact" rule, citing the bona fide occupational qualification exception to Title VII. Apparently the judges had decided that the maximum security prisons of Alabama were too violent to risk placing a female correctional officer in their midst. The case became the first decision by the Supreme Court that upheld an employer's claim to limiting jobs to one sex. Critics of this decision have stated that this has become a setback for women intending to work in male institutions; also that the decision appears to be based on a "gut reaction" rather than consideration of equal opportunities or realities of prison life (Jacobs, 1981: 59).

In another case, Gunther vs Iowa State Men's Reformatory (1979), the Supreme Court refused to review the

lower court ruling by indicating that the "bona fide occupational qualification" could not be used discriminately (Potter, 1980). This case involved a female correctional officer at the Iowa State Men's Reformatory, who was denied a promotion because of her sex. She was not in a contact position, therefore could not qualify for all duties needed for a promotion. The United States District Court ruled in Gunther's favor, the United States Court of Appeals affirmed the decision, and the Supreme Court would not review the case. According to the courts, scheduling adjustments could be made, and that therefore the female officer's opportunity for promotions should not be impeded (Potter, 1980).

These kinds of decisions have furthered legal arguments from state to state, with each state deciding how it will interpret Title VII and the bona fide occupational qualification clause. Although courts are recognizing the right for inmates to have privacy, courts must also balance this concern with women's employment opportunity rights (Horne, 1985). Although the Rawlinson decision was limited to the extreme conditions in the Alabama prisons at the time, the Supreme Court has upheld women's rights to do this kind of work. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act does specify a hiring mandate, with the door left open for women themselves to choose whether or not they want to work in a maximum security institution (Morris, 1987).

In 1975, the Federal Bureau of Prisons in Washington decided to introduce women as correctional officers in male

institutions on a pilot project basis (Coté, McCarthy, et al, 1977). Recruitment began in 1976, however, women have only been working in all positions in only the minimum and medium security Federal correctional facilities (FCIs). They may work in the six maximum security penitentiaries (such as Leavenworth), but only in non-security positions and not as guards (Horne, 1985). This restriction was imposed after a part-time female dietician was attacked and murdered in the Atlanta penitentiary in 1979 (Horne, 1985). As in the California state system, female correctional officers in the federal system do inmate searches, except for "strip" searches, and also do cell counts in the inmate living quarters.

Overall, one could say that women's entry into male institutions has been slow, uncertain, and at times sporadic. From the beginning, there has been considerable opposition to the hiring of women in these places. The job has always been dominated by men - and men who have traditionally held common, shared views on both the role of corrections (control of inmates) and the role of women (they do not belong in an all-male setting simply because they are female). Women have generally been seen in the traditional role of mother, wife, sister, and even in a career-oriented role. However the intrusion into non-traditional occupations has caused a view of mistrust, apprehension, a lack of acceptance, and misconception. A number of unsubstantiated fears have also helped cloud women's entry into male dominated occupations.

These have included women's lack of physical strength, security threats, possibility of manipulation by inmates, the possibility of rapes, etc.

The prison community is largely seen by society as a potentially violent and hostile environment, where the stress level is extremely high and where frustrated and angry inmates need to be "controlled". Women have not generally been seen as being able to fit into what appears to be a stereotypical "dangerous" prison environment. These sentiments are exemplified in the Dothard vs Rawlinson case (97 U.S. Supreme Court, 1977), as well as in the writings of many prison researchers (Potter, 1980; Harm, 1980; Zimmer, 1986; and Hunter, 1986). Hunter has said that women correctional officers "deal with some of the most violent people in our country in a closed setting . . . work in a stressful environment that few people outside the corrections system can truly understand" (Hunter, 1986: 13). And Zimmer has said that the "prison itself is a work environment characterized not only by periodic episodes of extreme violence but also by almost constant disruption, turmoil, and confusion" (Zimmer, 1986: 3).

B. Literature Review

In reviewing the dominant literature on the subject of female correctional officers in male correctional facilities, some notable studies and research papers have come to the forefront. These will now be summarized, in an

effort to show how the phenomenon of female correctional officers has become both a political reality as well as a much debated controversy.

Although by law women have been allowed to seek equal work opportunities with men, these efforts have resulted in uneven progress. This is due to a variety of reasons which will be discussed in the literature review. Several job related issues remain unresolved and in controversy. These involve inmate concerns as well as administrative and co-worker concerns. These also involve attitudes and personal value systems which have bearing on how female correctional officers are viewed in their role.

Cheryl Bowser Petersen's study of the Wisconsin Corrections system, from 1977-78, sought to examine the impact of female officers on male officers and on male inmates (Petersen, 1982). Her method consisted of participant observation, interviewing, and using questionnaires at four institutions. Petersen found that "in general, the reaction of residents to the women guards seemed positive", however the male officers were more hostile and created more problems for the women than the male inmates (Petersen, 1982: 456). Many of the male residents felt some sexual frustration, and were also concerned with privacy issues (ie, going to the toilet). The male officers' concerns were over maintaining order, protection of the females, and concern of sexual impropriety. There was a prevalence of sexual rumors which involved the women, and

which were spread through the officer subculture. The strength and the existence of an officer subculture was indicated, and it was obvious to the researcher that women did not fit into this subculture easily. Female officers were also seen as being more easily manipulated than male officers, and that females used "a more personal method of interaction" with inmates (Petersen, 1982: 455). These latter two concerns were also seen as violations of the correctional officer subcultural norms.

The results of inmate reaction showed a moderately positive attitude, however there were a lot of neutral responses as well. Many also responded that female officers improved the institution's atmosphere. Inmates were better groomed and behaved when females were present, they felt more "human", they enjoyed seeing female faces and hearing female voices, and that the threat of physical assault by an inmate was not a real concern (Petersen, 1982: 448-449). Although male officers felt great concern over the protection of females and the abilities of females, it appeared unwarranted. Some inmates did however question whether a female could break up an inmate fight satisfactorily. Concerning sex, most male officers thought the presence of females was much more of a problem than did the male inmates. There was not the anticipated "overwhelming" agreement that lack of sex is more frustrating due to female officers being there. Concerning job performance, there was confusion by both male and female officers on the question of inmate

privacy. This had to do with the definition of "emergency situation" in order to do a strip search, just when a woman was allowed to "pat down" an inmate, how to do surveillance of bathrooms and shower areas, and also what a woman officer could or could not do in the performance of her job. This was related to a lack of a clear policy statement by the Wisconsin Division of Corrections on the matter of inmate privacy concerns. This left the possibility of lawsuits by both male inmates (concerning privacy) and female officers (concerning sex discrimination and equal opportunities), thereby leaving individual state institutions in uncertainty (Petersen, 1982).

Lois Shawver investigated the issue of inmate privacy and how this has been used as a basis of lawsuits which try to remove female officers from working in "contact" positions (Shawver, 1987). The researcher discussed how "bodily modesty" is a product of acculturation, and that it may occur in a variety of situations. Definitions of embarrassment vary according to each individual and situation. The person doing the observing becomes important in how he observes another's body. Situations of embarrassment fluctuate similar to establishment of routine. The researcher also contends that a person can feel an invasion of privacy, embarrassment, or modesty with a member of the same sex the same as with an opposite sex person. Overall, only a small proportion of inmates were seen as having their "modesty sensitivities" violated when female correctional officers

worked in housing units. The benefits were seen to outweigh the privacy concerns, in that the "prison culture" is improved. The occasional complaint, it was determined, could be accommodated without taking women out of the job. This could be done by protecting inmates' rights to "civility and respect", and by avoiding unnecessary embarrassment. The use of modesty screens and shower curtains was recommended, as well as requesting female correctional officers to refrain from staring or making comments. The overall conclusion was that inmates could adapt to new situations. The privacy issue was not seen as being serious, nor prevalent, and therefore women should not be removed from working in housing units of male institutions.

Lois Shawver and Robert Dickover analyzed the California experience, seeking to find whether female officers were assaulted more often than male officers, whether assaults were more severe, and whether male officers were more vulnerable to assaults as the numbers of female correctional officers increased (Shawver and Dickover, 1986). The research results showed that women were assaulted significantly less than men, that if assaulted they would be just as likely as male officers to be injured, and that there was no evidence that male officers were assaulted in any increased way when more females were working. Their conclusions also supported the notion that females approached dangerous situations in a different way; they were less aggressive and more creative due to being physically more

vulnerable. Also, their research supports the contention that male inmates would not feel comfortable about assaulting a female (as opposed to a male) because women are more vulnerable, and it would not be seen as an act of "masculinity" (Kissel, 1980).

In Peter Kissel's 1980 study of female correctional officers, he found that most inmates did not have their privacy adversely affected by the presence of female officers. Kissel studied female and male staff, and male inmates at five correctional institutions in Virginia, Illinois, and Colorado. He concluded that both male officers and male inmates saw female officers according to their sexual status. Women were an asset in "cooling out" potential aggression, but they were not seen as being able to handle a situation once violence broke out. The consensus was also that women "softened" the institutional environment. The female officers that responded also indicated some aspects of harassment by male officers because they were female.

Many researchers support the view that female correctional officers are seen and treated according to stereotypical and traditional roles (Crouch, 1985; Etheridge, Hale, et al, 1984; Morris, 1987). This is true for inmates who have experiences, attitudes, perceptions of women before they enter the institution and which are perpetuated throughout the prison experience, as well as for the public and male correctional officers. The majority of the

literature does suggest that male officers are seen to be one of the largest areas of concern. Male co-workers may use the issue of inmate privacy to justify keeping female officers out of male institutions, but it is for their own benefit that they make these claims, not for the inmates' benefit (Shawver, 1987). This, accompanied with pre-conceived attitudes that are held about women seem to have been (and still are in many cases) the biggest single setback to the integration of female officers (Crouch, 1985; Hunter, 1986).

Many men have a very traditional way of looking at how women "need" to be protected, not only physically, but morally as well (Etheridge, Hale, et al, 1984; Ingram, 1980). Therefore many male correctional officers feel that their functioning is compromised if they have to worry about the physical safety of a woman who is working in the cell block. A warden of the Federal Correctional Institution in Butner, North Carolina, says that there is a protective attitude concerning females that is found in all institutions and especially in penitentiaries (Ingram, 1980). Men also have traditional attitudes that include morals and virtues that are used to characterize women, for example the "madonna/whore duality" that Feinman (1980) speaks of. Men have traditional notions of women being virtuous, caring, nurturing, and emotional. While some of these traits are needed in a prison environment, the male correctional officer would not generally feel that this is the case. Women who risk their "femininity" by observing near-naked men

masturbating, or hearing swear words all day long, simply lose that traditional feminine role (Zimmer, 1982). Overall, male co-workers often have questioned what "type" of woman would even want to work in such a setting. That is, she must be a "masculine" type, or she "hates" men, etc., thereby labelling such women as not being normal (Etheridge, Hale, et al, 1984; Crouch, 1985).

Women are not seen as being big or strong enough to cope with the traditional view of what a correctional officer is (Breed, 1981; Morris, 1987). However, the physically large, and older women are more readily accepted by male correctional officers (Crouch, 1985). Women are also seen as sex objects, with differing definitions by male co-workers, administrators, and inmates (Breed, 1981; Morris, 1987). And although some of the initial strong hostility of males decreases after women have worked in the institution for a time, the hostility may simply become less visible and overt, but does not disappear entirely (Horne, 1985).

Women, by their very presence in these all-male environments are shattering the traditional guard subculture that enforces a "macho", aggressive, and loyal image of solidarity. Women are seemingly trying to change the whole perspective of what it means to be a "guard". They are entering the profession with new and different coping skills, with new attitudes on corrections, and with aspirations that are breaking down traditional social and occupational roles. Women have been, and still are, a threat to male workers,

whether this threat is justified or not. Negative stereotyping of women and being assigned an inferior status has historically caused sexual discrimination in employment. Although the courts have legislated equal opportunities, attitudes are slower and more difficult to change, therefore prejudice against women remains strong (Graham, 1981).

Correctional administrators have traditionally also felt that women were too weak, could be manipulated too easily by inmates, that they sexually stimulated the inmates, and that there was an added security risk by having female correctional officers (Jurik, 1985; Graham, 1981). There have also been some myths about females that have perpetuated the claim that women cannot be integrated into all-male institutions. These include that women will quit sooner than men, that women get sick more often than men, or that women do not really "have" to work. Often, because of pressures placed upon administrators, women will be hired on in a "token" role (Harm, 1980; Jurik, 1985). This is damaging because she is singled out. She feels like she is in a "no win" situation because everyone is watching her successes or failures, and she generally lacks any peer support group or adequate training. Often these women feel they must work harder in order to "prove" their worth (Hunter, 1986), with a feeling that if they fail, they fail for all women (Jones, 1986). They must also continually dispel traditional stereotypical attitudes held by males and by the administration (Hunter, 1986).

Generally most studies have shown that female correctional officers' influence in a male institution has had more positive than negative effect. The term that seems to appear most often in the literature is "normalization" - that the presence of females in an all-male environment causes more normal interaction and reaction (Parisi, 1984; Horne, 1985). This was one of the main reasons why the United States federal prison system expanded to include female correctional officers in the mid 1970's. The experience of some co-educational prisons also influenced the decision to hire women, when administrators saw that there was a more normal environment created in these prisons. Since federal prisons were not co-educational facilities at this time, the hiring of female correctional officers was seen as the next logical step to take (Bailey, ed., 1976).

As well as normalization, the literature also mentions that female correctional officers "soften" the harsh prison environment (Horne, 1985), and that they have a calming effect on the prison (Hunter, 1986). Inmates generally behave and dress better (Horne, 1985; Petersen, 1982), "most prisoners do not experience serious modesty concerns as a result of the presence of female officers working in their housing units" (Shawver, 1987: 157), the majority of inmates do not mind having females in the institution (Shawver, 1987; Kissel, 1980), female officers resort to communicative skills rather than physical force to handle situations (Hunter, 1986), and inmates generally are able to control their behavior around women in authority.

Several researchers have studied role strain and the roles women adopt once they become correctional officers (Kissel, 1980; Bowersox, 1981; Zimmer, 1982, 1986). Most evidence shows that women do the job of correctional officer differently. There is a more service-oriented role, and women use a less aggressive style in their interaction with inmates when they want to maintain control. However, research also supports the notion that females do not have different motivations or aspirations for job satisfaction than males do. The reality of the economy, combined with the women's movement into traditional male careers has influenced women in the correctional officer category (Harm, 1980).

Work patterns and role definitions though, are perceived differently. In trying to fit into a perceived role, the female correctional officer may try to be "one of the boys", take on the "helpless" role, or alienate herself by doing only her job (Jones, 1986). However, role transition is seen to be easier if the officer tries to maintain "professional" standards, in addition to obtaining support and advice from colleagues. Group support through information sharing and communication is seen as being very important in a male dominated profession (Jones, 1986; Harm, 1980; Graham, 1981). The study done by Peter Kissel (1980) also showed that female officers continually had to balance their sexual roles with their occupational roles while they were working. They would often have to use an indirect approach when giving orders to inmates, because some inmates

could not deal with authority (of either female or male correctional officers).

The literature has also shown that women are less likely to enter corrections as a career aspiration, but rather it is because of the financial situation, or because the opportunity is there that they become correctional officers (Pollock, 1986; Zimmer, 1986).

Perhaps one of the most in-depth studies done on female correctional officers working in male institutions (in the United States), has been the sociological research of Lynn Zimmer. Her Ph.D. dissertation on this subject was completed in 1982, and involved a two year study of female "guards". Subsequent to her 1982 dissertation, a book, Women Guarding Men was published in 1986. Zimmer used a sociological style that was in the ethnographic tradition during her study of female correctional officers (her term used was "guard") in all-male "prisons" in the states of New York and Rhode Island. Her analysis included open-ended interviews with female officers, male officers, male inmates, and administrative personnel. Zimmer's conclusions support other literature in a number of ways. These include the opposition of male correctional officers to the entry of women, mixed reaction from inmates, and that women tend to become correctional officers "primarily because of extrinsic rewards - the money, security, and fringe benefits. In this respect, the women are probably quite similar to their male counterparts" (Zimmer, 1986: 50).

Her findings also support what other prison community literature has stated, in that the prison environment is not a very pleasant place, that it is dangerous, and that women were entering into a new arena that contained internal tensions as well as external changes. This was a male dominated environment, resistant to change ("old" guard vs "new" guard mentality) and focus (treatment, counselling, interaction vs custody, control, and detachment). Zimmer maintains these women who chose to become correctional officers had made extraordinary choices, but were not greatly different from all other women. She also discovered that there are various ways that women coped with male harassment and opposition, and that women developed certain strategies and roles for themselves within the environment of the institution. The institutional role was one in which the women follow the rules, wanting to perform the job on an equal basis with men, and not wanting any special privileges. In the modified role, women see their status as a deterrent to full performance of the job and therefore perform more limited duties. They also choose to work at posts that do not require a lot of inmate interaction. In the inventive role, women work in direct contact with inmates. The status of being female appears to be an asset to the job; they expect and receive help from inmates in the function of duties and avoiding injury during prison disturbances (Zimmer, 1982).

Zimmer's research shows that male prison guards were "overwhelmingly opposed to the hiring and equal deployment of females to all posts in men's prisons" (Zimmer, 1982: 111). Very few, out of one hundred interviewed, were supportive. Security of the institution and guard safety appeared to be the main reasons to opposition of the women. As well, sex differences were felt to make women unsuitable (inferior size and physical strength), and women were viewed as emotionally and psychologically weaker than men (less aggressive, lack of "proper" response in a crisis, more vulnerable). Men were also worried about having to protect women. This paternalism was seen as natural by some: "men have to protect women - just like other species. If the female wolf is in trouble, the male wolves will protect her even if they get killed themselves. It works the same way with humans" (Zimmer, 1982: 114).

Many of the same men who were opposed to women as co-workers were declaring however that they generally favored women's rights and equal job opportunities, with this type of job being regarded as an exception. Some men agreed that women could work in a limited capacity (no direct contact with inmates). Others which did not want to diminish the masculinity aspects of the job questioned the sexuality and femininity of the women. Even if some women were considered as being capable or successful, more often than not it was because they were not thought of as "real women" (Zimmer,

1982: 118). A few men did think that women had a "calming" effect on inmates, or were perceptive, but according to Zimmer's research, this was not widespread. Mistakes by a woman were also generally attributed to the entire group of women, and tended to support the males' belief that women were not as capable as men (Zimmer, 1982: 118).

Zimmer found a mixed reaction from male inmates. The overall finding was that there was "a diversity of inmate opinion, but only a small minority were adamantly opposed to the presence of women" (Zimmer, 1982: 124). Male inmates also had stereotypical images of women, women's roles in society, and women's capabilities. During the women's initial entrance into the all-male environment, inmates were apprehensive, confused, and wondered about the changes and how these would affect the inmates. After inmates became accustomed to the women, the initial reactive moments (being rude or hostile, giving her a "hard" time, etc.) wore off except for a few "troublemakers". Zimmer's research shows that inmates then developed one of three attitudes toward the women. One group was basically neutral, one was adamantly opposed, and the other was strongly in favor of the women being guards. Those that were neutral said it did not matter since the rules were the same and "a screw is a screw is a screw" (Zimmer, 1982: 120). Those that liked the women said it was a nice change, that women were better to lock at, that women treated them better (more helpful, compassionate, and understanding), that the women were easier to interact and

talk with, and that privacy was not a major problem. The inmates that favored the women also believed there were some disadvantages, such as the lack of a woman's ability to protect an inmate if he were attacked by another inmate. There was also a belief that women can get into fearful situations where they would have to be protected, for example, from the "troublemakers" in the inmate population. The inmates that did not like women guards claimed it was humiliating to take orders from a woman. This was interpreted by the researcher as a situation that threatened their "manhood" and violated "their sense of the rightful place of men and women in society" (Zimmer, 1982: 123). Others opposed and resented female officers due to privacy issues, the belief women were more "petty", and that sexual frustration was a problem. Zimmer feels that of the small minority that was opposed to female officers, "most negative comments came from inmates who had contact with one particular female guard - one who was disliked by nearly everyone in the prison - male guards, female guards, and inmates alike" (Zimmer, 1982: 124). Zimmer also stated that at the time of her research there were not very many female officers in most prisons, therefore generalizations concerning female officers resulted from inmates' limited experience with them.

Zimmer also mentions the legal and practical problems which may reduce women's potential in the quest for equal opportunity with their male counterparts, saying that the

future is uncertain because of these legal issues. Until the Supreme Court of the United States makes a final decision on the issue of inmate privacy versus female correctional officers, the whole area is not resolved. Individual states still vary in their interpretation of Title VII, and thus far, issues have not gone beyond lower court decisions (Zimmer, 1986).

Zimmer claims that "male opposition and harassment remain strong, and differential treatment of male and female guards continues"(Zimmer, 1986: 172). These then are serious obstacles to women seeking careers and realizing full potential in the correctional officer field. According to Zimmer, solutions lie in the federal law of the United States, the 1972 amendment to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. This gives women the right to work as correctional officers in men's institutions. The Rawlinson decision claimed grounds for a bona fide occupational qualification exemption due to the prison conditions existing in Alabama's maximum security prison. However Zimmer maintains that in subsequent cases, "no similar conditions were found, and women's right to prison employment was reaffirmed" (Zimmer, 1986: 173). In the future, the Supreme Court could decide to hear another case, and could also then establish additional qualifications, or in fact create a legal change that would remove women entirely from men's institutions. Thus far, prison administrators in various jurisdictions have no clear legal guidelines on how to interpret important and

controversial issues such as inmate privacy, inmate searches, female correctional officer deployment in the institution, equal employment opportunities, etc. (Zimmer, 1986). Not only are there legal problems to overcome, there are also practical problems to solve. According to Zimmer "only a few currently employed female guards are willing and able to perform all guard functions in the male prison" (Zimmer, 1986: 179). Many have not been given adequate training because they are in non-contact positions, and many are discouraged from full participation due to policies and male opposition. This may lead to emotional discouragement for a career-minded person, and a high turn-over rate (Zimmer, 1986). Zimmer's solution lies in proper screening procedures for correctional officers, proper training, and reducing male opposition and sexual harassment. This would be done through a clear management policy statement that establishes a disciplinary procedure, "educational and awareness sessions . . . help male guards become more sensitive to their own attitudes and behavior" (Zimmer, 1986: 184), and providing special assistance for women. This would include special physical training, how women can deal with sexual advances or misconduct from inmates, and the use of more female trainers for recruits. Women correctional officers themselves must be willing to offer each other support, provide assistance, share problems, and seek active union support for work-related problems (Zimmer, 1986).

Only 6% of women correctional officers are in men's institutions across the United States, and actual figures vary from state to state (Zimmer, 1986). The American Correctional Association has stated that as of June 30, 1985, there were 10,848 women working as correctional officers in state adult systems, representing 12% of the total 88,492 correctional officers (Hunter, 1986).

C. Conclusion

Legislation in the United States has ensured equal job opportunities for women in corrections. Women now work in all-male adult institutions of all security levels across the country. However, each state correctional system, as well as the federal correctional system, decides in what capacity the female correctional officers will be used. Various restrictions concerning women's work within all-male institutions are applied. Women do not have direct contact with male inmates in housing units in the majority of cases, and their correctional duties are restricted to other areas of the institution. In those institutions where women have equal duties with male correctional officers (with the exception of strip searches), the women appear to have adapted well, as have the male inmates. There continues to be problems with male co-workers and their opposition however.

Concerns over inmate privacy have been a problem. These concerns often clash with women's equal rights

opportunities. The courts have not been very decisive in how some of these issues are resolved. There is recognition of inmate privacy rights, however there is also recognition of women's rights to work in careers of their choosing. Realizing that inmate privacy can be accommodated through the use of screens, curtains, and barriers, some institutions have compromised. This then is an approach that provides some basic privacy for inmates from either sex, not just from female correctional officers. However security concerns often take precedent, and therefore many institutions are unwilling to provide such modesty barriers. In addition to privacy rights, there is also concern over how "normal" or appropriate it actually is to have female correctional officers working with male inmates. As Parisi (1984) has said, the concept of "normalization" is heavily debated and argued, and requires further research.

In their quest for equality, female correctional officers are continuing to face male opposition, harassment from co-workers, sexual discrimination in job assignments, inadequate training, and a lack of peer support and assistance. Due to unclear policy guidelines, a lack of direction, and improper training for all job posts, female correctional officers are finding promotional opportunities difficult to achieve. There is also uncertainty over the future in a correctional officer career due to inmate lawsuits, and governmental policies regarding hiring of women as correctional officers.

Women as correctional officers in all-male institutions also have to realize they are in non-traditional occupations, previously male dominated. Attitudes and values that have been traditionally held concerning the role of women in society are difficult to change, even if it is demonstrated that women can do an effective job as a correctional officer. Stereotypical views have created unfounded fears, especially in the minds of male correctional officers, who continue to cling to a correctional officer subculture that has no room for women. A woman who is a correctional officer in an all-male institution also has to worry about role definition, and how best to fit into her job. She must balance the work requirements with the fact that she is female (and therefore may approach the handling of a situation differently from a male officer). There is a certain amount of strain experienced as she realizes that there are those who will blame any shortcomings on her gender, and not on her inexperience. While legislation may ensure that women have the right to work at certain occupations such as correctional officer, the attitudes and hostility that surrounds the job will be much more difficult to overcome or change.

Overall, women appear to have entered the field as correctional officers in the United States for similar reasons as men, as Zimmer (1982, 1986) and others have shown. The pay of a correctional officer is better than what women could receive in other more traditional, semi-skilled or

unskilled areas, and the women's movement (concerned with equal rights) has created the opportunity to move into traditional male careers (Harm, 1980). The reality of economic times has also encouraged women to pursue work that provides security, a good level of pay, and good benefits (all of which concern women similar to men).

Overall, the advantages of having women as correctional officers in all-male institutions appear to outweigh the disadvantages. The fears that abounded when women first entered these institutions are largely unfounded, as women have adapted well to the job. However there are problems and issues that remain unresolved, which will require attention in the future.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE CANADIAN EXPERIENCE, FROM 1977 TO 1988

A. Modern History of Women in the Correctional Service of Canada, Prior to 1977

In February of 1967, a Royal Commission on the Status of Women in Canada was established, ". . . to ensure for women equal opportunities with men in all aspects of Canadian society . . ." (The Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, 1979: 6). The report was presented in 1970, with 167 recommendations, 122 of which were within the jurisdiction of the federal government. Many recommendations which were easily dealt with were quickly implemented in the early 1970's, others were revised or partially implemented, and still others had problems being recognized. Recommendation 36 dealt with the eradication of sex-typing in occupations. Until this occurred, the federal government was to: (a) take special steps to increase the number of women in non-traditional occupations, and (b) review and alter recruitment programs to indicate that women "are wanted in all occupations and professions" (The Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, 1979: 20).

In 1969, the Canadian Penitentiary Service was under the jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission, which prohibited discrimination in hiring on the basis of sex under Section 12 of the Public Service Employment Act and

Regulations (Kelly, 1980). Despite this, the Canadian Penitentiary Service continued the tradition of hiring only men as "gaolers" for male institutions, and only women as "matrons" for the federal Prison for Women. This was allowed because the Public Service Commission granted exemptions for a single sex restriction for specified positions in the correctional officer (CX) group (Kelly, 1980). At this time, men were classified as "gaoler" while women were called "matron" - by 1977, both gaoler and matron had been classified as "correctional officer" (Coté, McCarthy, et al, 1977).

In the early 1960's, the first female psychologist and a few female classification officers were hired by the Canadian Penitentiary Service (Campbell, 1988). When as late as 1969, a woman was hired at Warkworth Institution, "it was still considered a novelty for a woman to work in that capacity in male institutions and indeed she was the only one in the Ontario Region" (Coté, McCarthy, et al, 1977: 11). In 1973, female nurses were hired to work in male institutions; prior to this there were only males known as "hospital officers" who worked in the male institutions (Campbell, 1988).

During most of the 1970's, women that worked for the Canadian Penitentiary Service were still predominately in the clerical and secretarial categories, and thus had very minimal or no contact with inmates. In 1976 for example, nearly half of the total number of staff were classified in

the correctional officer group, approximately 15% of the Penitentiary Service was female, and yet only 1.5% of the females were correctional officers (as matrons in the Prison for Women) (Coté, McCarthy, et al, 1977: 14). Even though a small number of female classification officers and nurses had daily contact with male inmates, they did not have constant (twenty-four hours a day) and continuous (seven days a week) contact with the inmates (Coté, McCarthy, et al, 1977).

In 1975, the Public Service Commission of Canada decided to review its sex restriction policy in the correctional officer category. According to Mr. Terry Kelly, who later became chairman of the "Female CX Project", this review was probably as a result of complaints from various candidates that had not received jobs because of their sex (Kelly, 1980). This request for a review led to the formation of a committee that would study the sex restrictions and make recommendations to the Commission concerning their findings.

In a ten year review, done by The Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women in 1979, recommendation 36 of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women was seen as only partially implemented. The recommendation had concerned itself with the eradication of sex-typing in the workforce. The review indicated that despite equal opportunities for women programs indicating that jobs in the Public Service were open to both men and women, little progress had been made. The federal government had also initiated various

policies that were to increase recruitment, staffing, training, and development of women, however these were not seen as being successful. The recommendation of the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women included strengthening the equal opportunities for women programs, and the use of special measures for recruiting and selecting women for occupations (The Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, 1979: 20).

B. A Study of the Existing Sex Restrictions in the Correctional Group

In March of 1977, a study group of three persons, with Mr. Jacques Côté as chairman, was designated by the Public Service Commission to undertake a study of the existing sex restrictions used in filling correctional officer positions in the Canadian Penitentiary Service (Côté, McCarthy, et al, 1977). The three represented the Office of Equal Opportunities for Women, the Operational Security Division of the Penitentiary Service, and the Public Service Commission's Anti-Discrimination Branch. The Côté committee completed a six month study ending in August of 1977. In order to study the sex restrictions, the committee travelled across Canada, visiting several institutions, both federal and provincial (some provincial institutions were already using women as correctional officers in all-male institutions). They interviewed correctional staff and inmates, examined job stations and duties, and administered a

questionnaire for anonymous response. They also travelled to the United States, visiting two correctional centres in California. At least nineteen Canadian federal and provincial institutions of varying security levels, including the federal Prison for Women were visited. In California, two federal institutions, Lompoc Federal Correctional Facility and Terminal Island Federal Co-Correctional Facility were visited. Although the main thrust of this study appeared to be to examine the role of women in male institutions, the committee was also concerned with the sex restrictions at the Prison for Women. Here, the majority of males worked as administrative or support personnel, and no men worked in the living quarters of the female inmates.

During its examination of the sex restrictions, the Coté committee discovered several reasons why women were not recruited to work as correctional officers in all-male institutions in Canada (Coté, McCarthy, et al, 1977). These included:

(1) Work areas - Certain work areas such as dissociation, reception and discharge, and living ranges were seen as unsuitable areas for women. Concessions were made that women "could" work in towers, visiting areas, control centres, and on perimeters - anywhere where they would not be in direct contact with inmates. Other areas were seen as unsuitable because of lack of women's strength or inmate privacy concerns.

(2) Physical strength - This was seen as necessary for removing inmates from their cells or moving them elsewhere, and also for working with inmates who were in dissociation (these were seen as being more violent or more likely to lose control). Women were not considered good "back up" for another officer who may need assistance. Women were also seen as requiring protection if there was a problem, and therefore an added responsibility or liability.

(3) Privacy - There was a concern over the display of nudity by inmates, as well as privacy in their use of showers or toilets. There was also a concern over women seeing "homosexual acts" amongst inmates, which would embarrass both inmates and staff.

(4) Skin frisks - The Coté committee was told several times that if women could not do all aspects of the job, then they should not be hired. Performing skin frisks was one aspect which should not be done by women on men, mainly because of the degradation and humiliation of both parties concerned.

(5) Rape and hostage-taking - Women were seen as possible targets for rape if they were to work with male inmates. Also, the fear of hostage-taking was based on traditional male-held notions that women needed protection and were not as strong as men.

(6) Lack of acceptability - This was seen as a very significant concern, and was based on very personal and traditional views that were held by male correctional

officers. It was an emotional and biased concern that showed strong attitudes of traditional women's roles, fear that women would take jobs away from men, that men would resign rather than work with women, and that even if women could do the job, "it's that we don't want them in here" (Coté, McCarthy, et al, 1977: 33).

In addressing each of these concerns, the Coté committee studied those institutions, both at the provincial level in Canada and at the federal level in California, that did use female correctional officers in all-male environments. The committee also realized that the role of women was changing in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, the provincial police forces, and within city police departments. In March of 1974, the Ontario Provincial Police began employing women as officers. The RCMP made the decision to begin recruitment of female officers in 1974, and began employing women on the force in September of 1975. The new female "Mounties" were to receive the same officer training and be eligible for all postings and duties (Solicitor General Canada, 1981c). Studies had shown the Coté committee that these women were effective, did their jobs well, and did not contribute to additional problems.

Each of the above-mentioned concerns will now be addressed, as presented by the Coté study committee:

(1) Work areas - The committee felt there were no jobs that women could not do. Therefore, "being 'male' is not a bona fide occupational requirement for performing the duties

of a CX in a male institution . . ." (Coté, McCarthy, et al, 1977: 41). When inmates are in dissociation, correctional officers were not left alone, and in some places there was the use of hand-cuffs or ankle shackles which would reduce risk. And because cell doors are locked at night, a female could work by herself if she had to, the same as any other officer.

(2) Physical strength - This area was seen as lacking in many male officers. Also, that the need to physically confront inmates for removal from a cell is very minimal. The male inmates themselves have said it would not be very "manly" to fight with a woman. It was also felt that most inmates can be "talked out" of their cell. If a physical confrontation is necessary, "the obvious solution is to choose the most physically capable persons to remove him in the same manner that they do now" (Coté, McCarthy, et al, 1977: 27). Being male does not necessarily mean the person is capable of handling a situation that requires physical strength, since many male officers are also small or appear weak. Studies from women in policing had also shown the Coté committee that women were able to diffuse violent situations, because they did not present a hostile or aggressive front as their male counterparts might. Concerning women for "back-up", it was felt again that these situations were minimal (even though the male officers did explain that it may only be one situation where it is needed for survival). In cases of extreme trouble, one back-up, whether male or

female, would probably not be sufficient anyway. Often a back-up need not be physical but could use a conciliatory approach. The tendency to over-protect women stems from sexual stereotyping, attitudes, and views on traditional roles. It is found to be widespread in society, and in many occupations. Again, the Coté committee looked at the experiences of women in policing, as well as studies of women attendants in mental institutions. In mental institutions, it has been found that male inmates have accepted the females, and there have not been increased acts of violence or abuse even though the inmates had a history of this (Coté, McCarthy, et al, 1977: 29-30).

(3) Privacy - The Coté committee found that inmates lacked privacy in general, and that these conditions should be improved upon. The committee also used the examples of California, Ontario provincial institutions, and Alberta provincial institutions, all of which have made minor adjustments to allow for privacy in toilet and shower areas. Issues of privacy were seen as being important for the inmates whether or not there were female officers. Appropriate behavior by inmates was also expected. There was no need to walk around nude on the way to the showering area. The Coté committee did acknowledge that some inmates may be shy and embarrassed, and that there may be tense or difficult moments experienced by either sex. Regarding the act of homosexuality itself, the committee felt that since it was contrary to penitentiary regulations, it should not be used as a reason to keep women from working in male institutions.

(4) Skin frisks - This issue was examined from the California example. Here skin frisks were handled in such a way that allowed using women to perform skin searches only in emergency situations, and that under ordinary situations women would not perform them. The Coté committee stressed that searching was important for control of contraband. Various institutions have various procedures that were used, however the committee advocated "common sense and appropriateness" as guidelines, and that usually only a person of the same sex should frisk an inmate (Coté, McCarthy, et al, 1977: 32).

(5) Rape and hostage-taking - Rape of a female officer was seen as highly unlikely. There was no record of this occurring up to that time, and the "inmate code" would not favor such an action. Unusual situations could of course occur, however these were compared to what could happen in general society. Hostage-taking would involve male or female officers, and is generally seen as a risk of the job (Coté, McCarthy, et al, 1977: 32-33).

(6) Lack of acceptability - The Coté committee felt that they might not be able to fully address this concern, since it is largely based on feelings, emotions, traditional views, and stereotypical fears. It was seen as an area that would make entry of women particularly difficult, as it places additional strain and harassment on an already stressful and potentially dangerous job situation (Coté, McCarthy, et al, 1977: 34).

In addition to the above-mentioned rationale to the hurdles that were in place, the Côté committee also emphasized that their information included the idea of using women to help "normalize and make for a more relaxed atmosphere, would reduce the tension and bring a semblance of balance to an unbalanced single-sex society" (Côté, McCarthy, et al, 1977: 36). Overall, positive effects were anticipated, as had occurred in mental institutions, police forces, and other correctional facilities in Canada and the United States. The ability of women to do the work, and in relating to inmates was also seen as beneficial. Inmates who had been subjected to female officers were seen as generally accepting, that their language had improved, and that their personal appearance and morale had also improved.

The Côté committee concluded with the recommendation and suggestion that women be hired in the correctional officer (CX) category in male institutions; that sex restrictions be removed, opening positions to both sexes. Realizing there would be problems in implementing these changes in the Canadian Penitentiary Service, the Côté committee also proposed ways of instituting their new policy. These included support strategies, how to deal with problems and objections, choosing suitable sites for implementation, progress reports, guidelines, a bi-annual review of the integration process, changes in any new construction of institutions, and a greater emphasis on the suitability of all staff for corrections work (Côté, McCarthy, et al, 1977: 44-46).

The Coté committee had also visited Kingston Prison for Women, Canada's only federal facility for female offenders, to examine sex restrictions there. The committee found that 25% of the staff were men, however they were all in support or administrative positions. The men did not work in the women's living quarters of the prison. In speaking with the inmates there, there were many who objected to having men working in the living quarters due to privacy issues. The inmates also felt that they had "ample opportunity for relating to men in their daily routine and can't see any advantages to having any more around" (Coté, McCarthy, et al, 1977: 35). Overall, the Coté committee realized that the Prison for Women is in a unique position in Canada. If men were to be hired here in increased numbers, "the importance of choosing the right kind of persons for such positions was made abundantly clear" (Coté, McCarthy, et al, 1977: 35).

C. Report to Parliament, 1977

Soon after the Coté committee had begun its study, the Report of the Parliamentary Sub-Committee on the Penitentiary System in Canada (Mark MacGuigan, chairman) was presented in May of 1977. This committee carried out an extensive and thorough study of the Canadian penitentiary system, with various recommendations presented to Parliament. Included in the report was recommendation 17: "Women should be employed on the same basis as men in the Penitentiary

Service. Selections must be according to the same criteria used for men to ensure that recruits have the aptitude, maturity, stability and self-discipline required for penitentiary work". The MacGuigan sub-committee had also studied the United States experience where it found men and women performing the same correctional duties, including custody, training, shop instructing, and security (including "objectively" done frisks). The conclusion was that there was no justification for excluding women from all jobs in the Penitentiary Service, and that the integration of women would create "new talent and a healthier correctional environment" (MacGuigan, 1977: 61-62).

In August of 1977, the Solicitor General supported the recommendations of the MacGuigan Report. He also said that the Canadian Penitentiary Service had already begun reviewing the entire employment issue, of women as correctional officers, and that the Service "will be guided by the provisions of the Human Rights Act (Bill C-25) in this regard" (Coté, McCarthy, et al, 1977: 47).

D. Pilot Projects Introducing Female Correctional Officers in Male Institutions

By 1978, major reorganization within federal corrections had occurred, with the restructuring of penitentiary and parole services into the Correctional Service of Canada. The Senior Management Committee of Correctional Service of Canada also approved the

recommendation of hiring women in all-male institutions in 1978. The first "Female Correctional Officer Pilot Project" was initiated, with the objective being to determine the best way to integrate female officers into these male institutions, by seeking out problem areas before total integration. As Terry Kelly, who was director of preventive security of Correctional Service of Canada, remarked: "Our main objective is to find out if females can go into the institution and do exactly the same job as the men" (Solicitor General Canada, 1979: 7).

Mr. Kelly became the national chairman of the committee responsible for the female correctional officer pilot project. He and his implementation team also visited some United States institutions to "learn from the American experience" in order to use the most successful approach possible for Canada (Solicitor General, 1979: 7). At the onset of the project, there were some problems and delays. These included a government hiring "cut-back" for 1978, a lack of sufficient turnover in the Atlantic Region for their involvement, and the necessity of obtaining an exclusion order from the Public Service Employment Act and Regulations in order to advertise for "women only" (Kelly, 1980). The project was not officially initiated then until April of 1979, even though selection and training of females had begun earlier (Kelly, 1980).

In March of 1978, eight female officers began their training at the Edmonton Staff College, and were assigned to

the Regional Psychiatric Centre in Saskatoon. In January of 1979, the first male inmates arrived there. The second pilot project involved a group of ten female correctional officers assigned to the Mission Medium Security Institution, British Columbia, in May of 1979. More than twenty-five women had applied for these new positions in Mission. The recruits took the same training as their male counterparts, which included self defense and weapons training. Of these ten women, one was a grandmother of fifty-four, and the youngest was a twenty-two year old (Rockett, 1979). The third pilot project was a group of three custody officers and eight living unit officers that graduated from the Laval College in the fall of 1979, and were assigned to the Federal Training Centre in Laval, Quebec. At this point, only medium and minimum correctional institutions were considered for female officer deployment (Correctional Service of Canada, 1980). The training standards used for female and male correctional officers were the same, although different approaches in training were used because the staffing started at different times in the three regions (Kelly, 1980).

Work assignments at the institutions were the same for both male and female correctional officers, with the exception of skin frisks, which women did not do. When these projects were evaluated, they were for the most part, seen as successful. However, it was indicated that the employment of females as correctional officers did have to have the support of management (Kelly, 1980). There were some work related

problems for the females in the new Regional Psychiatric Centre, Saskatoon. These were seen as a result of lack of direction, the newness of the centre itself (it had to cope with a new beginning as a centre, as well as the introduction of the first female officers), and a lack of adequate staff preparation. At Mission, the entry of women was carried out in a more methodical way, staff were prepared, inmates were informed, and problems were handled in a positive way as they occurred (Kelly, 1980). In the Federal Training Centre, at Laval, management and staff were also supportive of the introduction of women; problems were discussed with inmates and male staff.

During the pilot projects, female correctional officers performed duties as well as their male counterparts. There were some complaints by inmates who objected to "pat down" or skin searches in the presence of females, and a lack of privacy, but generally the females were accepted by the male inmates. The main problem, as determined by the evaluating committee however, was the problems with male staff members (Correctional Service of Canada, 1980). These concerned the views and attitudes that men had regarding women, and confusion over expectations, job functions, abilities, and other questions that were natural due to the newness of the concept. The committee that did the evaluations found that there really were no major obstacles to using female officers in male institutions. It was however very important to involve the staff and have

management support before entry. Also, a training package specifically referring to use of female officers in male institutions should be integrated into a correctional officer induction course (Kelly, 1980).

E. Movement Toward Full Integration

In 1980, there appears to be a rapid acceleration of the female correctional officer program. The Senior Management Committee of Correctional Service of Canada had evaluated the pilot projects by April 1980, and had come to positive conclusions about the use of female correctional officers. The objective was to expand this to all medium and minimum institutions. Targets were set as well, to indicate long-term representation (25% to 30%), with short-term goals of 13% by 1987 (Correctional Service of Canada, 1984a). Special measures were also introduced in 1980 and 1982 that would help regions achieve targets. These involved limiting transfers of male correctional officers from maximum to medium and minimum security institutions, and the use of exclusion orders for women in specific correctional officer positions (Correctional Service of Canada, 1984a).

The coordinator of the Equal Opportunities for Women program, located at the National Headquarters in Ottawa, was also especially concerned with the promotion of women into the correctional officer positions. Increased information sessions had been directed by the Commissioner of Correctional Service of Canada to ensure all medium and

minimum security institutions and their staff were aware of these new changes, and to address concerns they had.

By November of 1980, the status of the various regions (for medium security institutions) was as follows:

(1) Pacific Region

Mission - part of the pilot project, was fully integrated; future positions open to either sex.

Mountain - two female correctional officers recruited; future positions open to either sex.

Matsqui and William Head - require special staffing action.

(2) Prairie Region

Drumheller - three female correctional officers recruited; future positions open to either sex.

Stony Mountain - two female correctional officers recruited; future positions open to either sex.

Bowden - requires special staffing action.

(3) Ontario Region

Joyceville - five female correctional officers began working November, 1980; future positions open to either sex.

Collins Bay - three female correctional officers began working November, 1980; future positions open to either sex.

Warkworth - requires special staffing action.

(4) Quebec Region

Federal Training Centre - was part of pilot project; future positions open to either sex.

Leclerc, Cowansville, LaMacaza - require special staffing action.

(5) Atlantic Region

Springhill - requires special staffing action (Kelly, 1980).

The special staffing action pertained to the recommendation that the Senior Management Committee had made regarding the introduction of females into an institution that previously did not have any female correctional officers. The committee recommended that these female officers be introduced in groups of no less than three, to facilitate easier integration. In order to do this, Correctional Service of Canada had requested the Public Service Commission to apply an exclusion order. This would allow Correctional Service of Canada to advertise competitions for "females only" on a one-time basis for all those medium security institutions that did not already have female officers. Regarding minimum security institutions, females were to apply singly on the merit principle, since all regions staffed correctional officer positions through internal competitions (Kelly, 1980).

While this vision of expansion was occurring across the country, the chairman of the "Female Correctional Officer Project", Terry Kelly, made some strong recommendations to the Senior Management Committee. These included that female correctional officers continue to be introduced in all medium security institutions, that the staff colleges use experienced female correctional officers to assist in induction courses, that assessment be made to allow for female correctional officers in maximum security institutions

in the future, and that regional committees be responsible for regional plans. The national committee was to be involved in a monitoring function for only one year, with further briefing sessions to be available for any integration problems, if necessary (Kelly, 1980).

As the integration process progressed, various publications and hand-outs appeared. The precise year and author of some of these are not indicated, however appear to be supported by or written by Correctional Service of Canada. These dealt with the various problems that had been perceived as obstacles to women working in all-male institutions, such as women working with male correctional officers, male inmates, etc. Issues addressed include sexual harassment, attitudes and views that men had toward women, training needs (self defense, stress management), inmate privacy concerns, positive aspects of "normalization" of the institution, and acceptance of male staff (Seiter, 1983; Correctional Service of Canada, 1979, 1980a). One article even contained a woman's own self-evaluation "checklist", to examine strengths, weaknesses, personality, goals, etc. (Correctional Service of Canada, 1980a). Various "discussion" areas were also presented, which would discuss appropriate responses to certain scenarios. Examples of these are: "What should a female employee do if she perceives herself to be the target of misconduct by a male employee?", or "How should comments with a sexual innuendo be handled?", or "How should a female employee respond when an inmate expresses deep emotional

feelings for her?" (Correctional Service of Canada, 1980a: 15-23).

Many of the discussion areas concerned the lack of physical strength issue or gender-related problems. Areas of concern not only related to male inmates, but it was obvious that new female correctional officers could anticipate resistance, harassment, and lack of support from their male counterparts as well (Correctional Service of Canada, 1980a, 1984a). Correctional administrators were also especially concerned with specific gender-related problems, as evidenced in the discussions on what to do if there were any "real or imagined relationship between a female employee and an inmate or between a female employee and a male employee", "personal questions", "gifts or written communications of appreciation, love, or threats", physical attack, or "an inmate blatantly expresses overt sexual thoughts and desires". Concerning additional fears of inappropriate behavior, "no bodily contact, including shaking of hands, is appropriate between female staff and male inmates . . . can be interpreted as sexual interest . . . must be aware of and be willing to modify her own natural inclinations for spontaneous touching." It was also pointed out that "a male staff member may frequently be able to express himself to an inmate in an appropriate physical manner where a female employee must not" (Correctional Service of Canada, 1980a: 15-23).

Correctional Service of Canada tried to discuss potential problem areas that related to the integration of

female correctional officers by addressing each concern in a supportive way, citing American studies done in mental hospitals and male prisons where women had been introduced. Correctional Service of Canada recognized that there would be reactions in Canada, similar to the early American experiences. These concerned security, strength, role definitions, etc. Canada therefore attempted to alleviate many of the concerns at the onset. Correctional Service of Canada also recognized that it had a commitment to cause successful integration of women, because it "is no longer simply an option open to us, the decision has already been made. Accepting this, the only way women will be successfully integrated into the Service is through the full cooperation and commitment of all involved" (Correctional Service of Canada, 1979: 4).

Part of this commitment was to show support - basically to help "sell" the idea to any that were opposed or in doubt, whether it was prison administrators, supervisors, or male correctional officers. It was made clear that women would be paid and treated on an equal basis with men. That did not necessarily mean that all duties were to be performed exactly the same way: "To say that men and women have to do everything the same to be equal is to miss the whole meaning of equality. Equality also involves discussion, respect and cooperation" (Correctional Service of Canada, 1979: 4). It was also stressed that some women would also make mistakes at first, and that this should not subject them to

generalizations concerning their abilities because of their sex. Overall, a positive impact was predicted, with more normalization and open communication as benefits to the inmate population stressed (Correctional Service of Canada, 1979).

A December 1984 publication by Correctional Service of Canada indicated results of a 1982 survey conducted in forty-eight states of the United States, and eleven jurisdictions in Canada (it does not indicate who performed this survey) (Correctional Service of Canada, 1984a). The survey showed that "only 2 (New Mexico and Nova Scotia) did not employ women correctional officers in male prisons". It also indicated that women made up 8.4% of officers in male prisons in the United States and 9.7% of officers in male prisons in Canada; and that there were some difficulties in male staff attitudes as well as some "romantic attachments" identified. There were also some restrictions on women's duties in that they did not supervise housing or bathroom areas (in the United States) and they did not perform strip or body searches. Overall, most respondents "felt there were no significant problems, many noted women constituted a positive addition to the prison environment" (Correctional Service of Canada, 1984a: 3).

Correctional Service of Canada summarized a literature review done for one of its articles, "Employment of Female Correctional Officers in Male Institutions" (Correctional Service of Canada, 1984a). The impact shown on

inmates was generally positive with the "softening" influence mentioned. As well, inmates felt they could communicate easier with women, that they (inmates) did not feel the need to "prove themselves" or "act tough" when around the women, and that women "normalized" the inmates' world leading to a general improvement in behavior and overall atmosphere. Some inmates were neutral, and their concerns with correctional officers were not gender-related ones. Negative concerns by inmates were over privacy issues and sexual frustration in having women in their presence. The privacy issue was recognized as being a concern both in the United States and Canada. It was mentioned that individual American states had already addressed this problem by restricting women's job functions or installing various modesty barriers. Canada, being relatively new at the integration of women into the correctional officer category in male institutions, was already faced with this problem. Canada's policy was not to bar female officers from the housing units of male institutions. However Canada was also beginning to tackle the problem of inmate privacy by using some modesty barriers in the more open parts of the institutions, and in addition was also studying various ways to ensure more privacy in individual cells (Correctional Service of Canada, 1979, 1984a). This privacy issue would continue to be a concern over the next several years, and is still not entirely resolved - this will be discussed in more detail further in this paper.

Concerning male staff, again the research and literature was reviewed, finding that overall, male staff felt women were doing a satisfactory job, had made "special contributions" to the job, increased the "livability" in the institutional environment, were not more easily manipulated or intimidated than male staff, and that their presence did produce improved inmate behavior (Correctional Service of Canada, 1984a). And although men thought women were beneficial in the prevention of certain crisis situations, their lack of physical strength hindered operations once a situation did develop. Male officers felt that they would be a liability in these cases, and also felt they would have to protect the women. This would affect the priority concern of "safety and security" that is common to all correctional officers. There were also some indications of sexual harassment, which Correctional Service of Canada indicated as "not unique to corrections, though it can have serious consequences in this environment" (Correctional Service of Canada, 1984a: 6). Regarding the female officers themselves, the article indicated that research showed generally high job satisfaction and a commitment to a career in the corrections field.

F. Equal Opportunities for Women

Equal opportunities for women became an issue in Canada soon after the entrenchment of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. By 1979, various women's groups across the

country began lobbying Correctional Service of Canada for more jobs for women, in all categories. Within the correctional officer category of Correctional Service of Canada, more jobs were opened up to women, especially since the initial pilot projects were seen as successful. France-Marie Trepanier who was Equal Opportunities Director in 1983 (before Affirmative Action began its program across the Public Service), said in Let's Talk, a Correctional Service of Canada publication, that many female officers are "pioneers considering the non-traditional context in which they are working . . . as a result, more and more women want to work as correctional officers in male institutions. This can only promote a calmer environment in the institutions over the long term"(Correctional Service of Canada, 1983). At this time, Ms. Trepanier's role was to increase the integration of women within the Correctional Service of Canada.

There appears to be considerable overlap in concerns between the office of Equal Opportunities for Women, and the new Affirmative Action program at this same time, that is 1982-83. It also appears that the Affirmative Action program more or less engulfed the earlier, but not as successful, Equal Opportunities for Women program. By the end of 1984, Equal Opportunities programs were to be completely integrated in the Affirmative Action programs (Correctional Service of Canada, 1984b). Ms. Trepanier also moved into the role of Affirmative Action director once this new program was fully implemented.

G. Affirmative Action in the Correctional Service of Canada.

In June of 1983, the Treasury Board of Canada announced that an Affirmative Action program would be implemented throughout the Public Service of Canada. This was to facilitate a more equitable distribution of women, indigenous people, and handicapped persons in the work force (Treasury Board of Canada, 1983). Each department in the federal public service was expected to be analyzed to identify employment concerns regarding these three target groups. The departments would then develop and implement various methods to eliminate discrimination in hiring practices. Prior to the implementation of the Affirmative Action program, the Treasury Board had commissioned a series of studies in the work force which indicated that certain groups, such as women, were discriminated against. Having concluded that there was discrimination, the objective became to allow for some immediate (and temporary) special measures. These were to "remedy the effects of past inequities and to achieve more equitable representation in a timely fashion" (Treasury Board of Canada, 1983: 1). Within Correctional Service of Canada, an Affirmative Action study looked at all employment groups and outlined action plans in "The Affirmative Action Implementation Reports and Plans", released late in 1984. Since then, all the Regions in Correctional Service of Canada have been actively involved in recruitment of women and visible minorities through

advertisement campaigns, recruitment kits, and informational brochures. There are also Affirmative Action personnel, both in the Ottawa Headquarters and in all the Regions, which specifically deal with Affirmative Action concerns (Correctional Service of Canada, 1984b).

The Affirmative Action target objective for the hiring of female correctional officers was determined to be 19% for March of 1988, according to Susan Leger, Chief of Affirmative Action, Correctional Service of Canada. This would be up from the 7% to 9% indicated in 1984. All departments were to continue to implement their existing equal opportunity action plans while the analytical studies of department hiring were made. However, within the Correctional Service of Canada, it was found that "Equal Opportunities for Women" was not having the desired impact that was originally hoped for, since attitudes were extremely difficult to change (Correctional Service of Canada, 1982). Equal Opportunities for Women programs were leaving too much discretion in the hands of managers, and it was found that a more specialized form of recruiting and hiring procedure was needed to increase the number of women in correctional officer jobs in the Correctional Service of Canada. Therefore the impact of Affirmative Action became increasingly important. Affirmative Action was endorsed and regulated by higher levels of government, and therefore would more or less "force" a more equitable hiring arrangement (Treasury Board of Canada, 1983).

According to Mr. Herb Gray, Treasury Board president in 1983, department heads were to begin implementing "specific remedies as they developed rather than waiting until their action plans are finalized", and that the implementation of the Affirmative Action program would "be considered a priority item in evaluating the performance of deputy heads" (Treasury Board of Canada, 1983: 3). Therefore, although Correctional Service of Canada did not complete its analytical study and proposal for "plan of action" (concerning Affirmative Action) until late in 1984, the department did begin active recruitment of women as correctional officers long before January 1985, when "departmental action plans will be implemented as part of the 1985/86 planning cycle" (Treasury Board of Canada, 1983: 3).

Although Affirmative Action did not enter the Correctional Service of Canada until 1983-84, it had already been initiated by 1982 within three other government departments. These were Secretary of State, the Treasury Board Secretariat, and Employment and Immigration. The aim was to extend the program after action plans for other departments had been developed. Affirmative Action endeavored to build on the foundations of Equal Opportunities, however in "a more sophisticated systems-based, result-oriented program" (Correctional Service of Canada, 1982: 1).

Staff within Correctional Service of Canada had to have Affirmative Action explained to them in a systematic and

non-threatening way. Initially many thought that there would be a quota system for hiring among the target groups. Although there was (and still is) a percentage target group established, Affirmative Action has maintained from its onset that the concentration is on making the system more fair. This is done by reviewing employment systems and replacing systems which discriminate against women (Correctional Service of Canada, 1982). Part of explaining Affirmative Action, meant the inclusion of various articles in the Correctional Service of Canada publication, Let's Talk. These discussed the "hidden barriers" in employment systems which led to "systemic discrimination", and how Affirmative Action would continue to uphold the merit principle ("which is the basis of all hiring and promotion in the Public Service") so that the best qualified person would get the job. However, "through the elimination of discrimination, through a review and improvement of employment practices, and by implementing temporary special measures, Affirmative Action will enable the Service to identify more qualified women, Native, and handicapped people for jobs in the Service, and assist the less qualified with training" (Correctional Service of Canada, 1984b: 3).

Information given also included the Public Service Commission's new programs developed for the target group members. These were: Women Career Counselling and Referral Bureau, Access Program for Handicapped People, and National Indigenous Development Program. Finally, Affirmative Action

was described as being beneficial to all of Correctional Service of Canada, in that there would be improvements in personnel, policies and practices, higher employee morale, better labor relations, more equity, and less discrimination in the work place (Correctional Service of Canada, 1984b). Affirmative Action offices for each region were established to answer questions, and to assist Correctional Service of Canada personnel and target groups. In the year 1983-84, out of 2,778 men that applied for employment through Correctional Service of Canada, only 214 were hired. Of the 916 women that applied, 223 were hired (Campbell, 1988). Therefore, during that one year, one can see the strength of Affirmative Action at work. Approximately 24% of the women were hired, compared to less than 8% of the men.

In May of 1985, a conference of Correctional Service of Canada Affirmative Action officials was held in Ottawa. During the conference, the officials were told by Michel Seguin, the director-general of Personnel, that Affirmative Action was a serious government priority and that their job was to speed up the process (Correctional Service of Canada, 1985a). Affirmative Action officials were also told to consider themselves as salesmen, to "get out and sell the target groups . . . to CSC's managers", by France-Marie Trepanier, director of Affirmative Action (Correctional Service of Canada, 1985a: 1).

According to the Affirmative Action division of Correctional Service of Canada, Affirmative Action officials

had until March 31, 1988 to reach their target goals. As mentioned earlier, one of the goals was to have women holding 19% of junior level jobs in the correctional and living unit officer groups. To help achieve these goals in the Correctional Service of Canada, the Affirmative Action Division created special measures. These were to make up for historical discriminatory practices, and included: training programs, hiring procedures, active recruitment and informational outreach (Correctional Service of Canada, 1985b). Specifically for women in the correctional officer category, Regions and institutions are to "set their own hiring pace, with carefully planned integration in maximum security institutions" (Correctional Service of Canada, 1985b: 1). Also, Affirmative Action coordinators were to monitor the recruitment and separation rate of women in these correctional officer categories, and take "corrective action if there appears to be difficulty meeting the goal of 19 per cent women officers in junior positions by 1988" (Correctional Service of Canada, 1985b: 2).

H. Annual Reports and Year End Reviews

Correctional Service of Canada annual reports are contained within the Solicitor General of Canada annual reports publications. Other year end reviews are published in Correctional Service of Canada publications, such as Let's Talk.

The employment of female correctional officers in male institutions was first mentioned in the 1977-78 annual report for the Canadian Penitentiary Service (soon to be renamed Correctional Service of Canada). There was a brief discussion on how the hiring of female officers had been recommended by the Public Service Commission and the Parliamentary Sub-Committee on Penitentiaries. It mentioned that the first female correctional officers had been hired for the new psychiatric centre in Saskatoon, Prairie Region, with more hiring expected the next year. The report also emphasized that the Equal Opportunities for Women program was particularly concerned with women being allowed to work as correctional officers in all institutions, not just in the federal institution for female offenders, Prison for Women. This was a prospect which had been closed as an option until January 1978 (Solicitor General Canada, 1980a).

In the 1978-79 annual report, the Equal Opportunities for Women program was listed under one of the responsibilities of the Personnel Branch. The report mentioned that the steps taken as part of a commitment to female career development (not necessarily just in the correctional officer category), included briefing and sensitization sessions across the country to help managers formulate plans of action. The pilot project of female correctional officers in Saskatoon was again mentioned; also that there were now more regions selected to participate in the deployment of female correctional officers in male institutions (Solicitor General Canada, 1980b).

In the 1979-80 annual report of Correctional Service of Canada, the Staff Development Division recognized that the influx of women into the correctional officer category required an additional component to staff training and development programs. "Three extra days were added to the three month compulsory induction course for all candidates to provide them with insight into attitudes and reactions toward female employees" (Solicitor General Canada, 1981a: 54). The report also mentioned that the issue of employment of women had been acted upon by Correctional Service of Canada, and that currently there were twenty-three female correctional officers in male institutions (and forty-six in the Prison for Women). However, in the same annual report, under the heading "Employment for Women", the female pilot project was mentioned, and the figure of twenty-eight female officers was given (Solicitor General Canada, 1981a).

In the annual report of 1980-81, there was mention of increased involvement by the Equal Opportunities program. This included overseeing regions, monitoring managerial responses, and increasing integration of women officers into male institutions. "Most problems affecting staff reactions to women as guards have been overcome, although there are still pockets of reaction to women patrolling the ranges and taking part in other correctional officer duties, such as frisking" (Solicitor General Canada, 1981b: 58). The figure given for female correctional officers in male institutions is thirty-two (with seventy-five at the Prison for Women).

It was mentioned that Equal Opportunities would also now have a representative on the selection board for female correctional officer recruitment. Correctional Service of Canada also said that the integration of female correctional officers into male institutions will continue, and that there will be gradual extension into all medium and minimum security facilities over the next few years (Solicitor General Canada, 1981b).

Early in 1981, Correctional Service of Canada's Strategic Planning Committee (Jim Vantour, chairman) undertook "predicting the correctional world of the future" by looking twenty years ahead. Various briefs were received from a number of criminal justice groups, which helped identify key indicators of change in corrections and criminal justice. One of the forecasts concerned "increasing civil rights", where the women's movement was mentioned as continuing to grow. As well as increased criminal charges for female offences, the prediction also included increased involvement of women in the corrections work force at all levels (Correctional Service of Canada, 1981a).

During the 1981-82 annual report, Correctional Service of Canada identified the creation of a new correctional officer recruitment program (CORP) to aid in the recruitment of correctional officers. Inadequate recruitment of all correctional officers had been identified as a problem in previous years (Solicitor General Canada, 1983). New programming also included the creation of a National

Correctional Staff College, in order to train recruits in a consistent way across the country. The new staff college in Kingston graduated its first recruits in September of 1981 (Correctional Service of Canada, 1981b). The Personnel Branch also undertook to develop "a nationally managed recruitment and selection process for correctional staff in order to ensure better human resource planning" (Solicitor General Canada, 1983: 63). There was no specific mention of female correctional officers, or of the Equal Opportunities program in this annual report.

The annual report of 1982-83 (Solicitor General Canada, 1984) did not specifically refer to female correctional officers.

In the January 1984 Correctional Service of Canada publication Let's Talk, the 1983 year end was reviewed. In it, there was mention of the change in hiring practices in Correctional Service of Canada due to the Treasury Board's new Affirmative Action program. This would mean an increase of female correctional officers over the next four years. The number of female correctional officers in male prisons was given as 228, with projected increase to 12.4% in 1987 (Correctional Service of Canada, 1984c). In another January 1984 issue of Let's Talk, the projected Correctional Service of Canada plan for 1984-85 was given. Concerning female employment, the plan included: "to recruit a minimum of two female instructors for the National Correctional Staff Colleges; Correctional Service of Canada's female

representation to be 24.2% of the total work force (compared to 22.6% in 83-84)" (Correctional Service of Canada, 1984d: 1-6). Specifically concerning female correctional officers working in male institutions, the plan included zero recruitment of males from outside the Correctional Service of Canada in all medium and minimum security institutions, and an increase of females in these institutions over the 1983-84 targets (as the following figures indicate):

TABLE ONE - Female Officers in Federal Male Institutions

	<u>Actual Numbers</u>	<u>83-84 targets</u>	<u>84-85 targets</u>
	(31-05-83)		
Atlantic	3	5	27
Quebec	15	42	111
Ontario	45	58	88
Prairies	34	46	77
Pacific	36	50	72

(Correctional Service of Canada, 1984d)

In the Correctional Service of Canada annual report of 1983-84, Correctional Services maintained that the department had increased the number of female correctional officers to 274 by March of 1984, "through the use of exclusion orders, a policy of no outside recruitment of males for CX positions in all S1 to S5 security institutions, restriction on transfers and new policies on equal employment opportunities for women" (Solicitor General Canada, 1985a: 59). Performance goals for 1984-85 were to increase the percentage of female correctional officers, in both the security and living unit classifications, to 7%.

In the annual report of 1984-85, Correctional Service of Canada declared that its goal of increasing the number of female correctional officers to 7% of all correctional officer staff was surpassed, and that women now made up 10.8% as of March 1985. Again this was attributed to the special provisions such as exclusion orders, restricted recruitment for males, and other policies aimed at equal opportunities for women (as mentioned in the previous year's report). Performance goals for 1985-86 mentioned furthering the involvement of women in all aspects of Correctional Service of Canada. They also included "to monitor the recruitment of correctional officers to ensure that the best qualified recruits are selected, with proper emphasis placed on experience and personal qualifications" (Solicitor General Canada, 1985b:62). This could be interpreted as an indication of some problems encountered in the rapid and increased recruitment and hiring of women - perhaps an indication of an over-emphasis on women, to the discrimination or exclusion of men. Or it could be attributed to problems in Correctional Service of Canada recruit qualifications, which in 1984 included the requirement that 90% of new recruits in the correctional officer category were graduates from colleges, universities or equivalent (Correctional Service of Canada, 1984d).

In the 1984 annual review, as examined by the publication Let's Talk, Affirmative Action was a highlight (Correctional Service of Canada, 1985c). The discussion

included the significant increase of women as correctional officers, now at 11.5% (more than 500 in the total correctional officer category), although the majority of women working in the Service were still associated with "traditional" female occupations. Special recruitment for women was to continue, and Affirmative Action would also ensure that women receive adequate training and developmental opportunities for eventual movement through supervisory and managerial ranks. It was also mentioned that in 1984-85, there were 648 new correctional officer recruits that graduated from the Kingston campus, and that 332 of these were women. In the summary of the progresses that occurred in 1984, it was mentioned that "women continued to play an ever-increasing role in the Service" (Correctional Service of Canada, 1985c: 2).

According to the Correctional Service of Canada annual report of 1985-86, goals had been established to increase representation of all women (not only correctional officers) on staff by an additional 2.5% by March of 1986, to 29.4%. This goal was not achieved in 1985-86, however "women's representation did increase by 0.9% . . . a considerable achievement during a period of reorganization and downsizing in the Service" (Solicitor General Canada, 1987: 56). Performance goals for 1986-87 included the close monitoring of the effects of the Affirmative Action program, and "to identify and rectify any situation which might impede its progress" (Solicitor General Canada, 1987: 57).

Major goals and initiatives in the annual report of 1986-87 included administrative downsizing and reorganization measures. Within this, the "Affirmative Action program is monitored very closely and status reports prepared semi-annually with corrective action taken if necessary" (Solicitor General Canada, 1988: 53). There was also an indication of reviewing and implementing planning systems for management positions within the organizational structure, in relation to the Correctional Service of Canada's commitment to the Affirmative Action program (Solicitor General Canada, 1988).

I. Correctional Investigator's Reports

The office of the correctional investigator was established in 1973, during the aftermath of a period in Canadian history that saw serious rioting and unrest in the country's prisons (Correctional Investigator Canada, 1987). During the post war years, both Canadian and United States penitentiaries were characterized by overcrowding, a rising prison population, and considerable inmate unrest (Solicitor General Canada, 1981c; Curtis, Graham, et al, 1985). By 1954, the inmate population at Kingston Penitentiary, for example, was approximately one thousand. And during that year there was a riot that caused fires and considerable destruction of part of the institution. The army had to be called in to control the riot (Curtis, Graham, et al, 1985). During this period in Canadian history, there was also a flurry of

legislative reform occurring, such as the Criminal Code revision (1955), the Fauteux Commission (1956), the Parole Act (1958), the opening of new security level institutions (1959-62), and a "ten-year plan" for penitentiary construction (1963) (Solicitor General Canada, 1981c). However in 1971, the "longest and most violent riot ever to take place at Kingston Penitentiary" occurred, causing great damage to the institution as well as death and injury to inmates (Curtis, Graham, et al, 1985: 126-127). Again the army was called in as the riot lasted for five days. When it was over, a large portion of the institution lay in ruins; the inmates were transferred to the new maximum security penitentiary, Millhaven Institution. Here, as reporters, personal witness accounts, and inmates have testified, many inmates were subjected to brutal beatings and harassment from some of the correctional officers. In the annual report of the Canadian Penitentiary Service, 1977-78, the report speaks of "repeated strikes, riots, murders and hostage-taking during 1970-75" (Solicitor General Canada, 1980a: 137). When the correctional investigator was appointed, this person was to be independent, someone that would review inmate complaints, investigate matters, and provide recommendations to the Solicitor General concerning these.

The first correctional investigator was Miss Inger Hansen, appointed June 1, 1973. She resigned October 1, 1977. After a brief period during which an interim appointee, Mr. Brian McNally, was correctional investigator,

Mr. R. L. Stewart was appointed by Order in Council November 15, 1977 (Correctional Investigator Canada, 1979). He has been the correctional investigator from that time to the present. During the year, the office of the correctional investigator may process approximately 1800 complaints, making visits to approximately forty institutions, and conducting approximately 770 inmate interviews (Correctional Investigator Canada, 1987). Before the office of the correctional investigator becomes involved in examining an issue, the concerned inmate must use the internal grievance procedure at his/her institution in order to avail himself of all possible legal or administrative possibilities. Therefore, when the correctional investigator becomes involved, the matter is obviously not a routine problem, and has often remained unresolved for considerable time.

The concern over deployment of female correctional officers in all-male institutions was first noticed in the 1981-82 Annual Report of the Correctional Investigator, covering the time period of June 30, 1981 to May 31, 1982, under the heading "Searching of Male Inmates by Female Staff" (Correctional Investigator Canada, 1983). The complaints involved two inmates at different institutions who objected to being searched by female officers. The type of search referred to was the "frisk" or "pat down" search, as opposed to the "strip" search. The complaint raised questions on discrepancies in the treatment of male versus female inmates. According to the correctional investigator's report,

Correctional Service of Canada's Commissioner's Directive 249 (concerning "searches and contraband"), allowed a male inmate to be "strip" searched by a female staff member in an emergency situation. However there was no restriction concerning the "frisk" searching of a male inmate by a female staff.

A "strip" search is defined as a "visual search of a completely unclothed person and requires the individual to bend over to allow a visual inspection of cavity areas". A "frisk" search is a "hand search of a clothed person from head to foot, down the front and rear of the body, around the legs and inside clothing folds, pockets, and footwear and/or a search by hand-held scanning devices . . . may be expanded to require . . . opening outer garments of clothing" (Correctional Service of Canada, 1987a: 2-3).

Concerning female inmates, the policy was that they do not have to be subjected to either type of search by male staff. In examining the policy further, the correctional investigator determined that a male staff member would normally be frisk searched by a same-sex staff, and that strip searches were not to be done by opposite sex staff. Also, visitors to institutions were only searched by same-sex staff. Therefore, the correctional investigator felt that "there is not only different treatment afforded to male as opposed to female inmates, but male inmates are also treated differently from male staff and male visitors" (Correctional Investigator Canada, 1983: 16). The two inmates who had

challenged this Commissioner's Directive said this treatment was an invasion of their person male identity. The correctional investigator said in his report, that he was not as concerned about the embarrassing elements of searches as he was about the discriminatory nature of the policy. Therefore in July of 1981, he recommended: "That Directive 249 be amended to accord the male inmate the same standard of dignity that is afforded all other individuals liable to be searched" (Correctional Investigator Canada, 1983: 16). This would have meant an amendment that would prevent a female staff from "frisk" searching male inmates, and from "strip" searching in emergencies.

When the Senior Management Committee of Correctional Service of Canada met in October of 1981, the policy was discussed, as was the Penitentiary Service Regulations. However in November of 1981, the correctional investigator's office was informed that "after considerable discussion of the ramifications of various courses of action, the Senior Management Committee decided to maintain the status quo" (Correctional Investigator Canada, 1983: 16). According to the annual report, the correctional investigator was also told by Correctional Service of Canada that it is seen as more socially acceptable for female staff to search male inmates, but not seen as acceptable is the searching of females by male staff. Correctional Service of Canada also felt that female police and female correctional officers were performing the same duties as male staff almost everywhere in

North America, and that issues of personal dignity and sexual harassment have not been considered as major problems. As a result of this, as well as having received only two complaints thus far, the office of the correctional investigator decided to wait for additional studies that the Canadian Human Rights Commission were conducting. The office also said that they would continue to monitor the issue until final decisions were reached on the matter (Correctional Investigator Canada, 1983).

In the annual report of 1982-83, this concern was listed as a recommendation "that had not been dealt with completely". The office of the correctional investigator was told by the Correctional Service of Canada that the Human Rights Commission and Correctional Service of Canada were still examining how to best integrate women into the system. A final report was not as yet formulated concerning searches and inmate privacy; therefore "the CSC policy regarding searches will be strictly adhered to" (Correctional Investigator Canada, 1984: 14).

In the 1983-84 annual report, the matter was again listed under "Outstanding Recommendation Responses for 1981-82". The office of the correctional investigator did not receive any further correspondence on the matter, and did not receive the anticipated final report. Therefore the conclusion was that "the policy with regard to searches has not changed . . . that the Correctional Service of Canada is not prepared to amend its present policy on searches at this time" (Correctional Investigator Canada, 1985: 14).

In the 1984-85 annual report, under the heading "Inmate Privacy", the correctional investigator mentions that his office had "a number of complaints concerning these areas" (Correctional Investigator Canada, 1986: 22). Because he did not have much response at the original onset (1981) of the problems, he was re-introducing the issue, and reporting on it. Correctional Service of Canada had previously indicated that there would be the introduction of modesty barriers in shower and toilet areas of institutions, as well as ongoing studies on how to install such barriers in individual cells. However, when the correctional investigator received a progress report, his staff found it to be inaccurate, and with no mention of individual cell barriers. Search procedures had also not been changed (Correctional Investigator Canada, 1986).

In further communication to the Inspector General, the concern that male inmates had, regarding lack of privacy due to the involvement of female officers in search procedures, was again outlined. The correctional investigator requested further information. According to the annual report, the return reply indicated a pilot project regarding cell modesty barriers was now in progress, and that there would be a final evaluation and decision soon. The correctional investigator concluded his annual report with a frustrating attack on how ineffective the Correctional Service of Canada had been in dealing with a number of old issues, and how long delays and inconclusive communications

had resulted in unresolved problems. Early 1985 was to see the appointment of a new Commissioner of Corrections (Mr. LeBlanc) and the investigator's office was now being optimistic that a number of unresolved recommendations would receive some definite attention (Correctional Investigator Canada, 1986).

The 1985-86 annual report from the office of the correctional investigator, contained no new information concerning inmate privacy issues with regard to female correctional officers working in all-male institutions (Correctional Investigator Canada, 1987).

Since the 1986-87 annual report from the office of the correctional investigator had as yet not been published, this researcher spoke to the correctional investigator, concerning the matter of male inmate privacy in the midst of female correctional officers (Stewart, 1988). Mr. Stewart felt that Correctional Service of Canada has not made a firm decision on the use of female correctional officers, and that there will be no real solution until there is a court decision (from the Supreme Court for example). There have not been many cases that have received court attention, and Mr. Stewart does not feel that there is much of a problem. He has not had many complaints by inmates, and he feels that for the most part female correctional officers are now accepted by staff and inmates alike. There are individuals however who do occasionally want to contest the issue in the courts, under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Since the

Federal Court decision of June 1987 (concerning Weatherall, Conway, and Spearman - this case is discussed further in this chapter), there are now two more cases pending. According to the correctional investigator, one is from Bowden, Alberta, and one is from Quebec. It is not known when these cases will be handled in the court. Both will be argued under privacy rights as guaranteed under the Charter.

Mr. Stewart said that the union is supportive of females working and doing the same duties as male correctional officers, since both get paid the same. However, he also spoke of a recent Federal Court case in Canada, concerning a male correctional officer who was seeking to work at the federal Prison for Women (male officers do not work in the living areas there). He was refused the job of a correctional officer there, and he took his case to the Federal Court. He lost his case at the court level, because it was felt that his employment opportunities were not being discriminated against, nor was he restricted in employment advancement. Because there are many federal custodial institutions for men across Canada, he could easily work elsewhere. However, the reverse is not true for female correctional officers since the Prison for Women is the only federal institution for female offenders in Canada. Therefore in order for women to advance in the correctional field, they must be able to work at male institutions as well. In speaking with two male instructors at the Kingston Staff College (names kept anonymous), as far as they know,

this is the only case they have heard of. However, they do believe that men will soon be allowed to work in the living quarters of the Prison for Women, with similar guidelines that female officers now have in male institutions. They feel this will happen within the Correctional Service of Canada because of the discriminatory nature of how male inmates and female inmates are now treated.

The correctional investigator also recounted how on a tour of an institution one day, a male inmate came up to him and complained about female correctional officers (Stewart, 1988). When the inmate was asked why he objected to them, the inmate said that on occasion he would get so angry and frustrated that he felt like hitting a guard. If he were to hit a male officer, he might get fifteen to twenty days in "the hole" (segregation) for his outburst, however if he hit a female, his "name would be mud" in the eyes of both other inmates and correctional officers.

The correctional investigator feels that female correctional officers are much more accepted by both staff and male inmates today than when they first began working ten years ago. Complaints by inmates are seen as very minimal. If Canada were to impose restrictions on job duties similar to what most of the American states do now, the guard's union would "fight" this. Also, since the duties and job descriptions have been the same for men and women for this long, women correctional officers have become fully integrated in the system. It would not be very easy to

change this, to restrict duties to only those areas where women do not come into contact with male living quarters (Stewart, 1988).

J. Privacy and Discrimination Issues

Correctional Service of Canada has an information handbook for inmates of federal correctional institutions, called Inmate Rights and Responsibilities. The following excerpt concerns the subject of "Searches":

Every inmate has the right to be secure against unreasonable search and seizure. Any inmate may be frisked or strip searched whenever a staff member considers such action reasonable to uncover contraband or to maintain the good order of the institution. No female inmate shall be frisked or strip searched by a male staff member. Every inmate has the right to refuse a body cavity search. Such a search cannot be carried out without written consent of the inmate and the written approval of the director.

(Correctional Service of Canada, 1985d: 23)

The three types of searches (strip, frisk, and body cavity) are described. The booklet also describes how male inmates can be frisked by either male or female staff, and how they may be strip searched by a female staff "in emergencies if male staff are unavailable" (Correctional Service of Canada, 1985d: 23). References that Correctional Service of Canada used for the description of this area in the handbook included the Charter of Rights and Freedoms 8, "Penitentiary Service Regulation 41", and "Commissioner's Directives on Searches and Contraband" (Correctional Service of Canada, 1985d).

The privacy issue encompasses various concepts. These include privacy within the living areas of male institutions (specifically related to the use of the toilet, showering, or being in states of undress), and searches (whether they be "frisk" searches or "skin" searches). When women were first introduced into male institutions in Canada as correctional officers, they came in on an "equal" basis with their male counterparts. The expectation from the beginning was that they would receive the same salary, the same training, and therefore be expected to perform the same duties as male officers, and not be given preferential treatment. After the pilot projects were declared successful, it was obvious to Correctional Service of Canada that the further integration of women should be done in such a way that institutions be "sensitized" and prepared.

Although there are still fears of the physical abilities of women doing "men's" work today, this area has generally been found to be without any real basis for concern. However, the privacy concerns are an area that have occasionally come to be addressed, whether by male staff members, male inmates, or the news media. Privacy concerns also place female correctional officers in the middle of the controversies, since it is most often they that are at the heart of inmate privacy concerns. Very often these concerns are expressed internally through informal complaints or verbalizations within an institution. These are more or less ignored or explained away. These petty complaints are often

seen as frustration with the entire "system" of the institution. Having female correctional officers in the inmates' living quarters may serve as an extra excuse to "bitch" about lack of rights, lack of privacy, etc. in general terms. Inmates also have a grievance procedure within institutions that can be used in a more formal way, stating the problem encountered, and then waiting while the issue is resolved internally.

Since female correctional officers are assigned the same duties as male officers, for the most part individual inmates cannot use their mere presence in the institution as a basis for complaint. So while male inmates may not like the idea of a female being allowed to "frisk" them, or a female looking into their cell, they realize that they really have no basis to challenge the procedure unless there is a flagrant disregard for the inmate's right to be treated fairly, with professionalism, and without harassment. Inmates interpret "privacy" in different ways, much the same as anyone else. Anger, frustration, shyness, humiliation, respect, etc. are also very individualistic emotions and reactions. Therefore what some may consider part of the institutional environment, a practice that is accepted and tolerated, or even enjoyed, others may tend to see as an invasion of basic human rights and a personal infringement.

As mentioned in the correctional investigator's reports, the privacy issue is not one which constitutes a great deal of complaint or concern. There are those inmates

however who will not be satisfied with internal grievances or informal complaints. Now that Canada has entrenched the Charter of Rights and Freedoms in its Constitution, there are many issues which can be argued in the courts on the Charter's basis.

When women were first entering all-male institutions in the late 1970's and early 1980's, they came in prepared to do all duties similar to male officers, with the exception for the skin search procedure. At that time, "skin frisks" were much more prevalent. It was an issue that inmates fought even if women officers did not participate in this type of search (unless it was considered an "emergency" and with no male officer available). If one examines the example of the court ruling of Gunn vs Yeomans and Caros, concerning the issue of strip searching all inmates leaving or entering Matsqui Institution, B.C. (Correctional Service of Canada, 1980b), we see that this resulted in the Federal Court of Canada judgement that would permit correctional officers to skin-frisk to maintain "the good order" of an institution. This new regulation, which replaced "reasonable grounds", was published in the July 11, 1980 Canada Gazette (Correctional Service of Canada, 1980b). The Solicitor General at the time, Mr. Bob Kaplan, also said such searches were necessary, especially for the more open prisons. He said that contraband must be kept under control to ensure less hostage-takings, and less violence to correctional officers and inmates (Correctional Service of Canada, 1980b).

When women first entered the male institutions, privacy was a concern. However there was discussion that toilet and shower areas could be provided with modesty barriers to help with this problem. This of course, has not been done in all areas of all federal institutions. In November of 1981, the Canadian Human Rights Commission prepared a report on the integration of female correctional officers in all-male institutions. At that time, the concern was expressed about inmate privacy and how this could be accommodated while still maintaining security. The discussion also centered around the use of various modesty barriers in all cells, even those with grilled fronts (Elliot, 1987).

While showering areas are easier to provide barriers for, the real concern is the toilet in individual cells. This is not hidden from view. Some cells have solid wood doors, with small security windows in them. The toilet is generally just to the side of the door, and cannot be easily seen by someone looking in. During a cell count, all inmates are locked in their cell as an officer goes through the cell block, checking each cell to ensure the inmate is in there. Generally inmates know when the regular cell counts are made, and therefore can expect a male or female officer to look into their cell. It is during other times of the day, when correctional officers do their unscheduled "winds" through the cell blocks or living units that an inmate might be using the toilet as a female officer approaches. There are also many older cell blocks, whose cells do not have doors, but

have grilled fronts (bars). This of course, offers less privacy. Many toilets in these cells are at the back of the cell and are not out of view. Some institutions have allowed inmates to use "regulation" curtains over a partial area of the cell bars to give some privacy. Others have modesty barriers that can be put around the toilet in the cell. However the problem also arises when this interferes with the security of the institution. Some inmates will hang too many things around their toilet or on their cell bars, causing correctional officers to occasionally pull it all down again so that they can have unobstructed views into the cell. When inmates are placed in punitive segregation, into "the hole", there are no modesty barriers allowed, again for security reasons.

For the most part, inmates have come to accept their confinement as losing many societal privileges. Learning to accept the presence of female correctional officers is another one of the realizations of their new environment. As it has been mentioned before, it may be just as uncomfortable for an inmate to be subjected to another man seeing him on the toilet, as for a woman to see him.

Regarding searches, female correctional officers routinely perform "pat-down" (or "frisk") searches, due to the amount of movement by inmates throughout the institution. Today of course, security is technically advanced over several years ago, and hand-held electronic scanners, "walk-through" security doorways, and cameras are also very

popular. These eliminate the necessity of doing excessive frisk or skin searches. However, as one female correctional officer told the researcher, the electronic doorways only pick up on metal and do not detect wooden or plastic items. There are those inmates who do not want women to do any kind of search on them, and there will be the occasional complaint or even a "disobeying" of an order to submit to a search. Many inmates also realize that female inmates are not subjected to any personal searches by male officers, and therefore the males feel that they are discriminated against.

K. Media Attention, Human Rights Tribunal, Federal Court

When women were first entering provincial and federal male institutions as correctional officers in the late 1970's, there appeared to be considerable media interest (Ottawa Journal, 1979, 1980; Toronto Globe and Mail, 1979; Toronto Star, 1977, 1980; Whig-Standard, 1980). Women as correctional officers seemed to be a novelty, as they were indeed relatively new to the system. Most of the articles talked in terms of how the women were adapting, and how the male workers and male inmates were reacting to them.

In more recent years, there have been a few cases that have caused media and public attention. In a lengthy "Saturday Special" article in the Toronto Star, February 22, 1986, large headlines proclaimed: "Abuse, resentment face women prison guards" and "Female guards face inmates' hostility" (Toronto Star, 1986a). The story was about both

the Ontario provincial and the federal systems, and spoke about the controversial changes which have occurred in the prison systems. Besides the problems associated with resentment from male correctional officers, and the questioning of the "femininity" of these women by friends and family, the writer talked about inmates' sexual tension, frustrations, and their right to privacy being abused. In a sensationalist way, the article claimed that "coarse language, verbal abuse, explicit sexual propositions and the threat of physical violence are a part of her daily working life. For security reasons, the stainless-steel toilets used by inmates are in plain view through the observation portholes in the doors". A letter from a Kingston Penitentiary inmate was also highlighted, especially the part where he talks about the privacy of men being invaded when they use the toilet, when they masturbate, or when they are subjected to frisk searches (that cause buttocks and genitals to be touched). The letter from this inmate, suggested women should not be working in the living areas of the male institution.

The newspaper article goes on to mention a couple of pending court cases concerning the privacy issue, and a conversation with a prison rights lawyer, Mr. Ron Price. The lawyer for the inmates, felt that "the sense of grievance about this is very, very high among the inmates . . . I think we have to decide if that advancement is to be done at the risk of humiliation of people in confinement". To provide a

balance, the news article also mentioned a conversation with Correctional Service of Canada Affirmative Action director, Ms. France-Marie Trepanier. She said that women have not been accepted easily, and that "we've had problems, mostly caused by male colleagues with sexist attitudes". She also spoke on the introduction of more modesty barriers for privacy, but that security also had to be maintained, therefore a compromise was still being sought. Correctional investigator Mr. Ron Stewart was also quoted as saying that privacy was an issue, however there were not a lot of complaints.

In a Toronto Star article of November 1, 1986, the writer gives an account of how an anonymous female correctional officer views her work (Toronto Star, 1986b). In the article, the work is described as degrading, boring, and filled with verbal and physical abuse from inmates. The environment is described as a non-caring one, where staff often cause more problems than the inmates. The environment is also described as containing danger, fear, harassment, and frustration which has affected her life outside the institution. The university-trained correctional officer says that she had been drawn into the federal civil service by very inviting recruitment ads that promised participation in rehabilitation programs, counselling, challenge, and rewards. However, after several years on the job, she has found a lack of promotional opportunity, a job where people only put in their time, and where people become embittered.

In a letter to the editor, to the Kingston newspaper the Whig-Standard, March 12, 1986, the male writer (who by the tone of the letter is not an inmate presently) strongly condemned the use of female officers in male institutions (Whig-Standard, 1986b). He called Affirmative Action and "various other women's groups . . . contemptuous". He goes on to argue discrimination, in that female offenders are not subjected to male officer presence. Therefore, "It soon becomes evident male prisoners have the very special privilege of being the only gender group which can be legally sexually humiliated, degraded and abused", and "Where in the Charter of Rights does it state that a man's dignity is not as important as a woman's?" The rest of the letter is a very strongly worded and emotional plea concerning sexism, "psychological rape of male prisoners", a mockery of male rights, what he sees as a lack of male representation or input, male humiliation, and his support of male inmates' demand for action.

At this same period in time, early in 1986, the Canadian Human Rights Commission became involved in a controversial issue that went back to 1981. Apparently at that time, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) had used women to guard both male and female prisoners in their RCMP lock-ups. However in January of 1981, the RCMP decided to reactivate a long-standing policy that prisoners should only be guarded by same-sex personnel, using the privacy issue as a right which would take precedence over women's equality in

the work place. Because there were not many female prisoners in the lock-ups to guard, the women staff members soon were out of regular work. Four women, three from Grande Cache, Alberta, and one from Jasper, Alberta, felt they were victims of sex discrimination by the RCMP and complained to the Human Rights Commission.

In 1982, the Human Rights Commission ruled that the RCMP did discriminate and that the women's employment opportunities were severely limited because of the small population of female prisoners in relation to male prisoners (Amiel, 1987; Whig-Standard, 1986a). The RCMP challenged this ruling of the Commission, whereby the Commission set up a Human Rights Tribunal, chaired by Robin Elliot. The four women were the complainants and the RCMP was the respondent, each party being represented by counsel. The hearing was very lengthy, with testimony and evidence presented from Calgary, Edmonton, Ottawa, and Montreal. Prison rights lawyers, prison psychologists, experts in Criminology, provincial and federal correctional officers and administrators, and inmates from the Kingston Penitentiary gave testimony. According to the newspaper account, more than 3500 pages of testimony was amassed from forty-five witnesses, including a key witness who was an inmate from the Kingston Penitentiary. He strongly disagreed with female correctional officers working in male institutions. He said it was humiliating to be seen using the toilet or in the nude. He also said that introducing shower curtains and

modesty barriers were not satisfactory: "It's the fact that you're having a crap that's relevant to the issue . . . it's eye contact" (Whig-Standard, 1986a).

Although the tribunal dealt with the issue of RCMP lock-ups, the entire phenomenon of female correctional officers was examined. This included looking at issues such as: the need for security, the duties of a guard, cross-sex guarding in Canadian correctional institutions, benefits of having females in all-male environments, inmate complaints, modesty barriers, etc. (Elliot, 1987).

The decision that the Tribunal reached was indeed not a simple one. In its 117 page decision of February 17, 1987, many questions and answers had to be justified and rationalized. Because the complainants in the case were relying on Section 7 and Section 10 of the Canadian Human Rights Act, which deals with "prohibited grounds of discrimination", the respondent was claiming that they (the RCMP) were not guilty of this. However in the alternative, the respondent was relying on the "bona fide occupational requirement" clause attached to the Act. Several precedent cases both from the United States and Canada, that dealt with the bona fide occupational requirement, were examined. In addition, the tribunal placed great importance on the "interest in inmate privacy . . . a function in part of the degree of importance we attach generally to the interest in personal privacy . . . degree of importance we attach to the specific interest in not being viewed in states of undress

and using the toilet by strangers of the opposite sex . . ."

(Elliot, 1987: 78).

In examining court cases that have dealt with balancing equal opportunity for women and the interest of inmate privacy, the tribunal declared that "the decisions in this area indicate that the balance in this case should be struck in favour of the interest of inmate privacy . . . prisoners are entitled to have those duties which result in such observations performed by persons of the same sex" (Elliot, 1987: 110). The tribunal also discussed the fact that male correctional officers have not been integrated into the federal Prison for Women. One reason for this, according to evidence presented, is Canada's commitment to the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (1955) which was approved by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations July 31, 1957. Article 53 in part, contains the following: "Women prisoners shall be attended and supervised only by women officers" (Elliot, 1987: 86). There was no mention of female officers guarding male prisoners. This is understandable considering the year of the resolution, during a time when "it would not have been expected that women would even be in a position to guard men; such work would have been considered unsuitable for women" (Elliot, 1987: 87).

Because the case at hand involved a "lock-up" situation, not a long term placement, the complainant's argument that female officers would improve the atmosphere or reduce the tension was not sufficient enough to justify

altering the balance in favor of the female attendants. Alternatives for the deployment of females was not considered feasible because of the nature of the specific duties as outlined by the RCMP. That is, there are to be very strict supervision periods, there could be no advance warning given before a guard entered the cell area, modesty barriers would pose a security risk (especially for those persons arrested who were suicidal), and suicidal detainees were sometimes left in a cell naked. The nature of a lock-up was decidedly different to any other custodial facility. Those persons being detained there have not necessarily been "sentenced", or even found guilty yet, therefore one could also perhaps say that these persons had more "rights" than other inmates in custodial facilities. In conclusion, the tribunal declared that the RCMP "has satisfied the objective component of the BFOR [bona fide occupational requirement] test" (Elliot, 1987: 117).

In this decision, the privacy rights of inmates were upheld, even though the right of women to equal employment opportunities was also supported. The decision also stressed that the RCMP policy does not mean that women do not have the ability to guard male prisoners. Because this was one specific case, the tribunal said that the decision does not necessarily apply to all institutions: "meaningful distinctions can be drawn between one institution and another . . . reasonable, non-discriminatory alternatives can be devised in some institutions, particularly those in which the

demands for tight security are not as great as they are in a lock-up facility . . . a decision supporting a same-sex guarding policy in one institution does not mean that a same-sex guarding policy will be justified in another" (Elliot, 1987: 117).

In Toronto, civil rights lawyer Ken Swan seemed to think however that this decision would affect all federal penitentiaries since these are of similar operations (Toronto Star, 1987). Also, in a February 26, 1987 article in the Ottawa Citizen, the writer told of some federal male inmates who were now using the Charter of Rights and Freedoms to protest searches (either frisk or skin), by female correctional officers. The argument put forth by the inmates included the fact that female offenders were not subjected to searches by male officers, therefore the Correctional Service of Canada Commissioner's Directives are discriminatory (Ottawa Citizen, 1987).

In an October 1987 issue of Maclean's, the problem of female correctional officers guarding men was again raised (Amiel, 1987). The author attacked the Human Rights Commission of Canada, which was characterized as not listening to the complaints of male inmates regarding privacy issues. The author also pointed to the problem of "sexual tension" in prisons, which she considered "incredible" (Amiel, 1987: 9). The case for humans needing personal privacy and human dignity was made. The writer felt that once the Human Rights Tribunal (Elliot, 1987) had made its

decision regarding the use of female guards in RCMP "lock-ups", that this case "ought to have ended the whole idea of female guards" (Amiel, 1987: 9). The writer concludes by saying that striving for female equality has gone beyond the bounds of dignity and common sense, and that women should only be guards in women's prisons.

Canada's most recent case concerning inmate privacy is the case involving the federal inmates Weatherall, Conway, and Spearman. All three cases were handled in the Federal Court of Canada on a joint basis, since all three involved elements of privacy and discrimination issues, and all three concerned the use of female correctional officers. Weatherall's case involved an incident in June of 1985, at Joyceville Institution, where he was strip searched in the presence of a female correctional officer. Conway and Spearman were both inmates from Collins Bay Institution. Conway objected to females doing "frisk" searches and also to their presence in the living areas of the cell blocks. Spearman had had an internal charge processed against him because he had refused to obey a female officer when she wanted to frisk search him. Conway also brought up the fact that it is discriminatory how male inmates are treated, considering that female inmates are not subjected to any bodily searches except by another female. The cases were all argued under the Charter of Rights and Freedoms.

The counsel for Correctional Service of Canada argued that women were entitled by law to have equal work

opportunity, and that internal regulations provided guidelines on when searches are made. Judge Strayer gave his judgement on June 9, 1987. He dismissed Spearman's action because the inmate had already pleaded guilty to his internal charge of disobeying a correctional officer's order to submit to a search. Therefore he did not feel that this warranted further action. Considering Weatherall's case, the Judge declared that there should not have been a strip search in the presence of a female officer, since there was no "emergency" as outlined in the Commissioner's Directives. However, the Judge did say that the Penitentiary Service Regulations give a very broad power of searching, and that there is discrimination between how male and female inmates are handled regarding searches. The Judge said that therefore, the paragraphs that relate to strip searches (paragraphs 41(2)(c) and subsection 41(3) of the Penitentiary Service Regulations) are invalid. He also said that the Directives are not law, even if they do provide restrictions on search procedures (Federal Court of Canada, 1987).

Considering the inmate Conway, the Judge agreed that female correctional officers should not make unannounced or unscheduled examinations of occupied cells. In order to be respectful of rights, the Judge declared that cross-gender viewing should not be unannounced, but that cross-gender frisking is "not unreasonable". He did issue a judgment, specifically aimed at Collins Bay Institution, that "it is unlawful, except in emergencies, for female officers to view

male inmates in their cells where such viewing is neither scheduled nor preceded by a warning or announcement" (Federal Court of Canada, 1987: 48). The Judge also said that because there are specific counts during the day, the inmates know exactly when these occur. Therefore, the onus is on the inmate to not be in an embarrassing situation when these counts occur. The only problem is the random "winds" which occur every hour, and which are supposed to contain an element of surprise. However, the Judge felt that there would not be much problem with an announcement of a female officer doing this "wind" down the range, since the first inmate that sees any officer coming to do such a random check will have his/her presence quickly announced through the cell block by the inmate. Another way to circumvent the required "announcement" is to allow male officers to do the random "winds" while the female officer stays in the control vestibule (as one officer is required to do anyway). The Judge said that this announcement by female officers is only required during waking hours, since during the night the onus is again on the inmate to be dressed or covered up.

The judgement was only directed at Collins Bay Institution, which now has erected a sign on each cell block that says whether a female officer is on duty for that particular shift. All other institutions can carry on with their mode of operation, as each case coming to court will be handled separately.

A Correctional Service of Canada memorandum, dated June 29, 1987, came from the Executive Secretary of the Commissioner of Corrections, to all Regional Deputy Commissioners, Wardens, and Superintendents. It concerned "Inmate Privacy/Female Correctional Officers, Federal Court Ruling". In this memorandum, the recent court ruling was said to have potential for major impact on the operation of institutions. A summary of the court ruling was given:

- (a) Searches of inmates do not require a warrant;
- (b) "Frisks" or "pat downs" of fully clothed inmates by a staff member running his or her hands over the inmate's clothing do not violate the Charter;
- (c) The powers of CSC staff to search, as outlined in the Penitentiary Service Regulations (para. 41(2)(c) and subsection 41(3)), are overly broad and are invalid. However, routine or general skin searches without prior authorization and without reasonable and probable grounds would be acceptable provided that the circumstances in which general or routine searches are to be authorized were set out in the PSRS. Commissioner's Directives cannot be regarded as "law" within the meaning of the Charter.
- (d) The employment of female guards is supported by the Charter, but their employment to perform non-emergency skin searches or unscheduled or unannounced surveillance of cells, is not supported.

This judgement will not come into effect until it is formally signed. However, a judgement directed specifically against Collins Bay Institution relating to point (d) above, is now in force. The Legal Services Unit has been consulted regarding possible grounds for appeal of points (c) and (d) and for suspension of the judgements.

(Correctional Service of Canada, 1987b: 1-3)

An appeal on behalf of Correctional Service of Canada was issued in the Weatherall case. The appeal was heard May 30 and 31, of 1988, and a unanimous judgement by three Justices of the Federal Court of Appeal was rendered June 28, 1988 (Federal Court of Appeal, 1988). The judgement basically upheld the lower court's decision, however added a few words ("male", "by or in the presence of female correctional officers in a non-emergency situation") to one of the paragraphs of the judgement. Overall, the judgement means that in its present form, paragraph 41(2)(c) of the Penitentiary Service Regulations, C.R.C.1978, c.1251, is "inconsistent with rights guaranteed to male penitentiary inmates by section 8 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms if it intends to authorize strip searching of male inmates by or in the presence of female correctional officers in a non-emergency situation" (Federal Court of Appeal, 1988: 24). The court recognized that prison life posed special problems that require concerns of safety and security, and that any new regulations would have to reflect this. Concerning the future prospect of drafting new regulations, the difficulty of defining an "emergency" situation was also pointed out.

The question of an inmate having a general right to privacy as guaranteed by section 7 of the Charter was also raised by counsel for the plaintiff (Weatherall). However, the Appeal Court decided it would not directly rule on this as "the question is not squarely raised for our decision"

(Federal Court of Appeal, 1988: 24-25). In checking with the Federal Court of Appeal in July of 1988, the researcher of this study discovered that neither Conway, nor Spearman's cases (originally heard with Weatherall) were under appeal.

Considering the Federal Court and Federal Appeals Court case that has been mentioned, there may be new changes at Correctional Service of Canada in the future. These will probably include a re-writing of various directives that authorize searches on inmates, as well as a new look at how male inmates and female inmates are treated differently. According to a male staff instructor (name kept anonymous) at the Staff College in Kingston, male correctional officers may soon be introduced into the Prison for Women. There are a small number that work there now on perimeter posts, or in other areas where there is no direct contact with female inmates. Even the "disturbances" on the ranges are normally handled by female correctional officers, since the sight of a male officer coming in to "handle" a situation often causes more problems among the inmates. This movement of men into the federal women's prison is seen as a possibility, because of the recent court cases which have outlined the discrimination in treatment of males versus females.

L. Statistical Representation of Female Correctional Officers in Male Institutions

Statistics on female representation in male institutions have been kept by the Affirmative Action

Division of Correctional Service of Canada, since the implementation of the Affirmative Action program. These show the hiring of women in the correctional officer category (custody and living unit) across the country, in the five different regions and various federal institutions. The following presentation is a brief summary.

TABLE TWO - Summary of Numerical Representation of Male and Female Correctional Officers in Correctional Service of Canada

Year	Female CXs in Male Institutions	Male CXs in Male Institutions
1978-79	28	n/a
March 1981	46 (CSC, 1981c)	n/a
Oct. 1982	103	4247
April 1983	130	4216
April 1984	264	4262
April 1985	516 65 at P for W	4281 9 at P for W
April 1986	504 66 at P for W	4164 8 at P for W
April 1987	571 66 at P for W	4293 8 at P for W
Sept. 1987	592 69 at P for W	4275 8 at P for W
March 1988	632 69 at P for W	4234 8 at P for W

(Correctional Service of Canada, 1982-1988)

P for W (federal Prison for Women, Kingston)

The figures from 1982-1988 have been compiled from statistics provided to the researcher by the Affirmative Action Division of Correctional Service of Canada. A more detailed numerical distribution of correctional officers can be found in the Appendices of this research study.

In ten years, the numbers of female correctional officers working in male institutions has gone from 28 in 1978-79 (pilot projects) to 632 as of March 31, 1988. During the last several years, the numbers of male correctional officers has not gone up at all. In 1982 there were 4247 male correctional officers in male institutions across Canada, compared to 103 female officers in male institutions. The latest statistics show a total of 4234 male correctional officers. Over the past several years, the numbers of male officers has remained fairly steady, fluctuating only slightly.

Significant increases of female correctional officers in male institutions can be seen throughout this ten year period, most notably from April 1983 to April 1985, going from 130 to 516 officers. The time period from April 1987 to March 1988 also shows an increase in hiring of female correctional officers, however a decrease in hiring of male officers. Female officers increased by 61, while male officers decreased by 59 during this one year period. The Affirmative Action target had been set at 19% females in junior level correctional officer jobs by March of 1988. Since this target has not been achieved, one can expect additional hiring of females over the next few years.

Female correctional officers only began working at multi-level security institutions in 1984, when the first twelve women were assigned to Saskatchewan Penitentiary (Correctional Service of Canada, 1984e). And according to statistics provided by the Affirmative Action Division of Correctional Service of Canada, it was also not until 1984-85 that women began working as correctional officers in maximum security institutions such as Kingston Penitentiary (Ontario Region), Archambault (Quebec Region), and Edmonton Institution (Prairie Region). Movement into other maximum security institutions occurred slowly over the next two to three years, into Millhaven (Ontario), Kent (Pacific), Laval (Quebec), Dorchester (Atlantic), etc. As of March 31, 1988, female correctional officers have been integrated (although in small numbers in some instances) into all maximum security institutions across Canada, with the exception of Saskatchewan SHU - the Special Handling Unit (Correctional Service of Canada, 1982-1988).

According to information provided by various staff instructors at the Regional Correctional Staff College, in Kingston, the correctional officer training program is now only a six week program (from the original three month program). The training consists of human relations training, self defense, fitness, use of various firearms and chemical agents, first aid, behavioral dynamics, and other security related topics. There is also considerable emphasis on on-the-job training, done at one of the regional

institutions. Whenever Correctional Service of Canada requires additional correctional officers across Canada, a group of approximately twenty recruits will be trained. These twenty will have been selected beforehand after a screening process used by Correctional Service of Canada. According to one instructor (name kept anonymous), the qualifications for recruits a few years ago asked for a degree, however now the requirements are only a grade twelve education. He says there is no psychological testing done during the screening process, however he thinks this would be a good idea. He feels that a person really needs to have an aptitude for correctional work. He also says many only intend to do "guarding" work for a limited period of time, however once they enter the "system", it is very difficult to get out, or to find other work. Only a few advance beyond the entry level classification.

Approximately four or five classes go through the college per year, depending on demand. In addition to the aforementioned courses, there is a one day "Women in Corrections" package that is presented to all new recruits. This was introduced because so many of the new recruits over the past several years have been women. It has been identified that because of the increasing numbers of women becoming correctional officers, that this was needed, especially for the benefit of male recruits. "Women in Corrections" provides a brief history of female correctional officers, various studies and recommendations that caused the

integration into male institutions, Affirmative Action statistics, etc. In the group of twenty recruits that went through the training in February-March of 1988, seventeen of them were women.

M. Conclusion

This chapter has presented an examination of the Canadian experience of female correctional officers in all-male federal institutions. Historically, prior to 1978, female correctional officers were called "matrons" and worked only in the federal prison for women. After a call for equal rights of opportunity in the work force, a study on sex restrictions in the correctional officer category was conducted across Canada in 1977. The aim was to study why women were not working in male institutions. The conclusion was that there were no justifiable reasons that would keep women from doing this kind of work, and recommendations for their integration were made to the Canadian Penitentiary Service (as Correctional Service of Canada was then called). The United States experience was a factor in Canada's movement to this end, however Canada decided to introduce women as correctional officers on an equal basis with men. In many American jurisdictions, the procedure is to restrict women's duties in some institutions so that they do not come into contact with the male inmates' living quarters. Reasons for this vary, some emphasizing male inmates' right to privacy, and others citing examples of extreme violence in

the working environment which would not be suitable for women. In Canada, women were introduced as doing the same duties and having the same responsibilities as male officers. The exception was that the women would not participate in "skin" (strip) searches unless it was an emergency situation, however the women would routinely perform "frisk" searches. To mitigate privacy concerns that many male inmates had, the proposal was to install modesty barriers and curtains for showering areas and toilets.

Initial pilot projects involving female correctional officers in 1978-79 were evaluated, and the recommendation was to continue the integration of women into all minimum and medium security institutions (with movement into maximum security institutions at a later date, if evaluations were still favorable). In 1980, and again in 1982, special measures such as exclusion orders and limiting male correctional officer transfers, were used to increase the numbers of female correctional officers entering all-male institutions. Equal Opportunities for Women programs were soon taken over by a new government measure, called Affirmative Action, introduced in 1983 by the Treasury Board of Canada. This measure was seen as being necessary, since it had been determined that there was discrimination in the work force over the hiring of women, natives, and the handicapped. Affirmative Action developed various strategies and programs to increase the recruitment, development, and hiring of women in the correctional officer category.

Affirmative Action also developed targets to achieve certain hiring levels by March of 1988. In examining the statistics over the last few years, it is obvious that Affirmative Action has been a factor in the increase in numbers of female correctional officers in male institutions.

Affirmative Action has had its critics, claiming that the program is using reverse discrimination in order to achieve goals and target percentages. For women in the correctional officer category, it is often too easy for men to tell the women that they have only gotten their job or promotion because they are "female". The resentment, hostility, and confusion over the introduction of women into traditional all-male environments and traditional all-male occupations, may be compounded by such "government" imposed policies. This often places women at the middle of arguments. On the one hand, women have demonstrated that they can do the job of a correctional officer, but in the past have not been able to get the jobs. With the assistance of Affirmative Action, more women have been considered for correctional officer employment. However in its efforts to achieve targets and goals, one hopes the program is not overly zealous in its approach to recruitment and selection of female trainees. Therefore, on the other hand, Affirmative Action must be cautious in its approach. Female correctional officers who have been in the Service for a few years are themselves recognizing the need to recruit "appropriate" female candidates that have some aptitude and

experience - that being female and qualifying under the Affirmative Action program is not enough. This is discussed further in Chapter Five, where interviews with the female correctional officers are examined.

Over the ten years between 1978 and 1988, there has been a steady increase in the numbers of women becoming correctional officers in male institutions. Integration began slowly, into minimum and medium security institutions at first, and into the maximum security institutions only in recent years. With the full integration of women into all-male environments, the problems also emerged. However these were not the problems originally mentioned, such as fear of women being raped, women's lack of strength, women's unsuitability for such work, etc. The women have shown that they can do the job as well as men, and that their concept of "security" is as good as a male officer's. They have apparently also, for the most part, been accepted by male inmates, and perhaps more grudgingly by male co-workers. The problems surrounding male co-worker acceptance is more difficult to define. Attitudes and traditional values are difficult to change. Women have been correctional officers in male institutions for only a short period of time, and their evolution is still continuing. Although Correctional Service of Canada is committed to participating in Affirmative Action programs, and committed to the full integration of women into male institutions, deep-seated resentments and lack of acceptance is not easy to measure.

There are also those persons, whether they be the public, in the media, the inmates, or co-workers who just do not feel that women should be working in male institutions - that there is something fundamentally wrong with the concept.

The more obvious problems facing female correctional officers are those concerning male inmates and issues of privacy. Women have been allowed to work in the living quarters of male institutions from the beginning of their integration. They have also performed routine "frisk" searches, and occasional strip searches in emergencies. When women first began working in all-male institutions there was a call for modesty barriers and curtains to provide some privacy while male inmates were using the toilet or showering. Although this was seen as beneficial even if there were no female correctional officers working, not all institutions in Correctional Service of Canada have satisfactorily provided for privacy. As well, there have been problems in defining an "emergency" situation which allows a female officer to participate in a "skin" search of a male inmate. Recent Federal Court cases have upheld inmate privacy rights, but have also supported women's equal employment opportunities. These court cases have also demonstrated the need for future consideration of equal treatment for male and female inmates. Female inmates at the federal Prison for Women presently are not subjected to having male correctional officers in their living quarters, nor do male correctional officers do any form of searches on females.

Male inmate privacy in the midst of female correctional officers has been an ongoing problem, as seen in the annual reports of the Correctional Investigator, media accounts, the Human Rights Tribunal, and the Federal Court cases. Although for the most part male inmates have appeared to have accepted the women, their lack of argument may be more indicative of resigned toleration than acceptance. This is true if the inmate feels he has lost most of his societal rights, and therefore resigns himself to the "prison experience". Only a few inmates may actually decide to confront and argue the problem in an overt and vociferous manner. These few may actually be speaking for many more than is indicated. Only an in-depth survey of the prison population will provide a better analysis of female correctional officer acceptance to male inmates. However, Correctional Service of Canada can continue to tackle the problem of inmate privacy issues by ensuring that provisions are made within the institutions. The fear of jeopardizing security and surveillance in the institution is hindering some of these developments, as well as the age of many of the institutions (which were not designed for many improvements or changes). The responsibility is also placed on the male inmates to provide for their own privacy and avoidance of embarrassing situations. However the female correctional officers' claim that inmates will often avoid the use of modesty barriers provided by the institution, and will also often sexually flaunt themselves for the purpose of getting

the attention of the female officer. There is further discussion concerning the issue of inmate privacy in Chapter Five of this research study.

It is obvious that women as correctional officers in male institutions have been an increasing force over the last several years. There are now approximately 632 female correctional officers working in male institutions in Canada, approximately 14.9% of all officers working there. Considering all-male institutions and the Prison for Women, female correctional officers make up 14.2% of all officers. It will not be easy to change their job descriptions at this time. Since Correctional Service of Canada has made the commitment to treat male and female correctional officers alike, their duty now lies in alleviating the problems associated with having women working directly with male inmates. As in other non-traditional occupations, women as correctional officers in male institutions will become more common-place, and those who come into contact with them should come to accept them more easily in the future.

CHAPTER FIVE

RESULTS OF INTERVIEWS AND DISCUSSIONS

A. Introduction

This chapter contains the results of interviews and discussions held with twenty female correctional officers (four living unit officers and sixteen custody officers), who work in three different all-male federal correctional institutions. This chapter also contains supplementary first-hand information received from several male inmates (and one ex-inmate) who are housed in one of the institutions visited. The subject areas have been categorized into sub-sections, with a summary and discussion of the results of the conversations and interviews provided. The manner in which these results are presented is to provide anonymity for the respondents. There was no statistical analysis that numbered the responses, and the responses were not tabulated in a quantitative way. Rather, the information is presented in a qualitative format, from the notes and recollection of the researcher. The results of each area that was discussed varied. This was according to how comfortable the respondent felt, or how much detail the respondent wished to provide in the subject area. The emphasis here is to provide the reader with impressions and feelings that the female correctional officers wished to share with the researcher. Overall, the female correctional officers were very open and cooperative

in sharing their views in a number of areas. Some were eager to provide much more than candid discussion, and others basically answered the questions without elaborating very much. Still others felt hesitant, but these were in the minority. Even they were able to provide the researcher with enlightening information. The cooperation experienced in the gathering of this information cannot be stressed strongly enough, and the researcher is extremely grateful that these women were able to share their thoughts so adequately.

B. The Institutional Setting

This research is not about prisons, or the prison environment, but about some female correctional officers working in three all-male Canadian federal institutions. Therefore, in order to facilitate an understanding of many of the main issues concerning this topic, a brief mention of the prison environment is necessary.

As mentioned previously, interviews were conducted with twenty female correctional officers who work in three federal correctional facilities. In order to assist in understanding their working environment, tours of these institutions were conducted. Tours were taken at two medium security penitentiaries and one multi-level security penitentiary, in the Ontario Region. Without such a visual presentation, an appreciation of the many duties that a correctional officer performs, and the atmosphere within which the work is performed, could not have the required

impact. It is an environment that few members of the public see, one which is highly regulated and structured. Of paramount concern is of course security, as well as the various bureaucratic regulations and structural procedures. Of concern also, is that the inmates are not subjected to unnecessary outside intrusions, or made to feel like "animals in a cage", that are put on view (like historical times). Because a penitentiary has the potential for violence, and is a volatile place, there is also concern for the safety of any "outsider" that is not a working member of that environment. The tours therefore were quite regulated and some areas were restricted, but for the most part, the tours did afford a greater comprehension of both the inmate's and correctional officer's world.

For the most part, the working environment appears depressive and hostile. The institutions differed from one another, however the overall security and control aspects are always there. Cell blocks and ranges also differed from one institution to another, and differed within individual institutions as well. Some blocks/ranges have cells with windows, while others are built "back-to-back" and therefore have no windows. Some cell blocks are tiered, one on top of the other, while others are situated more spaciouly with wide hallways between two rows of cells. Some cell blocks are a little more "modern", with wooden cell doors that have small viewing (security) windows. Other cells have open bars as their doors, offering little privacy. Because of an

increasing number of incarcerated offenders, many inmates are "double-bunked" and therefore must share their cell with another inmate, with each having their belongings in there as well. Some cells have allowances for modesty barriers around toilets or curtains for the grilled fronts, while others do not.

The medium security institution which is built on a living unit concept seemingly offers inmates more freedom than some other medium security institutions. There are spacious exterior areas where inmates move about quite freely, yet there is still overall internal and perimeter control, with security check points to control and restrict movement. The cells have wooden doors rather than bars. The correctional officers that work directly with the inmates on the living ranges wear "street" clothes rather than the Correctional Service of Canada uniform. The officers that work off the actual living unit, do a variety of "security" related duties and they wear the uniform. Here there are no "gun" towers, rather there is an elaborate system of security surveillance by camera. There are also perimeter checks done by correctional officers who drive in a van, and who carry shotguns.

The other two institutions visited still have "gun" towers where correctional officers are armed with an AR-15 rifle and a handgun, ready to shoot if an inmate were to attempt escape, or in case of "trouble" noticed anywhere on the grounds of the prison.

Inside the institutions, there are considerable security control booths or stations, that control and restrict movement from point to point. Some of these centres are built like mini-fortresses, seemingly very secure. The officers working in these control posts restrict movement through security gates for both inmates and other correctional staff. Some of these security posts have "smoked" glass so that inmates cannot see into them very easily, but the officer can see out very well. The door into this centre is also always locked, so no one can access it. There are several of these centres in each institution, some controlling internal movement, and some controlling movement of trucks or visitors in and out of the grounds of the institution. In one institution there was the ever-clanging sound of the electronic control gates, as they opened and closed all day long, controlling movement in and out of certain areas. In another institution, manual locking and unlocking of gates was needed, between the different sectors of the building.

The aforementioned security control areas are not "armed" stations. However, in one of the institutions, there are several "gun cages" placed in strategic areas of the institution. These are in external areas, such as above the exercise yard, and in internal areas, such as near the gymnasium or in a centrally placed location overlooking the many cell blocks. The correctional officers in them are armed with a rifle or a shotgun (inside cages). The officers

themselves are locked in there, after being escorted to these posts by other correctional officers. Some of these gun cages are manned all the time, others are manned during the evening or other times deemed necessary. Additional security at this same institution was provided through the use of two "guard" dogs that patrolled the yards over night with their handlers. Certain corrections staff there also have the use of "silent alarm" receivers that they wear on their person, depending on where they are working in the institution.

The institutional setting is an environment of continual mistrust and suspicion. It may concern what the correctional officers bring to work, as they too must pass through security systems and often have their things examined for contraband or inappropriate items. Or it may concern checking a local community bread truck, knowing that several hundred loaves of bread cannot thoroughly be scrutinized, and that items have been smuggled into hollowed out loaves of bread in the past, intercepted by inmates. Or it may concern trying to get the inmate head count correct, several times a day. If the count does not add up, the check is done again, in every cell block or living unit, until all inmates are accounted for. Sometimes this is the fault of an officer who miscounts, thus delaying the entire institution's further operation.

Two of the institutions were old, and one was only approximately twenty-five years old. Some areas of the old institutions still operated on the old-fashioned system of

locking cells by hand, and not electronically. Some areas of the old institutions have been upgraded to include electronic cell locks, however according to one female correctional officer, these have been quite unreliable, as the system has not functioned properly all the time. There are "panic" buttons in most cells, however some parts of one of the institutions did not have them. These are used to notify the correctional staff that there is an emergency. However, one female correctional officer confirmed that under normal circumstances, an inmate would not use this button if he were being "muscled" by another inmate. He would be labelled a "snitch" and suffer further consequences if he involved the guards. The buttons are useful though in the hospital section, or for inmates who have a medical problem (ie, diabetes). The female correctional officer also told the researcher that if someone were to have a medical emergency in his cell, other inmates would probably notify an officer to help. However, if it was an inmate committing suicide, this is doubtful since the act is seen by inmates as being his choice.

The institutions have "cable" television in the cells, if available. In the words of one corrections official, "TV is a great babysitter". The inmates are also allowed approximately \$1500 worth of personal items in their cell, including television, computer, tape recorder, radio, and other items. Some inmates can even obtain a "permit" to have items such as exactor blades (for hobbies) in their

cell. For those who do not have their own television, a communal television is supplied for certain areas of the institution. When an inmate is in punitive segregation these privileges are however not allowed. Meals in two of the institutions visited are eaten in the diningroom. However, in one of the institutions, there is no diningroom and all inmates must eat in their own cells. They all have a set of cutlery in their cells, however a female correctional officer told the researcher that these are not good "weapons" since the inmates could easily find more appropriate things to use as weapons.

The institutional setting is described here to provide the reader with a sense of understanding of where female correctional officers work. Security and control are concerns that are of utmost importance to the overall organization of each institution. Much of the work done by correctional officers is routine and boring - locking and unlocking doors, checking perimeter areas, and observing inmates. However the potential for danger and disturbance is always there, as evidenced by the institutions' policies that permit the use of chemicals, weaponry, handcuffs, and leg shackles. Female correctional officers have not worked in such all-male environments that long in Canada, and part of this research endeavors to seek the female correctional officer's personal input in relation to this kind of working environment.

In seeking to understand the phenomenon of female correctional officers in all-male institutions, the working environment is an important factor to consider. The institutional setting certainly may affect how these women view themselves or others. Various institutional problems of overcrowding, lack of privacy, inmate hostility, violence, and perhaps inadequate communication with management, must be considered when formulating a discussion of female correctional officers. It is not a "normal" environment, but one which is controlled and maintained by a relatively small number of correctional officers per total number of inmates. For example, one of the institutions visited has approximately 500 inmates, with a correctional officer complement of approximately 225. These officers are then deployed over a twenty-four hour period, seven days a week. There are usually only one to three officers working on any one cell block or living unit during the day and evening. Overnight, when inmates are locked in their cells for the duration of the shift, the correctional officers working are normally further reduced. Then there are the other duties within the institution that a correctional officer has, which does not involve direct contact with inmates. This further reduces the number of officers that are available to supervise the inmates. Therefore, the officers must be security conscious, must know their working environment, must know the type of inmate they are supervising, and must be comfortable with their working partners.

C. A General Overview of the Female Correctional Officers that were Interviewed

The length of time spent working as a correctional officer in a male institution ranged from the recruit level (beginning the experience), to a female officer who had been in the Service for approximately eight years. The majority of women had been working as correctional officers for four to six years. After being trained at the Correctional Service of Canada staff college, the correctional officers were assigned to a particular institution where they have for the most part remained (although there were a minimal number that had transferred from another federal institution).

The age of the women ranged from the early 20's to mid 40's, with the majority age group being between twenty-six and thirty-five. The youngest officer was twenty-one years old, and the oldest was forty-six years old. The majority of the women were either married or living with someone. Many had children to support and several had also been pregnant while on the job, and had returned to their work as a correctional officer after having had a child. At least one of the women was a grandmother.

Physical characteristics varied greatly. There were representatives from various body statures, including those that were small and petite, those that were tall, some that were overweight, and so on. None of the women were considered to have any "masculine" characteristics, and

indeed looked like "ordinary" women. However it was noticed that long hair was put into a "sensible" style, and there was a definite lack of excessive "feminine" additions, such as a lot of make-up or perfume - the custody officers wore uniforms, while the living unit officers wore comfortable "street" clothes such as jeans, sweat-tops, and shirts.

D. Female Correctional Officers' Background and Motivation

This area of discussion explored previous experience, how the women became correctional officers, any academic training in addition to what the Correctional Service of Canada staff college offers, and why the person is in this line of work.

At least half of the women had university degrees or college diplomas. Some of the educational background was "corrections" related (ie, corrections courses at a College, Masters degree in applied Criminology, police training course). Some had a background in other humanities and social science areas (ie, theology, sociology, counselling), and still others had an unrelated background (ie, biology). Job experiences before becoming a correctional officer included working with juvenile delinquents (in a group home, detention centre, or in "street" programs), working with the mentally handicapped, working in a police "lock-up", or working in a provincial correctional system. Other work experiences included working at a parole office, being in the Canadian Armed Forces, working as a security officer in a department

store, and working at a community residential centre (halfway house). Some unrelated previous work experiences included working in a bar, clerical/secretarial experience, and business experience.

Several of the women became involved in corrections because parents, husbands, or boyfriends were/are involved in correctional work. Therefore often it seemed to be the reasonable extension to make. Others could not find work elsewhere, even though they had an educational background. Others were influenced by the government's female hiring policies which made the Correctional Service of Canada's opportunities for women seem very attractive.

Although now placed in a correctional officer role, many did not seek this situation out, and indeed many would prefer to be doing something else. In the majority of cases, the motivating factor that contributed to a woman becoming a correctional officer, and in large part ensures she stays, is that the job offers security and a good program of benefits. According to the women the salary is very good, and there is a pension plan, medical/dental plan, insurance, etc. In looking for a job, many recounted that job security and wages were very important. Women working in other, more traditional avenues, would not make as much money. In a correctional officer job, there is equal pay with the men. It has become attractive to those women who perhaps would prefer a different job, but who cannot obtain one because they may not be academically qualified, or because the job

market cannot provide for all those women who are. Some women had to have a job in order to satisfy the family expectations - to help with the mortgage, raise children, pay bills, and so on. Others were intrigued by the interesting aspects of correctional work. Still others feel that corrections and its "spin-offs" can be a career to them, whether it be in "guarding" and advancing through the correctional officer group levels, or perhaps in parole, law, social work, or counselling.

Although there are those officers who enjoy counselling, interacting with inmates, and becoming involved in case management of inmates, there are many who see the job purely in a maintenance function, with little regard to "rehabilitation" of inmates. These officers do their work to the best of the Service's requirements without "getting close to" inmates in a helping-type role that is more associated with social workers or therapists. Many like the interesting aspects of their work, in that the job is not considered to be very boring, and even shift hours do not appear to be a real hardship. For the most part, not many women declared a real liking of the job duties (nor a real dislike), but did express their intent of doing the job as well as possibly expected, and in a manner which supports professionalism and integrity. Basically their feelings were quite neutral as to "like-dislike" of the work, and both advantages and disadvantages of the job were easily recounted.

Many women view this job as a "stepping-stone" to other government work, and hope to use the experience gained here for future employment elsewhere. Some are only "putting in time" (as many researchers have previously suggested is similar to the inmates) until other work opportunities come along, or until the family financial situation is such that does not necessitate them to work. Many would prefer to be doing a different job, however work opportunities for women are often limited, especially for those who lack advanced education. Many other jobs cannot compare to the pay and benefits offered by the federal government.

Many of the women felt that their backgrounds, be it educational experience or work experience, did not really prepare them for this kind of work. Even those with a corrections or criminology academic background expressed this. Basically it is felt one has to learn the job from doing the actual work in the institution. The "on-the-job" experience changes any pre-conceived or naive notions (sometimes in an abrupt manner) to a more realistic and practically-minded approach. Even the training given at the Staff Training College, said to offer weapons and defense skills as well as some interpersonal skills training, does not apply to the "real" situation. (Perhaps this is why the college has in recent years dropped its course time down to only six weeks, and part of this is direct "on-the-job" experience before the recruit graduates.) One respondent said she felt that it takes two years before one is really

familiar with all the job stations and duties available within an institution. If one is naive and unrealistic at first, one learns quickly through the experience.

Many women did not realize what the job of being a correctional officer really meant before immersion into the institution. Persons have different motivations or aspirations for a corrections job - some think more in "case management" and interactive ways, while others think predominately in the traditional "guarding" and security aspects of the job. Overall, the variety of all potential aspirations appears to be within the job parameters, allowing each individual to give as much or as little of her personal self to the role. Many women also made it known that they felt that male correctional officers were also doing this kind of work because of the money, benefits, and security offered through the government. One female officer did however feel that they were in a "high risk" group, similar to police officers, and therefore they should be making even more money than they presently make.

E. Future Aspirations and Career Moves

This area of discussion did overlap the personal motivation aspect, especially as it relates to how or why these women became correctional officers. As mentioned, some saw this career move as an opportunity to become entrenched in the government work force, thus allowing for easier access to other government work opportunities. Others believed that

the work experience itself could prove useful for a future career in areas such as parole, probation, social work, or similar. Some women admitted that they had no real career aspirations. They were content to "put in time" in order to secure benefits, and perhaps move on to another type of work after having had several years' experience here. Most of the women said they needed a job, and that this was fulfilling the need. Many also realized that opportunities to move on to another "good" job was limited, especially if the academic training was lacking. There was the feeling by several that many women use this job as a "stepping stone" to better work, and yet there was also some animosity there. It was felt by some that it takes a long while to become familiar with the role, that the government spends a lot of money to train new recruits, and it was not fair that people left the Service without really intending to stay for any length of time.

Several women did not really want to be at this job, and were hoping to find other work, or go back to school to acquire advanced education. Some had even set themselves a potential target time at which they would like to be out of this line of work (ie, in three years, no more than ten years, etc.). There were also women who seemed neutral toward the job and yet were also aspiring to go through the correctional officer level system, to become supervisors, and see how far they could advance in the correctional officer category. Many said that they did not mind the work that much and would probably stay at it for the next few years.

In the one institution visited, both living unit and custody (uniformed) officers are used. The other two institutions had no living unit officers. Several of the uniformed custody officers that worked at the living unit concept institution were asked if they would like to become a living unit officer. Many living unit officers used to be custody officers, but have passed the competition and have advanced into this higher paying position. Living unit officers only work the day and evening shift, they do not work overnight shifts, and they are more or less on a team concept, working directly with inmates. The general feeling by those asked, was that they would prefer to remain custody officers. The "security" function of this role was preferred to that of a living unit officer who had to interact more on a personal level with inmates. Reasons for remaining a custody officer ranged from enjoying the variety of various postings around the institution and a feeling that this was real "guarding" work, to a preference for remaining detached from direct inmate interaction. Because living unit officers wear "street" clothes and not uniforms, and because these officers have expressed a desire to work more closely with inmates, there may be some animosity between their role function and that of the stereotypical uniformed officer who sees him/herself as functioning in the traditional correctional officer role.

Some women were hoping to make a career out of this job, and had already written the correctional officer level

competition in order to move up the ladder, from a CX-1 position to a CX-3 position. It was also mentioned that movement up the level system was advantageous to salary advancement, as well as further removal from potential danger in working directly with inmates.

F. Female Correctional Officers' Relationship With Inmates

This area of discussion concerned itself with the female officers' relationship with the inmates they work with, the privacy issue, sexual flaunting, and skills used in dealing with the inmates.

Many of the women officers preferred not to develop any kind of rapport or relationship with inmates. This is not to say that they particularly "hate" the inmates - actually their feelings are largely ambivalent toward inmates, and most have said they "get along okay" with them. Many women prefer to do the functions and duties as expected without worrying about the inmate, without counselling, or without any close interaction. This is not to say they disregard the needs of the inmates, but have placed themselves in a "guarding" or security-type role, versus a service-oriented or caring role. And because of the many job functions and potential assignments that occur in any one institution (with the exception of living unit officer duties which are more specialized), correctional officers are never in one place in the institution for any length of time. Living unit officers, working on a team concept, are assigned

to one particular living unit (a housing unit composed of anywhere from forty to one hundred and twenty inmates). They work only day and evening shifts, thus become familiar with the men in their unit. Overnight shifts, during which the inmates are locked in their cells, are handled by uniformed custody officers. The custody officers are not there at that time of night to interact or develop a relationship with the inmates, rather are concerned with security and regular cell checks.

Inmates are most often referred to as "cons", and again in very ambivalent terms - for example, there are the ones who are hard to get along with, and there are those that are "okay". There is a definite feeling of detachment there, for various reasons that are understandable, considering what some of these inmates have done in society, and the potential dangers inherent in the job. It is also a question of "women guarding men", and that in itself brings additional problems to the job that male correctional officers do not have. There is an ever-present aura of suspicion and non-trust, with the realization that something can happen at any time. The inmates are usually characterized as using various tactics in order to gain something for themselves, therefore cannot be trusted. New female recruits are considered especially naive and inexperienced in this area. It is felt by most of the female officers that were spoken to, that these new recruits have to learn rather quickly from experiences on the job - that is, how to react or not to

react to inmates; when to say "yes" and when to say "no", and not be "wishy-washy".

As well as the feeling that inmates will "con" naive new female recruits, this feeling also applies to volunteers who come into an institution to counsel or visit with inmates. Many correctional officers felt that there are too many young, naive, and impressionable girls who visit the institution and are easily led to believe the one-sided version of the inmates. It is felt that these girls not only bring in little items to the inmates, but that they also indulge in inappropriate dress and behavior. Inmates, it is felt, also seem to gain the public sympathy very often, as well as get "good press" from the media. The correctional staff is often put in the antagonistic and aggressive role, but they cannot defend themselves thoroughly because of government policies which do not allow for free speech or explanations except through "proper" channels.

Some correctional officers felt that inmates seem to be gaining more and more rights. They feel that it is increasingly difficult to "charge" the inmate (or make the charge last), concerning an internal situation such as verbal abuse, physical abuse, disobeying orders, etc. It is felt that "management" does not appear that supportive of correctional officers. Those inmates that are charged are not given sufficient punishment, which has resulted in a feeling that some officers (both male and female) have of "why bother" to charge an inmate for an infraction. This is

especially relevant to those inmates who are already in segregation or are serving life sentences, and who do not seem to care what happens to them.

Some female officers have developed a good rapport or working relationship with inmates. Many of these women are older and more mature, and therefore find that the inmates enjoy talking with them. Or they are those women who are already interested in case management philosophies. Those correctional officers who work in a living unit and see the same inmates every working day are more apt to develop a good working relationship with inmates. They tend to allow themselves to interact, be casual when necessary, and offer helpful direction when required (some can also do this without expressly "liking" the inmate). The inmates in a living unit are also less likely to verbally abuse or sexually flaunt themselves at these female officers since they will be seeing them again soon. This is in contrast to the uniformed correctional officers who rotate around so many duties that relationships are more difficult to develop. Living unit teams can allow themselves a great deal of flexibility. One living unit will often be "run" in a much more relaxed and informal manner than the next in the same institution, depending on the correctional officers working there, and the type of relationship developed amongst each other and the inmates in that unit. Even within the team concept of the living unit, there are allowances for personal preferences when it comes to the type of correctional officer

role one would like to engage in. That is, one member of the two-person team may be more security minded and prefer to maintain those aspects, while the other member may be more case management oriented and will prefer to spend more time interacting and talking with inmates. Still, because of the size of the living unit (some have up to one hundred and twenty inmates), and with only two officers on average working per shift, there is little time possible that can be spent in direct contact with inmates or their concerns.

Many female correctional officers prefer the "no nonsense" type of approach. They will ensure that the inmates know the limits of toleration, and what will or will not be allowed beyond a certain limit. Beyond these limits, the inmate will be "charged" or reprimanded. If inmates are continually verbally abusive, non-cooperative, or sexually abusive, officers will use various methods to cope. These include charging the inmate, disregarding him, denying later requests or privileges, etc. Many believe that it is important to take control right from the beginning, especially for a female, to ensure that inmates know levels of toleration and acceptability.

Various coping and interactive skills are noted by female correctional officers. These include the use of humor in their interactions, talking and counselling, and a generally less aggressive approach. Most of the officers realize their size and lack of strength makes them vulnerable, and therefore they must use communication and

other methods to handle a situation. It is extremely important that a female correctional officer knows how or when to react or not to react, since male inmates are always seeking attention or reaction from the women. The wrong move, an over-reaction, or a verbal outburst from a woman will cause her more problems. For example, the next day after everyone in the cell block has heard, she will be faced with additional verbal abuse, harassment, and "cat-calls" from inmates, and even from male co-workers. This is part of the learning experience which occurs when a naive or young female begins working as a correctional officer. Even the experienced officer cannot foresee a situation that calls for personal "restraint". One example given was an incident where an inmate threw some urine in the face of a female officer as she came close to his cell. She at first thought it was water, but when the stinging sensation began in her eyes, she realized it was urine. She said that she was not going to give him the satisfaction of causing her to run out, so she said nothing and went about the rest of the cell count without reacting. Only when she was finished her job did she leave the area to clean up.

Verbal shouting matches are often the result when things out of the ordinary or out of regular routine are done, since most inmates become very routinized over time in the prison. If a correctional officer has transferred from another institution where methods are slightly different, she may find she needs additional time to re-accustom herself to that particular institution.

Some inmates will try talking to a female officer in order to gain information, or gain trust that could be misused later. Although talking to "guards" is not something inmates tend to do, they will often do it for their own motives or to gain some kind of helpful information. Females have to be especially vigilant, since they are well aware of all the potential problems that have been raised in such female-male relationships. Female officers also admit that they feel male workers probably tend to use a more aggressive and confrontive approach in a problem situation, whereas females must use counselling or other verbal skills to compensate for lack of size and strength. Many females also feel that inmates will naturally tend to avoid physical confrontations with females anyway, since this is not considered to be "macho" in the eyes of other inmates. Most females feel they could do an adequate job in a situation that called for an inmate restraint or removal from one cell to another, since these situations are handled by a group of officers, not merely by one or two officers. Yet they often feel they are not given the opportunity due to the male workers' paternalistic handling of such situations. Many also admit they do not have the strength. Others admit to a dislike of ever having to be involved in such a situation (where physical force is necessary), but many also want it known that they intend to "get involved" wherever and whenever necessary. Female officers also point to the fact that many male correctional officers are small, or are in no

shape because of being overweight or because they are elderly, to physically restrain an inmate by themselves either. Unless it is an emergency, it is not felt that one officer would get involved in such a situation anyway.

The female correctional officers that this researcher spoke to, have for the most part, not been involved in any real physical altercations. This is due to the lack of a problem situation, due to male officers taking over the situation and having the female stay at the control post, or due to being able to "talk down" a situation before it becomes necessary for force. One officer did mention that she received a "fat lip" once, but for the most part no real problem situations were mentioned. This is not to say there is no feeling of potential danger, and even helplessness, considering events which have occurred over time in various institutions. The threat of danger is always there, but most of the female officers have said they cannot dwell on those aspects very long or they would not be able to function on the job. They recognize the need to be wary, alert, vigilant, suspicious, and so on. There is also the use of various internally arranged "signals" to their partners on shift to let them know of a problem, or if they feel they are in danger. Keys also, can be handled in such a way that they could be used as weapons if need be.

It was also mentioned that many inmates create a problem for female officers because of the way that female correctional officers are seen - that is, women appear to be

"sluts" or "lesbians" if they insist on working in all-male prisons. The feeling by these inmates is that there must be something wrong with these women or they would not be working in that kind of environment. Other observations include the feeling by the women that older inmates appear to like and accept female officers more easily than younger inmates, who do not want women to have the power/authority over them. Older and more mature female officers also seem to be accepted more easily by inmates, including the young ones. Older inmates also have the overall feeling that conditions in institutions have improved over the years, and the addition of female guards is part of this.

Many correctional officers feel that inmates know everything about what happens around the institution. It is especially frightening to realize they know very "personal" things about the officers, such as when a woman has had a small hair trim, when she is pregnant (even before others know), what she has brought into the institution with her that day, and even if she has her menstrual period. This is very unnerving especially since inmates will question and comment, and will continually be looking for a reaction or for information they can use. Even very subtle things are taken note of, since the inmates do have the time to watch and listen to their advantage. Inmates have also been known to warn certain female officers of potential trouble or danger directed at that particular officer. This is however done in a covert and incomplete manner, so as not to portray

the inmate as a "rat" or "guard lover". It may be done by simply whispering a few words as the inmate walks by an officer, and if the warning is missed, then it's too bad. One female officer told the researcher that one of the problems that correctional officers face is that they are not allowed access to inmate files, unless under exceptional circumstances. Therefore they do not know much about the inmate, including medical history, social history, what his past offenses have been, etc. Their information is supplied by what they read in the media or hear through the "grapevine". According to her, this makes it difficult to work with an inmate, especially if there are certain psychological or medical problems apparent. If the inmate has a particular problem, such as suicidal tendencies, the consulting doctor or psychologist is supposed to let the correctional staff know, however this is not always done. Even those inmates who are characterized as having a "communicable disease" have their files kept confidential.

Concerning the privacy issue, many female officers feel that inmates use this as an excuse, and that there really is not the problem that some inmates portray. None of the women this researcher spoke to thought it was much of a concern, and said that they really were not interested in finding men in the showers or on the toilet, or in any undressed state. For the most part, many of these problems are seen as the complaints and irrational projections that a very few inmates have made to the media or to the courts. If

there is a problem, it is most often interpreted as the inmate's. It is the male inmate that engages in sexual flaunting, sexual comments, overt masturbation, and anything else in order to get the attention of, or reaction from, female correctional officers.

In some institutions, the structure of the cell (whether it has a wooden door, or a grille front), and the type of institution (whether it is maximum multi-level, or living unit, or low security) indicate whether there may be problems concerned with inmate privacy. In some cells, the toilet is more visible than in other cells, and some institutions have not fully implemented a satisfactory modesty barrier system. Women claim that they do not intend to watch anyone while he is on the toilet, and if doing a "body count" will only be interested in seeing if there is a "live body" in the cell. One female officer told the researcher that although toilet barriers are provided for inmates in her institution, many rarely use them for the designated purpose. Also, many inmates abuse their use by not placing them where they should be. Because all the showering areas have curtains, this is not so much of a problem area. Women do not supervise the showering areas, and the male inmates are expected to keep themselves covered going to and from the shower. Some may "accidentally" allow a towel to slip off, while passing a female officer however. Inmates are also expected to keep their "private parts" covered while lounging or sleeping in their beds, although

this is often not done, simply because of the fact there are females on duty and the men want to be seen. Some men who have had sexual problems in the community will also continue to exhibit these while incarcerated, and will become sexually excited when women are on duty.

Some female correctional officers prefer not to get involved in any hassles which involve issues of privacy. They may have informal arrangements with their male working partner so that problems do not occur. Although women are often reminded by male co-workers that job descriptions are the same, that head counts and unscheduled "winds" through an institution are a female officer's responsibility as well, some women feel better in having a male do certain unscheduled checks through a cell block or living unit. Then there are those who may feel like one female officer, who told the researcher that she did not care about the inmates' rights (such as privacy) since they did not particularly care about their victims' rights.

Because of the Federal Court decision involving the inmate Conway, and the Collin's Bay Institution (as recalled in Chapter Four), the institution now uses an informational board that specifies that a female officer is working that shift, in that cell block. For some inmates this is an announcement to regulate their toilet and showering habits. For others it is an invitation to display themselves in a sexual manner when that female does her rounds through the cell block. This announcement has also been referred to by

one female officer as an excuse for inmates to "plan" something, perhaps feeling a woman is more vulnerable or the security may be more casual. This officer also felt such a sign takes away from the equality that is supposed to exist between male and female officers.

It is felt by living unit officers that they do not experience the same problem of men exposing themselves, or men masturbating while they walk by the cell. This is because living unit officers work only in that unit, and the inmate knows he will be seeing that female officer again. However, the overnight correctional officer is a uniformed custody officer who is not very well known to the inmate, and there is no real relationship built up. Therefore, these women will get the problems more often, and they will occur when the periodic cell checks are made (the men are all locked in their cells for the night). In an institution which does not have a living unit, and where all officers (whether they work in direct contact with inmates or whether on tower duty) wear uniforms, the problem of sexual flaunting and flashing varies. It sometimes depends on where the inmate and officer are; other times it depends on the kind of officer she is - that is, whether she is young, petite, attractive, new on the job, etc. Some women have said that some inmates will wait specifically for that officer to be on duty in order to masturbate. Others will masturbate or "flash" for particular women (they may have a "crush" on them), and some will exhibit sexual behaviors for any female

officer on duty. Sometimes only a few men in a cell block will engage in this behavior; other times, especially at night after all are locked in their cells, almost the entire cell block will begin sexual behaviors. Some women have also said that it has not been a problem for them, and incidents are rare.

For some female correctional officers, this sexual flaunting behavior is difficult to get used to, but the women realize it does appear to be part of the job. They have also realized that it is very crucial as to how one acts or reacts to such behavior. It depends greatly on the type of correctional officer the woman is, it depends on the situation, and it also depends on the kind of inmate one is dealing with. Some women will use various strategies that include: the use of humor - laughing at him, or telling him to "put it away", or reminding him they've seen baby boys before; sternly staring him in the eyes and telling him the behavior is not appreciated, wanted, or tolerated; and ignoring him or showing no reaction at all. There is also the use of various tactics to get a certain individual or group on a cell block to stop these behaviors. This includes shutting off the electricity to one or a group of cells, thereby getting the offender to ask for the "power" to be turned back on, or letting peer pressure get the offender to stop the behavior. Still other tactics include "charging" the individual in the internal charging system of the institution, for which he may receive loss of privileges or a

stay in "the hole". One very young female correctional officer explained that she knows that when she is on duty, almost the entire cell block is masturbating. During late night cell counts, she will shine the flashlight right in the inmates' faces to avoid seeing what they are doing. The cell count is done quickly, and the officer hurriedly returns to the post.

The type of reaction is very important in that whatever method is used must not cause a greater problem the next time that officer faces the inmates. It is felt that for the most part, the inmates are trying to obtain some kind of reaction, and often want to see just how much they can do or get away with before some kind of action is taken. The type of reaction that a female offers is very often a signal to the inmates about her authority, her sense of vulnerability, and her sense of security in the job. This pertains to all other matters as well, and is not limited to a reaction to sexual exhibitionism. Inmates have also questioned women officers as to their physical abilities, their willingness to shoot if an inmate were to "climb the wall", how the women feel about certain things, and general capabilities concerning the job. This goes along with the informational and gossip grapevine within the institution, where all knowledge that an inmate has can be advantageous to him or to others. There are a great number of inmates in institutions who still entertain notions of escape, and knowing which officer has a tendency to occasionally sleep while on "tower" duty is very helpful.

As mentioned earlier, the sexual flaunting may be more difficult for some women to cope with than for others. Some inexperienced or young women officers find it very difficult to react properly (to not blush or show any embarrassment), and this could affect how they view the job. Some have found that some of the "unpleasant" habits and actions of male inmates have even produced a changed outlook on men in general.

Concerning the media attention that inmates have received regarding the use of women as correctional officers in all-male institutions, the female officers would like it to be known that they are not as bad as the press seems to portray them. The media has often published various letters, and have written their own articles that seem to portray female correctional officers as causing sexual frustration in inmates, and contributing to their lack of privacy. The media cites examples of what women wear (tight uniforms, suggestive clothing), and say that women are "sneaking" up on inmates while they are on the toilet. These articles also say that women seem to enjoy giving men frisk searches, and that this is done in a humiliating way to the men. The female correctional officers feel these allegations are one-sided and that the problem is simply not there, as explained by the media. The women feel that they cannot defend themselves adequately due to Correctional Service of Canada policies, and that public sympathy always seems to lie with the inmate. One correctional officer mentioned she felt

especially betrayed after a letter to the editor appeared by a certain inmate whom she had previously helped. Apparently he had collapsed and wanted to vomit, and she helped him before he fell down, and aided him while male correctional officers were ignoring the situation. Overall, none of the female officers were very impressed with the Maclean's article "When Women do Men's Work" (Amiel, 1987). They did not think it was a fair article, that they do not consider themselves suggestive or "teasing" in their relations with the male inmates. It is also felt by the officers that only a small number of inmates feel this way, and that they will seek attention any way they can, especially through the media.

Some correctional officers expressed the notion that the prison environment is extremely depressing, and that it is very hostile and depressing for inmates as well. Several women also mentioned that they feel the prison environment has improved because of the addition of female officers. They feel that male inmates' demeanor and dress has improved, and that various social skills are being used (or learned) because of the presence of women. They also feel that the majority of inmates do not mind, and even enjoy, having women there.

G. Female Correctional Officers Comment on Male Co-Workers

For the most part, female correctional officers feel that male officers have more or less accepted them, however

many feel that deep-seated negative feelings and resentment do still exist, and that these are not always so apparent. As well as the feeling they are now accepted by male co-workers, the majority also felt that men did not really want them there (in the institution) originally, and that many still do not want them there. Many of the women's husbands or boyfriends do not particularly want them working in such an environment either. Some women have said they therefore avoid discussion about their job when they come home from work. Some officers have also said that at the end of the day, a female officer is more apt to be upset with a male co-worker than with the inmates.

According to some of the female officers, there appears to be a traditional view of what a woman is, what a "prison" is, and how a prison should be guarded. Women, for many traditionalists, do not fit into the role that men think of when defining what a correctional officer is. Men realize that many of the inmates in their care are in an institution for hurting a female. For them it does not make sense that a female should subject herself to potential harm or danger, which is inherent in the job. Men see the prison environment as depressing, hostile, and potentially dangerous. Therefore they do not want to see women in this situation. Men are protective of women - some females think this is "natural" for men, while others think it is rather paternalistic and does not allow the female officers to do their job on an equal basis with the men. Either way it poses problems,

because it leaves little room for women to react in a troublesome situation. On the one hand, the woman is to function the same as a male correctional officer. Yet whenever there is a "problem" that requires physical force, more often than not the woman is asked to stay at the post while men handle the situation. This notion was expressed by several women, who also said that it was hard to prove that they could do the job if they are not given the opportunity. Women also admit that some of their own ranks have perpetuated this problem, especially some of the young and petite recruits who seem all too happy to let the men "protect" and do things for them. The women feel that this gives the rest of the female correctional officers a bad name, and makes them look "weak" when in fact they function very well at what they do.

It is felt by the female correctional officers that many females (especially newer recruits) are too meek or afraid to speak up for themselves. Therefore they will allow certain situations to develop or get out of control, and then not be able to change it. It is also felt that very often if things go wrong, it is blamed on the person being a woman. It is also true that some job assignments require a female officer to be relieved, for example during a strip search, or for escort duty. This can also cause a delay in job functioning, or an immediate negative reaction from a male co-worker.

Some women are not aggressive and do not project a very "authoritative" demeanor which may cause additional worry on the part of the male officers. Male officers are also conscious of "keeping the lid on" the institution, and if they see women as being "weak", it heightens their level of frustration and anxiety. Many of the women realize that their physical size and strength does not compare to that of men, however they feel their handling and intervention skills more than make up for a perceived lack there. The women also understand that very seldom does any one guard ever physically tangle with an inmate - several persons are used in a situation where an inmate is forcibly removed or restrained. Women feel very often that male correctional officers use aggression and physical strength to handle a situation, where the women will in fact use more communicative skills. One woman also mentioned that any guard, male or female, will tend to use other methods before resorting to physical force. The fact that many male correctional officers are out of shape and cannot do "physical stuff" was also pointed out to the researcher.

Several female officers mentioned that there appears to be a time period when a new female begins her work as a correctional officer, where she encounters more "hassles" and irritating behavior from the male officers. These are in the form of sexual advances, sexual innuendo, "silly" games, and "tests". This goes on until everyone knows where the new officer "stands", or until she comes to be accepted. New

women officers are often made to look silly (especially the very young and naive ones), put through various "tests" to prove her worth, asked out on dates, etc. From the beginning, women work harder, trying to prove themselves, and also trying to "fit in". Sometimes this causes extra strain, especially when a new female correctional officer wants to become "one of the guys" and finds herself going out to drink with the men after work. Or she may take on their slang, begin to act "tough", and may present herself in a severe and less than feminine way. Or the opposite may occur, where the new female officer takes on the "helpless" role and allows herself to be the object of flirtatious or attentive behavior by the male officers. Both of these scenarios very often lead to gossip, which is all too often present within the correctional facility (similar to any organizational structure where men and women work closely together).

One female correctional officer said that what helped her when she first entered the institution as an officer was to observe, learn through experience, and keep her mouth shut. She realized that although she had a good educational background (in criminology), that this meant very little here, and that perhaps her male co-workers would seem intimidated by her for this reason. She did not want to present herself in an all-knowing or threatening way, and therefore allowed herself to gain entry into the role in a gradual way. She also felt that even though she knows that many males do not want women in this role, she respects their

right to that opinion. She also believes there are many of the "old school" male guards left, who are reluctant and resistant to change traditional methods or views. However she feels women must continue to become confident in themselves despite this.

Many women did say that they felt they often had to work harder to be accepted. Some realized that the men were not working as hard and therefore they had to adjust their habits. Some women felt that if women are seen doing the same work as men (that is, being correctional officers), then this diminishes the importance of a job that traditionally only men did. This very often frightens men. Many men also still see women in a nurturing/caring role and feel that women should be the attentive ones when an inmate is sick; it has been said that men may ignore such a situation and "expect" a woman to handle it.

In terms of handling "difficult" co-workers or ones that "hassle" you, women officers have said that one comes to learn who these men are, and one accepts them for that. Some female officers also saw other female officers as bringing on a lot of the problems themselves, especially if the women wear inappropriate clothing, wear excessive make-up, use perfume, or allow men to do their work for them.

Many female correctional officers have said that they have developed a good working relationship with a male co-worker, even though they feel this co-worker really does not agree with women being there. In a living unit concept,

very often a male worker and a female worker are paired together and will work together for a very long period of time. These partners have developed good working relationships based on how each one likes to do the job. One may be particularly security minded and prefers the traditional "guarding" role, while the other may enjoy more interaction with inmates. These same partners also must have a good rapport, because they rely on each other for support and help. They have built-in signals and phrases that are used to summon assistance or inform of a particular situation.

Most women thought that it is easier to become accepted by male co-workers today, than it was several years ago, since so much has changed. However several also thought that some of their male counterparts were upset now over the advancements that many female officers are making in the "level" system. Several women at the CX-1 (Correctional Officer, One) or the CX-2 level have gone through the Correctional Service of Canada competition, and have passed a rigorous oral and written examination in order to advance beyond the entry level, to become CX-3s or CX-4s. This has sparked some debate over how much influence Affirmative Action may have had in wanting women to "move up the ladder". Those men who have failed to move up are concerned over this. The women who have passed to the next level are saying it is their work, motivation, and hard studying of Correctional Service of Canada policies that has caused their movement up.

(It is interesting to note also, that this movement up the level system is not easy. Many try, but fail the examinations. Many never move up, or even attempt the move. Some find the examinations too difficult, and others are not motivated enough to attempt the move.) Those that do reach the next level often find a whole new set of problems with male co-workers, as now these women are beginning to become "supervisors" and hold more responsibilities and authority.

Some female correctional officers are more outspoken over problems with male co-workers. They cite examples of sexual harassment, discrimination in job assignments (by male supervisors), strained relationships, women having to work harder to be accepted, a lack of support or respect from male officers, males embarrassing women on purpose in front of inmates or other male officers, and males being given preferential treatment. These women also feel that female correctional officers should communicate more freely with each other, should offer more support, and should not be afraid to "rock the boat" to get what they need for job survival. These women also say that men have "accepted" them, but that does not mean there are no problems.

The women who have been pregnant on the job have also said that during their pregnancy, they have to gauge both their own effectiveness on the job, and how their male co-workers feel about the pregnancy. Although they can stay on the job to their eighth month, they must also consider how their pregnancy will affect their functioning. Male

co-workers also become worried if they have to rely on a female officer that is pregnant. Therefore, most female officers will seek re-assignment to different duties, such as clerking, doing the mail, supervising visiting areas, etc. Others will leave the job early, or will seek schedule changes with other officers to avoid the more potentially hazardous job posts. Some female officers are also not happy with the lack of proper maternity guidelines, and inadequate maternity clothing.

Overall, many felt that they did not really have a problem with male co-workers, and that female correctional officers have now been accepted. Some felt that the researcher should also be speaking with male correctional officers to get their point of view. Unfortunately this could not be done within the research parameters at this time. Most women also felt that they were indeed doing the same work as men, and felt that they were doing their work well (that they had proved they could "pull their weight"). The women also felt that they are doing the job for similar reasons that men are, in that they have families to support and bills to pay as well, and that both enjoy the government's benefits package.

H. Reactions From Some Male Inmates

During the course of the research, the predominant focus was gaining information and personal impressions from female correctional officers. However there was also

valuable information that naturally emanated from the researcher's interaction with the project. The following information is the result of personally conducted conversations with six male inmates (and one ex-inmate). The inmates were incarcerated in one of the institutions the researcher visited.

The inmates seemed divided on the issue of having female correctional officers in their midst. Some were not particularly concerned one way or the other, and said that this was the case with many of the other inmates as well. One inmate, who is approximately in his early 30's, said a female officer is "just another guard". He says he and others he knows, are not that bothered by their presence and they do not mind them. Two younger inmates (approximately twenty-two years old and twenty-five years old) however, were more vocal about their feelings. Neither of them liked having females in the institution. Their main concern was lack of privacy, and personal intrusion by the frisking that is routinely done. The younger of the two said he was embarrassed for his father, who has been subjected to "pat down" searches by female guards on his visits to the institution. He also claims that he has no barrier around the toilet in his cell because there is no room for one. He says that the way the doors in his cell block are (solid wooden, with viewing windows), the inmates cannot tell if a guard is coming. He says he may be on the toilet at that particular time and therefore it is embarrassing for him.

This young inmate also said he did not like the way some female officers woke him up, in that they would "shake" him. He claimed this was dangerous because of the way a person could react being suddenly awakened and not knowing who or what it was. He said he could easily lash out at this person because of this. The inmate said that in order to ease the embarrassment of a frisk search, he may often react by "jumping", or commenting when the female touches him (ie, that he's getting a "thrill").

The other young inmate says it just does not feel right that females are there. He says that if he were a female inmate, he would not want a male looking at him either. He says that although showers have curtains, the cells do not have barriers around toilets. He also recalled an incident one day where he had just returned from having a shower. He had returned to his cell, and was naked, but was going to lie down on his bed. All of a sudden a female guard walked by, saw him standing there, and let out a scream. He grabbed a towel, but both of them were embarrassed. Later he said he was hassled by other guards wanting to know what he had done or said to the female that made her scream. This inmate was attempting to explain to the researcher that having female officers was problematic in a "sexual" way, however he had difficulty expressing exactly what he meant. In a more positive note, he did say that he liked how females talked to him, in a calmer, relaxed, and non-threatening way. The male guards are seen as being more authoritative and

"stuck up". He says he has often been awakened quite gently by female guards, compared to males who are abrupt and more aggressive. Perhaps the way a female officer approaches a male inmate is determined in part by the size and "look" of the male inmate. The latter of the aforementioned young inmates was a "well built", muscular, large, and tattooed young man, although he appeared to be rather soft-spoken and amiable with the researcher. This is in contrast to the other young inmate, that was very "boyish" looking, not very muscular or tall, who presented the appearance more of a young teenager than an inmate doing a life sentence.

Another inmate says that the institution now has a sign that indicates whether a female officer is on duty. In a facetious way, he said that that is the day he does not go to the shower room. The youngest inmate there, the one referred to earlier, said that this sign does not mean much anyway, nor is it accurate.

One older inmate, approximately 60'ish, said that he does not like female officers. He was however not too concerned about discussing the issue, other than to say that he had seen enough things that would "shock" the researcher. Another older inmate, approximately 50'ish, says he does not mind females, but he did not care to elaborate.

One ex-inmate, who has spent considerable time in prisons, thinks it is alright for female correctional officers to work in male institutions. He did however feel that maximum security institutions were not the place for

them. He says that he believes most inmates think female officers are "okay", except for those inmates who are "psycho-sexually" disorganized - these would get too aroused or upset. He thinks that for an inmate, it is better to look at a female officer than never to be able to see a female. He also finds that women have a "softer" approach. He says that privacy is the big concern with inmates, but if it is handled appropriately, it will be alright. He says that women may accidentally catch the inmate masturbating (he says that male inmates spend a lot of time daydreaming and fantasizing to pass the time away), but the women also know that this is natural for these men. Therefore, he says that most women will not react, unless the act is specifically directed at the woman.

I. Conclusion

This chapter has presented a discussion of the institutional environment within which the female correctional officers that the researcher interviewed work. It has also provided the summaries of personal reflections of the twenty female officers that were interviewed, concerning various aspects of their occupation. Some personal information was also received from some inmates and an ex-inmate, and these were presented for supplementary discussion.

Prison is considered a depressive environment, not only for inmates but for the workers as well. Not only does

one have potential danger at all time, which can be directed at a correctional officer or an inmate, but there are additional frustrations and strain that seem to be inherent in the job. The working atmosphere is hostile and depressive. According to the female correctional officers, it causes many workers to escape through the use of drugs and alcohol, or it causes emotional problems. Several women this researcher spoke with have found murdered inmates, or inmates who have committed suicide. Imagine the traumatic situation of finding an inmate hanging by a shoelace from the bars in his cell, and then trying to summon aid without "waking" the rest of the inmate population in the cell block. This kind of situation appears to be more traumatic and stressful than the potential of being involved in a physical altercation. And considering that most cell checks or institutional rounds are made by only one officer at a time, the constant vigilance and readiness for attack or for finding a "problem" must be ever-present. One female correctional officer has said that she feels the prison atmosphere is so depressing, that she would rather be dead than live in there for any length of time.

Many female officers felt that the depressive nature of the environment they work in really changes the person (the officer), in that they begin to be suspicious and mistrusting outside the institutional walls as well. Strangers are not looked at the same way, the security aspect is ever-present, and even ordinary men are viewed differently

by some female officers (because of the experience in dealing with some types of men in the institution). Some female correctional officers find great difficulty in keeping some of their "outside" friends who have sympathy for the plight of inmates. These people do not "know" the inmates like the officer does. This presents a problem for the correctional officer, in how should she deal with her friends, how much can she even tell them of what goes on in prison, and how much does she even want to talk about. Friends and family often also do not understand why a woman would want to be a correctional officer (especially in an all-male prison), and the woman at times feels like everyone thinks there is something wrong with her for being a correctional officer.

Because of the institutional experience, a female officer may also react a little differently to things that occur outside of the institution. For example, if an inmate is continually threatening to commit suicide in order to get what he wants in prison, the officer may finally have heard it that often that she feels like telling him to "do it". Because of this kind of experience, a suicide that is discussed in the community may not seem so important or out of the ordinary. Family and friends may not get the expected reaction from the female officer. The job often gives one a very cynical and pessimistic outlook. One can become very cold and detached. Many would like to go on to a different job simply because they realize this is what occurs to, most, if not all, people working there. That is why many have set

indefinite deadlines on just how long they think they can stay at doing the work.

The potential danger is also always in mind, however cannot be dwelled on or the work would be affected. One remains cognizant of it and cautious on the job. Danger is something that not many want to really think about in great detail. One wants to feel safe, and if one dwells too much on the bad things at work, then the good aspects are destroyed.

Many new recruits, especially the very young girls (those aged nineteen, twenty, twenty-one) have to learn to "grow up" quickly. They are faced with so many new things, many of them very unpleasant realities of the work. If they do not adjust to the demands and stresses, they will not make it. Many of the experienced female correctional officers were worried about what appears to them to be the introduction of more and more young, small, and naive "girls" (some are as young as eighteen when they do a College practicum at an institution). It is claimed that many of these girls do not seem to be very strong (mentally or physically), they are young and therefore quite immature, and they can easily be "conned" because they are naive and inexperienced. Not only do the female correctional officers fear for the safety of these new recruits, but also for the image that they give to male workers and male inmates. There are also female correctional officers who are not "new", but who cannot deal with many of the realities of the job either.

Many also do not have the mental strength to face a potentially dangerous situation, such as facing the possibility of having to shoot an escaping inmate with an AR-15 rifle. The process used to recruit and screen potential female recruits is also at question, in that is the right "type" of person being recruited, and is the hiring board using "common sense"? Some correctional officers recalled that the job of a correctional officer was displayed to them in a way that did not address the realities of the situation. The job was projected as entailing challenge, opportunity to travel, helping people, was very interesting, had a good package of salary and benefits, that the government was specifically looking for women, and that women had an excellent opportunity for advancement, etc. It is felt by the women that it takes a special kind of person to stay, to deal with the stresses and depressive work, and that many of the new recruits have problems because they are too young, naive, and perhaps not entirely suited to this type of career.

Many female correctional officers feel less than adequate support and direction from management: management does not support their concerns enough, does not support some of the internal "charges" made by officers (male and female), does not address specific female needs, and there is inadequate communication about new or proposed changes. The way various incidents which occur in some institutions are handled is also an area where some female officers feel a

lack of communication exists. There are also those women that say there have been several incidents across Canada, such as rapes and assaults, and that most of these are "hushed up" so no one really knows about them. There is not enough communication that lets correctional officers know of potentially dangerous inmates or situations. Also, during the past year Correctional Service of Canada has been working on the new "Unit Management" program, which has had a few officers worried. This is because they do not know enough about it, or how it will affect their job security or classification.

Another worry that some female correctional officers have is the effect of the Federal Court judgement of June 1987 (discussed in Chapter Four), in which the Judge gave support to male inmate privacy in their living quarters. The judgement also said that male inmates were discriminated against if female inmates are not subjected to male correctional officers searching them or working in their living quarters. This also has people worried that the entire job description of a female correctional officer may be altered, to restrict them to various duties and take away the equality that females now share with male officers. In upholding the Royal Canadian Mounted Police policy of same-sex guarding in lock-ups, the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal has also come out in favor of inmate privacy concerns. Although this example was not mentioned by the women, it is nonetheless a precedent setting case which will

undoubtedly be used at some time in the future by prison rights activists to restrict the use of female correctional officers in all-male institutions.

Female correctional officers see themselves as doing the job as well (or better in many instances) as male officers. They also feel they often have to try harder and work harder at some things in order to be accepted by the men. How a woman handles herself on the job, and the role she takes, is a great factor in how she will be accepted by her co-workers, both male and female alike. The women are concerned with their image in the public's eye, and in the media's eye. They would like to be able to defend themselves, or explain things, but cannot do so adequately (while inmates seem to be able to say what they like without any substantiation). Women feel they do a good job, are effective, and are professional. They want to avoid being "different" from male correctional officers, and would like to be respected and accepted since they feel they have proven they can do the job.

What the Canadian female correctional officer interviews have produced is supported by previously done research and studies concerning female correctional officers in male institutions. In Zimmer's research (1982) she also discusses the "old guard" versus "new guard" mentality; the mistakes made being attributed to being a woman; the sexual misconduct by male inmates; discrimination in job assignments by supervisors; and male co-worker opposition and harassment.

Zimmer (1982) also discusses the various roles that female correctional officers take on in order to adjust to their job, as does Jones (1986). Shawver (1987) and Parisi (1984) also discuss inmate privacy concerns in relation to female correctional officers. Hunter (1986) and Jones (1986) discuss stereotypes and how female correctional officers are tested by peers. Jones (1986) looks at how a female correctional officer is defined by male inmates, in terms of being gay or promiscuous. Petersen (1982) supports the point that male co-workers present more problems to female officers than male inmates. Etheridge, Hale, et al (1984) discuss community attitudes toward female officers, and the difficulty with friends and family. Kissel (1980) spoke about female officers taking a more "indirect approach" than male officers in giving orders, and how most inmates did not feel their privacy was being invaded by females (although some inmates did find it difficult to accept women in positions of authority). Shawver and Dickover also support the idea that female correctional officers "may approach dangerous situations less provocatively and more creatively than many male officers - because they are physically more vulnerable", and that male inmates are "uncomfortable about assaulting a woman officer" (Shawver and Dickover, 1986: 34). In Canada, there has also been concern attached to the type of female that is being recruited to enter men's institutions as correctional officers (Taylor, 1986) and the "over-zealous application of an equal opportunities program" (Solicitor General Canada, 1985c: 12).

These have been but a few examples of how previous research and written material has related to what the Canadian female correctional officers have said during their interviews and discussions.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, the researcher has presented both a ten year overview of female correctional officers in male institutions within the Correctional Service of Canada, and a descriptive, phenomenological examination of twenty female correctional officers in selected federal male institutions in Canada. Information was obtained from literature reviews, statistics, and more importantly from listening to what various female officers have had to say. Over the past ten to twelve years, Canada has seen the movement from a non-existent female correctional officer category to an integration that affects all of Correctional Service of Canada. Initial movement into male institutions was gradual, and various worries and fears were emphasized (perhaps overly so) and addressed. However, from the onset it appeared not so much a concern or problem on the part of the new women recruits, but one of acceptance and understanding on the part of managers, supervisors, male co-workers, and male inmates. The women who first entered the occupational field were obviously motivated and felt the challenge, with little regard to traditions or public opinion. Over the years, it was found that fears were unsubstantiated. Women were not more easily manipulated by male inmates, inmates could learn to accept and "get along with" women in the "guard" role,

women were not becoming easier targets for rape or hostage-taking, women's presence did not detract from security (and that their methods of intervention were often preferred), male co-workers can work with and "get along with" female officers, men were not leaving their jobs because they had to work with women, and women's productivity on the job was no less than anyone else's. Whatever the obstacles along the way, women seemed to have "proven" that they can be valued members of the correctional officer work force.

Today, as in any large bureaucratic organization, problems, concerns, and solutions all come and go depending on the institution, the policies, the managers, government department heads, and politics. The level of acceptance that women have with their male co-workers and with the inmates may fluctuate from time to time, but their presence in the Correctional Service of Canada is now quite established. There are now over 700 female correctional officers in the Correctional Service of Canada, with approximately 632 working in all-male institutions. This latter figure represents approximately 14.9% of all correctional officers that work in male institutions. Whether this would have occurred without some of the government programs, such as Equal Opportunities for Women, Affirmative Action, and special exclusion orders, is perhaps doubtful. It would definitely have taken longer without these programs. There does not appear to be any real "serious" problems that exist

because women have been so thoroughly entrenched throughout the federal system in Canada.

This thesis has however, indicated a number of concerns that have surfaced time and again. The inmate privacy issue, which has been a concern in the United States experience as well as in Canada, still does not appear to be adequately resolved, either within Correctional Service of Canada or in the courts. Another controversy which may create new changes and policies in the Correctional Service of Canada is the discrimination between how female inmates and male inmates are treated. Perhaps it will require close scrutiny by the Supreme Court of Canada to end these controversies, at least in the legal sense, but this is not likely to happen unless there are more decisions at the lower court level. Privacy and discrimination cannot be dismissed as trivial concerns, and therefore will no doubt continue to surface in the federal courts from time to time. These are also controversial issues which often do not lend themselves well to legal rhetoric, but more to emotions, values, sympathies, and biases on the part of the opposing sides. Also, the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, an important document being used more and more in all kinds of criminal and civil court cases in Canada, will undoubtedly continue to provide a base for arguments for opposing viewpoints. Considering that women are being recruited into the correctional officer category at a regular and steady pace now, even into maximum security institutions, the trend will

become increasingly difficult to reverse as the years go by. To Canada's credit, from the beginning the Correctional Service of Canada has tried to put women on an equal basis with men in the Correctional Officer category, with very few restrictions. This is unlike the United States where each state system, as well as the federal system, may differ from time to time. Perhaps for Canadian female correctional officers then, their role is more definite and defined, and the expectations are therefore also more concrete. There should also be no confusion amongst the male officers as to the duties of a female officer, a problem which has been identified in the American system. Male inmates are given a handbook by Correctional Service of Canada, which explains the presence of female officers, and so they too are aware of Canadian institutional life. All of this will not of course limit the problems that arise when females work in a predominately male environment, but over time, the acceptability should become easier and more natural.

Women who have entered other non-traditional job avenues in the past have also had their share of difficulties. Women in law enforcement, at the municipal, provincial, and federal levels were also feared and "fought against" when they were making their initial breakthrough. Yet their numbers have been steadily increasing as well. They have become quite commonplace now, although problems continue to exist for various policewomen. These problems include ones similar to that of the female correctional

officer, one of them being the belief that women do not have the strength for violent confrontations. However, research such as that done by Barbara Raffel Price (1983) has shown that few such situations actually occur. Another problem is one of acceptance - a 1986 survey reported that women were still not accepted as equals in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, that they were resented by many of their male colleagues, and there were negative attitudes leading to discrimination (Ottawa Citizen, 1988).

The kind of debate that involves women in jobs traditionally held by men will continue for as long as there are persons whose value systems are dramatically different. For it does eventually come down to one's value system, and not objective rationale. Objectively, even if it has been shown that women can do the job "as well as" men, this does not mean it has to be done "the same as" men. The ultimate goal can be arrived at in different ways. However, it is still the individual's value system that causes an acceptance or rejection of the woman as a correctional officer. This is not easily changed, even through a demonstration of work that is equally accomplished.

The "prison" environment is depressing in nature, it is hostile and resenting, it is inherently dangerous for both workers and inhabitants, it is full of routine, and it has many stresses and frustrations. Within this, one must understand the personalities of the individuals who choose to work there, be they male or female. Although the job

situation may not be a "preferred" one, the ultimate decision of doing that kind of work really does lie with the motivation and survivalist nature of the correctional officer. Many are functioning quite well in this environment, and have been able to compensate for the overall unpleasantness of the role. Of course, the benefits and salary are said to be a motivating factor by female officers, but the question then is, should they not be well compensated? Correctional officers themselves know that their status is often not considered much above those they "guard". Various press clippings, media accounts, and even scholarly "experts" have stated this. It is true that many do bring a bad reputation on themselves by their actions, however most would like to see the old stereotypical image of the "guard" destroyed. Correctional officers are increasingly seeking "professional" status, which includes a higher level of education, more "in-service" training, better public awareness and relations, improved interaction and case management with inmates, and department standards that scrutinize and evaluate performance. This is seen in the Correctional Service of Canada recruitment brochure, entitled "Career Opportunities for Professionals", in which the correctional staff is described. They strive for professionalism has also been a subject of a recent issue of Let's Talk, where the new "professional association for correctional workers" is described. One of the aims of this new association is "to promote professionalism among

correctional workers" (Correctional Service of Canada, 1988: 3). The "sense" of professionalism, identified as having been lacking, is an objective that is being strived for. This is often referred to as the "old guard" mentality versus the "new guard" mentality. The addition of women into male institutions as correctional officers could also be used as an indication that corrections is headed toward more modernization and normalization of institutions and programs, and rehabilitation and reintegration of inmates.

According to previous research (Zimmer, 1982) as well as to the female officers interviewed, women are not doing the job of a correctional officer for reasons that are different from male officers. Women also have family to support, bills to pay, aspire to make a "good" salary, and seek the security of a good job. This is probably far more important than aspiring to a "career" as a correctional officer. In asking what the salary was, one female correctional officer (who was at the CX-2 level because she worked at a multi-level institution), told the researcher that the "top range" for that level was approximately \$33,000.00 per year. She did say that living unit officers would be making more money, and those at the CX-1 level (those in minimum and medium security institutions) would be making less. Male officers make the same amount of money. Up until last year, many correctional officers were making much more money because of the amount of overtime, which was a regular routine for institutional work. However,

Correctional Service of Canada now has a part-time correctional officer program to take care of overtime concerns, in an effort to reduce its organizational expenditures.

One could say these female correctional officers who work in all-male institutions are quite "ordinary" women, and on the other hand, they are not so ordinary. This is not by any means to diminish the fact that the officers interviewed are feminine, and are "women", but they are also women who play an extraordinary role in our society no less. They are in non-traditional occupations where they are expected to participate on an equal footing with men, and yet are often stigmatized or negatively characterized because they do just that. They appear to be showing society that they can indeed function in a role that has historically and traditionally been a male one. They are accomplishing the task without a great deal of controversy or hostility from the male inmate population. It appears that male co-workers have also come to more or less accept the women. As more and more men enter the field with women already there, this aspect should become easier.

These women must be strong and self assured in their identity. They have too much to cope with, including opposition from the public, opposition from the "old school" male correctional officer, stress and danger that is inherent in the occupation and working environment, and opposition from some of the male inmate population. Yet they must also

remain a "woman" in both the modern and traditional sense - a mother to their children, a wife to their husband, and a daughter to their parents. These women have found murdered inmates, they have found inmates who have committed suicide, and they have been trained to shoot and possibly kill, with rifles, shotguns, and handguns. They face potential danger and aggression every shift they work, as well as routine and boring functions. It is not a job that everyone has the physical or mental stamina for.

It is true that some female officers who were interviewed feel that women have an uncertainty of where or how to fit in, once becoming a correctional officer. The women are placed in stressful situations, work in a depressive environment, and yet because they are female must be careful just how they project themselves and how they will fit into the total organization of things. Some women may go to extreme lengths to make themselves appear severe and less feminine. This may be done so as not to have the inmates feel sexually frustrated, to satisfy the public's image, and also to show their co-workers that they can be a "guard" just like one of the guys. Female correctional officers have after all been told at one time, that women cannot even shake an inmate's hand for fear he will get the wrong idea. Some co-workers may also get the wrong idea if they see such behavior. If a woman uses any make-up, is she compromising her role or security, or is she "frustrating" a male, or is she being normal? And then, how much make-up is too much?

Should her uniform, or clothing be baggy (which may also appear "sexy"), or should it fit snugly? Either way could be argument for inappropriateness. The female officer must also know when and how to react to inmates and co-workers, so as to set limits and toleration, and yet still establish a working relationship. Almost every turn or move can be interpreted as a cause for some negative reaction or comment, and this is not only on the part of the male inmates.

How female recruits enter the system is important, in that age, physical size, maturity, and experience appear to be important factors that concern many of the female officers interviewed. The concerns are whether the appropriate type of person is being recruited, hired, and given a good introduction into what the job is "really" like. There also appears to be a crucial time frame at the onset of the experience during which the female requires support and guidance to allow her to adjust to the realities of the job.

To be sure, there are those who say having women working in all-male institutions is causing more problems than benefits. They say men have the "right" to privacy from the opposite sex, and that male inmates are discriminated against because female inmates are treated differently. It is not only some male inmates who feel this way, as evidenced by the literature review, media attention, and court cases. Again as the media accounts, Human Rights Commission case, and Federal court experience shows, there are prison rights lawyers, some criminologists, and some members of the public

who also share these views. They are not all "traditionalists" in their thinking, as many do believe in women's rights, however they believe that the issue of male privacy is more important. On the other hand, the case is also made for women's right to equal employment, that there are benefits realized from women's integration into male institutions, that the majority of inmates actually approve, and that female correctional officers' functioning in the role has been successful. Perhaps if issues of inmate privacy were more adequately dealt with, there would be even less than the present minimal objection that inmates have to women being in their living quarters. Problems that concern inmate privacy should be adequately addressed by the Correctional Service of Canada so that female correctional officers can continue to do their jobs like they have been. It is felt by many that inmates deserve privacy to perform toilet functions, or privacy from unwarranted searches, from male officer intrusion as well. Security problems are always brought up when talking about putting modesty barriers in each individual cell, or reducing the number of personal searches made on inmates. It is felt by some officials and correctional officers that some inmates could use these barriers to their advantage, such as hiding what they are doing, hiding items, or hiding a suicide attempt. As for searches, correctional officers realize that there are many contraband items that can be brought into the institution or that can be "made", therefore searches are necessary.

Security is also mentioned as a concern when referring to having to "announce" that a female correctional officer is making a "wind" through the cell block, since the purpose of unscheduled checks is to see what is going on. The purpose of the check is therefore often compromised. Because security is of utmost concern in a penitentiary, there are continual debates over what systems work and which do not. Overall, these lead to unresolved and ongoing problems, with the inmates often caught up in the middle.

There are many future research possibilities that this study has generated. In speaking with twenty female correctional officers who work in male institutions, one naturally feels like talking to many more. The original format of questions could very well include more areas of discussion. Future research could certainly accommodate this possibility, as well as research into more specialized areas. These could include a more detailed historical examination of women in corrections in Canada, female officers who work in maximum security institutions (since it has only been the last few years that they have been integrated here), a comparison of living unit officers with custody officers, or a study of provincial female correctional officers working in male institutions.

Because it was suggested to the researcher by a few of the female correctional officers that were interviewed, a similar research study could also be presented to male correctional officers. Their opinions regarding inmate

relationships, working with female correctional officers, ideas on traditional values, and their future aspirations would be an interesting accompaniment to the information provided by the female correctional officers. If male correctional officers are to be fully integrated into the federal Prison for Women in the future, a whole new research area can be developed. One could expect several problems and concerns with "men guarding women". Another indication of this research is that male inmates also need to be heard, since they are one of the principal participants in the criminal justice system. Therefore, further research regarding issues of privacy and discrimination, the acceptability or rejection of female correctional officers, sexuality, and views on "normalization" are indicated, from the inmates' point of view.

Further research areas include the study of new institutional structures that would mitigate some of the depressing and hostile elements of a prison environment. Also, to alleviate concerns over the kind of person being recruited as a correctional officer, there could be research into the possible introduction of a "Pre-Employment Psychological Screening Program", as used in the New York Department of Correctional Services (Malin, Luria, et al, 1987). Finally, as female correctional officers in male institutions are only beginning to become supervisors, their experiences with the "system" and with co-workers will soon produce further interesting research possibilities.

REFERENCES

- Amiel, Barbara (1987) "When Women do Men's Work". Maclean's Magazine 100 (41), 9.
- Bailey, Charles A., ed. (1976) "Women Correctional Officers, Can Their Charm Tame the 'Real World' of Prison Life?" Corrections Digest 7 (7), 1-10.
- Bailey, Charles A., ed. (1983) "Ruling on Female Officers". Corrections Digest 14 (23), 7.
- Bailey, Charles A., ed. (1986) "Female Officers Can 'Pat Down' Inmates, Watch Them Shower". Corrections Digest 17 (1), 10.
- Bowersox, Michael (1981) "Women in Corrections: Competence, Competition, and the Social Responsibility Norm". Criminal Justice and Behavior 8 (4), 491-499.
- Breed, Allen (1981) "Women in Correctional Employment". Women in Corrections. American Correctional Association, Congress of Corrections, Series 1, Number 1, 37-44.
- Campbell, Elaine (1988) "History of Women in Corrections". Kingston: Correctional Service of Canada Staff Training College, 1-5.
- Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women (1979) 10 Years Later. Ottawa: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1979) "Women as Correctional Officers". Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada, 1-5.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1980a) "Female Employees in Security Institutions". Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada, 1-23.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1980b) "Skin-Frisks Okayed for the 'Good Order' of an Institution". Let's Talk 5 (18), 1.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1981a) "Predicting the Correctional World of the Future". Let's Talk 6 (9), 3.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1981b) "First National Induction Course Graduates from New National Staff College in Kingston". Let's Talk 6 (23), 1.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1981c) "The Service's Women Officers are Doing O.K.- Where They're at" Let's Talk 6 (5), 7.

- Correctional Service of Canada (1982) "Affirmative Action in the Federal Government". Let's Talk 7 (5), 1, 4.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1983) "Women in CSC - An Active Presence". Let's Talk 8 (10), 2.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1984a) "Employment of Female Correctional Officers in Male Institutions". Kingston: Correctional Service of Canada Staff College, 1-6.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1984b) "Affirmative Action - What Will it Mean to Staff?". Let's Talk 9 (5), 4.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1984c) "Safety Record, Female CX were '83 Priorities". Let's Talk 9 (2), 5.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1984d) "CSC Anticipated Results Plan for 1984-85". Let's Talk 9 (1), 7-12.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1984e) "A First for Females at Sask. Pen." Let's Talk 9 (12), 4.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1985a) "A.A. is Serious Business". Let's Talk 10 (11), 1
- Correctional Service of Canada (1985b) "Women to Get More CX Jobs". Let's Talk 10 (12), 1-2.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1985c) "Annual Review - 1984, A Year of Real Progress". Let's Talk 10 (10), 2.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1985d) Inmate Rights and Responsibilities. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1986) Basic Facts About Corrections in Canada 1986. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1987a) "Commissioner's Directive # 571". Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada, 1-9.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1987b) "Inmate Privacy/ Female Correctional Officers Federal Court Ruling", June 29, 1987, a memorandum from the Executive Secretary of the Commissioner of Corrections. Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada, 1-4.
- Correctional Service of Canada (1988) "Professional Association for Correctional Workers". Let's Talk 13 (3) 2-3.

- Correctional Service of Canada (1982-1988) "Statistical Reports on the Representation of Target Group Members Within Correctional Service of Canada". Ottawa: Affirmative Action Division of Correctional Service of Canada.
- Correctional Investigator Canada (1979) Annual Report of the Correctional Investigator, 1977-1978. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Correctional Investigator Canada (1983) Annual Report of the Correctional Investigator, 1981-1982. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Correctional Investigator Canada (1984) Annual Report of the Correctional Investigator, 1982-1983. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Correctional Investigator Canada (1985) Annual Report of the Correctional Investigator, 1983-1984. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Correctional Investigator Canada (1986) Annual Report of the Correctional Investigator, 1984-1985. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Correctional Investigator Canada (1987) Annual Report of the Correctional Investigator, 1985-1986. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Coté, J., L. McCarthy, and J. Lavoie (1977) A Study of the Existing Sex Restrictions in the Correctional Group. Ottawa: Public Service Commission of Canada.
- Crouch, Ben M. (1985) "Pandora's Box: Women Guards in Men's Prisons". Journal of Criminal Justice 13, 535-548.
- Curtis, D., A. Graham, L. Kelly, and A. Patterson (1985) Kingston Penitentiary, The First Hundred and Fifty Years. Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada.
- Elliot, Robin M. (1987) "Human Rights Tribunal", decision of February 17, 1987. Ottawa: Canadian Human Rights Commission, 1-118.
- Etheridge, R., C. Hale, and M. Hambrick (1984) "Female Employees in All-Male Correctional Facilities". Federal Probation 48(Dec/84), 54-65.
- Federal Court of Appeal (1988) "Reasons for Judgment". Court File No. A-724-87. Decision rendered June 28, 1988. Ottawa: Federal Court of Canada, 1-25.

- Federal Court of Canada (1987) "Reasons for Judgment". Court File Nos. T-2339-85; T-2613-85; T-2614-85. Decision rendered June 9, 1987. Ottawa: Federal Court of Canada, 1-51.
- Feinman, Clarice (1980) Women in the Criminal Justice System New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Glaser, B. and A. Straus (1967) The Discovery of Grounded Theory. New York: Aldine.
- Graham, Camille (1981) "Women Are Succeeding in Male Institutions". Women in Corrections. American Correctional Association, Congress of Corrections, Series 1, Number 1, 27-36.
- Harm, Nancy J. (1980) "Female Employees in Male Institutions". American Correctional Association, 110th Annual Proceedings of Congress of Corrections. 269-274.
- Horne, Peter (1985) "Female Correction Officers" Federal Probation 49 (3) Sept/85, 46-54.
- Hunter, Susan (1986) "On the Line Working Hard With Dignity". Corrections Today 48 (4), 12-13.
- Ingram, Gilbert L. (1980) "The Role of Women in Male Federal Correctional Institutions". American Correctional Association, 110th Annual Congress of Corrections, 275-281.
- Jacobs, James B. (1981) "The Sexual Integration of the Prison's Guard Force: A Few Comments on Dothard v. Rawlinson". Women in Corrections. American Correctional Association, Congress of Corrections, Series 1, Number 1, 57-74.
- Jones, Susan Tilton (1986) "United, If We Are To Stand". Corrections Today 48 (10), 16, 66.
- Jurik, Nancy (1985) "An Officer and a Lady: Organizational Barriers to Women Working as Correctional Officers in Men's Prisons". Social Problems 32 (4), 375-388.
- Kelly, T. B. (1980) "Employment of Female Correctional Officers in Male Institutions". Ottawa: Correctional Service of Canada, 1-11.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. (1973) Foundations of Behavioral Research New York: Holt, Rinehart.

- Kissel, Peter J. (1980) "A Study in Role Balancing: Female Corrections Officers on the Job". Ph.D.diss. University of Colorado, 1-248.
- MacGuigan, Mark (1977) Report to Parliament. Ottawa: The Sub-Committee on the Penitentiary System in Canada.
- Malin, S., J. Luria, and L. Morgenbesser (1987) "New York State Pre-Employment Psychological Screening Program, Longitudinal Validation Study". Presented at the American Society of Criminology 39th Annual meeting, Montreal, 1-11.
- Matusewitch, Eric (1980) "Equal Opportunity For Female Correctional Officers: A Brief Overview". Corrections Today 42 (6) Nov/Dec., 36-37.
- Morris, Allison (1987) Women, Crime and Criminal Justice. New York: Basil Blackwell Inc.
- Morton, Joann B. (1981) "Women in Correctional Employment: Where Are They Now and Where Are They Headed?". Women in Corrections. American Correctional Association, Congress of Corrections, Series 1, Number 1, 7-16.
- Ottawa Citizen (1987) February 26 (B. Evenson, "Male Inmates Protest Frisks By Females").
- Ottawa Citizen (1988) March 16 (S. Bindman, "No Equity for Women in RCMP, Report Says").
- Ottawa Journal (1979) July 21 (Vancouver UPC, "Prison to use Female Guards").
- Ottawa Journal (1980) July 16 (P. McLaughlin, "Female Guards Gain Acceptance in Region Jail").
- Parisi, Nicolette (1984) "The Female Correctional Officer: Her Progress Toward and Prospects for Equality". Prison Journal 64 (1), 92-109.
- Petersen, Cheryl Bowser (1982) "Doing Time with the Boys: An Analysis of Women Correctional Officers in All-Male Facilities" in Barbara Raffel Price and Natalie Sokoloff (eds.), The Criminal Justice System and Women. New York: Clark Boardman Co. Ltd., 437-460.
- Pollock, Jocelyn (1986) Sex and Supervision - Guarding Male and Female Inmates. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Potter, Joan (1980) "Should Women Guards Work in Prisons for Men?". Corrections Magazine 6 (5), 30-38.

- Price, Barbara Raffel (1983) "Female Roles in Criminal Justice: Offender, Victim, and Law Enforcer". Liaison 9 (1), 24.
- Rockett, Eve (1979) "A Woman's Place is in the Jail". Maclean's Magazine 92 (31), 17-18.
- Schwartz, Howard and Jerry Jacobs (1979) Qualitative Sociology: A Method to the Madness. New York: The Free Press.
- Shawver, Lois (1987) "On the Question of Having Women Guards in Male Prisons". Corrective and Social Psychiatry and Journal of Behavior Technology Methods and Therapy 33 (1), 154-159.
- Shawver, L. and R. Dickover (1986) "Exploding a Myth" Corrections Today 48 (8), 30-34.
- Seiter, Richard (1983) "Women in Corrections - Issues Regarding Full Employment". Correctional Service of Canada Staff College Kingston, 1-14.
- Solicitor General Canada (1979) "Equal is as Equal Does". Liaison 5 (4), 6-10.
- Solicitor General Canada (1980a) "Annual Report 1977-1978". Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.
- Solicitor General Canada (1980b) "Annual Report 1978-1979". Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.
- Solicitor General Canada (1981a) "Annual Report 1979-1980". Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.
- Solicitor General Canada (1981b) "Annual Report 1980-1981". Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.
- Solicitor General Canada (1981c) "Highlights of Federal Initiatives in Criminal Justice: 1966-1980". Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services Canada.
- Solicitor General Canada (1983) "Solicitor General Annual Report 1981-1982". Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Solicitor General Canada (1984) "Solicitor General Annual Report 1982-1983". Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Solicitor General Canada (1985a) "Solicitor General Annual Report 1983-1984". Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.

- Solicitor General Canada (1985b) "Solicitor General Annual Report 1984-1985". Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Solicitor General Canada (1985c) "Women in Corrections". Liaison 11 (10), 9-12.
- Solicitor General Canada (1987) "Solicitor General Annual Report 1985-1986". Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Solicitor General Canada (1988) "Solicitor General Annual Report 1986-1987". Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Stewart, R. (1988) Correctional Investigator, interviewed by telephone March 23.
- Taylor, Brenda E. (1986) "No Place For a Lady? Female Security Staff in Male Prisons". The Correctional Review, 51-53.
- Toronto Globe and Mail (1979) March 19 (P. McCallum, "Women Guards: 'What's a nice girl like you doing in a place like this?'").
- Toronto Globe and Mail (1979) May 16 (D. Grant, "Woman, 23, is Jail's Guard of the Year").
- Toronto Star (1977) November 26 (D. Hopper, "Women Hold Keys to Locked Doors in Men's Prisons").
- Toronto Star (1980) February 7 (Edmonton CP, "Alberta Prisoners Get Women Guards").
- Toronto Star (1986a) February 22 (L. Scotton, "Abuse, Resentment Face Women Prison Guards - Female Guards Face Inmates' Hostility").
- Toronto Star (1986b) November 1 (K. Kenna, "Guarding Inmates Degrading, Boring, Young Woman Finds").
- Toronto Star (1987) February 18 (Kingston CP, "Tribunal Backs RCMP Policy Barring Women Guards for Men").
- Toombs, Thomas G. (1979) "Female Officers in Male Institutions - Inmates' Right to Privacy vs Women's Right to Work". American Correctional Association, 109th Congress on Corrections, 263-266.
- Treasury Board of Canada (1983) "Affirmative Action in the Federal Public Service". Ottawa: Treasury Board of Canada News Release, June 27, 1-19.

- Whig-Standard (Kingston) (1980) February 7 (Edmonton CP, "Women Soon to be Guarding Male Prisoners in Alberta Jails").
- Whig-Standard (Kingston) (1986a) March 1 (B. Large, "Women Guarding Men").
- Whig-Standard (Kingston) (1986b) March 12 (letter to the editor, "Allowing Female Guards at Male Inmates' Strip-searches is Sexist and Unfair").
- Zimmer, Lynn Etta (1982) "Female Guards in Men's Prisons: Creating a Role for Themselves". Phd.Diss. Cornell University, 1-314.
- Zimmer, Lynn Etta (1986) Women Guarding Men. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

APPENDIX A

Correctional Service of Canada Male and Female Representation
By Group, 1982-1988

Correctional Service of Canada Male and Female Representation by Group, October 31, 1982

Group	N.H.Q.			Atlantic			Quebec			Ontario		
	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
CX-COF	1	0	0	279	3	1.0	1072	4	0.37	709	28	3.7
CX-LUF	0	0	0	78	0	0	381	3	0.78	170	5	2.8
CX (COF & LUF) without Prison for Women	1	0	0	357	3	0.83	1453	7	0.48	879	33	3.6
	Prairies			Pacific			Departmental Total					
	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
CX-COF	604	16	2.5	475	17	3.4	3140	68	2.1			
CX-LUF	266	8	2.9	212	19	8.2	1107	35	3.0			
CX (COF & LUF)	870	24	2.6	687	36	4.9	4247	103	2.3			

CX-COF (Correctional Officer - Custody Officer)
 CX-LUF (Correctional Officer - Living Unit Officer)
 N.H.Q. (National Headquarters) - also includes the National Correctional Staff Colleges

Correctional Service of Canada Male and Female Representation by Group, April 30, 1983

Group	N.H.Q.			Atlantic			Quebec			Ontario		
	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
CX-COF	1	0	0	276	3	1.1	1061	4	0.38	710	36	4.8
CX-LUF	0	0	0	75	0	0	378	12	3.1	172	6	3.4
CX (COF & LUF) without Prison for Women	1	0	0	351	3	0.85	1439	16	1.1	882	42	4.5
Prairies												
	M	F	%F	Pacific			Departmental Total					
				M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
CX-COF	600	17	2.7	466	16	3.3	3114	76	2.4			
CX-LUF	269	16	5.6	208	20	8.8	1102	54	4.7			
CX (COF & LUF)	869	33	3.6	674	36	5.0	4216	130	3.0			

N.H.Q. also includes the National Correctional Staff Colleges

(Correctional Service of Canada, 1982-1988)

Correctional Service of Canada Male and Female Representation by Group, April 30, 1984

Group	N.H.Q.			Atlantic			Quebec			Ontario		
	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
CX-COF	17	12	41.3	302	9	2.8	1046	26	2.4	740	62	7.7
without maximum security inst.	17	12	41.3	88	9	9.2	312	25	7.4	336	53	13.6
CX-LUF	1	5	83.3	80	4	4.7	367	26	6.6	170	12	6.5
CX (COF & LUF) without P. for W.	0	0	0	384	13	3.2	1413	52	3.5	910	74	7.5
CX (COF & LUF) without maximums	18	17	48.5	168	4	2.3	624	54	7.9	506	65	11.3
	Prairies											
	M	F	%F	Pacific			Departmental Total			M	F	%F
CX-COF	617	25	3.8	461	50	9.7	3183	184	5.4			
without maximums	237	16	6.3	263	50	15.9	1236	153	11.0			
CX-LUF	278	26	8.5	199	24	10.7	1095	97	7.9			
CX (COF & LUF)	895	51	5.3	660	74	10.0	4262	264	6.1			
CX (COF & LUF) without maximums	450	42	7.9	367	74	16.7	2115	248	10.4			

N.H.Q. includes the National Correctional Staff Colleges

(Correctional Service of Canada, 1982-1988)

Correctional Service of Canada Representation by Group, as of April 30, 1986

Group	N.H.Q.			Atlantic			Quebec			Ontario		
	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
* Total CX-COF	19	13	40.6	295	23	7.2	1046	62	5.6	703	160*	18.5
Total CX-LUF	0	2	100.0	79	6	7.1	338	39	10.3	184	29	13.6
Total COF & LUF	19	15	44.1	374	29	7.2	1384	101	6.8	887	189	17.6
Prairies												
Pacific												
Departmental Total												
	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
Total CX-COF	646	68	9.5	418	89	17.6	3127	415	11.7	418	89	17.6
Total CX-LUF	259	53	17.0	185	26	12.3	1045	155	12.9	185	26	12.3
Total COF & LUF	905	121	11.8	603	115	16.0	4172	570	12.0	603	115	16.0

* Total includes 66 females at Prison for Women, Ontario Region
 N.H.Q. includes the National Correctional Staff Colleges

Correctional Service of Canada Representation by Group, as of April 30, 1987

Group	N.H.Q.			Atlantic			Quebec			Ontario																																																																																															
	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F																																																																																													
* Total CX-COF	0	0	0.0	399	50	11.1	1112	99	8.2	737	163*	18.1																																																																																													
Total CX-LUF	0	0	0.0	78	5	6.0	333	41	11.0	174	33	15.9																																																																																													
Total COF & LUF	0	0	0.0	477	55	10.3	1445	140	8.8	911	196	17.7																																																																																													
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="6">Prairies</th> <th colspan="6">Pacific</th> <th colspan="6">Departmental Total</th> </tr> <tr> <th>M</th> <th>F</th> <th>%F</th> <th>M</th> <th>F</th> <th>%F</th> <th>M</th> <th>F</th> <th>%F</th> <th>M</th> <th>F</th> <th>%F</th> <th>M</th> <th>F</th> <th>%F</th> <th>M</th> <th>F</th> <th>%F</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Total CX-COF</td> <td>651</td> <td>72</td> <td>10.0</td> <td>412</td> <td>102</td> <td>19.8</td> <td>3311</td> <td>486</td> <td>12.8</td> <td>4301</td> <td>637</td> <td>12.9</td> <td>3311</td> <td>486</td> <td>12.8</td> <td>4301</td> <td>637</td> <td>12.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total CX-LUF</td> <td>230</td> <td>48</td> <td>17.3</td> <td>175</td> <td>24</td> <td>12.1</td> <td>990</td> <td>151</td> <td>13.2</td> <td>990</td> <td>151</td> <td>13.2</td> <td>990</td> <td>151</td> <td>13.2</td> <td>990</td> <td>151</td> <td>13.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total COF & LUF</td> <td>881</td> <td>120</td> <td>12.0</td> <td>587</td> <td>126</td> <td>17.7</td> <td>4301</td> <td>637</td> <td>12.9</td> <td>4301</td> <td>637</td> <td>12.9</td> <td>4301</td> <td>637</td> <td>12.9</td> <td>4301</td> <td>637</td> <td>12.9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>													Prairies						Pacific						Departmental Total						M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	Total CX-COF	651	72	10.0	412	102	19.8	3311	486	12.8	4301	637	12.9	3311	486	12.8	4301	637	12.9	Total CX-LUF	230	48	17.3	175	24	12.1	990	151	13.2	990	151	13.2	990	151	13.2	990	151	13.2	Total COF & LUF	881	120	12.0	587	126	17.7	4301	637	12.9	4301	637	12.9	4301	637	12.9	4301	637	12.9
Prairies						Pacific						Departmental Total																																																																																													
M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F																																																																																								
Total CX-COF	651	72	10.0	412	102	19.8	3311	486	12.8	4301	637	12.9	3311	486	12.8	4301	637	12.9																																																																																							
Total CX-LUF	230	48	17.3	175	24	12.1	990	151	13.2	990	151	13.2	990	151	13.2	990	151	13.2																																																																																							
Total COF & LUF	881	120	12.0	587	126	17.7	4301	637	12.9	4301	637	12.9	4301	637	12.9	4301	637	12.9																																																																																							

* Total includes 66 female correctional officers at Prison for Women, Ontario Region

Correctional Service of Canada Representation by Group, as of September 30, 1987

Group	N.H.Q.			Atlantic			Quebec			Ontario		
	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
* Total CX-COF	0	0	0.0	382	47	11.0	1118	114	9.3	755	167*	18.1
** Total CX-LUF	0	0	0.0	79	4	4.8	327	41	11.1	175	32	15.5
Total COF & LUF	0	0	0.0	461	51	10.0	1445	155	9.7	930	199	17.6
Prairies												
	M	F	%F	Pacific								
	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
Total CX-COF	646	80	11.0	414	109	20.8	3315	517	13.5			
Total CX-LUF	218	44	16.8	169	23	12.0	968	144	12.9			
Total COF & LUF	864	124	12.6	583	132	18.5	4283	661	13.4			
Departmental Total												

* Total includes 69 female correctional officers at Prison for Women, Ontario Region

** Total includes 1 female CX-LUF at CCC (Community Correctional Centre) Laferriere, and 1 female CX-LUF at CCC Sherbrooke, both in Quebec Region

Correctional Service of Canada Representation by Group, as of March 31, 1988

Group	N.H.Q.			Atlantic			Quebec			Ontario		
	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
* Total CX-COF	0	0	0.0	370	46	11.1	1130	129	10.2	731	178*	19.6
** Total CX-LUF	0	0	0.0	79	4	4.8	318	40	11.2	173	31	15.2
Total COF & LUF	0	0	0.0	449	50	10.0	1448	169	10.5	904	209	18.8
Prairies												
Pacific												
Departmental Total												
	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
Total CX-COF	634	94	12.9	416	112	21.2	3281	559	14.6	3281	559	14.6
Total CX-LUF	218	45	17.1	173	22	11.3	961	142	12.9	961	142	12.9
Total COF & LUF	852	139	14.0	589	134	18.5	4242	701	14.2	4242	701	14.2

* Total includes 69 female correctional officers at Prison for Women, Ontario Region

** Total includes 1 female CX-LUF at CCC Laferriere, and 1 female CX-LUF at CCC Sherbrooke, both in Quebec Region

APPENDIX B

Correctional Service of Canada Male and Female Representation
By Group Level, 1988

Correctional Service of Canada Representation by Group Level, as of March 31, 1988

Group Level	N.H.Q.			Atlantic			Quebec			Ontario		
	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
CX-COF 1	0	0	0.0	52	13	20.0	246	60	19.6	182	64	26.0
CX-COF 2	0	0	0.0	200	27	11.9	588	65	10.0	307	90	22.7
CX-COF 3	0	0	0.0	34	2	5.6	72	1	1.4	108	4	3.6
CX-COF 4	0	0	0.0	56	3	5.1	161	3	1.8	88	14	13.7
CX-COF 5	0	0	0.0	8	0	0.0	23	0	0.0	18	0	0.0
CX-COF 6	0	0	0.0	13	1	7.1	31	0	0.0	18	5	21.7
CX-COF 7	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	1	0	0.0	1	0	0.0
CX-COF 8	0	0	0.0	7	0	0.0	8	0	0.0	9	1	10.0
Prairies												
	M	F	%F	Pacific			Departmental Total					
				M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
CX-COF 1	99	41	29.3	163	87	34.8	742	265	26.3			
CX-COF 2	323	48	12.9	112	19	14.5	1530	249	14.0			
CX-COF 3	54	4	6.9	78	5	6.0	346	16	4.4			
CX-COF 4	111	1	0.0	36	1	2.7	452	22	4.6			
CX-COF 5	17	0	0.0	14	0	0.0	80	0	0.0			
CX-COF 6	23	0	0.0	12	0	0.0	97	6	5.8			
CX-COF 7	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	2	0	0.0			
CX-COF 8	7	0	0.0	1	0	0.0	32	1	3.0			

The above representation of Custody Officers by Level, does include the Prison for Women. (Correctional Service of Canada, 1982-1988)

Note: New correctional officers may enter the system at Level 1, and then they progress to Level 3, Level 5, and Level 7; they enter at Level 2 if they work at a maximum or multi-level security institution, and then they progress to Level 4, Level 6, and Level 8.

Correctional Service of Canada Representation by Group Level, As of March 31, 1988

Group Level	N.H.Q.			Atlantic			Quebec			Ontario		
	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F	M	F	%F
CX-LUF 1	0	0	0.0	72	4	5.3	288	40	12.2	156	31	16.6
CX-LUF 2	0	0	0.0	7	0	0.0	30	0	0.0	17	0	0.0
Prairies												
	M	F	%F	Pacific			M	F	%F	Departmental Total		
CX-LUF 1	190	45	19.1	153	22	12.6	859	142	14.2			
CX-LUF 2	28	0	0.0	20	0	0.0	102	0	0.0			

(Correctional Service of Canada, 1982-1988)

Note: The above representation of Living Unit Officers by Level, does not include the Prison for Women, since that facility does not have any living unit officers working there. Therefore, this representation is of male institutions only.



UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA