

MFL

114803

# National Institute of Justice

## Research in Action

Ongoing  
Projects

### The Courts: Current Federal Research

#### Research Abstract

Court Procedures .....	1
Crime Specific.....	4
Juvenile Justice .....	6
Offenders .....	7
Prosecution .....	8
Sentencing .....	11
Trials .....	13
Victims .....	14

**August 1988:** The National Institute of Justice offers a central place to find Federal research about criminal justice—the Federal Criminal Justice Research Data Base. You can keep abreast of the latest projects by requesting a search of the data base, which contains more than 1,000 projects funded by Federal agencies.

A search of the data base, which is a free service, provides a printout that describes the research design, lists the contact person, start and end dates, dollar amounts, and expected products or documentation for each project identified. The data base changes frequently as new products are added.

This Research Abstract is a synopsis of research related to the courts culled from the data base in early 1988. For each topic, National Institute of Justice research is listed first, followed by that of other agencies; projects are arranged chronologically by their end dates.

**The information in this Abstract is subject to change due to the ongoing nature of the research and the continual updating of the data base.**

Other Research Abstracts are available on the following topics: corrections, drugs and crime, and law enforcement.

For more information or to request a search of the data base, contact the National Institute of Justice/NCJRS, at 800-851-3420, or write to Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20850.

NCJRS

JAN 10 Rec'd

ACQUISITIONS

## About the National Institute of Justice

The National Institute of Justice is a research branch of the U.S. Department of Justice. The Institute's mission is to develop knowledge about crime, its causes and control. Priority is given to policy-relevant research that can yield approaches and information that State and local agencies can use in preventing and reducing crime. The decisions made by criminal justice practitioners and policymakers affect millions of citizens, and crime affects almost all our public institutions and the private sector as well. Targeting resources, assuring their effective allocation, and developing new means of cooperation between the public and private sector are some of the emerging issues in law enforcement and criminal justice that research can help illuminate.

Carrying out the mandate assigned by Congress in the Justice Assistance Act of 1984, the National Institute of Justice:

- Sponsors research and development to improve and strengthen the criminal justice system and related civil justice aspects, with a balanced program of basic and applied research.
- Evaluates the effectiveness of justice improvement programs and identifies programs that promise to be successful if continued or repeated.
- Tests and demonstrates new and improved approaches to strengthen the justice system, and recommends actions that can be taken by Federal, State, and local governments and private organizations and individuals to achieve this goal.
- Disseminates information from research, demonstrations, evaluations, and special programs to Federal, State, and local governments, and serves as an international clearinghouse of justice information.
- Trains criminal justice practitioners in research and evaluation findings, and assists practitioners and researchers through fellowships and special seminars.

The Director of the Institute is appointed by the President of the United States, and upon confirmation by the Senate, serves at the President's pleasure. The Director establishes the research and development objectives of the Institute. The Director has final authority to approve grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements, and maintains responsibility for fiscal operations of the Institute. In establishing its research agenda, the Institute is guided by the priorities of the Attorney General and the needs of the criminal justice field. The Institute actively solicits the views of police, courts, and corrections practitioners as well as the private sector to identify the most critical problems and to plan research that can help resolve them.

**James K. Stewart**

*Director*

114803

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been

granted by

Public Domain/NIJ

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

---

# Research on the Courts

---

## Court Procedures

### *NIJ research*

#### **An Experiment on the Use of "Day Fines" in Criminal Court.**

Sally T. Hillsman, Vera Institute of Justice, 377 Broadway, New York, NY 10013. 212-334-1300. Begin date: November 1986. End date: October 1989.

A day-fine approach to imposing criminal fines in the Staten Island court will be implemented and evaluated. The day-fine system is directed toward improving the use and administration of monetary penalties while applying means-based fining concepts and practices. The project goals are (1) to demonstrate that a day-fine system can be implemented in an American court, (2) to determine the effects of this change on current fining practices, and (3) to determine what penalties day fines are displacing.

#### **The Use of Masters and Monitors in Jail Crowding Litigation.**

Howard R. Messing, 300 Holiday Drive, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316. 305-522-2300. Begin date: January 1987. End date: September 1988.

Masters and monitors are appointed by the courts as part of the resolution of jail crowding and jail conditions lawsuits. This project examines the roles masters and monitors play and is producing a manual to assist those assigned to carry out this responsibility. It also provides information to local jurisdictions to evaluate affirmative and workable options for dealing with local jail crowding and its attendant problems.

#### **Collection and Enforcement of Fines: Issues and Innovations.**

George Cole, Institute for Social Inquiry, University of Connecticut, U-24, Storrs, CT 06268. 203-486-2535. Begin date: January 1988. End date: August 1988.

This study identified and described models of procedures and mechanisms developed by National, State, and local governments to collect and enforce fines effectively. Articles are being written for judges, court administrators, and criminal justice planners who need information on successful efforts to deal with the fines problem.

#### **Dispute Resolution and the Courts: A 30-Minute Video Program.**

Thomas Brady, National Institute for Dispute Resolution, 1901 L Street NW., Suite 600, Washington, DC 20036. 202-466-4764. Begin date: August 1987. End date: July 1988.

This 30-minute video program examines court-annexed and court-referred dispute resolution projects designed to relieve court delay and provide a fair, productive alternative to litigation. The program focuses on four judicially based dispute resolution project sites that deal with matters as diverse as minor criminal cases, child abuse and neglect, civil cases involving minimum dollar amounts, and difficult-to-resolve civil cases filed in Federal court.

#### **An Evaluation of Mental Health Expert Assistance Provided to Indigent Criminal Defendants.**

National Center for State Courts, 300 Newport Avenue, Williamsburg, VA 23185. 804-253-2000. Begin date: November 1986. End date: August 1988.

This study compared and contrasted practices and procedures for providing mental health expert assistance to indigent criminal defendants in three court systems. Courts selected for the study have cost-efficient and fully operational programs. Each site was studied using forensic mental health screening and evaluation as the framework against which practices and procedures were compared.

#### **Assessing the Utility of Bail Guidelines.**

John Goldkamp, Temple University, Broad Street and Montgomery Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19122. 215-787-1378. Begin date: September 1984. End date: April 1988.

This project built on prior successful bail guideline developments in Philadelphia. Three new sites (Boston, Phoenix, and Miami) were selected for developing, implementing, and assessing bail guidelines.

#### **Drug Use as a Predictor of Behavior on Probation.**

Eric Wish, Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc., 55 West 125th Street, New York, NY 10027. 212-870-8348. Begin date: July 1985. End date: March 1988.

This project measured the extent to which drug users on pretrial release differed from nonusers in incidence of rearrest and failure to appear for trial, and assessed whether urinalysis test results can be used to improve identification of high-risk defendants.

#### **Alternative Procedures for Reducing Delay in Criminal Appeals.**

Joy A. Chapper and Roger Hanson, Justice Resources, 658 Independence Avenue SE., Washington, DC 20003. 202-547-1769. Begin date: November 1985. End date: October 1987.

---

This project examined alternative procedures used for criminal appeals—fast-tracks, postbriefing screening, and case management. The research focused on the incentives that led to the adoption of the alternative procedures and that underlie their continued use. To understand the context in which incentives operate, the research examined the applicability and the effect on outcomes and appeal time for the entire delay reduction procedure.

#### **Budgetary Incentives and Reducing Delay in Criminal Courts.**

Thomas Church and Milton Heumann, State University of New York, P.O. Box 9, Albany, NY 12201. 518-442-3300. Begin date: December 1984. End date: August 1987.

New York City allocated \$8.25 million over 3 years to its six district attorneys' offices to be distributed according to their success in reducing their backlog of cases and long-term jail cases. This project analyzed the impact that the budgetary incentives had on individual and organizational behavior in the court system.

#### **The Organizational Context of Case Processing.**

Mary Lee Luskin, Indiana University Foundation, P.O. Box 1847, Bloomington, IN 47402. 812-335-5820. Begin date: May 1986. End date: July 1987.

Data on the organization and policies of prosecutors' offices in Minnesota were collected and merged with existing data on case processing time, sentencing outcomes, case characteristics, and defendant characteristics. Results provided information about the effects of case- and court-level characteristics on case processing time and sentence severity.

#### **Implementation of Delay Reduction Programs in Urban Trial Courts.**

Barry Mahoney, National Center for State Courts, 300 Newport Avenue, Williamsburg, VA 23187. 303-534-3063. Begin date: September 1984. End date: May 1987.

This project involved analysis of case processing time. It concentrated on learning the current pace of litigation in the courts, how case processing times have changed, and what causes fast and slow processing time. Case studies isolated the factors that contribute to successful court delay programs.

#### **Use of Volunteer Lawyers to Supplement Judicial Resources.**

Alexander Aikman, National Center for State Courts, Western Regional Office, 720 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, CA 94108. 415-557-1515. Begin date: July 1983. End date: April 1987.

Six experiments were conducted using volunteer lawyers in a variety of judicial capacities. Results suggested that such programs are successful and can contribute to an effective delay reduction program.

#### **Plea Bargaining and Proposition 8 Politics: The Impact of California's Ban on Felony Negotiations.**

Jerome Skolnik, University of California, M-11 Wheeler Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720. 415-642-8111. Begin date: January 1986. End date: May 1987.

This study described and evaluated the effects of a statewide ban on felony plea bargaining. The reform's impact on the felony prosecution process and sentencing outcomes was examined in San Diego and Alameda Counties. Changes in prosecutorial outcomes were measured and quantitative data were used to assess organizational and environmental factors that may have accounted for these changes.

#### **Impact of Case Assignment on Criminal Court Productivity.**

Randall Guynes, Institute of Economic and Policy Studies, 1013 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314. 703-549-7686. Begin date: May 1984. End date: March 1987.

This study measured the success of attempts by courts in Hudson and Middlesex Counties, New Jersey, to reduce case processing time and lower overall costs. The investigators examined case outcomes to ensure that reductions in time and money did not undermine the quality of justice. Both jurisdictions were successful in reducing court delay and costs while maintaining the quality of justice.

#### **National Baseline Information Estimating Offender Processing Cost.**

Joan Jacoby, Jefferson Institute of Justice Studies, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, DC 20005. 202-737-6551. Begin date: September 1983. End date: November 1986.

Estimating the cost incurred by criminal justice agencies while processing offenders through the various stages of the system was the subject of this project. Cost estimates were fully loaded, including salaries, fringe benefits, and overhead.

#### **Development and Validation of an Index of Criminal History.**

Susan Welch, University of Nebraska, Political Science Department, Lincoln, NE 68588. 402-472-2341. Begin date: September 1984. End date: June 1986.

Criminal records affect most decisions concerning a case, i.e., pretrial release, bail, and sentencing. Yet there is no single index or measure of criminal record. This project identified measures of criminal records that most highly correlated with sentencing and bail setting decisions.

#### **Classification Systems for the Accused: An Empirical Analysis.**

Mary Toborg, Toborg Associates, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, DC 20006. 202-293-0888. Begin date: May 1984. End date: May 1986.

This project was designed to develop a statistical model for classifying arrestees with respect to their risk of committing new crimes and their risk of not appearing for trial.

#### **Public Danger as a Criterion in Pretrial Release Decisions.**

Mary Toborg, Toborg Associates, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, DC 20006. 202-293-0888. Begin date: March 1983. End date: May 1986.

This project assessed the nature of State laws that permit the court to consider dangerousness in pretrial release decisions. It assessed the nature of these laws, their implementation, and impact.

#### **Appellate Court Adaptation to Workload Increases.**

Thomas Marvell, Court Studies, Inc., Southern Bank Building, 306 South Henry Street, Williamsburg, VA 23185. 804-229-9772. Begin date: May 1984. End date: January 1986.

This project was a longitudinal study of the effects of procedural and managerial changes on appellate court productivity during the past 15 years. Findings suggested the most productive size for appellate courts, the best balance of manpower between judges and staff aides, and the effects of each major procedural change on case productivity.

### ***Bureau of Justice Assistance research***

#### **Appellate Court Delay Project.**

Douglas Somerlot, American Bar Association, Fund for Justice and Education, 750 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, IL 60611. 312-988-5704. Begin date: October 1987. End date: September 1988.

An appellate court delay reduction model is being developed to help expedite case processing and decrease litigation costs. A text will help appellate courts apply case flow processing standards and develop operational models. Subsequently, a guide will be prepared to help courts implement delay-reduction operations.

### ***Bureau of Justice Statistics research***

#### **Feasibility Study for National Pretrial Data Base.**

Alan Henry, Pretrial Services Resources Center, 918 F Street NW., Washington, DC 20004. 202-638-3080. Begin date: November 1983. End date: April 1989.

This study will determine the feasibility of collecting accurate, comprehensive data on persons awaiting trial. The data collected includes actions taken by criminal justice agencies, such as previous pretrial release decisions and actions taken by the accused such as rearrest or failure to appear.

#### **Federal Statistics Project.**

Joan Mullen, Abt Associates, Inc., 55 Wheeler Street, Cambridge, MA 02138. 617-492-7100. Begin date: August 1985. End date: August 1988.

This project extends and expands the activities relating to the development and analysis of a comprehensive Federal criminal justice data base. The data base, the first systemwide resource for research, traces Federal processing from investigation through prosecution, adjudication, and corrections.

#### **Prosecution of Felony Arrests.**

Barbara Boland, INSLAW, Inc., 1125 15th Street NW., Washington, DC 20005. 202-828-8675. Begin date: March 1986. End date: May 1987.

Because methods for counting cases and measuring case processing vary, comparison across jurisdictions is difficult. This project analyzed data from PROMIS and other sources to create data tables that are consistent across jurisdictions.

#### **Pretrial Release: Improved Information for Decisionmaking.**

David Jones, Department of Crime Control and Public Safety, P.O. Box 27687, Raleigh, NC 27611. 919-733-5013. Begin date: May 1985. End date: August 1986.

To determine the effectiveness of an existing pretrial release system, this project quantitatively described the opportunity for pretrial release systems and the risks involved with pretrial release.

### ***Other research agencies***

#### **Experimental Study of Effectiveness and Perceived Fairness of Court-Annexed Arbitration.** National Science Foundation.

E. Allen Lind, Rand Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90406. 213-393-0411. Begin date: July 1985. End date: July 1988.

An experimental program in North Carolina randomly assigned cases to a control group that receives traditional pretrial treatment and an experimental group that involves an arbitration program. The research promises to contribute to an understanding of perceptions of justice, the nature and impact of dispute resolution mechanisms, and the efficiency of the actual litigation process.

#### **U.S. Supreme Court Judicial Data Base.** National Science Foundation.

Harold Spaeth, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48823. 517-355-1855. Begin date: June 1984. End date: December 1988.

The data base contains comprehensive information on the cases that came before the court from 1953 to the present including information on judges' votes, decisions and opinions, lower court rulings, and a range of other variables.

#### **Training Curriculum on Child Sexual Abuse for Tribal Judges and Professionals.**

Nancy Tuthill, American Indian Law Center, Inc., P.O. Box 4456, Station A, Albuquerque, NM 87196. 505-277-5462. Begin date: November 1985. End date: March 1987.

A curriculum was developed to increase the tribal court judges' and court-allied legal professionals' knowledge about child sexual abuse. Project staff reviewed existing materials and developed a unified curriculum on child sexual abuse capable of being adapted for specific tribes.

#### **National Judicial Targeted Professional Training on Child Sexual Abuse.**

James Toner, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, University of Nevada at Reno, P.O. Box 8970, Reno, NV 89507. 702-784-4836. Begin date: November 1985. End date: January 1987.

The Council designed, field tested, and implemented an extensive curriculum on child sexual abuse for judges and court personnel. This specialized curriculum promotes judicial handling and out-of-court procedures to reduce trauma and to assist treatment of the sexually abused child.

**Misdemeanor Probation: Managing the Change.** U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections. Malcolm MacDonald, Texas Adult Probation Commission, 8100 Cameron Road, Austin, TX 78753. 512-834-8188. Begin date: October 1985. End date: June 1986.

Beginning in 1987, Texas paid only for felony prosecution. Misdemeanants make up the majority of probationers in Texas, therefore, this project involved planning, analysis, and training for a significant transition.

#### **The Negotiation Process in Ordinary Litigation.**

National Science Foundation.  
Herbert Kritzer, University of Wisconsin, 500 Lincoln Drive, Madison, WI 53706. 608-262-1234. Begin date: May 1984. End date: May 1986.

While more civil disputes are settled out of court than are eventually adjudicated, little is known about the actual process by which settlement is reached. This research examined the bargaining and negotiation process and identified types of negotiation practices.

## **Crime Specific**

### ***NIJ research***

#### **The Indianapolis Domestic Violence Prosecution Experiment.**

David A. Ford, Indiana University Foundation, 355 Lansing Street, Indianapolis, IN 46202. 317-264-2449. Begin date: January 1986. End date: December 1988.

Following a case assignment procedure that gives victims the authority to drop charges, one group of defendants will be prosecuted and a comparable group will be diverted to rehabilitative counseling programs in lieu of prosecution. The resulting deterrent effect on repeat violence by the offender will be examined.

#### **Police Documentation of Drunk Driving Arrests.**

John Snortum, Claremont McKenna College, Department of Psychology, Pitzer Hall, Claremont, CA 91711. 714-621-8000. Begin date: October 1986. End date: September 1988.

This archival study is examining court records in Los Angeles, Denver, and Boston that involve DWI cases. The cases will be compared based on the quality and quantity of police evidence concerning the suspect's behavior prior to the stop, immediately after the stop, and during the field sobriety tests to determine whether such evidence adds to or is neutral to hard evidence from blood tests.

#### **Evaluation of Administrative Per Se Laws.**

Kathryn Stewart, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 1777 N. California Blvd., Walnut Creek, CA 94596. 415-939-6666. Begin date: January 1987. End date: June 1988.

Administrative per se laws, which allow courts to revoke a drunk driver's license, impose a serious penalty without the necessity of judicial processing. This study examined the specific deterrence effects of administrative per se laws. The evaluation compared recidivism rates of 1,000 drunk driving offenders in each of four States for a 3-year period before and after the implementation of the law.

#### **The Impact of Rape Reform Legislation.**

Julie Horney, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE 68588. 402-472-3677. Begin date: October 1985. End date: June 1988.

This project assessed the impact of various types of rape reform legislation on arrest, charging, conviction, and sentencing, as well as on victim reporting and victim treatment by the system. Data from 1970 to 1984 were collected in five sites.

**Child Abuse Prosecution and Investigation Study.**  
Kenneth R. Freeman, Los Angeles District Attorney's Office, Room 18000, 210 W. Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012. 213-974-3725. Begin date: April 1987. End date: May 1988.

Standard prosecution methods may break down when the victim is a young child. This study was designed to find more effective ways to prevent victims of child sexual abuse from being revictimized by the criminal justice system and to improve the conviction rate for guilty offenders.

**Urine Testing of Offenders: A Manual for Practitioners.**

Eric Wish, Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc., 55 West 125th Street, New York, NY 10027. 212-870-8348. Begin date: November 1986. End date: May 1988.

Previous research has indicated that urine testing is a reliable means of identifying drug use among arrestees and that periodic drug testing of pretrial releasees is effective in reducing their rearrest rates. This project produced a manual to guide practitioners in establishing urine testing programs that are technically competent, meet reliability standards, and are legal. In addition, data for a drug use forecasting program were collected in geographically diverse cities to track drug use over time.

**Using Offense-Related Variables To Identify Career Criminals.**

Alfred Blumstein, Carnegie-Mellon University, 5000 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15213. 412-578-2175. Begin date: September 1982. End date: June 1987.

Attempts to identify career criminals prospectively from self-reports face ethical and empirical problems. To avoid those problems, this project explored the feasibility of developing a less controversial approach to identifying career criminals by using official arrest histories. The approach relies on empirical estimates of criminal career parameters, and the variation of the parameters.

**Plea Bargaining and Proposition 8 Politics: The Impact of California's Ban on Felony Negotiations.**

Jerome Skolnik, University of California, M-11 Wheeler Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720. 415-642-8111. Begin date: January 1986. End date: May 1987.

This study described and evaluated the effects of a statewide ban on felony plea bargaining. The reform's impact on the felony prosecution process and sentencing outcomes was examined in San Diego and Alameda Counties. Changes in prosecutorial outcomes were measured and quantitative data were used to assess organizational and environmental factors that may have accounted for these changes.

**Pretrial Diversion Program for Incest Offenders: Guidelines.**

Arnold Binder, University of California, Irvine, CA 92717. 714-856-5481. Begin date: October 1984. End date: April 1987.

This project was designed to develop an effective screening procedure of intrafamily sexual abuse offenders based on likely recidivism and amenability to treatment. The project evaluated programs in Orange and Sacramento Counties in California.

**Bureau of Justice Statistics research**

**Aggravated Assault: Analyzing Offender Behavior and Exploring Outcomes of System Response.**

Steve Grohman, Statistical Analysis Center, Wisconsin Office of Justice Assistance, 30 West Mifflin Street, Suite 1000, Madison, WI 53702. 608-266-7646. Begin date: September 1986. End date: August 1987.

This two-part study focused on the nature of behavioral incidents reported to law enforcement as aggravated assault, examining whether incidents classified as aggravated assault have changed over time and whether this change relates to increased incidence. The study also examined the treatment cases receive as they are processed through the courts.

**Modeling the Effects of DWI Policy Changes on the Criminal Justice System.**

David Edwards and Tom Epperlein, Arizona Department of Public Safety, P.O. Box 6638, Phoenix, AZ 85005. 602-262-8082. Begin date: July 1985. End date: June 1986.

In DWI cases, what effect does banning plea bargaining and imposing mandatory sentencing have on the criminal justice system? This study examined the systemwide effect, from arrest through release.

**Bureau of Justice Assistance research**

**Governor's Project for Legislative Reform of Organized Crime and Narcotic Laws.**

Penny Wakefield, National Criminal Justice Association, 444 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, DC 20001. 202-347-4900. Begin date: April 1985. End date: April 1986.

This project continued previous work to analyze the magnitude of disparity among the 50 States concerning organized crime drug-enforcement laws, and to develop an objective, neutral "State Officials' Guide for Legislative Reform of Organized Crime and Narcotic Laws."

---

## ***Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention research***

**National Center for the Prosecution of Child Abuse.** Benjamin Shapiro, American Prosecutors Research Institute, 1033 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, VA 22314. 202-724-8491. Begin date: November 1985. End date: January 1989.

The National Center is a program to improve the local prosecution of child physical and sexual abuse cases. It provides technical assistance, training, and clearinghouse activities.

### ***Other research agencies***

**The Impact of Rape Reform Legislation.** National Science Foundation. Julie Horney and Cassica Spohn, University of Nebraska, Omaha, NE 68101. 402-472-3677. Begin date: July 1985. End date: January 1988.

The impact and implementation of change is influenced by complex interactions between formal law, informal norms, and routinized expectations of behavior. The researchers studied change in rape reform legislation in six cities over a 14-year period (1970-1984).

## **Juvenile Justice**

### ***NIJ research***

#### **Impact of Juvenile Court Sanctions on Youth Felony Offenders.**

Jeffrey Fagan, New York City Criminal Justice Agency, 305 Broadway, Fifth Floor, New York, NY 10007. 212-577-1635. Begin date: October 1987. End date: March 1989.

The sanctions and recidivism rates of adolescents ages 15 to 16 years, charged in juvenile court with armed robbery and aggravated assault, will be compared with youths whose cases originated in criminal court. Results will be used to determine whether sanctions in juvenile courts are more severe and more effective in reducing recidivism than sanctions in criminal courts.

### ***Bureau of Justice Statistics research***

#### **Juveniles Waived to Maryland's Criminal Justice System.**

Charles Wellford, University of Maryland, South Administration Building, College Park, MD 20742. 301-454-4538. Begin date: August 1985. End date: October 1988.

In response to a legislative directive to study the need for a maximum security facility to house violent juvenile offenders, this project is developing a profile of juveniles waived to adult court between 1982 and 1983.

#### **Juvenile Justice Records and Record Systems.**

Tom Wilson, SEARCH Group, Inc., 925 Secret River Drive, Sacramento, CA 95831. 916-392-2250. Begin date: September 1985. End date: July 1987.

This project reviewed and documented characteristics of existing juvenile justice records and recordkeeping systems. The results describe the contents, accuracy, and organization of juvenile records and identified the systems' responsibility for maintaining and disclosing such records.

## ***Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention research***

#### **Evaluate Serious Habitual Offender/Drug Involved (SHO-DI) Juveniles.**

Terry W. Koepsell, Koepsell Associates, P.O. Box 212, Great Falls, VA 22066. 703-759-4147. Begin date: September 1983. End date: September 1987.

This project evaluated the SHO-DI program, which is designed to increase the effectiveness of police, juvenile probation-intake, prosecutors, judges, and corrections (or aftercare) agencies to deal with and suppress juvenile criminal activity and drug use. SHO-DI focuses on juveniles who are serious, repeat, habitual offenders.

#### **The Impact of Juvenile Court Interventions on Delinquent Careers.**

Barry Krisberg, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 77 Maiden, San Francisco, CA 94108. 415-956-5651. Begin date: July 1985. End date: April 1987.

This study assessed the impact of various levels of court intervention on delinquent behavior, attitudes, and juvenile justice costs.

#### **Juvenile Justice Reform.**

Ralph Rossum, Claremont McKenna College, Rose Institute for State and Local Government, Claremont, CA 91711. 714-621-8000. Begin date: November 1984. End date: February 1987.

This project developed a model code to guide States in dealing with crimes committed by juveniles. The project conducted a national conference, 3 regional conferences, and 10 intensive liaison-training sessions. A guidebook and training materials for legislators and policymakers were developed.

### **Prosecutor Training in Juvenile Justice.**

Cliff Roberson and Michael McGown, National College of District Attorneys, University of Houston Law Center, Houston, TX 77004. 713-749-1571. Begin date: June 1982. End date: August 1986.

Prosecutors in juvenile courts face special challenges. This project developed a training curriculum for the National College of District Attorneys. The training addressed the following issues: the role of the prosecutor, the defense attorney, priority prosecution, evidence, and confidentiality.

### **Juvenile Court Judges Training Project.**

Louis W. McHardy, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, P.O. Box 8978, Reno, NV 89507. 702-784-6012. Begin date: April 1979. End date: April 1986.

The instruction developed in this project emphasized deinstitutionalization and due process, explored the alternative of restitution, and urged that children not serve in the same facility as adults.

### **Program of Executive Sessions for Examining the Juvenile Justice System.**

Mark Moore and George Kelling, Harvard University, JFK School of Government, Cambridge, MA 02138. 617-495-1113. Begin date: December 1984. End date: February 1986.

This project created a forum for Federal, State, and local public and private experts. These individuals convened to discuss current policies and policy revisions concerning juvenile crime. The resulting papers and publications formed the basis for continuing critical discussions about issues facing the juvenile justice system.

### ***Other research agencies***

#### **Recruitment and Training of CASAs To Work with Abused and Neglected Children in Tulsa County.**

Sandra Renard and Jeanne Clements, National Council of Jewish Women, 315 South Gilcrease Museum Road, Tulsa, OK 74127. 918-584-2561. Begin date: July 1986. End date: November 1987.

A group of trained volunteers, Court Appointed Special Advocates (CASAs), represent the neglected or abused child throughout the legal process to ensure permanency planning. CASAs gather information to help the court determine placement in the child's best interests. A training package and child abuse reference manual were developed for CASAs.

#### **Volunteer Advocacy: Children.**

Sally Erny, CASA Project, Jefferson Hall of Justice, Room 200, Louisville, KY 40202. 502-588-4911. Begin date: July 1986. End date: November 1987.

A CASA project, operating through the Juvenile Session of District Court, assured that the best interests of Kentucky's abused, dependent, and neglected children are served and that they receive a stable, permanent home placement. Volunteers were recruited and trained as independent advocates for children in the court system.

## **Offenders**

### ***NIJ research***

#### **Developmental Factors Associated with Sexual Dangerousness.**

Robert Prentky, Brandeis University, 415 South Street, Waltham, MA 02254. 617-697-8161. Begin date: September 1985. End date: March 1988.

Rapists and child molesters participated in a self-administered interview that was combined with archival data (psychiatrists' reports, criminal history data) to construct a life-path typology of sexual dangerousness. The project compared predicted recidivism with actual recidivism.

#### **Strategies To Incapacitate Narcotics Wholesalers.**

Police Executive Research Forum, 2300 M Street NW., Washington, DC 20037. 202-466-7820. Begin date: December 1986. End date: March 1988.

This project addressed the gap in drug enforcement emphasis that now occurs between the Federal strike force—which targets high-level narcotics manufacturers and importers—and local street sellers. The study focused on strategies to incapacitate middle-level cocaine and heroin wholesalers and highlighted particular vulnerabilities inherent in wholesaling operations. In addition to a report, the project produced a manual of recommended strategies for drug unit investigators and police administrators.

#### **Hating the Sin, Loving the Sinner: Sentencing the Child Sex Offender.**

Judith Martin, University of Minnesota, Office of Research and Technical Transfer Administration, 1919 University Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55104. 612-624-0327. Begin date: July 1986. End date: June 1987.

This project examined prosecution, adjudication, and sentencing practices in Minnesota and elsewhere in the United States for serious child sexual abuse committed by offenders with no criminal history. The records of those convicted of child sexual abuse in 1983 and 1984 in Minnesota were analyzed. Probation conditions, offender characteristics, and prosecutorial practices were also analyzed. Data were obtained demonstrating that the conflicting policies and goals of criminal prosecution in child sexual abuse cases result in inconsistent sentencing practices.

### **Selection Criteria for Career Criminal Prosecution.**

Marcia Chaiken, Brandeis University, National Institute for Sentencing Alternatives, Waltham, MA 02254. 617-736-2000. Begin date: July 1984. End date: March 1987.

Prosecutorial efficiency would be significantly enhanced if prosecutors focused on career criminals. This project evaluated different criteria for identifying these offenders. The criteria were derived from legislative directives, from the prosecutors, or from research.

### **National Baseline Information Estimating Offender Processing Cost.**

Joan Jacoby, Jefferson Institute of Justice Studies, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, DC 20005. 202-737-6551. Begin date: September 1983. End date: November 1986.

This project estimated the cost that criminal justice agencies incur while processing offenders through the stages of prosecution—from investigation through imprisonment and parole. The model can be used to advise decisionmakers of the cost implications of policy and procedural changes.

### **A Study of the Evolution of Criminal Careers.**

Carl Jesness, California Youth Authority, 4241 Williamsborough Drive, Sacramento, CA 95823. 916-445-9626. Begin date: October 1983. End date: June 1986.

Using Rand's work on selective incapacitation, the California Youth Authority examined criminal careers. The study described changes in criminal careers and estimated the predictability of future criminal behavior.

### **Constancy and Change in the Criminal Career.**

Kimberly Kempf, University of Pennsylvania, 3451 Walnut Street, Franklin Building, Philadelphia, PA 19104. 215-898-7111. Begin date: September 1984. End date: February 1986.

This study examined the continuity of criminal careers and determined whether consistent or varying patterns of criminal behavior exist during the progression from youth through adolescence to adulthood.

### **Other research agencies**

#### **Subtyping of Sexual Offenders.** National Institute of Mental Health.

Raymond Knight, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA 02254. 617-647-2479. Begin date: May 1980. End date: March 1987.

This project developed a rich data base to increase knowledge of subtyping and prognosis of sexually dangerous persons. The study used 1,300 clinical files of male sexual offenders who were judged as possibly dangerous and admitted to treatment over the past 20 years.

## **Prosecution**

### **NIJ research**

#### **The Use and Effectiveness of Hypnosis and the Cognitive Interview for Enhancing Eyewitness Recall.**

Dr. Martin Orne and Dr. Wayne G. Whitehouse, Unit for Experimental Psychiatry, Institute of Pennsylvania Hospital, 111 North 49th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19139. 215-472-1055. Begin date: January 1988. End date: December 1989.

Two procedures that are considered to have value in facilitating eyewitness recall—hypnosis and the cognitive interview—will be evaluated under circumstances where there is a range of memory impairment. Findings will be relevant to forensic investigations. These procedures will be assessed relative to a stringent forced-recall condition that involves neither hypnosis nor retrieval instructions.

#### **Research On the Police-Prosecutor Team Concept.**

John Buchanan, The City of Phoenix Police Department, 251 West Washington Street, Phoenix, AZ 85003. 602-262-7439. Begin date: January 1988. End date: January 1989.

This research will assess use of police-prosecutor teams, determine where they are used and their impact, and review existing research related to the police-prosecutor team concept. Police-prosecutor team concepts used in various jurisdictions and recommendations regarding the potential expansion of this strategy will be presented.

#### **Child Abuse Prosecution and Investigation Study.**

Kenneth R. Freeman, Los Angeles District Attorney, Room 18000, 210 West Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012. 213-974-3725. Begin date: November 1986. End date: October 1987.

The criminal justice system may inadvertently revictimize child victims because the standard ways of dealing with children frequently break down when the child is marginally competent because of age, physical disability, or mental infirmity. This study investigated ways of more effectively preventing victims of child sexual abuse from being revictimized by the system. The types of child abuse cases, the manner in which they enter the system, and techniques for dealing with them were examined. This research produced a handbook for prosecutors and police to use as a legal reference and "how to."

#### **Enhancing Police and Prosecutors' Ability to Successfully Apply Asset Seizure and Forfeiture Laws and Procedures.**

Gwen Holden, National Criminal Justice Association, 444 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, DC 20001. 202-374-4900. Begin date: December 1986. End date: October 1987.

This project modified and enhanced a previously developed curriculum on drug trafficking asset seizure and forfeiture procedures for police, prosecutors, police management, and line personnel. The project produced an instruction manual and a presentation of the program based on the model curriculum.

**Improving Evidence Gathering Through a Computer-Assisted Case Intake Program.**

William McDonald, Georgetown University, 37th and O Streets NW., Washington, DC 20057. 202-624-8220. Begin date: November 1984. End date: June 1987.

A computer-assisted case intake procedure was developed for burglary, the most common felony committed in Nashville, Tennessee. The procedure simulates prosecutors' questions and the procedures they follow. The aim was to improve the accuracy of case charging decisions and case outcomes.

**Improving Evidence Gathering Through Police and Prosecutor Coordination.**

Edward Conners, Research Management Associates, Inc., 911 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314. 703-836-6777. Begin date: January 1985. End date: June 1987.

Police and prosecutors in three jurisdictions developed arrest conviction standards and policies to use to screen cases before they are referred for prosecution. Cases that needed additional evidence or preparation were referred to the case officer for further action. The procedures were evaluated to determine whether the quality of evidence at arrest improved and whether the conviction rate increased for felonies.

**Reducing Avoidable Felony Case Attrition.**

James Garofalo, Research Foundation of SUNY, Hinde-lang Criminal Justice Research Center, P.O. Box 9, Albany, NY 12201. 518-442-5213. Begin date: January 1985. End date: April 1987.

Many cases presented to the prosecuting attorney are dismissed for legitimate reasons, but many others are dropped needlessly. This research examined ways to reduce avoidable felony case attrition by improving police-prosecutor relations.

**Convicting Guilty Criminals: Experiment in Police and Prosecutor Communication.**

Susan Martin, Police Foundation, 1001 22nd Street NW., Washington, DC 20037. 202-833-1460. Begin date: January 1985. End date: March 1987.

This project developed, implemented, and evaluated a low-cost strategy for reducing felony case attrition. The project tested the impact of investigative checklists, supervisory reviews, and weekly feedback on felony case

dispositions for individual patrol officers and their supervisors in Baltimore County, Maryland.

**How Police and Prosecution Procedures Affect Case Attrition Rates.**

Joan Petersilia, The Rand Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90406. 213-393-0411. Begin date: November 1984. End date: January 1987.

This project was conducted in Los Angeles County with the cooperation of 31 police departments and the district attorney. The research involved identifying police departments with high and low attrition rates and gathering data to learn which policies and practices accounted for the differences. It described the program components that were used by the departments with especially low attrition rates. These data will be used to improve police-prosecutor coordination.

**The Reliability of Hypnotically Induced Testimony in the Criminal Justice System.**

Martin Orne, Institute for Experimental Psychiatry, 290 Sycamore Avenue, Marion Station, PA 19066. 215-472-1055. Begin date: July 1982. End date: January 1987.

Hypnosis has been found to be a useful investigative tool although the accuracy of recall for witnesses remains problematic.

**Illicit Money Laundering Activities and Strategies To Combat Them.**

Clifford Karchmer, Battelle Memorial Institute, 4000 NE 41st Street, Seattle, WA 98105. 206-525-3130. Begin date: April 1985. End date: December 1986.

In recent years, organized crime and narcotics traffickers have increasingly used money laundering techniques to protect their illegal profits. This project published a report that transmits to State and local officials the techniques Federal investigators have learned about money laundering and its effective detection, investigation, and prosecution.

**Improving Evidence Gathering Through Police and Prosecutor Coordination.**

Anthony Lukin and Donna Schram, Office of Snohomish County Prosecutor, 3000 Rockefeller, Everett, WA 98201. 206-259-9333. Begin date: January 1985. End date: July 1986.

This program to reduce felony case attrition was based on past National Institute of Justice research. It provided regular feedback to administrative and line officer personnel on the amount and cause of felony case attrition, a system in each police agency whereby cases are reviewed for evidentiary and investigative sufficiency prior to referral, and interagency training opportunities. The causes of felony case attrition at varying stages in case processing and the impact of changes within participating agencies were evaluated.

### **Public Danger as a Criterion in Pretrial Release Decisions.**

Mary Toborg, Toborg Associates, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, DC 20006. 202-293-0888. Begin date: March 1983. End date: May 1986.

This project assessed State laws that permit the court to consider dangerousness in pretrial release decisions. It assessed the nature of these laws, their implementation, and impact.

### ***Bureau of Justice Statistics research***

#### **Citizen Attitude Surveys.**

Richard Rosen, State of New York, Stuyvesant Plaza, Executive Park Tower, Albany, NY 12203. 518-457-8381. Begin date: May 1987. End date: April 1988.

A survey of citizen attitudes toward the criminal justice system was conducted among a representative sample of the New York State population. It was used to identify issues and concerns that can be translated into policies. Questions covered perceived levels of crime, fear of crime, preventive measures, police activities, corrections, sentencing, and alternative sanctions.

#### **A Proposal To Analyze Disparities Between Felony Charges at Time of Arrest and Those at Time of Prosecution.**

John Angell, University of Alaska, School of Justice, 3211 Providence Drive, Anchorage, AK 99508. 907-786-1810. Begin date: June 1987. End date: January 1988.

Disparities between felony charges at arrest and at prosecution were analyzed using data from Alaska's Offender Based Transaction Statistics (OBTS) system.

#### **Felony Case Processing Data Project.**

Barbara Boland, Abt Associates, 55 Wheeler Street, Cambridge, MA 02138. 804-323-3564. Begin date: May 1986. End date: February 1987.

Case processing data from PROMIS and 38 jurisdictions were analyzed for a report consisting of tables comparing jurisdictions in three primary stages of the felony arrest disposition process. Variables included case processing variations, aggregated case variables, community demographic characteristics, resources for criminal justice agencies, and prosecutor office policies and organizations.

#### **An Investigation of the Relationship Between Criminal Justice Policies and Outcome.**

Stephen Klein, The Rand Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90406. 213-393-0411. Begin date: July 1985. End date: December 1987.

An adjudication data base was developed to address criminal justice policy questions such as: What effect does determinate sentencing have on sentence differentials?

How do jail and prison overcrowding affect sentencing decisions? What impact do organization and structural differences have on case outcome? Detailed processing data on 5,000 arrestees charged with robbery or burglary were collected, and relationships between outcomes, community characteristics, and relevant criminal justice policies and resources were examined.

#### **Leviticus Project Association.**

Richard Harris, Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services, 805 East Broad Street, Richmond, VA 23219. 804-323-3560. Begin date: January 1985. End date: September 1986.

This grant continued the work of the Leviticus Project to identify, investigate, and prosecute criminal conspirators engaged in crimes associated with the coal mining industry in Appalachia.

### ***Bureau of Justice Assistance research***

#### **Leviticus Project Association.**

Andy Hantwerker, Department of Criminal Justice Services, Commonwealth of Virginia, 805 East Broad Street, Richmond, VA 23219. 804-323-3564. Begin date: May 1986. End date: February 1987.

The Leviticus Project Association was created to detect, investigate, and prosecute individuals and conspirators engaged in major white-collar crime and organized crime. Fourteen agencies in six States actively coordinated investigative planning and operations to target major criminal and civil offenders.

### ***Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention research***

#### **Prosecutor Training in Juvenile Justice.**

Cliff Roberson and Michael McGown, National College of District Attorneys, University of Houston Law Center, Houston, TX 77004. 713-749-1571. Begin date: June 1982. End date: August 1986.

Prosecutors in juvenile courts face special challenges. A training curriculum was developed for prosecuting attorneys that addressed the roles of prosecutors and defense attorneys and priority prosecution, evidence, and confidentiality.

### ***Other research agencies***

#### **Intensive Training of Prosecutors.**

Carolyn Norris, Department of Justice, Criminal Justice, 100 Justice Building, Salem, OR 97310. 503-378-6347. Begin date: July 1986. End date: June 1987.

A training program was designed for prosecutors in child sexual abuse cases to help improve the outcome of the prosecution for the child victims. Instruction included the technical aspects of effective prosecution and stressed the need for a multidisciplinary approach and interagency cooperation.

**The Influence of Economic Conditions and Mediating Institutions on Crime and Criminal Justice.** National Science Foundation.  
Richard McGahey, New York University, Washington Square, New York, NY 10003. 212-598-1212. Begin date: July 1985. End date: January 1987.

This project examined not only the impact of economic conditions and economic change on the level of crime, but also the influence of mediating institutions such as families, schools, and neighborhoods. Using rigorous quantitative tests of alternative models, the project illuminated how mediating factors may account for the influence of the economy on crime and reciprocally how changes in criminal justice processes influence crime, social change, and the economy.

**Longitudinal Study of Personal Injury Litigation.** National Science Foundation.  
Lawrence Friedman, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA 94305. 415-723-2465. Begin date: July 1983. End date: December 1986.

Using data from 1880 to 1980, this project evaluated personal injury litigation from Alameda County, California, as well as supplementary information on population growth, industrial and economic development, legal change, and related community indicators.

**Deception, Lie Detection, and the Dynamics of Legal Decisionmaking.** National Science Foundation.  
Benjamin Kleinmuntz, University of Illinois, Chicago, IL 60680. 312-996-7000. Begin date: June 1984. End date: December 1986.

The legal system depends on its ability to judge witness credibility. In an effort to reveal deception, the legal system turns to polygraphic examinations. This research investigated the polygraph experts' decisionmaking process—how polygraph experts assess evidence and make decisions about the results of the polygraph.

**Factors Influencing Eyewitness Identification and the Construction of Unbiased Lineups.** National Science Foundation.  
John Brigham, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306. 904-644-2525. Begin date: May 1985. End date: November 1986.

This project involved six studies on issues relevant to eyewitness testimony. The first two studies examined the length of time between witnessing an event and attempting an identification. The remaining four investigated the

effect of race, training, and level of experience on the construction of fair lineups and measures of lineup fairness.

**Development of a Diagnostic Polygraph Test and Evaluation of Blood Pressure Recording Methods for Polygraph Examination.** Federal Bureau of Investigation. Forensic Science Research Supervisor, FBI Academy, Quantico, VA 22135. 703-640-3308. Begin date: February 1984. End date: Ongoing.

This experimental research is developing a polygraph technique to give polygraph examiners the ability to distinguish among different roles that a subject may have taken in a crime (e.g., perpetrator, accomplice, witness, innocent).

**Explosive Overpressure Measurements.** Federal Bureau of Investigation.  
Forensic Science Research Supervisor, FBI Academy, Quantico, VA 22135. 703-640-3308. Begin date: Unknown. End date: Ongoing.

Courts are increasingly requiring forensic explosives experts to base opinions concerning the destructive capability of improvised explosive devices on actual laboratory experiments. This project seeks to implement a means of measuring blast overpressures to give an objective basis for comparing explosives.

## Sentencing

### *NIJ research*

**Detering the Drunk Driver: A Randomized Field Experiment of Specific Deterrence.**  
Brian Forst, Police Foundation, 1001 22nd Street NW., Washington, DC 20537. 202-833-1460. Begin date: October 1986. End date: September 1989.

This project will conduct a random sanction experiment in one U.S. city to evaluate the relative effectiveness of four types of sanctions on recidivism of first-time drunk drivers: incarceration, fines, license revocation, and education/treatment programs. Approximately 1,000 convicted first-time drunk drivers will be sentenced to one of the four sanctions. Two-year followup data will be analyzed compared to recidivism rates and times-to-failure for offenders receiving each of the four sanctions.

**Use and Effectiveness of Fines, Jail, and Probation in Municipal Courts.**  
Daniel Glaser, University of Southern California, Social Science Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA 90089-1111. 213-743-6955. Begin date: July 1986. End date: August 1988.

The study examines the cost effectiveness of fines, jail, and probation, and all combinations thereof, as penalties for convicted adult felony arrestees in Los Angeles County who are sentenced in its municipal courts. The research supplements sanction data from Offender Based Transaction Statistics with information from probation files on fines, cash restitution, court cost penalties and payments, job and financial status at sentencing, and subsequent recidivism. Findings will provide the basis for sentencing guidelines that minimize recidivism, costs, and possible jail overcrowding.

#### **A Comparison of Sentences for Sex Offenders.**

Jane Chapman, American Bar Association, Criminal Justice Section, 750 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, IL 60611. 202-331-2260. Begin date: October 1984. End date: March 1987.

Many child advocates criticize the courts for being too lenient in sexual abuse cases, but virtually no data are available on actual sentencing practices. This project compared criminal sanctions in each State for sexual offenses against both children and adults.

#### **Effectiveness of Client-Specific Planning as Client Advocacy and Alternative Sentencing.**

William Clements, University of Delaware, Sociology Department, Newark, NJ 19716. 302-451-6636. Begin date: October 1985. End date: April 1987.

This project was designed to aid policymakers, correctional administrators, and practitioners interested in seeking alternatives to incarceration. It assessed the viability and effectiveness of the National Center on Institutions and Alternatives Specific Planning Project to determine if the program reduces recidivism more effectively than incarceration and traditional probation.

#### **Evaluation of the Minnesota Determinate Sentencing System.**

Terance Miethe, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Department of Sociology, Blacksburg, VA 24061. 703-961-6878. Begin date: August 1985. End date: May 1987.

This evaluation of the 1980 Minnesota Determinate Sentencing Guidelines assessed trends in case processing and changes in sentencing practices. Preliminary findings indicated a significant reduction in sentencing disparities without additional strain on correctional resources.

#### **The Effects of Sentences on Subsequent Criminal Behavior.**

Jack McCarthy, Administrative Office of the Courts, Office of the Courts, Trenton, NJ 08625. 609-292-9580. Begin date: January 1985. End date: February 1987.

Focusing on robbery, burglary, and drug offenses, this project tracked offenders from 1977 to the time they

committed subsequent offenses. The effects of various sentences on subsequent recidivism were evaluated.

#### **Crime Control Effects of Sentencing Reform.**

Colin Loftin, University of Maryland, South Administration Building, College Park, MD 20742. 301-454-5129. Begin date: July 1984. End date: September 1986.

In the past decade, 39 States have inaugurated sentencing reforms. This project developed estimates of the crime that is prevented due to alternative sentencing policies.

#### **An Analysis of Who Receives Probation.**

Joan Petersilia, Rand Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90406. 213-393-0411. Begin date: October 1982. End date: February 1986.

This research provided an analysis of who receives felony probation, who succeeds on it, and the impacts of alternative sentencing options.

#### **Development and Testing of Selective Incapacitation Policies.**

Peter Greenwood, Rand Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90406. 213-393-0411. Begin date: September 1983. End date: February 1986.

Prison and jail overcrowding have generated research to predict the amount of crime that could be avoided by using selective sentencing or release. This project extends previous research using official records data from the California Youth Authority for two cohorts over a 10-year period.

#### ***Bureau of Justice Statistics research***

##### **Prison Commitment Patterns and Alternatives to Incarceration.**

George Roehm, Michigan Office of Criminal Justice, Lewis Cass Building, 2nd Floor, Lansing, MI 48909. 517-373-6510. Begin date: June 1987. End date: May 1988.

A study of prison commitment patterns provides a clear picture of the sentencing process in Michigan and suggests alternative solutions to the existing prison overcrowding problem.

##### **Sentencing Law Impact Study.**

Mary Mande, Colorado Division of Criminal Justice, 1325 South Colorado Boulevard, Building B-700, Denver, CO 80222. 303-691-8131. Begin date: June 1986. End date: May 1987.

Research was conducted to profile charged and convicted offenders before and after implementation of the 1985 Colorado Sentencing Law (HB 1320). It assessed the law's impact on plea bargaining, court case dispositions, and the correctional system; examined attitudes and responses of judges, district attorneys, and probation

officers toward the law; and examined the law's effectiveness as a get-tough-on-crime policy.

### *Other research agencies*

#### **Development and Expansion of Community Service Sentencing Program.**

U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections. Mark Umbreit, Minnesota Citizens Council on Crime and Justice, 822 South 3rd Street, Suite 100, Minneapolis, MN 55415. 612-340-5432. Begin date: October 1987. End date: October 1988.

This project is a geographic expansion of an existing program, the Court Referral Volunteer Program (CRVP), from one to seven counties surrounding St. Paul and Minneapolis, Minnesota. The program provides a placement service and supervision for misdemeanor probationers ordered to perform community service hours.

## **Trials**

### *NIJ research*

#### **Predicting Pretrial Success: A Comparison of Techniques.**

Charles Worzella, Wisconsin Correctional Service, 436 W. Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, WI 53203. 414-271-2512. Begin date: October 1987. End date: September 1989.

A prediction model to screen pretrial offenders will be developed and evaluated. Success is to be measured by failure-to-appear rates, rearrests, and a combination of the two. Felony cases will be analyzed separately from misdemeanor cases to identify any differences. A variety of release options will be studied including release on recognizance, pretrial supervision, and conditional release. Prediction variables will be compared and categorized as prior criminal history or community ties.

#### **Reducing Trial Time.**

Larry Sipes, National Center for State Courts, 300 Newport Avenue, Williamsburg, VA 23187. 804-253-2000. Begin date: November 1985. End date: February 1988.

This project examined in detail the length of criminal and civil trials in different States, the time consumed by the various components of trials, and the factors that accounted for the wide variations that were found. The project was designed to identify practices and procedures that appear to reduce trial length without impairing fairness.

#### **Juror's Death Penalty Beliefs and Conviction Proneness.**

James Luginbuhl, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695. 919-737-2254. Begin date: September 1984. End date: August 1986.

Jurors who strongly oppose the death penalty are typically not permitted to serve on juries of capital offenses. This project examined whether juries that are selected in capital trials are more likely to convict the defendant than are juries in noncapital trials.

#### **Scientific Evidence in the Courtroom: Overcoming Jurors' Inferential Problems.**

Ronald Mizokawa, University of Washington, 22 Administration Building, Seattle, WA 98195. 206-543-2100. Begin date: October 1985. End date: September 1986.

What influence does the mode of delivery have on jurors who are presented with probable evidence? This study evaluated the effects on the factual inferences jurors draw in criminal and civil courts.

### *Other research agencies*

#### **The Effects of Pretrial Publicity on Jury Behavior and Decisions.**

National Science Foundation. Norbert Kerr, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48823. 517-355-1855. Begin date: May 1985. End date: October 1987.

The tensions between the First Amendment right of a free press and the Sixth Amendment right to a speedy and impartial jury was the subject of this project. A major phase was a laboratory experiment that systematically varied the nature of the pretrial publicity, the timing between exposure to pretrial information and the actual trial, the type of voir dire questioning, as well as the strength of judicial admonitions.

#### **The Bilingual Courtroom: The Impact of the Court Interpreter on Juror's Perceptions of Witnesses and Attorneys.**

National Science Foundation. Susan Berk-Seligson, State University of New York, Stony Brook, NY 11790. 516-246-5000. Begin date: July 1985. End date: January 1987.

Jury decisionmaking is affected by a variety of factors. This research evaluated the impact of court interpreters on juror's and attorney's perceptions of witnesses.

#### **The Effects of Evidence on Inferential Processes of Juror and Juries.**

National Science Foundation. Sarah Tanford, Purdue University, Lafayette, IN 47907. 317-494-4600. Begin date: July 1984. End date: January 1986.

This study advanced our understanding of the dynamics of legal decisionmaking. It used realistic videotape to identify the inferences that explain how jurors assess evidence and make legal judgments that are based on various procedures—such as the judge's instruction to the jury.

### **Statistical Assessments as Evidence in the Courts.**

National Science Foundation.

David Goslin, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20418. 202-334-2000. Begin date: July 1985. End date: January 1986.

This project stimulated thinking about and research on ways in which the burgeoning use of statistics in litigation affects the justice system and court processes. The project considered how courts handle and adapt to statistical evidence, and developed an agenda of further research.

## **Victims**

### ***NIJ research***

#### **Victim Impact Statements: Their Effects on Victims and Court Outcomes.**

Robert Davis, Metropolitan Assistance Corporation, Victim Services Agency, 2 Lafayette Street, New York, NY 10007. 212-577-7700. Begin date: October 1987. End date: June 1989.

This research will examine the effect of victim impact statements on sentencing decisions and victim satisfaction with the criminal justice system. It will address different methods of presenting victim impact statements, and will attempt to determine which methods are most effective. A sampling of robbery victims in the Bronx, New York, felony court will be interviewed about their satisfaction with the court process and case outcome. Judges, prosecutors, and defense attorneys will be interviewed for their reaction to the victim impact statements.

#### **Effects of Criminal Court Testimony on Child Sexual Assault Victims.**

Gail Goodman, University of Denver, Psychology Department, Denver, CO 80208. 303-871-3717. Begin date: September 1985. End date: August 1988.

Despite the current focus on child sexual abuse, little scientific data exist concerning the effects of criminal involvement on children. This project measured the effects of court testimony and related experiences on children and identified children who are likely to be retraumatized by court involvement. The study also identified the types of cases that go to trial, children's feelings about court involvement, and their reactions to testifying.

#### **The Impact of the Courts on the Sexually Abused Child.**

Desmond Runyan, University of North Carolina, 300 Bynum Hall-008A, Chapel Hill, NC 27514. 919-962-1136. Begin date: October 1985. End date: January 1988.

This project followed a group of 100 sexually abused children for 18 months after the initial sexual abuse was reported. Comparisons were made between children whose cases received criminal court attention and those

that did not; children who did and did not testify; children whose perpetrator was or was not incarcerated; and children who were placed in foster care and those who remained at home.

#### **Authorization-Implementation of Victim Impact Statements.**

Maureen McLeod, State University of New York, Hindelang Criminal Justice Research Center, P.O. Box 9, Albany, NY 12201. 518-442-3300. Begin date: January 1986. End date: December 1987.

Victim impact statements are oral or written descriptions about the effects of the crime on the victim. This project examined the rationale for and implementation of victim impact statements. Statutes, case law, and administrative rules were reviewed, and probation administrators, prosecutorial personnel, and parole board administrators were surveyed to elicit information on local practices. A report will provide guidance to legislators considering such legislation and to practitioners in charge of programs for victims.

#### **Study of Robbery Murder and Robbery Serious Victim Injury.**

Philip Cook, Duke University, 4875 Duke Station, Durham, NC 27706. 919-684-2323. Begin date: March 1983. End date: June 1986.

This project sought means to reduce serious injuries and deaths in robberies. The research was designed to enhance prosecutorial and sentencing strategies targeted at violent career criminals.

#### **Victim Appearance at Sentence and Parole Hearings in California.**

Edwin Villmoare, McGeorge School of Law, 3200 Fifth Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95817. 916-739-7129. Begin date: November 1983. End date: January 1986.

California's Proposition 8 gave victims the right to appear and be heard at sentencing proceedings and at parole eligibility hearings, but victim appearances seem to have had little effect on sentencing. The possible impact is severely limited by the high percentages of cases plea bargained, the determinate sentencing laws, and the strong indication that victims are not aware of the right to appear.

### ***Bureau of Justice Assistance research***

#### **Los Angeles City Family Violence Intervention Program.**

Michael F. Thompson, California Criminal Justice Planning Office, 200 North Spring Street, Room M-10, Los Angeles, CA 90012. 213-485-4425. Begin date: October 1986. End date: March 1988.

A uniform and coordinated criminal justice system response to family violence was established to deter

abusers as well as provide a sensitive response to victims. A Family Violence Intervention Unit, comprised of a supervising attorney and a team of attorneys, analyzed, prepared, and conducted trials; developed a vertical system of prosecution involving the trial attorney team; and developed procedures to obtain complete criminal histories and records of uncharged family violence incidents prior to the first court appearance. Specific policies for handling domestic violence cases were implemented. A Family Violence Coordinator trained trial attorneys and acted as a liaison with community resources to provide victim advocacy.

#### **Family Violence Intervention Program.**

Constance Caplan, Baltimore County, Criminal Justice Coordinator's Office, 312 Courthouse, Towson, MD 21204. 301-494-4230. Begin date: May 1986. End date: October 1987.

New grant resources were integrated with the existing service structure to increase the effectiveness of law enforcement and criminal justice intervention in reducing domestic assault. The program provided the following resources: a domestic violence coordinator, a State's Attorney law clerk for pretrial preparation, a victim-witness law clerk for victim advocacy, a minicomputer information management system, and improved treatment services.

#### ***Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention research***

##### **Victims and Witnesses in the Juvenile Justice System.**

Blair Bourque, American Institutes for Research, 1055 Thomas Jefferson Street NW., Washington, DC 20007. 202-342-5000. Begin date: October 1987. End date: September 1990.

This initiative will help juvenile justice and related human services agencies establish specialized programs and services for victims and witnesses. The programs and services are designed to enhance dispositional development and decisionmaking; ensure that opportunities for victim participation in the adjudicatory process are fully utilized; and increase overall victim satisfaction with the juvenile justice system.

##### **The Child Victim as a Witness: Research and Development Program.**

Debra Whitcomb, Education Development Center, Inc., 55 Chapel Street, Newton, MA 02160. 617-969-7100. Begin date: September 1987. End date: August 1990.

Techniques to improve the handling of child victims who are witnesses will be tested. These include avoiding direct confrontation between the child victim witness and the defendant; permitting special exceptions to hearsay for sexually abused children; eliminating or modifying

competency criteria for child victims; and excluding spectators from the courtroom audience. A collaborative relationship with local courts, prosecutors, judges, law enforcement personnel, and protective services workers in four jurisdictions will be established to implement procedural and evidentiary techniques intended to reduce trauma.

##### **National Center for the Prosecution of Child Abuse.**

Benjamin Shapiro, American Prosecutors Research Institute, 1033 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, VA 22314. 202-724-8491. Begin date: November 1985. End date: October 1988.

This program was designed to assist prosecution of physical and sexual child abuse cases. Technical assistance, training, and clearinghouse activities will be available to improve the handling and treatment of the child victim, to help develop model legislation, and to provide training in prosecution and treatment of these cases.

#### ***Other research agencies***

##### **Children as Witness in Cases of Child Sexual Abuse.**

James Bond, National Council of Jewish Women, Center for the Child, 15 East 26th Street, New York, NY 10010. 212-532-1740. Begin date: September 1986. End date: August 1989.

This study will examine how the accuracy and credibility of a child's testimony can be improved by investigating the legal decisionmaking process. The following questions will be addressed: What features of a child's testimony make it credible to criminal justice decisionmakers? What factors influence the quality of a child's testimony? And what factors other than a child's testimony (particularly factors that might be manipulated by systematic reform) affect decisions in child sexual abuse cases?

##### **Children's Testimony and Juror's Reactions to Child Witnesses.**

Gail Goodman, University of Denver, Colorado Seminary, Department of Psychology, University Park, Denver, CO 80208. 303-871-3717. Begin date: September 1986. End date: August 1989.

A child's ability to provide accurate eyewitness testimony and to resist suggestion, and jurors' reactions to child witnesses will be examined. Techniques to support the accuracy of a child's reports, limit suggestibility, and strengthen credibility in the courts will be investigated.

##### **Preparing Sexually Abused Children for Testimony: Children's Perceptions of the Legal Process.**

Gary Melton, University of Nebraska at Lincoln, Department of Psychology, 209 Barnett Hall, Lincoln, NE 80308. 402-472-3130. Begin date: September 1986. End date: August 1989.

---

Knowledge about children's perceptions of the legal system and their experiences interacting with the legal process is needed to adequately prepare sexually abused children to testify on their own behalf. Sexually abused children will be interviewed during the legal process about their concepts, perceptions, and feelings. Their perceptions will be compared to those of a matched sample of nonabused children.

**Crime Victims' Model Legislation.** Office for Victims of Crime.

Dan Eddy, National Association of Attorneys General, 444 North Capitol Street, Washington, DC 20001. 202-628-0435. Begin date: June 1984. End date: February 1988.

This project continued the collection of model legislation drafted in response to specific recommendations of the President's Task Force on Victims of Crime. Model statutes were brought before State legislatures for consideration. States likely to pass new legislation received intensive assistance.

The Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, coordinates the activities of the following program Offices and Bureaus: National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and Office for Victims of Crime.

U. S. GPO: 1989-241-714/80017