

95374

THE 1985 SURVEY OF INMATES OF ADULT STATE
CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES
RATIONALE AND ISSUES FOR INCLUSION

PHYLLIS JO BAUNACH, Ph.D.
Statistician

Bureau of Justice Statistics
March, 1984

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

Bureau of Justice Statistics

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

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

I. Background of the Survey of Inmates of Adult State Correctional Facilities

Survey of Inmates of Adult State Correctional Facilities (hereafter referred to as the Survey) is part of the National Prisoner Statistics (NPS) Program. First begun in 1926 in the U. S. Bureau of the Census, the purpose of the NPS program is to "collect and interpret data on State and Federal correctional institutions and their inmates" (Cantwell 1974: iii). The program was transferred to the Bureau of Prisons in 1950 and to LEAA in 1971. The U. S. Bureau of the Census has served as the data collection agent for the NPS program since its transfer to LEAA.

Within LEAA, the program has evolved into two major branches dealing with admissions and releases in one unit and the Survey and Census in another unit. The admissions and releases program counts the numbers of inmates admitted to and released from adult state correctional institutions on a quarterly basis. The Survey and Census provide a snapshot of inmates and facilities, respectively, at one point in time every five years. In the past, both the Survey and Census have been conducted at the same time. Beginning with this cycle, however, the Census of Adult State Correctional Facilities will be conducted in 1984 and the Survey of Inmates in 1985. Additional information about the Census may be found in Baunach, P. J., "The 1984 Census of Adult State Correctional Facilities: Rationale and Issues for Inclusion", BJS, July, 1983, unpublished paper, available from the author.

The first Survey was conducted in January, 1974 with individual interviews using a representative sample of roughly 10,000 inmates. The information obtained in the Survey

included demographic and socioeconomic background, military experience, prior criminal record, current offense, history of incarcerations, adjudication experience, prison routine, and drug and alcohol use. This information was tabulated and presented in two separate reports. Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities, 1974: Advance Report issued in March, 1976 and Profile of State Prison Inmates: Sociodemographic Findings From the 1974 Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities, released in August, 1979. The first report presents a broad overview of the major topics covered in the Survey (ie., demographic information; alcohol consumption; offense; adjudication and sentence data; prison routine; and prior criminal record). The second or final report for the Survey, delineates the inmates' demographic and socioeconomic characteristics in relation to one another and in relation to various criminal characteristics. The most frequently used variables include race, offense and number of past sentences an inmate had served. In addition, comparisons were made between the inmate population and the U. S. population on selected characteristics.

The second Survey was conducted in November, 1979 using a representative sample of about 12,000 inmates from adult state correctional facilities. Topics covered in this Survey included demographic and socioeconomic background, military experience, prior criminal record, current offense and incarceration history, adjudication experience, grievance mechanisms, use of legal materials in prison, involvement in incidents and disposition during incarceration, parole hearings, work assignment, drug and alcohol use and health care during incarceration. Preliminary information was presented as an advance report in the Bulletin, Prisons and Prisoners in January, 1982. In addition, three topical Bulletins and a special report have been prepared. The Bulletins include Veterans in Prison, November, 1981, Prisoners and Alcohol, January, 1983, and Prisoners and

Drugs, March, 1983. To date, a final report summarizing the information gathered in the 1979 Survey has not been written. A Special Report, Career Patterns in Crime, was issued in June, 1983.

Both of these Surveys were conducted in tandem with the Census of Adult State Correctional Facilities. Presumably, the rationale for conducting these two efforts simultaneously was twofold: (a) to enable a linkage between the Census and Survey data bases; and (b) to allow for weighting the Survey data by the universe of inmates as represented in the Census. However, to date, there has been no systematic attempt to link the two data bases. Moreover, it may be more beneficial in selecting the sample for the Survey to conduct the Census at least one year in advance. The need for weighting Survey data is then eliminated and staff time may be concentrated on the development of the Census and Survey one at a time, rather than jointly and more hastily. Thus, the 1985 Survey will vary from previous efforts in that it will be conducted a year after the Census of Adult State Correctional Facilities. Census data will then be used to draw the sample for the Survey.

The following pages present a rationale, objectives, issues and specific questions to be addressed in the 1985 Survey of Inmates of Adult State Correctional Facilities. The questions are framed as they relate to major issues in corrections today. In this sense, this paper defines the boundaries of the Survey in terms of its relevance in obtaining information which will be useful to policy-makers, practitioners, researchers and academicians. In addition, the questions posed reflect, to some extent, an interest in updating information collected in prior Survey efforts to enable an analysis of changes over time.

Finally, there may be additional issues of importance to the corrections field that should be addressed in the upcoming Survey that have not been mentioned herein. The reader is thus invited to submit for consideration, additional such issues along with a rationale for their inclusion and specific questions to be raised and analysis approaches to be used. Please send this information along with comments on the proposed Survey no later than June 1, 1984 to:

Phyllis Jo Baunach, Ph.D.
Bureau of Justice Statistics
Room 1013
633 Indiana Avenue N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20531
Phone: 202/724-7755

II. Why Study the Inmates? :Survey Objectives

Over the past few years there has been a dramatic increase in the numbers of men and women incarcerated in prisons across the country. In 1981, there was a 12.5% increase (roughly 40,000 inmates), in the incarcerated population, the largest increase in the nation's history (Gardner 1982: 6; Minor-Harper 1982: 1). Similarly, in 1982 there was an 11.6% increase in the prison population size, bringing the total of incarcerated persons well over 412,000 (Minor-Harper 1983: 1; Gettinger 1983: 6). By mid-year 1983, the prison population figure was 431,829, a 4.2% increase over 1982 (Cantwell, 1983: 1). These staggering increases in size of the incarcerated population have exacerbated already crowded prisons throughout the country, and have stimulated resounding cries for

additional reforms in sentencing policies, ceilings on prison population sizes, greater use of alternatives to incarceration and, among a more conservative faction, more prison construction.

In an era when the primary focus of correctional philosophy is on punishment (von Hirsch 1976) or incapacitation (Sherman and Hawkins 1981), rather than on rehabilitation, one may well ask why there should be much interest in collecting information about inmate characteristics. Three points are relevant to address this concern. First, despite the decline of rehabilitation as the focal point of correctional philosophy and effort, there is still a need to provide services for incarcerated offenders and there is still a recognition of the rehabilitative ideal among corrections practitioners (Morris 1974). This point was articulated in the American Correctional Association's recently announced "Public Correctional Policy", which outlines the goals and objectives of corrections in this country. Among the elements of the purpose for corrections are: "...to offer the widest range of correctional options...to meet the needs of both society and the individual..." and " ... to provide humane program and service opportunities for accused and adjudicated offenders that will enhance their community integration and economic self-sufficiency..." (Nesbitt 1983:86).

Second, particularly because of the massive increase in the numbers of incarcerated offenders, there is a need to determine the nature of the population to know to whom correctional practices are being directed. The development of whatever services are provided in the institution must begin with an understanding of for whom these services are being provided (Conrad 1967: 288). Absent some understanding of client characteristics, it would be impossible to provide meaningful services.

The importance of this point has been echoed by those who argue that programs for the incarcerated offenders may be effective in changing post-prison behavior but that it is imperative to ascertain under what conditions which programs work for whom (Palmer 1976: 42). Determining the "for whom", again underscores the importance of carefully identifying the population served.

Finally, in planning for much needed reforms in the corrections processing and handling of offenders, some have argued for a need to "selectively identify" (Montilla and Harlow 1979: 28) the problems to be addressed. An accurate identification of problems begins with a clear understanding of both the inmate and environment within which he lives.

In order to enhance our understanding of the inmate and the environment, the Bureau of Justice Statistics conducts the Survey of Adult State Correctional Inmates and the Census of Adult State Correctional Facilities. The Survey concentrates on a profile of the inmates and the Census, on a profile of the facilities. These systematic data collection efforts provide the only comprehensive national picture of incarcerated offenders and facilities in the country.

Two other points about these data collection efforts are worthy of note. First, the Survey and Census data were collected previously in 1974 and 1979. Thus, the information obtained at the end of this data collection phase will enable researchers to compare conditions and inmate characteristics at three points in time over roughly a ten year period. These kinds of comparisons have heretofore not been possible. Second, data tapes from each of these efforts have been placed in the Criminal Justice Archives and

Information Network at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor and are available for public use.

Within this framework, the primary purpose of the Survey is to describe the characteristics of inmates housed in adult state correctional facilities nationwide. These facilities include both state prisons and residential community correctional facilities operated by the state. The facilities housing these inmates are taken from the Census of Adult State Correctional Facilities to be conducted in June, 1984.

The Survey covers a broad range of topics encompassing both criminal and non-criminal characteristics. Given this scope, it is not intended as a hypothesis-testing but as a hypothesis-generating device. Information from the Survey may be used in many ways: to provide a descriptive analysis of the prison population at one point in time; to assess changes over time; or to conduct specific analyses on key issues in corrections. More specifically, the objectives of the Survey are as follows:

- 1) To obtain a detailed profile of the characteristics of inmates housed in adult state correctional facilities across the country. This information which will be used in part, to assess changes in the inmate population since the 1974 and 1979 inmate surveys, will include demographic and socio-economic characteristics, current offense, prior criminal record, military service, drug and alcohol use, prison activities, and victim offender relationships.
- 2) To obtain information that addresses major issues in corrections related to inmates and inmate characteristics. These issues include, for instance, sentencing; recidivism;

career criminals; deterrent effects of incarceration; incapacitation; the impacts of drug and alcohol use on criminal involvement; and the evolution of criminal patterns from juvenile status through adulthood.

3) To provide information that will be used in assessing trends in the characteristics of the inmate population from 1974 through 1985 (eg., changes in criminal offenses; demographic characteristics; prison activities; drug and alcohol use).

4) To provide public use data tapes for use by interested practitioners, planners, academicians and researchers through the Criminal Justice Archive and Information Network (CJAIN) at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

With a focus on the collection and dissemination of information about inmates, the Survey provides the most accurate, concise information about inmate characteristics that may be used by planners and practitioners in making informed policy decisions and by researchers in their examination of specific corrections issues. In this sense, the Survey data provide a national picture of who is incarcerated and a starting point for developing programmatic changes in processing and handling criminal offenders.

III. Development of the 1985 Survey of Inmates of Adult State Correctional Facilities

The following section presents information regarding the development of the 1985 Survey, (ie., methodology, topics for inclusion and analysis approaches).

A. Methodology

The methodology for the Survey includes the sample selection, pre-test and data

collection.

1. Sample Selection

The Survey sample selection procedures provide a representative sample of inmates in state correctional systems across the country. Institutions include both prisons and state-operated community based facilities. Sample selection for the Survey entails a two-stage process. The first stage involves selection of a random sample of facilities from among the universe of correctional facilities included in the Census of Adult State Correctional Facilities. The second stage involves selection of a random sample of inmates from within each facility sampled in stage one. Interviewers at each facility select the inmates based upon predetermined subsampling instructions devised by the Census Bureau in accord with BJS specifications.

In both 1974 and 1979, selection of facilities involved stratification of facilities by the four Census Bureau regions and the selection of facilities according to population size.

In 1974, as a first step in developing the Survey design, all institutions were stratified by number of prisoners: 0-19, 200-399, 400-899, and 900+. All institutions with an estimated prisoner population of 900+ inmates were designated for the sample with certainty. Prisoners in these institutions were sampled at a rate of 1 in 18. Institutions in the remaining four strata were sorted within stratum by: type of institution (Adult Prison, Community Correctional Center, Work Release Center, Prison or Road Camp, Reception or Pre-Release Center, and Other Types of Facilities), Region (Northeast, North Central, South, and West) and specific size of institution. Institutions were selected from stratum I (size 0-19) at 1 in 18, from stratum II (size 20-199) at 1 in 6, from stratum III (size 200-399) at 1 in 3.6, and from stratum IV (size 400-899) at 1 in 2. Prisoners from selected

institutions were sampled from the non-self representing strata at 1 in 1, 1 in 3, 1 in 5, and 1 in 9, respectively. The differing sampling procedures assured an estimated sample of about 200 institutions and an overall sampling rate of 1 in 18 for all prisoners (memo from Morton Boisen, Chief, SMD to Earle Benson, Chief DSD, January 31, 1975: 1).

In 1979, a sample of approximately 215 facilities was selected. From these facilities a total of 12,000 inmates, 500 male inmates and 2,500 female inmates, were chosen for interviews. This sample was designed to oversample the number of women to enable analyses by sex of inmates and to produce reliabilities of no larger than a 5% coefficient of variation for estimates of 10% subpopulations of male inmates and a 10% coefficient of variation for estimates of 10% subpopulations for women inmates nationally (memo from Charles Jones, Chief, SMD, to Marvin Thompson, Chief, DSD, June 1, 1979: 1). The actual coefficients of variation were 4.8% for male inmates and 6.0% for female inmates (memo from Charles Jones, Chief, SMD to Thomas Walsh, Chief, DSD, November 14, 1983 :2).

The sample selection procedure for the 1985 Survey will closely parallel the procedures established in previous Surveys. Women inmates will be oversampled to allow for meaningful analyses by sex. In order to attain coefficients of variation of roughly 5.4% for women and 4.3% for men for estimates of 10% subpopulations for male and female inmate samples, respectively, and to maintain roughly the same proportion of men to women in the sample (ie., 3.8) as was used in 1979, approximately 15,000 inmates should be sampled.

This figure includes 11,875 men and 3,125 women (memo from Charles Jones, Chief,

SMD, to Thomas Walsh, Chief, DSD, September 26, 1983 :2). Procedures for sample selection will be finalized over the coming months.

2. Pre-Test

During late 1984 or early 1985, a pre-test of the questionnaire and training materials for interviewers will be conducted. Roughly 200 male and female inmates from two states will be included. The actual sample size and sites for the pre-test have not been finalized. The purposes of the pre-test are twofold:

- 1) to determine the appropriateness, readability and flow of the items included on the questionnaire; and
- 2) to determine the utility and appropriateness of the home study training materials for interviewers.

Interviewers will be selected through the Census Bureau's Field Division to collect the pre-test data. BJS staff will accompany interviewers to observe the interview process. Debriefings with interviewers will be done to obtain input from interviewers as to the interview process, training materials and changes needed.

In addition, the pre-test will include a records check in order to ascertain the extent to which information obtained from inmates, particularly relating to current offense and prior criminal record, accurately reflects what is reported in the records.

Information from the pre-test will be used to revise the questionnaire and the training

materials.

3. Data Collection

Immediately prior to the data collection effort, a formal training session for Census Bureau region Supervisors will be conducted in Washington, D.C. to ensure their understanding and enlist their support in conducting the study. This type of training session held prior to the Survey of Inmates of Local Jails was helpful in enhancing the Supervisors' understanding of the program and issues related to jails and jail inmates and may have indirectly, contributed to the decrease in the refusal rate for the Jail Survey.

In addition, formal training for interviewers will be conducted. This training will consist of two phases. First, interviewers will participate in home study of materials related to the criminal justice system and the questionnaire. Information regarding the criminal justice system will be incorporated into the training materials to familiarize interviewers with the criminal justice concepts and the criminal justice process. Second, interviewers will participate in group training sessions. Included in these sessions will be simulations of interviews (ie., wherein one interviewer plays the role of the inmate and the other, the interviewer) in order to give interviewers practice in determining how to respond to possibly difficult situations in recording information presented by inmates.

The actual data collection effort will be conducted during the summer of 1985. As in previous Survey efforts, interviewers will draw a random sample of inmates at their assigned prisons and conduct interviews.

B. Topics for Inclusion in the 1985 Survey

As noted in the previous section, the Survey serves many purposes. It provides an overview of inmates at one point in time, enables comparisons of characteristics over time, and allows for analysis of specific timely issues. Given these broad purposes, the Survey will provide general information on a wide range of issues pertaining to adult offenders incarcerated in state penal and state-operated community-based corrections facilities.

Topics include both criminal and non-criminal characteristics as follows:

1) Criminal Characteristics

- a) Current Offenses
- b) Victim-Offender Relationships
- c) Pre-Trial Experience
- d) The Adjudication Process
- e) Prior Criminal Record

2) Non-Criminal Characteristics

- a) Demographic Characteristics
- b) Socioeconomic Characteristics
- c) Military Service
- d) Drug and Alcohol Use

e) Prison Activities

These topics will be described briefly.

1. Criminal Characteristics

Criminal characteristics refer to factors and experiences that describe an inmate's involvement with the criminal justice process. These factors relate to both prior criminal involvement from youth through adulthood and the crime or crimes for which the offender is currently incarcerated. The latter category includes not only the nature of the current offense(s) but also victim-offender relationships and experiences encountered in the pre-trial and adjudication processes for the most recent offense(s). Each of these topics will be discussed briefly.

a. Current Offenses

This topic refers to the crime or crimes for which the offender is currently incarcerated. The current offense may be the only one for which the offender has ever been incarcerated. On the other hand, an offender may have been on probation or incarcerated previously, released on parole and violated for any number of reasons other than a new offense. The crime for which the offender had been placed on probation or had been released on parole, (assuming he has not been violated for an additional offense), then, is his current crime. For an offender who had been on probation or parole and had been involved in subsequent criminal activity, the most recent crime for which he was arrested and (presumably) convicted is the current offense.

For offenders currently serving time on more than one offense, the Survey will collect data on the sentence imposed for each crime; this information, which was not collected in past Survey efforts, is important to obtain an accurate assessment of the length of time imposed by the court as a sanction for different crimes. The crime which has been given the longest sentence will be used in analyses as the controlling offense for each offender.

Moreover, for those offenders who had been released on probation or parole and violated for any reason, the lengths of time they had spent on the street will be obtained to determine patterns of criminal behavior during probation or parole.

Questions that will guide the development of this section of the questionnaire include the following: For what crime(s) is the offender currently incarcerated? When was he arrested for the current crime(s)? When was his trial? When was he convicted? What was the nature of the sanction imposed (ie: prison? probation? probation plus restitution or community service?) How long was the sentence imposed by the court for each offense of conviction? If placed on probation, how long did he serve on probation? Was he violated for a new criminal offense or for some other reason? If he was released on parole, conditional release, etc., and returned to prison, when was he released from prison? When was he returned to prison? Was he returned to prison for a new criminal offense or for some other reason? How long was he released on parole, conditional release, etc.?

b. Victim-Offender Relationships

Within recent years, there has been a growing interest in the role of the victim in criminal events (Schafer 1968; 1970). Victimologists have considered the attribution of victim-responsibility in precipitating crimes (Gulotta and Neuberger 1983: 10). Activists have begun to fight for the rights of victims in the criminal justice process, particularly in violent crimes or domestic disputes (Moore 1979; Fleming 1979). In attempting to alleviate the suffering borne by thousands of victims of criminal activities each year, the President's Task Force on Victims (1982) promulgated several recommendations for legislative reforms and agency action to assist victims at every stage of the criminal justice process.

Moreover, determinations of the seriousness of offenses from the standpoints of both public perceptions (Klaus and Kalish 1984) and the development of indices of crimes (Blumstein 1974) have begun to take into account victim-related factors (Heller and McEwen 1973).

From the perspective of processing offenders, those who favor deterrence and just deserts for offenders (von Hirsch 1983) urge that consideration be given to the nature and extent of the harm inflicted on the victim as well as the culpability of the offender in determining the appropriate sanction. This approach requires that the sanction imposed satisfy the demands of justice and remain fair to the offender. For instance, a sanction requiring 20 years of imprisonment for stealing a loaf of bread from a bakery would seemingly satisfy neither criteria. Of course, the standard setter (ie., legislature, court,

commission) bears the great responsibility of determining which sanctions most appropriately meet these criteria and fit each crime.

The desert model suggests, in essence, that longer imprisonment should be imposed on those who commit the most serious crimes. "Seriousness" is defined in terms of the harm inflicted and the culpability of the offender. Culpability refers generally to the extent of the offender's blameworthiness. Factors which contribute to the blameworthiness include whether the offense was done intentionally, recklessly, negligently or punishable regardless of the offender's intent (such that the offender has strict liability for the crime as in products liability cases); the extent of the victim's involvement in the crime; and whether the offender was the primary perpetrator or had a lesser role in the offense (von Hirsch 1976: 80).

Harm to the victim has been operationalized most recently in efforts to assess the "seriousness" of offenses based on the initial work of Sellin and Wolfgang. This method of measuring seriousness cuts across the labels we commonly associate with crimes (ie., larceny, burglary, rape) to assess the gravity of the event in terms of the injury to the victim. In this schema, criminal events may be characterized by the components that reflect personal injury, threat and intimidation and property damaged, stolen or destroyed. From scores on each component, a total seriousness score may be derived (Figlio 1983).

Obtaining information on the seriousness of crimes, particularly as seriousness is measured by the harm to the victim, would allow for several types of analyses:

1) From a national level, one analysis would entail considering the nature of various offenses, such as robbery, in terms of its component parts of harm to the victim. To what extent does robbery, for instance, generally include intimidation? Threat? Personal injury? Property damage?

2) A seriousness of offenses ranking could be constructed to determine the relative rank order of various types of crimes on a national level. Seriousness would, of course, be measured in terms of harm to the victim. Similarly, this information could be compared across regions for specific crime types to determine whether robbery, for instance, appears to be a more serious offense in one region of the country than in another. This measure would provide a crude estimate of the level of violence to the victim associated with specific types of crime in various regions.

3) In addition, the lengths of sentence imposed for various types of crime (ie., current offense) could be compared nationally and by region to determine the extent to which more serious crimes are, in fact, associated with longer terms of judicially imposed imprisonment. This information would be particularly useful if such factors as prior criminal record (ie., number of prior incarcerations; nature of the crime; previous sentence length) are controlled. Among first offenders (ie., those who have not been incarcerated in the past), one might expect that those convicted of more serious crimes should be given longer terms of imprisonment than those convicted of less serious crimes and shorter terms of imprisonment than offenders convicted of similar crimes who have been incarcerated in the past. In essence, one might expect the number of prior incarcerations to diminish the favored status of those who have erred only once

Survey data could be used to test these expectations as well as to make comparisons in these expectations by such factors as age, sex, and race. For instance, are both men and women convicted of more serious crimes given longer prison terms than are men and women convicted of less serious crimes? Or is there, perhaps a cross-over effect, such that women convicted of less serious crimes are given shorter sentences but those convicted of more serious crimes are given longer sentences than men convicted of similar crimes? How are these results changed when prior record of each sex is taken into account? Analyses of this kind will provide information on the issue of to whom longer sentences are given for more serious crimes.

To the extent that offenders convicted of less serious crimes are given longer prison terms than those convicted of more serious crimes, there is a need for policy-makers to reconsider the means used in determining sentence lengths imposed to enhance fairness. This information is important given swelling prison populations and the need to use existing prison space most efficiently. Further, the extent to which more serious offenders regardless of such factors as sex or race, are, in fact, given longer prison terms would suggest the extent to which this country as a whole is more closely embracing a sentencing structure akin to the deserts model and thus, perhaps providing relative fairness in sentencing.

An additional variable of interest is the relationship between the victim and offender at the time of the offense. For which types of crimes do victims of incarcerated offenders tend to be persons, businesses, government, etc? What is the nature of the relationship (ie., family? friend? acquaintance? stranger? employee? employer?) for various types of

offenses? Does the sentence length imposed vary for a certain crime when the victim differs? Is there a relationship between the relative seriousness of the crime of conviction and the type of victim (ie., person, business, government)? That is, do more serious crimes tend to have to be those that have persons as victims as opposed to those that involve more impersonal businesses or governments as victims?

Questions regarding the nature of the relationship between victim and offender at the time of the offense may be easily asked in a face-to-face interview. However, items concerning the elements of the criminal event may be more difficult to obtain. Items used in the BJS Victimization Survey may be adaptable to the inmate Survey; this possibility is currently under exploration.

c. Pre-Trial Experience

The pre-trial experience refers to an offender's experiences, criminal activity and involvement with the criminal justice system from arrest to conviction for the current offense.

Information on the pre-trial experience provides an important backdrop against which to assess the current incarceration and a link to the prior criminal record. Since the focus of the Survey is on convicted offenders serving time in state correctional facilities, only a few important issues regarding the pre-trial experience will be examined. These issues include: the nature of pre-trial crime; type of pre-trial release; and jail time.

1) The Nature of Pre-Trial Crime: Many jurisdictions release a large proportion of the

pre-trial population in order to alleviate crowded jail conditions and to enable unconvicted citizens to remain at home with loved ones and lead relatively productive lives. However, considering the priority of protecting the public safety, it is important to determine the extent to which this release practice results in an increased number of crimes. Although the parameters of the Survey preclude an in-depth study of crime among all pre-trial persons, these data will enable us to assess the nature and extent of pre-trial crimes committed by offenders incarcerated in state penal and correctional facilities. The primary questions of interest are: what proportion of the offender population has committed crimes while awaiting trial? What types of crimes were committed?

2) The Type of Pre-Trial Release: In determining the conditions under which pre-trial crimes occur, the Survey will also request information on the nature of pre-trial release. Offenders awaiting trial may be released on bail, own recognizance, or third party conditional release. Within recent years, there has been some controversy on the use of bail as a viable means of enabling offenders to remain in the community before and during trial.

Bail is required as a condition of release presumably to ensure the offender's appearance in court. However, whether or not bail should be set and the amounts required are left to the discretion of the court. Although the U. S. Constitution forbids excessive bail, courts have the discretion to set bail beyond the ability of the defendant to pay. In essence, then, the bail system has generated a form of pre-trial detention in that those charged with crimes who are unable to pay the price of bail are detained. Judges thus have the power to set bail beyond the means of indigent offenders whom they suspect will abscond

or commit new crimes prior to trial. The threat of pre-trial confinement has been used to coerce defendants to accept guilty pleas or risk spending time prior to trial in jail (von Hirsch 1976: 114).

Advocates of pre-trial release contend that bail poses undue burdens on indigent offenders and should be reserved for offenders charged with heinous crimes. In order to provide some data on these issues, the Survey will include questions regarding the nature, extent and use of bail as opposed to other types of pre-trial release.

Questions regarding pre-trial release will include: What proportion of the incarcerated population was released prior to trial for the current crimes on bail? on own recognizance? on third party conditional release? How long were these persons out on release prior to trial? For those offenders released on bail, how much bail was required? Who provided the money? How much (if any) was returned? For those offenders who were unable to be released prior to trial, why was release not granted (ie., nature of the charges; amount of bail set, etc.)? What are the characteristics of those persons released on bail, own recognizance, on third party conditional release (ie., demographics, current charges, prior record, socioeconomic status)?

3) Jail Time: Not all offenders are released prior to trial. Given the nature of the offenses charged and/or the amount of bail required as noted earlier, many offenders are required to remain in jail during the trial. Given currently crowded jails, some of these offenders may be more appropriately released prior to trial. Thus, the Survey will ascertain the proportion of incarcerated offenders who were detained prior to trial; the reasons for their detention (ie., nature of the offenses; amount of bail required; own

desire to remain in jail); and the amount of time detained in jail prior to and following trial.

In addition, offenders detained in jail either prior to or following conviction may incur "jail time" that is subtracted from the sentence imposed. This information is important to understand the amount of time an offender has to serve in the state facility. "Jail time" thus serves as an important index for both jail crowding, (ie., how long has the offender stayed in jail?) and prison crowding, (ie., how much longer will he stay in prison?).

d. The Adjudication Process

The dynamics of the adjudication process influence who ends up in prison and for what offenses. Plea bargaining lowers initial charges to those for which a conviction is obtained. In addition, whether an offender is able to afford his own legal counsel as opposed to having one appointed by the court may be related to the extent of plea bargaining used and the outcome of the case. Although it is impossible to obtain information on all of the intricacies of the adjudication process, the Survey will include information on some of the key factors of the adjudication process that may affect prison populations. These include the nature of legal counsel (ie., appointed by the court or hired by the offender); whether the offender has plead guilty or was found guilty for the crimes charged; and whether original charges were lowered through plea bargaining. This information will enable us to address descriptive questions such as the following: What are the characteristics of offenders who hired their own lawyers as opposed to having counsel appointed by the court? who plead guilty as opposed to experiencing a

trial? and whose original charges were lowered through plea bargaining? To what extent do offenders plead guilty or use plea bargaining when they hire their own own counsel as opposed to when counsel is appointed by the court? For specific crimes, are there wide discrepancies in lengths of sentences imposed on offenders who hire their own lawyers as opposed to those for whom counsel is appointed? Do offenders spend more or less time in jail prior to trial when they hire their own lawyer as opposed to when counsel is appointed for them?

e. Prior Criminal Record

Prior criminal record refers to an offender's offense history from the time of the first arrest as a juvenile through the time of release for the most recent offense prior to his current incarceration. Although prior criminal record usually refers to arrests as well as convictions and incarcerations, the Survey will focus primarily on incarceration history as this information will most likely be the easiest for inmates to recall given the nature of the experience. In addition, the Survey will collect information on sentences, and prior probation and parole.

Within this context, a number of descriptive studies may be done. First, it will be possible to trace the general evolution of criminal behaviors for offenders from youth through their current incarceration to determine if specific types of criminal behavior are evident by sex and race for various levels of age. In addition, comparisons may be made among groups of youthful offenders (with an age range of roughly 17-23), juveniles (under 17) and adults (over 23) of sentences imposed, lengths of time and place sentences have been served for similar crimes of conviction. This information will provide a useful

profile of incarceration histories among offenders of various ages.

Second tracking incarceration histories will be useful in determining if there are specific factors (ie., demographic, socio-economic, family background) that may be associated with individuals who tend to have high rates of incarceration. In addition, the prior criminal record information will be useful in updating information on characteristics (ie., demographic, socio-economic, drug and alcohol use) associated with career or habitual criminals.

Third, these data will provide a profile of prior incarcerations and other background characteristics for offenders currently convicted of specific types of crimes, such as robbery, burglary, murder or of categories of crimes (ie., violent crimes, drug crimes, property crimes). One of the foci of this inquiry will be to determine if there are specific background (ie., demographic, family, criminal) characteristics associated with the tendency to commit these kinds of crimes.

Fourth, this information will provide the basis for a retrospective recidivism study. In essence, retrospective recidivism is a consideration of recidivism in the past. For those offenders who had been convicted of crimes in the past and who have served time on probation, in prison and on parole, it will be possible to ascertain the nature and extent of subsequent criminal behaviors. For instance, to address the question of the nature and seriousness of criminal behavior or following release from probation, prison, or parole among offenders convicted in the past of a specific crime, an analysis may be made of the relationship between length of sentence imposed, the time actually served and the length of time following release before subsequent reincarceration and the nature of the

subsequent criminal offense. In addition, this kind of analysis will enable us to gain an understanding of the extent to which criminal behavior escalates in seriousness as the number of incarcerations increases

Moreover, to some extent, this information will be useful in understanding the deterrent effects of incarceration. If incarceration has a deterrent effect, ideally, we would expect those offenders who have served time to discontinue a life of crime. Somewhat more realistically, we might expect these offenders to commit less serious crimes than previously in order to avoid the onerous experience of serving additional time. For those offenders who do commit subsequent crimes, how much imprisonment time is required for a deterrent effect to "work" is unknown (von Hirsch 1976: 113) In suggesting that five years should be the highest penalty of incarceration imposed for serious crimes, (other than for murder), von Hirsch relied not on the deterrent effects of imprisonment but on more traditional theories of sentencing developed by the American Bar Association (von Hirsch 1976: 136)

Thus, in order to examine the potential deterrent effects of imprisonment, the Survey data may be used to link the length of time served for a specific crime with the length of time that elapses before the offender is reincarcerated and the nature of the subsequent crime. If prison deters criminal behavior, one might expect that the longer the sentence imposed for a certain crime, the more time it will take following release for an offender to be reincarcerated. On the other hand, there may be a curvilinear relationship between the length of incarceration and the latency to subsequent criminal involvement such that up to a certain point, the length of time for incarceration varies directly with the latency between release from prison and criminal reinvolverment (ie., the longer the

incarceration, the more time it takes following release before reincarceration). However, beyond this point, there may be an inverse relationship such that offenders who serve longer time may engage in subsequent criminal behavior more quickly following release. In addition, it may be possible that the nature of the subsequent criminal behavior becomes more serious following longer terms of imprisonment. The rationale for an inverse relationship stems from the literature indicating that prisons are schools for crimes or tend to institutionalize inmates making readjustments to community life following release difficult (ie., Clemmer 1940; Goffman 1941). A third possibility is that there may be an inverse relationship between the length of incarceration and subsequent criminal reincarceration (ie., the longer the imprisonment, the less time it takes for offenders to be reincarcerated following release).

Moreover, as suggested earlier, the nature of the subsequent crimes committed following release are important. If prisons deter, one might expect that subsequent crimes will be of less seriousness than earlier ones in order to minimize the negative sanctions of imprisonment. On the other hand, to the extent that imprisonment has little deterrent effect, subsequent crimes may escalate in seriousness.

Given the fact that the Survey data include only incarcerated offenders there are obvious limitations to the generalizability of results from this kind of analysis. We will not, for instance, be able to truly test the deterrent effects of incarceration in the absence of a comparison group of offenders who have been released and who have not been reincarcerated. Moreover, there may be many factors other than the length of incarceration that affect an offender's likelihood of reincarceration. For instance, those inmates released on parole, must abide by parole regulations and have the added burden

of supervision that makes them more visible in the community. These factors may affect their later involvement with the criminal justice system over and above the length of time they have been incarcerated. Despite these limitations, a discernible relationship among these variables will suggest possible impacts of incarceration that will be useful addressing the policy issue of whether offenders convicted of certain crimes should be incarcerated for longer or shorter periods of time in order to maximize the deterrent effects of prison. Given currently crowded prison conditions, information bearing on ways to make more efficient use of limited prison space has great importance.

Related to the deterrent effects of incarceration is the recent work by RAND on selective incapacitation. Selective incapacitation relies on predictions of future criminal behavior to determine whether or not and for how long an offender should be "incapacitated" by means of imprisonment. This approach suggests that incarcerating offenders who tend to have high rates of offending will both contribute to an overall reduction in the crime rate and will make the most efficient use of limited prison space (Greenwood and Abrahams 1982; Chaiken and Chaiken 1982).

The prediction technique uses seven categories to identify high rate offenders. These include prior conviction and incarceration, juvenile conviction, commitment to a state or federal juvenile institution, drug use and employment (Greenwood 1984: 6). Using this schema, Greenwood found that for California inmates convicted of robbery, those who scored higher than four tended to have committed an average of 31 robberies a year while on the street whereas those who had scored one or lower had committed only two robberies while on the street (Greenwood 1984: 6).

As other methods of predictive restraint, this approach has come under attack for the pitfalls of overpredicting those presumed to be high risks when they are not and unfairly inflicting undeserved punishment on these persons (von Hirsch 1984: 8).

Given the controversy surrounding selective incapacitation, data to address the utility of this approach would be useful. Since the Survey data will include information on each of the seven categories used in the prediction technique, it will be possible to use the Survey data to retrospectively predict rates at which offenders incarcerated for specific offenses such as robbery had committed these kinds of crimes in the past. Given the national character of the Survey effort, this information will be useful in shedding light on the appropriateness of selective incapacitation approach as a predictive tool.

Based upon the kinds of issues that will be examined with the Survey data, the variables regarding criminal history will include: age at first arrest; number of previous probations as a juvenile and as an adult; the nature of the offense for which probation was given; the age at which probation was given each time in the past; number of previous incarcerations as a juvenile and as an adult; the offenses for which incarceration was given in the past; where the sentence was served; the length of sentence imposed by the courts for each offense; the amount of time actually served for each incarceration in the past; the offender's age at each incarceration in the past.

2. Non-Criminal Characteristics

Non-criminal characteristics refer to those factors other than an offender's criminal involvement that are useful in describing who the offenders are and in understanding the

nature and extent of criminal involvement. These factors include demographic characteristics, socio-economic characteristics, drug and alcohol use, military service and prison activities. These characteristics will be used to describe the entire inmate population; to profile sub-groups of the inmate population (ie., robbers, murderers, career criminals, those convicted of violent crimes as a class); and to link prior criminal activities with current offenses. These background characteristics will be discussed and variables to be included for each in the Survey will be discussed briefly.

a. Demographic and Socio-economic Characteristics

Both demographic and socio-economic characteristics will be included on the Survey mainly as descriptors. These descriptors are important in providing background information as to who is incarcerated. Demographic characteristics will include age, sex, race, ethnic origin, marital status and date of birth. Socio-economic characteristics will include education, employment immediately prior to incarceration and family background. Although each of these socio-economic characteristics as it relates to crime could be the basis for an indepth study, the fact that the Survey deals only with incarcerated individuals, precludes analyses of these factors as they relate to the crime rate. Further, in order to obtain accurate, sufficient information to examine major issues related to any of these factors requires a great deal more data than the Survey can collect. For instance, to examine the relationships between economic status and involvement in crime would require an understanding of factors associated with the opportunity costs of crime for any offender (Sullivan 1973). Since Survey resources do not permit a thorough examination of the records, interviews with staff, counselors, peers and family in the community, this kind of analysis is impossible. Therefore, the

Survey will include only very basic questions regarding employment and level of income within a year prior to incarceration; education; and family background.

The family background concept includes two elements: information about the family from which the offender came and information about the family with which he is closely associated at the time of the interview. In terms of the first element, the family from which the offender came, there are three variables of interest: who the offender lived with most of the time before reaching age 21; whether any family members were involved in the criminal justice process; and who they were in relationship to the offender. This information will be useful in tracking correlates of criminal patterns and involvement with various types of crimes. For instance, are offenders who have been convicted of violent crimes more likely than offenders who have been convicted of property crimes to have lived with one parent or in an institution while growing up, or to have other family members who have been incarcerated? Have offenders who lived most of their lives in institutions, foster homes or with only one parent been incarcerated more frequently as a juvenile and/or as an adult than offenders who have lived most of their lives with both parents? Are there different patterns in these relationships for male and female offenders and for offenders of various races? Do these patterns vary by region?

In terms of the second element, the family with which the offender associates most closely at the time of the interview, there are seven variables of interest: whether the offender has any children currently under age 18 at the time of the interview; the number of such children and their ages; where these children have been placed during the offender's current incarceration; whether the offender was living with them prior to

current incarceration; whether the offender still has legal custody and whether the offender plans to reunite with children after release.

Prior research in this area has focused mainly on mothers in prison. This research indicates that the proportion of women having dependent children 18 years or younger generally ranges between 56% and 68%. For instance, in their study of homosexuality among incarcerated women, Ward and Kassebaum (1965) reported that 68% of the women were mothers. Similarly, Bonfanti, et al. (1974) found that 68% of the women in the Louisiana Correctional Institution for Women were mothers. Glick and Neto (1977) noted that roughly 56% of the 1,607 incarcerated women in 14 states were mothers. McGowan and Blumenthal (1978) reported 67% and Baunach (1984) found that 66% of the imprisoned women in Kentucky and Washington State were mothers. Children of inmate-mothers most frequently had been placed with the child's grandmother (McGowan and Blumenthal 1978: 76%; Baunach 1984: 83%) and less often, with relatives (Stanton 1980: 77%) or foster parents (McGowan and Blumenthal 1978: 12%; Baunach 1984: 7%; Stanton 10%). Moreover, most of these women had lived with their children prior to the current incarceration (Bonfanti, et. al. 1974: 66%; Lundberg, et. al. 1975: 74%; McGowan and Blumenthal 1978: 75%; and Baunach 1984: 74%). For many of the mothers, this was the first major separation from their children. In addition, for about half the children in Baunach's study (1984), mothers still retained legal custody.

Further, most of the women planned reunions with children at some point following release. Zalba (1964) found that 34% of the mothers in her study planned immediate reunions and another 27% planned reunions after a period of adjustment, Bonfanti et al. (1974) found that nearly two-thirds of the mothers planned reunions; McGowan and

Blumenthal (1978) found that 78% of their national sample at the New York Correctional Institution for Women planned to re-establish homes with children after release. Baunach (1984) reported that 89% of the inmate-mothers in her study planned reunions.

Most of the previous research in this area has focused on inmate-mothers mainly because the American culture traditionally has considered child-rearing a female function. However, there are no doubt many fathers in prison as well. The information from the Survey will provide a national overview of the extent to which inmates of both sexes are parents and plan to reunite with children. This information will be useful in determining the need for resource allocation to develop programs to retain ties or develop parenting skills and in estimating the number of children whose lives have already been affected by their parent's involvement with the criminal justice system.

b. Military Service

In 1979, roughly one fourth of the inmates in state prisons were veterans. Of the approximately 65,500 veterans in prisons, most had served in the Vietnam era, (39,500); many had served in the pre-Vietnam era, (19,500), and the least number (6,000) had served after the Vietnam era (Cantwell and Masumura 1981: 1). Given the relatively large proportion of veterans who had been imprisoned in 1979, the Survey will collect information with which to update and compare the 1979 data.

Variables of interest will include whether the offender had ever been in the service and in what branch; when the offender entered and when he/she was discharged; what type of discharge was issued; whether the offender had served in Southeast Asia; whether the

offender was disabled because of military service; whether the offender had become dependent on drugs in the service; and on what type of drugs. This information, along with other data collected in the Survey (ie., current offense; sentence length imposed; prior criminal record; drug and alcohol use; employment and income immediately prior to the current incarceration; and education), will be used to prepare a profile of veterans currently incarcerated in American prisons, much like the Veterans in Prison Bulletin (Cantwell and Masamura 1981).

c. Alcohol and Drug Use

At the present time, there is little information about the alcohol consumption patterns of incarcerated offenders or the role that alcohol consumption plays in criminal involvement. Yet there is a common sense assumption that intoxication may disinhibit an individual such that hostile propensities are exposed and that aggressive or criminal behavior may be ascribed to excessive alcohol indulgence. Recent research, however, suggests that the alcohol itself may not be the deciding factor in stimulating aggressive behavior. McAndrews and Edgerton (1969), for instance, examined the validity of this disinhibition assumption across several cultures in terms of the societal context within which drinking occurs and its relationship to aggression. Their results indicate that the alcohol in and of itself was not the determining factor in generating aggressiveness, but that the cultural context within which the drinking occurs shapes the behaviors associated with drinking.

Taking the social context approach one step further, Donovan and Marlatt (1980) found that when one expects to drink alcohol, consumption of a liquid heighten aggressive

tendencies. Subjects in the study were randomly assigned to groups wherein they either expected or did not expect to receive alcohol and then either actually did or did not receive it. From their findings, the authors concluded that the American culture has built up an expectation that alcohol consumption leads to aggressiveness and an acceptance of this response to alcohol consumption.

Based on this kind of information, Heath (1981) proposed a practical application of the social cultural context of drinking. He noted that understanding the norms of the population regarding acceptance of drinking and concomitant behaviors is important in developing programs to assist problem drinkers in coping with their subsequent behaviors. Enabling the drinker to assess his own behaviors as they relate to drinking is an important element of this approach.

These studies suggest the importance of understanding the social context within which drinking occurs in this country to determine the relationship between when drinking usually occurs among offenders and where it occurs just prior to the offense of conviction. Consistent discrepancies in this relationship would suggest social milieus wherein alcohol consumption may be related to expressions of aggressiveness perhaps partially because of the acceptability of this response to drinking. A recent illustration of this point is the gang rape of a woman in New Bedford, Massachusetts. While patrons looked on and cheered, four men mercilessly raped a young woman.

The Survey provides the only national source of information about alcohol and drug use among incarcerated offenders. In the 1979 Survey, the assesment of drinking habits among inmates was determined based on three measures: the frequency of drinking

during the year before the incarceration and just prior to the offense; the amount of alcohol usually consumed at these times; and the inmate's perception of his level of intoxication once he had stopped drinking. The results showed that nearly one-third of the inmates had been drinking very heavily just prior to the commission of the offense for which they were incarcerated at the time of the interview: about 20% said that they had drunk very heavily in the year prior to incarceration; 16% had at some time been enrolled in an alcohol treatment program (Kalish and Masamura 1983a: 1). In addition, roughly 60% of those offenders incarcerated for violent offenses and 68% of those incarcerated for property offenses reported that they had been drinking very heavily immediately prior to the crime (Kalish and Masamura 1983a: 3). Heavy drinkers in the year prior to the crime of incarceration tended to be white, male, divorced, unemployed and to have a high school education or lower (Kalish and Masamura 1983a: 2).

The first two measures used in the Survey are closely akin to those developed by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) to assess the quantity and frequency with which individuals consume alcohol. The index, called the quantity-frequency, adjusted (QFA) combines measures of the frequency of consumption of a particular beverage over some time period, (usually 30 days); the typical quantity consumed on that day; and the number of days during a time period, (usually a year), wherein a person has consumed large quantities of a beverage, (eg., 12 or more cans of beer at one time), commonly referred to as binge drinking. The QFA provides a valid, reliable means of determining total volume of consumption, that takes into account both average drinking and binge drinking over a specified time frame (Armor and Pollich 1982). Although the 1979 Survey obtained information on frequency and quantity of drinking, it did not tap binge drinking. However, this information would be useful to

estimate whether the current offense had been committed during a period of such heavy drinking.

The third measure used in the Survey attempted to assess heavy drinking by asking the inmates whether they considered themselves "relatively sober," "feeling good," "pretty loaded" or "very drunk" after they had finished drinking. However, this subjective measure is flawed by individual differences in perceptions of "drunkenness". A more objective means of determining Blood Alcohol Concentration for usual drinking patterns is to ascertain the quantity of alcohol consumed, the number of hours over which the person has been drinking and the individual's weight at that time. This information may then be compared with the estimated BAC for the day of the offense. This kind of measure would provide insight into whether drinking on the day of the offense is typical of usual drinking patterns (personal communique from Dr. Brenda Miller, Research Institute on Alcoholism, Buffalo, New York, February 27, 1984).

Because of the importance of understanding the role that alcohol consumption plays in criminal involvement, the 1985 Survey will include questions that address the usual drinking patterns of inmates over the year prior to incarceration, during the month surrounding the crime and at the time of the crime. Variables of interest will include the quantity of beer, wine and liquor consumed during these periods; the frequency of alcohol consumption; the extent of binge drinking; the social context within which inmates had consumed alcohol (ie., alone or with others and the location of drinking); and the age at first alcohol consumption. In addition, the Survey will include questions regarding involvement in alcohol treatment programs prior to incarceration. The emphasis in these questions will be on determining whether inmates had been involved in detoxification

only, in-patient treatment, outpatient treatment and/or some type of self-help group (eg., Alcoholics Anonymous) and whether they had continued drinking once the program had been completed.

With these data, analyses will include: a profile of the characteristics of inmates who consume alcohol; how much and how frequently consumption occurs; the types of crimes committed by those who reported drinking heavily at the time of offense; conversely, a profile of alcohol consumption for incarcerated offenders for specific types of crimes; the extent to which binge drinking may be related to criminal involvement; patterns of consumption during the year and month prior to the current offense; the social context within which drinking occurred at the time of the offense; the extent to which age at first consumption may be related to patterns of involvement with crime as a juvenile; and involvement in various programs for treatment of alcohol abuse. In addition, this information will be compared with that obtained in 1979 to determine national trends in alcohol use among imprisoned offenders.

As with alcohol consumption, the link between drug use and crime commission is tenuous and there is little empirical research describing the characteristics of incarcerated drug users. The 1979 Survey included information on lifetime use of drugs, use during the month preceding the crime; and use at the time of the offense. Results showed that nearly one-third of all state prisoners had been under the influence of an illegal drug at the time of the offense; more than half had taken some illegal drug in the month before the crime; and more than 75% had used illegal drugs at some point in their lives (Kalish and Masamura 1983b: 1). Similarly, the 1985 Survey will include questions to address such issues as: at what age offenders began using drugs; at what age offenders began

using drugs regularly; drug use during the month prior to the current offense; drug use at the time of the first offense; and involvement in drug treatment programs. In addition, since the effects of various drugs on behavior may differ from one another, information will be asked about drugs separately. The drugs that will be included are heroin; cocaine; methadone (outside of a treatment program); amphetamines; barbituates; marijuana or hashish; PCP; LSD; and other drugs.

Using these data, analyses will cover: a profile of the characteristics of incarcerated offenders who use drugs; the age at which they began drug use and at which they began regular drug use for various types of drugs; the extent and nature of drugs used at the time of the current offense and at the time of the first offense for which they were incarcerated; the relationship between the evolution of drug and alcohol use over the offender's life; the relationship between drug and alcohol use and involvement in juvenile crime, in prior adult crime and in the current offense; the types of crimes committed by those who reportedly used drugs at the time of the offense; conversely, a profile of drug use for those incarcerated for specific types of crimes; and a description of the extent of involvement in drug treatment programs. In addition, as with the data on alcohol use, the data on drug use will be compared with that obtained in 1979 to determine national trends in drug use among incarcerated offenders.

d. Prison Activities

From roughly the end of World War II through the mid-1970's, the focus in corrections had been on "rehabilitation" of offenders. Within this context, the medical model of treatment, positing that treators must do something "to" or "for" offenders, led to the

development of a myriad of programs designed to change behavior patterns both within and beyond the confines of the prison walls. However, the publication of Martinson's research which suggested the failure of prison programs to "rehabilitate" offenders or to reduce subsequent criminal behavior (Martinson 1974), coupled with disaffection with indeterminate sentencing as a fair and effective means of imposing sanctions (von Hirsch 1976; Goldfarb and Singer 1973; Dershowitz 1976; Hood and Sparks 1970), and with dwindling funds to support programs, ushered in a new era of correctional treatment. More recently, the functions of deterrence, incapacitation and punishment have dominated correctional philosophy. Although perhaps on the decline as a major source of treatment for "rehabilitative" purposes, institutional programs remain important as a means of providing inmates with opportunities for voluntary advancement (Morris 1974), and perhaps in some jurisdictions where parole boards still determine release decisions, as a means of enhancing the possibility of release.

In addition, within recent years, there has been growing concern over the disparities in the nature and extent of educational opportunities and programs provided for female as opposed to male inmates in state correctional facilities (Glick and Neto 1977; Neto 1981; GAO 1980; Pendergrass 1975; Bowker 1978). The nature of training programs for women have, most frequently, emphasized cosmetology, key punch, secretarial skills, sewing, cooking or other skills closely related to a stereotyped belief about the role of women in our society. Arguments for fewer training programs for women inmates have focussed on the fact that women comprise such a small proportion of the incarcerated population. However, given that many incarcerated women are single heads of households (Baunach 1982; Lundberg, et. al. 1975; McGowan and Blumenthal 1976; DuBose 1975), it is important that they be able to learn transferable, marketable skills as well as enhance

parenting skills during incarceration.

Moreover, the extent of inmate idleness is a growing concern among administrators given burgeoning prison populations. There are only a limited number of education or work assignments that may be filled and many more inmates to fill them. If large proportions of the inmate population are idle, there is the potential for tensions to mount and frictions to develop into explosive situations.

Depending on the size and resources of the institution, the activities that inmates may engage in include educational and counseling programs, and work assignments. Work assignments include prison industry, maintenance and vocational training. Prison industry deals with the production and distribution of goods for state institutions and agencies; the focus is on reducing the cost of operating state institutions and agencies, on productivity and/or on profits (American Correctional Association 1966). Maintenance includes the use of labor relating to the care of prisoners and the upkeep of the institution (American Correctional Association 1966). Vocational training programs are designed to provide inmates with a transferable skill that will be useful in obtaining employment upon release rather than to enhance productivity or profit (American Correctional Association 1966).

Given the nature of the tasks, there may be a fine line between a vocational training program and a maintenance assignment, as, for instance, when an inmate may earn a certificate for food preparation while working with the dietician in the kitchen. He not only learns skills associated with food preparation (a vocational training function), but also assists in feeding the inmate population, (a maintenance function). Moreover, some

maintenance functions may be euphemistically referred to as vocational training and/or on the job training programs. To be sure, there are skills to be learned; however, the extent of transferability of these skills to jobs upon release is marginal at best.

The Census of Adult State Correctional Facilities will obtain information from administrators regarding the extent of inmate participation in education, counseling, study release, work release, and work assignments, (prison industries, vocational training programs and maintenance work), as of June 1984. Information on work assignments will include the total number of inmates involved in each category, average number of hours a day worked per inmate and the average hourly wage per inmate. Information on education and counseling programs and work release will include whether the institution has the program and the enrollment as of June 30, 1984.

As a complement to these data, the Survey will obtain information on whether inmates had been involved in education or vocational training programs since admission and to what extent they completed the program; and whether they were involved in a maintenance assignment at the time of the interview (ie., the nature of the assignment; number of hours of work per week; amount paid in money or other benefits). In addition, as another way to tap idleness, questions will request information on the number of hours inmates spend in their sleeping quarters each week and the number of hours they are allowed outside of their sleeping quarters for physical exercise. Finally, since one of the highlights of prison activities includes visits, questions will be included regarding the extent to which inmates receive visits from family, especially from children, and the conditions under which visiting occurs (ie., in a quiet place as opposed to a noisy, crowded room; with or without physical contact allowed).

Information from the Survey and Census will not be directly compared since the data collection efforts will be conducted a year apart and since the nature of the questions will be different. However, both data sets will be analyzed for such things as discrepancies in the nature and extent of education or training programs afforded for inmates of each sex. The extent to which the results from both data sets are similar (as, for example, in showing that male and female inmates have roughly the same kinds of education and training programs and are paid roughly the same; or have very different types of education and training programs and are paid unequally for their work), will provide verification of the results and will reduce the likelihood that either set of findings is simply an artifact of such extraneous factors as the timing of the data collection effort.

C. Identifiers

In addition to information on these major topics, the data tape will include identifiers such as sex of inmates housed in the facility; average daily population of the facility within which the interviewed inmates are housed; and region of the country (ie., Northeast, Northcentral, South and West); and whether the inmates are housed in state-operated community-based facilities or prison. These identifiers, which have heretofore never been included on the Survey data tape, will enable analyses to take into account such factors as geographical area of the country and size of the facility. For instance, the variations in the profile of incarcerated offenders, in the deterrent effects of incarceration or in patterns of career criminal behavior may be analyzed in terms of size of facility or across regions of the country. These identifiers will thus broaden the types

of analyses that may be done with the Survey data.

D. Other Issues

In addition to these major topics, four issue areas included in the 1979 Survey will be dropped from the 1985 Survey. These issue areas include: appeals; grievance procedures; parole hearings; and medical services. Data for each of these areas were obtained probably because of the importance of the issue at the time of the previous Survey. However, to date, none of these data have been analyzed.

In terms of appeals, only one question, regarding whether inmates had initiated an appeal, was included in both the 1974 and 1979 Surveys. There were no questions regarding the completion or outcome of the appeal. In the absence of this additional information, a single question about appeals has very limited utility. Thus, if included in the 1985 Survey, the issues should be developed more fully.

For the second issue, grievance procedures, a battery of questions regarding inmates' perceptions of grievance procedures and extent of involvement in them (ie., was he formally charged with violation of a rule; was he found guilty; did he appeal) was included in the 1979 Survey. In addition, as part of the 1979 Survey, information about the grievance process was requested from each facility. However, nothing was done with this information.

The third issue, parole hearings, was presumably included to ascertain information on the rights inmates had at parole hearings (ie., could they bring witnesses or have a lawyer

present). However, since 1979, several states have eliminated parole release in developing legislatively prescribed standards for incarcerations or in establishing sentencing commissions. Other states utilizing parole release guidelines have developed specific parole release standards (von Hirsch and Hanrahan 1981: 299, 309). Thus, given the changing roles that parole plays in corrections today, the questions included in the Survey regarding inmates' involvement in seeking parole during incarceration are of less importance than they were in 1979.

Thus, since the Survey cannot include items related to every facet of corrections, and since these three areas were included in 1979 primarily to tap issues that were of relatively more significance at that time than they are now, these three issue areas will, in all likelihood, be dropped from the 1985 Survey.

In terms of the fourth issue, questions on medical care, the 1979 Survey included questions as to whether inmates had received a routine examination within the past year; whether they had asked and were able to see a doctor for a particular problem; and whether they were on medication. Since the 1984 Census includes questions regarding the extent of medical care provided for inmates, this issue will be dropped from the Survey. However, given a current interest in the mental health care facilities provided for incarcerated offenders, the Survey will include questions regarding mental health care provided to inmates. Issues of interest include whether the offender had been under psychiatric care prior to incarceration; whether he had been hospitalized and/or had received medication prior to incarceration; and whether any psychiatric care had been afforded him since admission to prison.

Finally, the topics for inclusion in the Survey presented in this section may not be exhaustive of all possible issues that should be explored in the 1985 Survey. Therefore, additional issues of importance to the corrections field today, along with a rationale for their inclusion and proposed means of analysis are welcomed.

E. Analysis Approaches

An analysis of data entails two parts. These are: 1) a selection of variables for analysis; and 2) a selection of the appropriate statistical techniques to be used in computing results. In terms of the first part, specific variables of interest have been outlined in the discussion of each topic. The questions raised, however, are not intended to be exhaustive, but to provide a rationale for the Survey and to guide analyses. As the Survey unfolds, the issues raised herein will be refined more fully and additional questions will be posed. The number and diversity of topics included in the Survey provide a wealth of information that will, it is hoped, generate many additional analyses.

Further, the demographic variables and identifiers provide both potential controlling factors or bases of comparisons. For instance, a study of women in prison or veterans in prison would control for the characteristics of sex or involvement in military service, respectively. Moreover, identifiers such as region allow for comparisons of results in varying geographical location across the country. In addition, data from the 1985 Survey will be compared with data from previous Surveys to provide an overview of issues, such as the changes in the characteristics of the inmate population or trends in the types of offenses of conviction and sentences imposed by region.

In terms of the second part, significance testing will employ confidence levels and standard errors. The latter will be devised by the Statistical Methods Division of the Census Bureau.

Finally, in collaboration with BJS and the Census Bureau programming staff, the Michigan Archives staff will prepare a user-friendly codebook. The codebook will include a brief description of the Survey; a source and reliability statement regarding data collection procedures; standard error terms and an explanation of how to use them in conducting analyses; a copy of the Survey questionnaire; variables keyed to questionnaire items; frequencies for each variable; explanations of the derivations of any created variables that are added to the file; and a crosswalk to the variables and questionnaire items for the 1974 and 1979 Surveys for ease in making comparisons.

IV. Final Products

The final products for the 1985 Survey will consist of an advanced report and a series of special reports/bulletins covering each of the topics included in the Survey. The advanced report will be issued during the summer of 1986 to provide consumers with a general overview of the findings. More specifically, the advanced report will cover demographic and socio-economic characteristics (ie., age; sex; race; education; pre-arrest employment; pre-arrest income; military service; use of any drug throughout life; use of any drug or alcohol at the time of the current offense); and offense related characteristics (ie., current crime(s); if had prior record; bail use for current offense; maximum sentence length imposed; pre-trial crime; jailtime; overview of victim-offender relationships).

Subsequent reports will cover the individual topics raised in the Survey. For instance, there will be reports on victim-offender relationships; criminal patterns among prison inmates; veterans in prison; drug and alcohol use; women in prison; recidivism; and the deterrent effects of incarceration. Data for these reports will be presented in the context of current correctional issues. Specific contents of each report will address the questions raised in the issues section of this paper. As with the advanced report, individual reports will be issued as quickly as possible to maximize their utility by consumers.

REFERENCES

- American Correctional Association. 1966. Manual of Correctional Standards. Washington, D.C.: The American Correctional Association.
- Armor, David J. and Pollich, J. Michael. 1982. "Measurement of Alcohol Consumption." In Encyclopedic Handbook of Alcoholism, ed. E. Mansell Pattison, pp. 72-80. New York, New York: Gardner Press.
- Baunach, Phyllis Jo. 1982. "You Can't be a Mother and be in Prison... Can You?: Impacts of the Mother-Child Separation." In Judge, Victim, Lawyer, Thief, ed. Nicole Rafter and Elizabeth Stanko, pp. 305-340 Boston, Massachusetts: Northeastern University Press.
- Baunach, Phyllis Jo. 1984. Mothers in Prison. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction (in press).
- Blumstein, Alfred. 1974. "Seriousness Weights in an Index of Crime." American Sociological Review 39 (December): 854-864.
- Bonfanti, Marcia; Felder, Sharon; Loesch, Mabel; and Vincent, Nan. 1974. "Enactment and Perception of Maternal Role of Incarcerated Mothers." Masters Thesis. Louisiana State University.

Bowker, Lee. 1978. Women, Crime and Criminal Justice. Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath.

Cantwell, Mimi. 1974. Profile of State Prison Inmates: Sociodemographic Findings From the 1974 Survey of Inmates of State Correctional Facilities. Washington, D.C.: National Criminal Justice Information and Statistics Service.

Cantwell, Mimi. 1983. Prisoners at Midyear 1983. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Cantwell, Mimi and Masumura, Wilfred. 1981. Veterans in Prison. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Chaiken, Jan M. and Chaiken, Marcia R. 1982. Varieties of Criminal Behavior. Santa Monica, California: RAND.

Clemmer, Donald. 1940. The Prison Community. New York, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Conrad, John. 1967. Crime and Its Correction. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Dershowitz, Alan. 1976. Fair and Certain Punishment. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Donovan, Dennis M. and Marlatt, G. Alan. 1980. "Assessment of Expectancies and Behavior Associated with Alcohol Consumption. 1980." Journal of Studies on Alcohol 41 (11): 1153-1185.

DuBose, Dorothy. 1975. "Problems of Children Whose Mothers are Imprisoned." New York, NY: Institute of Women's Wrongs. Mimeographed.

Figlio, Robert. 1983. "Developing and Applying The Scale of Offense Gravity." In the Seriousness of Crime: Results of a National Survey, Draft Final Report, #J-LEAA-012-79, 308-336.

Fleming, Jennifer Baker. 1979. Stopping Wife Abuse. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.

Gardner, Richard. 1982. "Prison Population Jumps to 369, 725." Corrections Magazine 8 (3): 6-14.

Gettinger, Steven. 1983. "The Prison Population Boom: Still No End in Sight." Corrections Magazine 9 (3): 6-11, 47-48.

Glick, Ruth and Neto, Virginia. 1977. National Study of Women's Correctional Programs. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Goffman, Erving. 1961. Asylums. Chicago, Illinois: Aldine.

Goldfarb, Ronald and Singer, Linda. 1973. After Conviction: A Review of the American Correctional System. New York, New York: Simon and Schuster.

Greenwood, Peter and Abrahmsa, Allan. 1982. Selective Incapacitation. Santa Monica, California: RAND.

Gulotta, Guglielmo and Neuberger, Luisella de Cataldo. 1983. "A Systematic and Attributional Approach to Victimology." Victimology: An International Journal 8 (1-2): 5-16.

Heath, Dwight. 1981. "Determining the Social Cultural Context of Alcohol Use." Journal of Studies on Alcohol Supplement #9: 9-17.

Heller, Nelson B. and McEwen, J. Thomas. 1973. "Applications of Crime Seriousness Information in Police Departments." Journal of Criminal Justice 1 (3): 241-253.

Hood, Roger and Sparks, Richard. 1970. Key Issues in Criminology. New York, New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kalish, Carol and Masumura, Wilfred T. 1983a. Prisoners and Alcohol. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Kalish, Carol and Masumura, Wilfred T. 1983b. Prisoners and Drugs. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Klaus, Patsy and Kalish, Carol. 1984. The Severity of Crime. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Lundberg, Dorothy; Sheckley, Ann; and Voelkar, Therese. 1975. "An Exploration of the Feelings and Attitudes of Women Separated From Their Children Due to Incarceration." Masters Thesis, Portland State University.

McAndrew, Craig and Edgerton, Robert. 1969. Drunken Comportment: A Social Explanation. New York, New York: Aldine.

McGowan, Brenda and Blumenthal, Karen. 1978. Why Punish the Children?: A Study of Children of Women Prisoners. Hackensack, NJ: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Minor-Harper, Stephanie. 1982. Prisoners in 1981. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Moore, Donna M. 1979. Battered Women. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Montilla, Robert and Harlow, Nora. 1979. Correctional Facilities Planning. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company.

Morris, Norval. 1974. The Future of Imprisonment. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Nesbitt, Charlotte. 1983. "Public Correctional Policy on the Purpose of Corrections." Corrections Today 45(6): 66-72.

Neto, Virginia. 1981 "Expanding Horizons: Work and Training Programs for Female Offenders." Corrections Today 43(6): 66-72.

Palmer, Ted. 1976. "Martinson Revisited." In Rehabilitation, Recidivism, and Research, ed. Matthew Mattlin, pp. 41-62 Hackensack, New Jersey: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Pendergrass, Virginia. 1974. "Innovative Programs for Women in Jail and Prison: Trick or Treatment." In The Female Offender, ed. Annette M. Brodsky, pp. 67-76 Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

President's Task Force on Victims of Crime. 1982. Final Report. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Schafer, Stephen. 1968. The Victim and His Criminal. New York, New York: Random House.

Schafer, Stephen. 1970. Compensation and Restitution to Victims of Crime. Montclair, New Jersey: Patterson Smith.

Sherman, Michael and Hawkins, Gordon. 1981. Imprisonment in America. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.

Stanton, Ann. 1980. When Mothers Go To Jail. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath.

Sullivan, Richard. 1973. "The Economics of Crime: An Introduction to the Literature." In An Economic Analysis of Crime, ed. Lawrence J. Kaplan and Dennis Kessler, pp. 15-23 Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

von Hirsch, Andrew. 1976. Doing Justice: The Choice of Punishments. New York, New York: Hill and Wang.

von Hirsch, Andrew. 1983. "Commensurability and Crime Prevention: Evaluating Formal Sentencing Structures and Their Rationale." Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 74(1): 209-248.

von Hirsch, Andrew. 1984. "Selective Incapacitation: A Critique." NIJ Reports January: 5, 7-8.

von Hirsch, Andrew and Harrahan, Kathleen. 1981. "Determinate Penalty Systems in America: An Overview." Crime and Delinquency 27 (3): 289-316.

Ward, David and Kassebaum, Gene. 1965. Women's Prison. Chicago, Illinois: Aldine.

Zalba, Serapio. 1964. Women Prisoners and Their Families. Sacramento, California: State of California Department of Social Welfare and Department of Corrections.

END