



ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please contact us to request a format other than those available.

ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

Contenu archivé

L'information dont il est indiqué qu'elle est archivée est fournie à des fins de référence, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Elle n'est pas assujettie aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada et elle n'a pas été modifiée ou mise à jour depuis son archivage. Pour obtenir cette information dans un autre format, veuillez communiquer avec nous.

This document is archival in nature and is intended for those who wish to consult archival documents made available from the collection of Public Safety Canada.

Some of these documents are available in only one official language. Translation, to be provided by Public Safety Canada, is available upon request.

Le présent document a une valeur archivistique et fait partie des documents d'archives rendus disponibles par Sécurité publique Canada à ceux qui souhaitent consulter ces documents issus de sa collection.

Certains de ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans une langue officielle. Sécurité publique Canada fournira une traduction sur demande.

_____ **Research Report** _____

**Gender Differences in Disciplinary
Sanctions within the Canadian
Federal Offender Population**

Ce rapport est également disponible en français. Pour en obtenir un exemplaire, veuillez vous adresser à la Direction de la recherche, Service correctionnel du Canada, 340, avenue Laurier Ouest, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0P9.

This report is also available in French. Should additional copies be required, they can be obtained from the Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, 340 Laurier Ave. West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0P9.

**Gender Differences in Disciplinary Sanctions within the Canadian Federal Offender
Population**

Aileen Harris

&

Jennie Thompson

Correctional Service of Canada

May 2014

Acknowledgements

Several people have aided in the development of the study. We would like to thank Jeff Rix for his time in helping us understand the operational aspects of the inmate disciplinary sanction process. We would also like to thank Caroline Rueberer for her recommendations regarding the categorization of offence types and Yan Elgin for his assistance in understanding security practices. Thank you to Renée Gobeil for her helpful edits and constructive feedback during the report writing process. Finally, we would like to thank Michael-Anthony Lutfy, Othman Doueidar, and Christabel Martey for their assistance with tabular data entry.

Executive Summary

Key words: *offender discipline, sanctions, gender, institutional offences*

One of the Correctional Service of Canada's (CSC'S) strategic priorities is to ensure the safety and security of staff and offenders in federal institutions, which includes a focus on the importance of order and proper conduct within institutions. Accordingly, disciplinary practices within institutions aim to discourage misconduct and ensure institutional safety. Research related to disciplinary procedures, however, is limited, especially in regards to offenders incarcerated in Canada. Given the importance of institutional safety and the effective management of offenders, the goal of the current study was to examine disciplinary sanctions administered to both men and women offenders in the Canadian federal correctional context while identifying differences and patterns based on gender and additional demographic and incarceration-related factors.

All disciplinary sanctions, including fines, suspended sanctions, warnings, segregation, and "other" (e.g., cell confinement, extra duties), administered for institutional offences between April 1st, 2010 and March 31st, 2013 were examined. In addition, person-specific information was considered for those offenders who were the recipients of these sanctions. A total of 57,405 sanctions that occurred in the time period for 696 women and 12,839 men were examined.

There were relatively few differences in the profile of the men and women that were likely to have a significant impact on the type of charges and/or sanctions that they may receive for their institutional behaviour. The most common sanctions were fines (45%), suspended sanctions (24%), and warnings (18%). All other sanction types occurred 5% or less of the time, including segregation. Women were more likely than men to receive concrete sanctions such as segregation or other, whereas men were more likely to receive warnings or suspended sanctions. Women, however, were sanctioned on average to fewer days in segregation than men. Aboriginal offenders were more likely than non-Aboriginal offenders to receive a fine, and the fine was, on average, slightly higher for Aboriginal offenders. Offenders in higher security levels, those with a greater number of institutional charges, and those who had been charged with a serious offence tended to receive more concrete sanctions than their counterparts (e.g., segregation, other). Regional variations also existed. For example, the sanction of segregation was used more often in the Quebec region than in other regions.

Although it was not feasible to ascertain why these differences existed due to the nature of the data, potential explanations regarding gender and regional differences were explored. For example, given the emphasis placed on dynamic security in women's institutions, it is possible that staff may rely more heavily on informal sanctions with women. If that is the case, it is understandable that when a woman does receive a sanction after several informal attempts, that the sanction would be more concrete. Variations by region may be due to differences in regional offender populations (e.g., Quebec has a higher representation of gang-affiliated offenders), disparity in operational practices (e.g., Quebec is the only region with a special handling unit), or differences of interpretation and application of directives. Given that the study was novel and exploratory in nature, additional research could provide a more comprehensive understanding of the full disciplinary process (including informal sanctions), the decision-making process, and the impact of sanctions on future institutional adjustment and behaviour.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Executive Summary	iii
List of Tables	v
List of Appendices	v
Introduction.....	1
The Disciplinary Process.....	1
Gender and Disciplinary Practices	2
Current Study	4
Method	6
Data/Sample	6
Measures	6
Analytic Approach	7
Results.....	9
1. What is the Profile of Men and Women Offenders Receiving Sanctions for Institutional Offences?.....	9
2. What Types of Sanctions Are Received for an Institutional Offence?	12
3. Does the Type of Sanction Received Vary by Other Factors?.....	13
4. What Role Do Gender and Other Factors Play in Predicting the Type of Sanction Received for an Institutional Offence?	16
Additional analyses	18
Discussion.....	21
Profile.....	21
Distribution of Sanction Type	21
Predictors of Sanction Type	21
Limitations and Future Directions	23
Conclusions	24
References.....	25

List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Demographic, Incarceration, Risk and Correctional Plan Indicators by Gender</i>	10
Table 2 <i>Type of Sanction</i>	12
Table 3 <i>Type of Sanction by Gender and Aboriginal Ancestry</i>	13
Table 4 <i>Type of Sanction by Region</i>	14
Table 5 <i>Type of Sanction by Security Level</i>	15
Table 6 <i>Type of Sanction by Institutional Offence Category and Severity</i>	16
Table 7 <i>Summary of GEE Results by Type of Sanction</i>	18
Table 8 <i>Summary of GEE Results by Type of Sanction including Static and Dynamic Risk</i>	20

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Measures	27
Appendix B: Categorization of Offences.....	30
Appendix C: Results	31

Introduction

A strategic priority of the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) is to ensure the safety and security of staff and offenders in all federal correctional institutions and in the community. For incarcerated offenders, this preservation of safety includes an emphasis on reducing misconduct within the institutional environment. Accordingly, there are disciplinary practices within correctional facilities that are in place to discourage misconduct and ensure institutional safety. Research related to disciplinary procedures, however, is limited, especially in regards to offenders incarcerated in Canada. The goal of the current study, therefore, is to examine the types of disciplinary sanctions administered to both men and women offenders in the Canadian federal correctional context while identifying differences and patterns based on gender and additional demographic and incarceration-related factors.

The Disciplinary Process

Within the Canadian federal correctional system, the disciplinary process is regulated by the Correction and Conditional Release Act (CCRA; 1992), the Corrections and Conditional Release Regulations (CCRR; 2013), and Commissioner's Directives (CDs). The overall purpose of the disciplinary system is to encourage offenders to comply with institutional regulations to ensure institutional order and safety, while contributing to an offender's rehabilitation and successful reintegration into the community (CCRA, s. 38).

When there are reasonable grounds to indicate that an offender has committed, or is committing, an institutional offence, staff are encouraged to engage in informal resolution if it is considered an appropriate option (CCRA, s.41 (1)). Informal resolution requires both parties to acknowledge the misconduct and identify alternative resolutions to prevent future reoffending (CSC, 2013). If an informal resolution is not achieved or is not considered an appropriate option, the formal disciplinary process is initiated. Staff are required to file an institutional offence report providing details regarding the offender misconduct and the Institutional Head or a designated staff member can issue a charge of a minor or serious disciplinary offence (CCRA, s. 41(2)). A formal disciplinary hearing is then conducted where evidence of the offence is presented and a finding of guilty or not guilty is determined. For minor charges, the Institutional Head or a designated delegate (e.g., the correctional manager) conducts the hearings, while serious offences require an appointed external Independent Chairperson (ICP) to conduct the hearings. Upon a finding of guilt, disciplinary sanctions are selected and administered. Prior to

the administration of a sanction, several factors are taken into consideration including: seriousness of the offence, relevant aggravating and mitigating factors (e.g., previous misconduct), the type of sanction previously imposed for similar offences, and the least restrictive sanction that would be appropriate considering the offence in question and all other factors (CCRR, s.34 (a-g)).

Single or multiple sanctions can be imposed for each institutional offence. Possible sanctions include: fine, warning, restitution/restore property, extra duties, cell confinement, loss of privileges, segregation (only applicable for serious offences), and suspended sanction. This final category, suspended sanction, can be applied to all other sanction types. After a finding of guilt, a sanction can be “suspended” (i.e., lifted) for a certain number of days contingent on the offender’s behaviour. If an offender is on good behaviour for that designated time period, then the sanction is not enacted; in contrast, if the offender engages in additional institutional misconduct during the suspension period, the sanction is imposed (CCRA, s.44(1)).

Gender and Disciplinary Practices

Research regarding disciplinary practices is quite limited and dated. The focus of the literature is related more to the actual misconduct and offences, rather than the formal charge and disciplinary process. Notwithstanding this issue, there have been a few landmark studies that have shed light on the issue of gender and institutional discipline.

Craddock (1996) suggested that significant differences in minor misconduct between men and women may be due in part to sanctioning practices rather than behavioural patterns. Findings from this study showed that non-violent sexually related offences and minor assaults were slightly more common among women, while fighting was more common among men. It was argued that staff tend to view women’s confrontational and assaultive behaviour (e.g., swearing, fighting) as being more deviant (i.e., not conforming to a “stereotypical” gender role) and thus, requiring formal sanctions. In contrast, staff may view comparable behaviour in men as expected and, therefore, do not discipline as frequently.

Research by McClellan (1994) also demonstrated differences in disciplinary practices as a function of gender in a Texan sample. Using disciplinary case records over a one-year period, the author found that women were cited for a greater number of minor rule violations while comparable behaviours in men were often overlooked. The author found that a “reprimand” category was even incorporated into correctional policy specifically for women’s disruptive or

non-conforming behaviour, although a comparable rule was not implemented for men. The existence of this unique category resulted in a much higher rate of rule violations for women than for men (3,698 citations for 245 women inmates in comparison to 786 citations for 271 men). Given that a similar category was not established for men, the author concluded that disciplinary practices differed by gender.

Not including the gender-specific reprimand sanction category, McClellan (1994) found that the most commonly administered sanction for both men and women was loss of privileges; however, gender differences existed among other sanctions. Women were more likely to receive sanctions of loss of good conduct time (86%),¹ solitary confinement (85%), and reduction in time-earning status² (82%). In contrast, after loss of privileges, the most common sanction types administered to men were restriction to cell (27%) and extra duties (24%). Although men also received loss of time-earning status, a significantly smaller proportion of the sample did so in comparison to women (18% vs. 82%). Given that the majority of women's sanctions consisted of serious factors that could have a significant impact on their sentence, the authors concluded that women received harsher sanctions than men.

Using a different perspective, more recent international research (Bosworth, 2007) analyzed correctional practices and policies over time and identified differences in rules and regulations based on offender gender. For example, a review of management regulations in the United Kingdom suggested that women's behaviour and sexuality should be monitored more closely than men's. Rules regarding offender appearance (i.e., "non-provocative attire"), associates, and sexuality are only outlined for incarcerated women, implying that despite their lower static risk, women are viewed as needing greater structure and control (Bosworth, 2007). In other words, this study identified the potential for differential treatment based on gender at the policy level.

A greater focus in the literature on gender and discrepancies in the discipline of offenders has been on sentencing and court decision-making practices. Although a comprehensive review of this literature is beyond the scope of the current report, it is relevant to note that the literature argues the presence of chivalry/paternalism and gender conflict issues in sentencing practices. These perspectives argue that women who do not conform to traditional

¹ The sanction groups are not mutually exclusive.

² An offender classification system based on the amount of good conduct time earned (Texas Department of Criminal Justice, 2012).

gender roles are disciplined more severely in comparison to women offenders who follow a more “traditional” role (Koons-Witt, 2002). When compared to men, however, other literature shows that women are more likely to be treated with leniency in the judicial process (e.g., Jeffries, Fletcher & Newbold, 2003). For example, Jeffries et al. (2003) found that judges demonstrated more lenient sentencing decisions (especially in regard to sentence length) with women in comparison to men, even after controlling for other factors such as criminal history.

Demographic Factors and Disciplinary Practices

Although additional factors that may play a role in the disciplinary process have not been addressed in Canadian literature (e.g., ethnicity, age, risk level, security classification), some of these factors have been examined in other jurisdictions. Ethnicity has been a significant demographic factor in American literature, for example, with research demonstrating clear links between ethnicity and stricter judicial decision-making and harsher sentences (e.g., Freiburger & Hilinski, 2013; Warren, Chirics, & Bales, 2012). Despite the overrepresentation of offenders of Aboriginal ancestry in the Canadian correctional system (Public Safety Canada, 2012), examinations of the role of ethnicity in disciplinary practices have not been conducted.

Overall, research in the area of disciplinary practices in corrections is limited, especially in regard to gender differences. Although limited extant literature demonstrates discrepancies in both disciplinary and judicial practices based on gender and ethnicity, this research is very dated and based in the United States. Findings may be indicative of a previous paternalistic mentality and not necessarily reflective of current societal perspectives or correctional practices. Additionally, literature in the broader area of decision-making offers inconsistent perspectives regarding leniency and severity towards women in the judicial system.

Current Study

Given the importance of institutional safety and the effective management of incarcerated offenders, the goal of the current study is to examine disciplinary sanctions administered within the Canadian federal correctional environment, focusing on gender differences in the type of sanctions administered to incarcerated men and women offenders as well as differences associated with other offender and incarceration-related factors.

Research Questions. Given the gaps in the research and the dated literature, the current study was considered exploratory in nature and direct hypotheses were not formulated. The following research questions were explored:

- (1) What is the profile of men and women offenders receiving sanctions for institutional offences?
- (2) What type of sanctions are received for an institutional offence?
- (3) Does the type of sanction vary with other factors (e.g., gender, Aboriginal ancestry, offence, region, security level)?
- (4) What roles do gender and other factors play in predicting the type of sanction received for an institutional offence?

Method

Data/Sample

Two types of data were collected for this study: event-centred (i.e., sanction-centred) data and individual- or person-centred data. The event-centred data included all disciplinary sanctions administered for institutional offences of which offenders were found guilty between April 1st, 2010 and March 31st, 2013. The person-centred data included the offenders who were the recipient of these sanctions.³

A total of 57,405 sanctions were examined,⁴ related to a total of 35,469 minor and 21,367 serious institutional offences for 696 women and 12,839 men. In some cases, a single individual had multiple sanctions related to different charges or for the same charge. Overall, most offenders had received at least two sanctions in the time period under examination.

Measures

Independent measures: Person-centred data. Several indicators were compared among men and women and within these groups by Aboriginal ancestry.⁵ More specifically, an examination of demographic and incarceration characteristics included: age at admission, length of sentence, type of index offence, and security level at admission (for specific descriptions of how these and all other examined items are defined, see Appendix A). In addition to these indicators, several factors were taken from the Offender Intake Assessment. First, assessments of overall static risk (i.e., criminal history) as well as overall dynamic risk (i.e., criminogenic need) were included. Several indicators are also collected as indicators of involvement in the correctional process: motivation to participate in a correctional plan; potential for successful reintegration; accountability for actions; responsivity issues for interventions; and engagement in correctional process.

Independent measures: Event-centred data. Commissioner's Directive 580 (CSC, 2013) outlines factors that can be taken into consideration as part of the decision-making process

³ Only two offenders in the current sample had multiple sentences within the study timeframe. Only information from their first sentence in the time period examined was considered for analysis.

⁴ Due to data quality challenges with regard to information on suspended sentences, collapsing of information was undertaken to ensure a similar level of detail for each case. Therefore, all sanctions that were considered for suspension on a single charge were reduced to a single count of considered for suspension to ensure over-estimation of this type of sanctioning did not occur in the current study.

⁵ Aboriginal includes offenders with Inuit, Métis, or First Nations ancestry and non-Aboriginal offenders included individuals not of Inuit, Métis, or First Nations ancestry.

in selecting a sanction for an institutional offence. Accordingly, several factors were taken into consideration when running analyses for the current study (gender, Aboriginal ancestry, security level at the time of the sanction, time in the institution prior to event involvement, total number of previous guilty findings for institutional offences, and the region in which the sanction occurred).

Severity and type of institutional offence were also considered. In total, there are 23 different types of offences, each of which can be categorized as being either minor or serious. Two different methods of offence categorization were employed: first, a severity level designated by the staff recording the offence (i.e., minor or serious), second, the 23 offence types were collapsed into six categories: offences pertaining to institutional safety, offences against a person, substance-related offences, property-related offences, disciplinary offences, and offences related to the possession of contraband and/or unauthorized items (see Appendix B).

Outcome measures: Disciplinary sanctions. As outlined above, it is possible to receive any of seven types of sanction, all of which can be considered for suspension.⁶ For ease of interpretation, these categories were collapsed into the following five categories for the majority of analyses presented here: warning and/or reprimand; fine; considered for suspension; segregation; and “other”.⁷ Due to record keeping practices, there was no efficient way of determining if a suspended sanction was eventually administered or withdrawn. For that reason, the category is referred to as “considered for suspension.”

Analytic Approach

To assess the first research question, descriptive statistics were used to compare the men and women who received a sanction on a variety of offender characteristics, sentence information, and offence information, as well as risk assessment and correctional plan involvement indicators. Given that a specific population of offenders was examined rather than a sample, the use of inferential statistics (i.e., statistics which estimate the probability that a drawn

⁶ In the case where a sanction is considered for suspension, if the offender is not found guilty of an institutional offence within a period of time specified in the suspension of the preceding offence, the sanction is not enforced; however, in the case where an offender is found guilty of a new institutional offence while in a period of suspension for a preceding institutional offence, both offences can be enforced (CCRA, s.44(1)). Although it would have been preferential to understand the type of sanctions that were being considered for suspension, this was not possible due to data quality issues. In any case where one of the sanctions was considered for suspension on a given charge only the suspended sanction category was retained.

⁷ Due to infrequent use as a sanction, other includes each of the following type of sanction: restitution, extra work, loss of privileges, confinement to cell, and restore property.

sample actually reflects the population) was not appropriate. Thus, the results of this study were interpreted where practical differences exist and insight into these differences also took into consideration the magnitude of differences as assessed by Cramer's Phi. Cramer's Phi ranges from 0 to 1.0 and this statistic is interpreted in the following way: values under 0.20 are considered to be a small difference, values between 0.20 and 0.60 indicate moderate to relatively strong differences, and values above 0.60 indicate a strong to very strong difference (Rea & Parker, 1992).

In assessing the second and third research questions, event-centred analyses were used to examine the number and type of sanctions while considering region, gender, Aboriginal ancestry, and offence type in the distributions of these events. The magnitude of the differences in the distribution of sanctions between these groups was assessed using Cramer's Phi.

Finally, to assess the fourth research question, Generalized Estimating Equations (GEE) were used. This method of analysis was chosen to address the repeatable nature of sanction events (i.e., many individuals have multiple sanctions). When events are repeated and analyzed together, steps should be taken to address the non-independence of the observations to estimate error properly and, therefore, have a more reliable test of significance (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). GEE is one manner in which to address this issue (Hanley, Negassa, Edwardes, & Forrester, 2003; Liang & Zeger, 1986). Moreover, this procedure works well with binary data such as those used in the current study (Hanley et al., 2003).

Results

1. What is the Profile of Men and Women Offenders Receiving Sanctions for Institutional Offences?

Overall, the men and women were in their early thirties ($M = 32$, $SD = 10$) and women were more likely than men to be of Aboriginal ancestry⁸ (39% vs. 25%; see Table 1). With regard to incarceration, most offenders had determinate sentences, with a greater proportion of men serving sentences of more than three years (50% vs. 35%) and a greater proportion of women serving sentences of three years or less (55% vs. 37%). Similar proportions of men and women were serving index offences for homicide or related offences, robbery, and assault. Notably, however, a much larger proportion of women were serving sentences for drug-related offences (22% vs. 14%) whereas proportionally more men were serving sentences for sexual offences (8% vs. 2%). Although the majority of men and women were placed at medium security after admission (69% vs. 60%), women were more likely than men to be placed at minimum security (27% vs. 12%).

When considering the various indicators of risk assessed at admission, the majority of men were assessed as having high static risk (59% vs. 37%) whereas the majority of women were rated as having moderate or low static risk (63% vs. 41%). Both men and women were most likely to be rated as having high dynamic risk, although women were slightly more likely than men to be rated as having moderate or low dynamic risk (moderate: 31% vs. 24%; low: 6% vs. 3%). Forty-eight percent of men were rated as low reintegration potential (compared to 31% of women) while 53% were rated as having moderate reintegration potential at admission compared to 35% of men.⁹

⁸ Analyses were also conducted separately by Aboriginal ancestry within gender. Few differences were noted by Aboriginal ancestry; therefore, demographic, incarceration, risk, and correctional involvement indicators are broken down by gender only in the main results. See Appendix C for the breakdown by gender and Aboriginal ancestry.

⁹ Overall, comparisons showed that the population of offenders who were sanctioned differed from those who did not receive a sanction. For example, the comparison sample was older, had a smaller proportion of offenders of Aboriginal ancestry, had fewer offenders with indeterminate sentences, and fewer offenders classified as maximum security. Additionally, this group showed lower static and dynamic risk levels, and higher levels of reintegration potential.

Table 1

Demographic, Incarceration, Risk and Correctional Plan Indicators by Gender

	Men (<i>N</i> = 12,839) % (<i>n</i>)	Women (<i>N</i> = 696) % (<i>n</i>)	Magnitude of difference ϕ
Demographic characteristics			
Aboriginal ancestry			
Non-Aboriginal	75 (9,636)	61 (422)	
Aboriginal	25(3,178)	39 (271)	0.07
Unknown	0 (25)	0 (3)	
Incarceration characteristics			
Length of sentence			
Three years or less	37 (4,748)	55 (383)	
More than three years	50 (6,361)	35 (243)	0.08
Indeterminate or life sentence	13 (1,730)	10 (70)	
Type of offence			
Homicide or related offence	17 (2,250)	20 (137)	0.01
Sex offence	8 (1,078)	2 (16)	0.05
Robbery	21 (2,725)	18 (129)	0.01
Assault	15 (1,877)	12 (87)	0.01
Other violent	6 (762)	6 (40)	0.00
Drug-related offence	14 (1,765)	22 (152)	0.05
Property offence	12 (1,499)	12 (81)	0.00
Other non-violent	7 (883)	8 (54)	0.01
First security level			
Minimum	12 (1,488)	27 (178)	
Medium	69 (8,873)	60 (395)	0.10
Maximum	19 (2,439)	13 (89)	

	Men (<i>N</i> = 12,839) % (<i>n</i>)	Women (<i>N</i> = 696) % (<i>n</i>)	Magnitude of difference ϕ
Assessment of risk			
Static risk			
Low	7 (904)	19 (135)	0.12
Moderate	34 (4,401)	44 (303)	
High	59 (7,521)	37 (254)	
Dynamic risk			
Low	3 (363)	6 (42)	0.06
Moderate	24 (3,146)	31 (215)	
High	73 (9,317)	63 (435)	
Reintegration potential			
Low	48 (6,167)	31 (212)	0.08
Moderate	35 (4,533)	53 (365)	
High	17 (2,117)	16 (115)	
Correctional plan involvement indicators			
Accountability			
Low	26 (3,062)	11 (68)	0.15
Moderate	64 (7,533)	58 (375)	
High	10 (1,219)	31 (202)	
Motivation			
Low	19 (2,486)	5 (36)	0.24
Moderate	70 (8,908)	47(325)	
High	11 (1,423)	48 (331)	
Engagement			
No	32 (3,776)	12 (78)	0.10
Yes	68 (8,038)	88 (567)	
Responsivity			
No	82 (9,640)	68 (440)	0.08
Yes	18 (2,174)	32 (205)	

Note. Missing values vary by item.

Four correctional plan involvement indicators were also examined. Women were much more likely than men to be rated as having high accountability and motivation, although high proportions of both groups were rated as having moderate levels of either indicator. Accordingly, women were much more likely than men to be assessed as being appropriately engaged in their correctional plans (88% vs. 68%); however, women were also more likely than men to have a flag alerting staff to some issues with regard to responsivity to treatment (32% vs. 18%).

In summary, there were relatively few differences in the profile of the men and women. Existing differences were not likely to have a significant impact on the type of charges and/or sanctions that they may receive for their institutional behaviour.

2. What Types of Sanctions Are Received for an Institutional Offence?

Most offenders had received a total of two sanctions during the study period. Generally, women had received more sanctions than men for a minor institutional offence (3.3 vs. 2.6). There were a total of 57,405 sanctions given for 56,836 institutional offences over the three-year period. Generally, only one sanction was used per offence; however, multiple sanctions were used in 1% of cases where up to three sanctions were given. The most commonly imposed sanction was a fine (45%; see Table 2) with warnings and sanctions that were considered for suspension making up a large portion of the sanctions as well (42%). The remainder of the sanction types each accounted for 5% or less of the total sanctions.

Table 2

Type of Sanction

Sanction Type	<i>N</i> = 57,405 % (<i>n</i>)
Fine	45 (25,870)
Suspension considered	24(13,623)
Warning	18 (10,614)
Loss of privileges	5 (2,649)
Segregation	4 (2,469)
Confined to cell	2 (1,056)
Restitution or restoration property	1 (664)
Extra work	1 (460)

A relatively small number of institutional offences resulted in the following types of

sanctions: loss of privileges; confined to cell (with or without privileges); restitution or restoration of property; and extra work. Accordingly, all additional analyses were conducted with these sanctions collapsed into an other category.

3. Does the Type of Sanction Received Vary by Other Factors?

Gender and Aboriginal ancestry. In examining the distributions of sanctions by gender and Aboriginal ancestry, limited differences were noted between these groups (gender: $\Phi_c = 0.05$; Aboriginal ancestry: $\Phi_c = 0.6 - 0.7$). The only notable gender difference was that men were more likely than women to receive a sanction that was considered for suspension (24% vs. 18%; see Table 3). There was a slight difference in the use of the other sanctions by gender, with women being more likely than men to receive other sanctions (12% vs. 8%). Although not presented here, the difference was likely related to the use of extra work as a sanction for women as compared to men (5% vs. 0.5%). Differences based on Aboriginal ancestry within each gender were quite limited among the men, but Aboriginal women were more likely than non-Aboriginal women to have received a fine (52% vs. 47%) and less likely to have a sanction considered for suspension (15% vs. 20%).

Table 3

Type of Sanction by Gender and Aboriginal Ancestry

Group	Sanction type				
	Fine (<i>n</i> = 25,870)	Suspension considered (<i>n</i> = 13,623)	Warning (<i>n</i> = 10,614)	Segregation (<i>n</i> = 2,469)	Other (<i>n</i> = 4,829)
Men	45 (24,171)	24 (13,009)	19 (10,031)	4 (2,348)	8 (4,418)
Non-Aboriginal ^a	43 (17,459)	25 (10,198)	19 (7,622)	5 (1,887)	8 (3,382)
Aboriginal ^a	50 (6,672)	21 (2,809)	18 (2,393)	3 (461)	8 (1,023)
Women	49 (1,699)	18 (614)	17 (583)	4 (121)	12 (411)
Non-Aboriginal ^a	47 (904)	20 (382)	18 (342)	3 (63)	12 (218)
Aboriginal ^a	52 (793)	15 (232)	16 (239)	4 (58)	13 (192)

^aThese analyses did not include 25 men and 3 women whose Aboriginal ancestry was unknown, which resulted in the removal of 71 sanctions for men and 5 for women.

Region. The distributions of sanctions varied by region ($\Phi_c = 0.26$; see Table 4). The differences were generally limited when considering fines and warnings; however, larger

variation was noted for the other types of sanctions. For example, the Atlantic region was more likely than other regions to give other sanctions such as loss of privileges or cell confinement, but was the least likely region to consider a sanction for suspension. In the Quebec region, segregation was used as a sanction almost two to eight times as often as the other regions.

Table 4

Type of Sanction by Region

Region	Sanction type				
	Fine (<i>n</i> = 25,870)	Suspension considered (<i>n</i> = 13,623)	Warning (<i>n</i> = 10,614)	Segregation (<i>n</i> = 2,469)	Other (<i>n</i> = 4,829)
Atlantic	50 (2,794)	13 (704)	15 (833)	4 (248)	18 (1,033)
Quebec	38 (7,084)	30 (5,706)	17 (3,283)	9 (1,646)	6 (1,068)
Ontario	42 (4,569)	25 (2,729)	24 (2,607)	2 (199)	7 (797)
Prairies	54 (9,038)	19 (3,162)	17 (2,827)	1 (188)	9 (1,532)
Pacific	45 (2,385)	25 (1,322)	20 (1,064)	3 (761)	7 (399)

Security level. The type of sanction received varied by the offender’s security level at the time of the sanction ($\Phi_c = 0.23$). Offenders at maximum security were more likely than those at minimum or medium security to receive a sanction for segregation; however, these offenders were less likely than offenders at other security levels to receive a warning and/or reprimand as a sanction for an institutional charge (see Table 5). Compared to offenders at other levels of security, offenders at minimum security were the most likely to receive a fine and the least likely to have a sanction considered for suspension or to receive the less frequently used other sanctions such as extra work, loss of privileges, or cell confinement.

Table 5

Type of Sanction by Security Level

Security level	Sanction type				
	Fine (<i>n</i> = 25,870)	Suspension considered (<i>n</i> = 13,623)	Warning (<i>n</i> = 10,614)	Segregation (<i>n</i> = 2,469)	Other (<i>n</i> = 4,829)
Minimum	57 (2,382)	16(646)	23 (957)	1 (43)	3 (110)
Medium	44 (19,837)	23 (7,210)	21 (6,754)	2 (782)	10 (3,077)
Maximum	44 (8,709)	28 (5,399)	12 (2,390)	8 (1,558)	8 (1,525)

Note. Not all offenders had been assigned a security level at the time of their sanction; therefore, these analyses exclude 2,026 sanctions for which there was no security level available. The exclusion of these cases did not have an impact on the distribution of sanction nor was the distribution of sanction notably different between those with and without security levels.

Type of offence. There was a strong relationship between institutional offence and the sanction received for the charge (charge type: $\Phi_c = 0.34$; charge severity: $\Phi_c = 0.50$). The use of fines was the most common sanction for all types of offences, with the exception of offences against a person (see Table 6) in which case 37% of the sanctions were considered for suspension. Segregation was generally the least often used sanction for all offence types except for those against a person.

When examining offence severity (minor vs. serious), a clear difference in the sanctions emerged. The most relied upon sanction for minor offences was a fine, while the most frequently used for a serious offence was a sanction considered for suspension. The use of segregation was 49 times higher with a serious offence compared to a minor offence (11% vs. 0.2%). Warnings were the least likely sanction for a serious offence, but were the second most frequently used type of sanction for a minor offence (2% vs. 28%).

Table 6

Type of Sanction by Institutional Offence Category and Severity

	Sanction type				
	% (n)				
Institutional offence	Fine (n = 25,870)	Suspension considered (n = 13,623)	Warning (n = 10,614)	Segregation (n = 2,469)	Other (n = 4,829)
Type of institutional charge					
Against the person	32 (938)	37 (1,084)	3 (105)	21 (620)	7 (204)
Against property	51 (191)	15 (55)	25 (91)	2 (7)	7 (27)
Contraband/ Unauthorized item	49 (7,268)	26 (3,881)	13 (1,869)	5 (680)	7 (998)
Disciplinary	45 (13,908)	20 (6,180)	25 (7,805)	2 (829)	8 (2,422)
Institutional safety	38 (1,122)	19 (579)	10 (306)	7 (213)	26 (777)
Substance related	48 (1,951)	40 (1,624)	2 (93)	3 (103)	7 (283)
Severity of institutional offence					
Minor	51 (17,979)	12 (4,362)	28 (10,072)	0 (78)	9 (3,090)
Serious	36 (7,891)	42 (9,261)	3 (542)	11 (2,391)	8 (1,739)

In sum, many factors were found to be associated with the type of sanction imposed on offenders. Institutional charge severity, charge type, region, and security level were moderately related to sanction type, while gender and ethnicity (Aboriginal ancestry vs. non-Aboriginal ancestry) had negligible to small relationships with sanction type.

4. What Role Do Gender and Other Factors Play in Predicting the Type of Sanction Received for an Institutional Offence?

The findings for the final research question are summarized and presented by type of sanction in Table 7 (see Appendix C for detailed GEE results).

Gender. Women had a lower likelihood of receiving a warning or a suspension considered and a higher likelihood of receiving segregation and other sanctions. Although women were more likely than men to receive a sanction of segregation, on average women were sanctioned to six days of segregation compared to 13 days for men (women: $Mdn = 6$, $M = 6$, $SD = 8$; men: $Mdn = 10$, $M = 13$, $SD = 11$).

Aboriginal ancestry. Aboriginal ancestry was associated with a higher likelihood of receiving a fine. Additionally, offenders of Aboriginal ancestry typically received a slightly higher fine for minor offences ($Mdn = \$10$, $M = \$10$, $SD = \$6$) in comparison to non-Aboriginal offenders ($Mdn = \$5$, $M = \$9$, $SD = \$6$). This was the case for serious offences as well (Aboriginal offender: $Mdn = \$30$, $M = \$30$, $SD = \$11$; non-Aboriginal Offender: $Mdn = \$25$, $M = \$27$, $SD = \$12$). Notably, despite reaching statistical significance, these differences in monetary fines never exceeded \$5.

Security level. Individuals classified at both medium and maximum security had a lower likelihood of receiving a fine than did those at minimum security. In contrast, those at medium or maximum security were more likely to receive a sanction in the “other” category. Although those at medium security did not differ from those at minimum in terms of their likelihood of receiving segregation, those at maximum security were significantly more likely to receive a segregation sanction than were those at minimum security.

Offence severity. In comparison to serious offences, minor offences were associated with a higher likelihood of receiving a fine, a warning, and a sanction in the “other” category, as well as a reduced likelihood of receiving a suspension considered and segregation.

Previous institutional offences. A greater number of previous institutional offences was associated with an increased likelihood of receiving a fine, segregation, or other sanctions, and a lower likelihood of receiving a warning.

Days incarcerated. Those for whom a longer period had elapsed from admission to the occurrence of the offence were less likely to receive a sanction in the “other” category.

Table 7

Summary of GEE Results by Type of Sanction

Final model variables	Sanction type				
	Fine	Suspension considered	Warning	Segregation	Other
Women vs. men	Same	Lower	Lower	Higher	Higher
Aboriginal vs. non-Aboriginal	Higher	-	-	-	-
Security level					
Maximum vs. minimum	Lower	-	Same	Higher	Higher
Medium vs. minimum	Lower	-	Higher	Same	Higher
Offence severity					
Minor vs. serious	Higher	Lower	Higher	Lower	Higher
Number of previous institutional offences	Higher	-	Lower	Higher	Higher
Days since most recent admission	-	-	-	-	Lower

Note. For interpretation: comparisons are made based on the order of variable categories listed in the first column. The first category (e.g., women) is contrasted against the second category (e.g., men) to show for example that women have a *lower* likelihood of receiving a warning compared to men, or that Aboriginal offenders have a *higher* likelihood receiving a fine compared to non-Aboriginal offenders. Region was statistically controlled in each model; these results are displayed in Appendix C. “-” indicates the variable was not found to be significant in the model for a specific sanction type and was, therefore, not retained.

Additional analyses

Moderation analyses. Given the potential impact the offence may have on the selection of sanction, GEE analyses were subsequently run separately by offence severity (minor vs. serious; see Appendix C for detailed GEE results). The purpose of this analysis was to identify if sanctions differed when assessing serious and minor charges separately. It was not possible to complete these additional analyses for the segregation sanction due to small numbers.

Gender. Few gender differences were noted. Women with a serious offence were less likely to receive a suspended sanction and more likely to receive an other sanction in comparison to men with a serious offence.

Security level. For minor offences, being at medium security was related to a reduced likelihood of receiving a fine when compared to being at minimum security. Although the likelihood of receiving a warning for a minor offence was similar between maximum and

minimum security, medium security was associated with an increased likelihood of receiving a fine in comparison to minimum security. When considering serious offences, individuals at maximum and medium security levels were less likely than those at minimum security to receive a fine or a warning.

Previous institutional offences. A greater number of previous offences was related to a decreased likelihood of receiving a warning as a sanction for a minor offence.

Models including other demographic and incarceration characteristics. Additional GEE analyses were conducted to explore the possible contributions of two supplementary factors: dynamic and static risk (see Table 8 and Appendix C for detailed results). Although there is no specific reference to these factors in the policies guiding disciplinary practices, dynamic and static risk factors were examined given their operational significance and the role they play in offender classification and operational practices (CSC, 2012).

The only impact on the original model (Table 7) was a change in the gender variable for the other sanction category. After controlling for static and dynamic risk, gender was no longer a significant factor in the administration of other sanctions. Static risk only demonstrated significance in the administration of a warning, with the medium risk group showing a lower likelihood than the high risk group of receiving a warning. Individuals with medium dynamic risk showed a lower likelihood of receiving a fine or a suspended sanction when compared to those with high dynamic risk. In contrast, those with both low and medium dynamic risk had an increased likelihood of a warning compared to the high dynamic risk group. Overall, static and dynamic risk had limited associations with the types of sanctions administered.

Table 8

Summary of GEE Results by Type of Sanction including Static and Dynamic Risk

Final Model Variables	Sanction Type				
	Fine	Suspension Considered	Warning	Segregation	Other
Women vs. Men	Same	Lower	Lower	Higher	Same
Aboriginal vs. non-Aboriginal	Higher	-	-	-	-
Security Level					
Maximum vs. minimum	Lower	-	Same	Higher	Higher
Medium vs. minimum	Lower	-	Higher	Same	Higher
Charge					
Minor vs. serious	Higher	Lower	Higher	Lower	Higher
Number of previous institutional offences	Higher	-	Lower	Higher	Higher
Days since most recent admission	-	-	-	-	Lower
Static Risk					
Low vs. high	-	-	Same	-	-
Medium vs. high	-	-	Lower	-	-
Dynamic Risk					
Low vs. high	Same	Same	Higher	-	-
Medium vs. high	Lower	Lower	Higher	-	-

Note. For interpretation: comparisons are made based on the order of variable categories listed in the first column. The first category (e.g., women) is contrasted against the second category (e.g., men) to show for example that women have a *lower* likelihood of receiving a warning compared to men, or that Aboriginal offenders have a *higher* likelihood receiving a fine compared to non-Aboriginal offenders. Region was statistically controlled in each model; “-” indicates the variable was not found to be significant in the model for a specific sanction type and was, therefore, not retained.

Discussion

The main objective of the current study was to explore differences and patterns in the administration of disciplinary sanctions within the Canadian federal offender population. Although the primary focus was gender differences, demographic factors, sentence characteristics, and risk assessments were considered as well. Given that the literature on disciplinary practices was dated and inconsistent prior to this project, the current study was exploratory in nature.

Profile

The first research question involved examining gender differences in the offenders being sanctioned. Women had shorter sentences, were more likely to be incarcerated for a drug offence, were classified to lower security levels, and were assessed at lower risk than men. These gender differences are consistent with those found in the general offender population (e.g., Blanchette & Brown, 2006; CSC, under review; Kong & AuCoin, 2008; Public Safety Canada, 2012).

Distribution of Sanction Type

Second, distribution of sanction types was examined. Fines were the sanction most frequently administered, followed by suspended sanctions and warnings. These findings are in contrast with the single relevant previous study (McClellan, 1994), where the most commonly administered sanction type for both men and women offenders was loss of privileges. Again, given that work by McClellan is dated and American, this inconsistency may simply be indicative of differential practices and perspectives over time and location.

Third, the distribution of sanctions was assessed across demographic and other factors. As one would expect, offence severity (minor vs. serious) and offender security level (maximum, medium, minimum) were associated with sanctions. A more notable difference, however, was found across regions, including Quebec's greater use of segregation as a disciplinary sanction. Potential explanations regarding regional variations are discussed below.

Predictors of Sanction Type

Finally, both gender and regional differences were found to predict sanction type. Although segregation was infrequently imposed as a disciplinary sanction (4%), women were more likely than men to receive a segregation sanction. On average, however, they spent less

time in segregation than men, a finding that is in line with the argument that women receive more lenient or shorter sentences (CSC, under review; Kong & AuCoin, 2008; Public Safety Canada, 2012). Women were also more likely than men to receive other sanctions (e.g., extra duties) and less likely to receive warnings or suspended sanctions. These results demonstrate that women are more likely to receive concrete and immediate sanctions (e.g., segregation, extra work, restitution); in comparison, men are more likely to receive intangible sanctions such as warnings.

Two explanations for this gender difference are possible. First, the findings align with previous evidence that women are more likely than men to be sanctioned harshly for similar behaviours, potentially due to paternalistic mentalities (McClellan, 1994). A second explanation may be related to staff practices. Staff training for working in a women offender correctional environment places extensive importance on dynamic security, including frequent interactions with women and using a very hands-on approach with the women. Staff in women's institutions may engage in informal sanctioning more frequently than their counterparts in larger men's institutions due to the dynamic environment and the interaction and mutual participation required for the informal resolution process. These informal resolutions may consist of warnings and less concrete consequences. If indeed informal resolutions are frequently attempted, it is understandable that when a woman does receive a sanction, perhaps after several informal attempts, that the sanction would be more concrete and immediate. This possibility is a strong argument for the need to record and track informal sanction practices; without this tracking, the explanatory role of informal sanctions in these gender differences can only be hypothesized.

Although disciplinary practices are dictated by the same national policies and directives, regional discrepancies were found. The reason for these differences is unknown, but may reflect regional variations in institutional characteristics (specifically, Quebec is the only region with a special handling unit which houses offenders who cannot be safely managed in maximum security institutions) or offender characteristics (Quebec has historically had a greater representation of offenders affiliated with motorcycle gangs and organized crime; Nafekh & Stys, 2004). This may also be the result of differences in the interpretation and application of directives. If that is the case, it is possible that a tracking system or an annual report of the sanctions received across the country may reduce this variation. Judicial decision-making, for example, relies heavily on precedence and consistency based on an accumulation of precedent

decisions and strict guidelines (Vago & Nelson, 2013). It is possible that the correctional system could rely on this type of decision-making if there was a greater awareness of decision processes and sanctions received in disciplinary hearings for similar offences. This reporting could provide a reference point for all Independent Chairpersons and designated delegates who conduct disciplinary hearings, which could potentially facilitate more consistency across the country.

Aboriginal ancestry was significantly associated with a higher likelihood of receiving a fine and also with receiving a fine of slightly higher monetary value. Although the rationale for imposition of sanctions was not examined, fines and restitution may be considered to be more in line with Aboriginal cultural practices which place a very strong emphasis on restitution and restorative justice (*R. v. Gladue*, 1999). Future research focused on qualitatively examining court proceedings and decision-making procedures would allow for a more in-depth explanation of the reasoning used in sanctioning which could be especially relevant to explaining these findings.

Offence severity and problematic institutional offence history were both related to a higher likelihood of receiving concrete and immediate sanctions (e.g., fine, segregation). These findings are consistent with correctional policy dictating that an offender's behaviour in the institution and the seriousness of the offence should be taken into consideration when imposing a disciplinary sanction (CCRA, s.44 (a) (c)).

Limitations and Future Directions

Although policy encourages informal resolutions, there is no procedure for recording informal responses to offender misconduct. As such, analyses were based on the data recorded and available and only related to the formal disciplinary process. Consequently, a whole facet of disciplinary practices -- informal resolution -- was not assessed. Although it would require changes in record keeping practices and a sufficient period of time to accumulate an adequate amount of data, it could be beneficial to include informal sanction responses in the analysis of disciplinary practices in the future. In some cases data quality also limited analyses. For example, the method of recording suspended sanctions varied extensively and required collapsing and grouping of sanction data. Greater consistency across institutions in record keeping practices could, therefore, be beneficial for CSC. Finally, building on the current findings by examining whether sanctions have an impact on future institutional behaviour, and whether gender differences are identifiable in this area, may be beneficial.

Conclusions

The current study contributed to the scarce literature on factors associated with disciplinary sanctions, and was the first such study in the Canadian context. Overall, disciplinary practices were fairly consistent, with most differences being relatively small in magnitude. That being said, the results may inform operational practices, specifically in regards to regional consistency and the need for more comprehensive and consistent national record keeping and decision-making procedures. Given that the study was novel and exploratory in nature, additional research would provide a more comprehensive understanding of the full disciplinary process, the reasons and justifications for the administration of disciplinary sanctions, and the impact of sanctions on future institutional adjustment and behaviour.

References

- Blanchette, K., & Brown, S. L. (2006). *The assessment and treatment of women offenders: An integrative perspective*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley.
- Bosworth, M. (2007). Creating the responsible prisoner: Federal admission and orientation packs. *Punishment & Society*, 9, 67-85.
- Correctional Service of Canada (manuscript submitted). *Changing federal offender population – 2012, Women offenders in custody*. Ottawa, ON: Author
- Correctional Service of Canada (2012). *Commissioner's directive 705-6: Correctional planning and criminal profile*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2013). *Commissioner's Directive 580: Discipline of Inmates*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Corrections and Conditional Release Act*. (1992).
- Corrections and Conditional Release Regulations* (2013).
- Craddock, A. (1996). A comparative study of male and female prison misconduct careers. *The Prison Journal*, 76, 60-80.
- Freiburger, T., & Hilinski, C. (2012) An examination of the interactions of race and gender on sentencing decisions using a trichotomous dependent variable. *Crime & Delinquency*, 59, 59-86.
- Hanley, J. A., Negassa, A., Edwardes, M. D. de B., & Forrester, J. E. (2003). Statistical analysis of correlated data using generalized estimating equations: An orientation. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 157, 364-375.
- Jeffries, S., Fletcher, G. J. O., & Newbold, G. (2003). Pathways to sex-based differentiation in criminal court sentencing. *Criminology*, 41, 329-354.
- Kong, R., & AuCoin, K. (2008). *Female offenders in Canada*. Statistics Canada (No. 85-002-X).
- Koons-Witt, B. (2002). The effect of gender on the decision to incarcerate before and after the introduction of sentencing guidelines. *Criminology*, 40, 297-327.
- Liang, S. L. & Zeger, K. Y. (1986). Longitudinal data analysis for discrete and continuous outcomes. *Biometrics*, 42, 121-130.
- McClellan, D. S. (1994). Disparity in the discipline of male and female inmates in Texas prisons. *Women and Criminal Justice*, 5, 71-97.

- Nafekh, M., & Stys, Y. (2004). *A profile and examination of gang affiliation within the federally sentenced offender population* (Research Report R-154). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Public Safety Canada. (2012) *Corrections and conditional release statistical overview: Annual report 2012*. (ISSN No. 1713-1073). Retrieved from http://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/res/cor/rep/_fl/2012-ccrso-eng.pdf
- R. v. Gladue*. (1999).
- Rea, L. M., & Parker, R. (1992). *Designing and conducting survey research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (5th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Texas Department of Criminal Justice. (2012). *Disciplinary rules and procedures for offenders*. (No. GR-106). Retrieved from http://www.google.ca/url?q=http://www.tdcj.state.tx.us/documents/cid/Disciplinary_Rules_and_Procedures_for_Offenders_English.pdf
- Vago, S., & Nelson, A. (2013). *Law and Society* (4th ed.). Toronto, ON: Pearson Education Canada.
- Warren, P., Chiricos, T., & Bales, W. (2012). The imprisonment of young Black and Hispanic males: A crime-specific analysis. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 49, 56-80.

Appendix A: Measures

Independent Measures – Person-Centred Data

Demographic, incarceration, risk, and correctional plan indicators

Age at admission. This variable indicates the age of offenders at the time of their admission and is measured in whole years. No cases were missing this information.

Length of sentence. This variable indicates the total length of an offender's sentence in years. Offenders are divided into three groups: aggregate sentence length of three years or less, aggregate sentence length greater than three years, and indeterminate sentence. No cases were missing this information.

Offence type. An offender's most serious offence type on his/her sentence was categorized into the following eight dichotomous variables: homicide (e.g., murder or attempted murder), sexual offence (e.g., sexual assault), robbery, assault (e.g., major assault, common assault), drugs (e.g., drug possession, trafficking and importing), property (e.g., break and enter, possession of stolen property), other violent (e.g., kidnapping, abduction, weapons and explosives), and other non-violent (e.g., public order offence, administration of justice, impaired driving).

Security level at admission. Security level is classified as maximum, medium, or minimum. This information is provided for the first assigned security level after admission. A total of 34 cases (5%) and 39 cases (0.3%) were missing respectively for women and men. It is likely that these cases had yet to be assigned to a security level given recent admission to an institution.

Offender intake assessment – assessment of risk. The Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) is used to assess levels of static (i.e., criminal history) and dynamic risk (i.e., criminogenic need) as well as motivation to participate in their correctional plan and reintegration potential. This information was taken at the time closest to admission to a federal correctional institution.

Static risk at intake. Offenders are assessed as being of low, medium, or high risk based on an assessment of factors associated with their criminal history, offence severity, and sex offence history. These static factors are fixed because they are historical and cannot be changed by attending programs and interventions (CSC, 2012). A total of 4 cases (0.6%) and 13 cases (0.1%) were respectively missing for women and men. It is likely that these cases had yet to be fully assessed given recent admission to an institution.

Dynamic risk at intake. Dynamic risk refers to an offender's needs, which have been traditionally correlated with correctional outcomes, and are used to determine the level of intervention an offender requires. These needs are considered modifiable through program participation. Offenders are assessed as low, medium, or high risk based on an assessment of these criminogenic needs (CSC, 2012). A total of 4 cases (0.6%) and 13 cases (0.1%) were respectively missing for women and men. It is likely that these cases had yet to be fully assessed given recent admission to an institution.

Reintegration potential at intake. This variable is assessed as low, medium, or high and assesses the probability of an offender successfully reintegrating back to the community. This rating is based on the Custody Rating Scale (CRS) the Revised Statistical Information on Recidivism (SIR-R1) and the Static Factor Rating for non-Aboriginal men (CSC, 2012). For Aboriginal offenders and women offenders, this level is determined by using the Custody Rating Scale, the static factor rating, and the dynamic factor rating (CSC, 2012).

A total of 4 cases (0.6%) and 22 cases (0.2%) were respectively missing for women and men. It is likely that these cases had yet to be fully assessed given recent admission to an institution.

Offender intake assessment – correctional plan involvement

Motivation level at intake. This variable is assessed as low, medium, or high, based on an offender's drive and willingness to complete the requirements of their correctional plan (CSC, 2012). A total of 4 cases (0.6%) and 22 cases (0.2%) were missing respectively for women and men. It is likely that these cases had yet to be fully assessed given recent admission to an institution.

Accountability for actions at intake. This indicator rates the offender's accountability for their actions and behaviour. Overall accountability is assessed as being high, medium, or low. (CSC, 2012). Generally, this rating is based on acceptance of responsibility and feelings of guilt and empathy. A total of 51 cases (7%) and 1,025 cases (8%) were respectively missing for women and men. It is likely that these cases had yet to be fully assessed given recent admission to an institution.

Flag for responsivity factors to be considered for interventions at intake. The presence of factors that could influence an offender's ability to benefit from correctional interventions (CSC, 2012). A total of 51 cases (7%) and 1,025 cases (8%) were respectively missing for

women and men. It is likely that these cases had yet to be fully assessed due to recent admission.

Flag for engagement issues at intake. This flag combines information from the three above-mentioned indicators. Offenders are considered engaged when they are rated as having either a medium or high rating on the accountability and motivation indicators. A total of 51 cases (7%) and 1,025 cases (8%) were respectively missing for women and men. It is likely that these cases had yet to be fully assessed given recent admission to an institution.

Independent Measures - Event-Centred Data

Aboriginal ancestry. Two categories are used: 1) Aboriginal (includes all individuals who self-identify as Inuit, Métis, or First Nations ancestry) and non-Aboriginal individuals (includes all offenders who do not identify as being of Inuit, Métis, or First Nations ancestry, but excludes those of unknown ancestry). A total of 3 cases (0.4%) and 25 cases (0.2%) were classified as having an unknown ethnic ancestry. In some analyses, these case were removed.

Region. This variable represents CSC regional divisions in which the sanctions were received: Atlantic, Quebec, Ontario, Prairies, and Pacific.

Security level at the time of the sanction. Security level is classified as maximum, medium, or minimum. This information is provided for the offender security classification assigned closest to the date of the sanction. A total of 373 (11%) and 1,653 (3%) of sanctions which occurred were missing information regarding security level respectively for women and men.

Total number of offences prior to sanction since most recent admission. This indicator is a simple count of all the institutional offences an offender committed and were found guilty of since their most recent admission up until the current date of sanction.

Total time in institution prior to sanction since most recent admission. This indicator is a simple count of the amount of time passed between most recent admission and the sanction.

Appendix B: Categorization of Offences

Institutional Safety

- Creates/participates in disturbance
- Creates/participates to jeopardize security
- Damage/destroy government property
- Escape/assist

Against the Person

- Fight/assault/threaten
- Throws bodily substance
- Disrespect to provoke violence¹⁰
- Intimidate/threaten violence

Substance-Related

- Intoxicants into body
- Fails/refuses urine sample

Property-Related

- Possession of stolen property
- Theft

Disciplinary

- Disrespect/abusive to staff
- Disrespect to provoke violence towards staff
- Disobeys rule
- Disobeys order
- Refuses/leave work
- Prohibited area
- Gambling

Contraband/Unauthorized Item

- Possession of contraband
- Possession of unauthorized item

¹⁰ Although this offence description is similar to those included in the “disciplinary” category, this offence is often considered serious due to the intention of provoking violence. Given that the majority of disciplinary offences were minor, this offence was not included in the disciplinary category and was grouped in the serious category of “crimes against the person” instead.

Appendix C: Results

Table C.1

Demographic, Incarceration, Risk, and Correctional Plan Indicators by Gender and Aboriginal Ancestry

Characteristic	Men (N = 12,839) ^a			Women (N = 696) ^a		
	Non-Aboriginal (N = 9,636) % (n) or Mean (SD)	Aboriginal (N = 3,178) % (n) or Mean (SD)	Magnitude of difference ϕ	Non-Aboriginal (N = 422) % (n) or Mean (SD)	Aboriginal (N = 271) % (n) or Mean (SD)	Magnitude of difference ϕ
Demographic characteristics						
Age at admission	32 (10)	29 (9)	-	34 (11)	30 (9)	-
Incarceration characteristics						
Length of sentence						
Three years of less	37 (3,523)	38 (1,212)		55 (233)	55 (148)	
More than three years	50 (4,814)	48 (1,537)	0.01	36 (153)	33 (89)	0.07
Indeterminate	13 (1,299)	14 (429)		9 (36)	12 (34)	
Type of Offence						
Homicide or related offence	17 (1,616)	20 (631)	0.04	15 (63)	27(74)	0.15
Sex offence	8 (736)	11 (339)	0.05	3 (14)	1 (2)	0.08
Robbery	22 (2,116)	19 (607)	0.03	18 (75)	20 (53)	0.02
Assault	12 (1,202)	21 (672)	0.11	9 (39)	17 (46)	0.12
Other violent	6 (604)	5 (157)	0.02	6 (25)	5 (15)	0.01
Drug-related offence	16 (1,534)	7 (224)	0.11	27 (112)	15 (40)	0.14
Property offence	12 (1,161)	10 (337)	0.02	14 (61)	7 (20)	0.11
Other non-violent	7 (667)	7 (211)	0.00	8 (33)	8 (21)	0.00
Assessment of risk						
Static Risk						
Low	8 (804)	3 (93)		25 (104)	11 (31)	
Moderate	36 (3,465)	29 (930)	0.12	46 (191)	41 (111)	0.21
High	56 (5,355)	68 (2,154)		29 (123)	48 (129)	

Characteristic	Men (<i>N</i> = 12,839) ^a		Magnitude of difference ϕ	Women (<i>N</i> = 696) ^a		Magnitude of difference ϕ
	Non-Aboriginal (<i>N</i> = 9,636)	Aboriginal (<i>N</i> = 3,178)		Non-Aboriginal (<i>N</i> = 422)	Aboriginal (<i>N</i> = 271)	
	% (n) or Mean (SD)	% (n) or Mean (SD)		% (n) or Mean (SD)	% (n) or Mean (SD)	
Dynamic risk						
Low	3 (341)	0 (20)	0.12	9 (38)	2 (4)	0.23
Moderate	27 (2,554)	19 (584)		36 (152)	23 (63)	
High	70 (6,729)	81 (2,573)		55 (228)	75 (204)	
Reintegration potential						
Low	43 (1,887)	64 (2,033)	0.20	24 (101)	40 (109)	0.19
Moderate	37 (3,605)	29 (922)		55 (230)	50 (134)	
High	20 (4,123)	7 (222)		21 (87)	10 (28)	
Correctional plan involvement indicators						
Accountability						
Low	26 (2,306)	25 (752)	0.05	11 (43)	10 (25)	0.02
Moderate	63 (5,563)	67 (1,958)		58 (229)	58 (145)	
High	11 (984)	8 (230)		31 (120)	32 (82)	
Motivation						
Low	19 (1,852)	20 (627)	0.05	5 (20)	6 (15)	0.03
Moderate	69 (6,582)	73 (2,312)		46 (193)	48 (130)	
High	12 (1,181)	7 (238)		49 (205)	46 (126)	
Engagement						
No	32 (2,815)	33 (956)	0.01	11 (45)	12 (32)	0.02
Yes	68 (6,038)	67 (1,984)		89 (347)	87 (220)	
Responsivity						
No	84 (7,443)	74 (2,182)	0.11	70 (273)	66 (166)	0.04
Yes	16 (1,410)	26 (758)		30 (119)	34 (86)	
First security level						
Minimum	14 (1,289)	6 (191)	0.10	35(140)	14 (38)	0.24
Medium	68 (6,550)	73 (2,313)		53 (207)	70 (186)	
Maximum	18 (1,768)	21 (665)		12 (46)	16 (43)	

^aThese analyses did not include 25 men and 3 women whose Aboriginal ancestry was unknown.

Table C.2

Final GEE Model Results by Type of Sanction

Final model variables	Sanction type				
	B (SE)				
	Fine	Suspension considered	Warning	Segregation	Other
Women vs. men	0.02 (0.06)	-0.35 (0.07)***	-0.33 (0.09)*	0.40 (0.16)*	0.21 (0.09)*
Aboriginal vs. non-Aboriginal	0.08 (0.03)*	-	-	-	-
Security level					
Maximum vs. minimum	-0.31 (0.05)***		0.03 (0.04)	0.54 (0.23)*	1.14 (0.12)***
Medium vs. minimum	-0.43 (0.04)***		0.30 (0.05)***	0.37 (0.22)	1.46 (0.11)***
Charge					
Minor vs. serious	0.52 (0.03)***	-1.73 (0.03)***	2.54 (0.05)***	-4.03 (0.24)***	0.32 (0.05)***
Number of institutional offences	0.00 (0.00)*	-	-0.02 (0.003)***	0.01 (0.00)**	0.01 (0.00)***
Days since most recent admission	-	-	-	-	-0.0002 (0.00)***
Region					
Atlantic vs. Pacific	-0.11 (0.05)*	-0.89 (0.07)***	0.04 (0.08)***	0.60 (0.15)***	1.43 (0.09)***
Quebec vs. Pacific	-0.37 (0.04)***	0.40 (0.05)***	-0.15 (0.06)**	1.09 (0.13)***	-0.17 (0.10)
Ontario vs. Pacific	-0.29 (0.04)***	0.29 (0.05)***	-0.03 (0.06)	-0.10 (0.15)	0.14 (0.09)
Prairies vs. Pacific	0.18 (0.04)***	-0.21 (0.05)***	-0.40 (0.06)***	-0.66 (0.16)***	0.53 (0.09)***

Note. The total n for all models was 54,247. “-” indicates the variable was not found to be significant in the model for a specific sanction type and was, therefore, not retained * $p < 0.05$. *** $p < 0.01$. **** $p < .001$.

Table C.3

Final GEE Model including the Moderating Effect of Minor Offences by Type of Sanction

Final model variables	Sanction type				
	B (SE)				
	Fine	Suspension considered	Warning	Segregation	Other
Women vs. men	0.13 (0.07)	0.7 (0.8)	-0.35 (0.07)***	--	0.09 (0.10)
Aboriginal vs. non-Aboriginal	0.08 (0.03)*	--	--	--	
Security level					
Maximum vs. minimum	-0.08 (0.05)	--	0.02 (0.06)	--	1.12 (0.14)***
Medium vs. minimum	-0.55 (0.04)***	--	0.32 (0.05)***	--	1.39 (0.12)***
Number of institutional offences	0.01 (0.00)***	--	-0.01 (0.00)***	--	0.01 (0.00)***
Days since most recent admission	--	--	--	--	--
Region					
Atlantic vs. Pacific	-0.48 (0.07)***	0.04 (0.12)	-0.40 (0.07)***	--	2.15 (0.14)***
Quebec vs. Pacific	-0.17 (0.05)**	0.44 (0.09)***	-0.13 (0.05)*	--	0.53 (0.15)***
Ontario vs. Pacific	-0.51 (0.05)***	0.93 (0.09)***	-0.03 (0.05)	--	0.68 (0.14)***
Prairies vs. Pacific	-0.18 (0.05)***	0.76 (0.09)***	-0.44 (0.05)***	--	1.03 (0.14)***

Note. "--" indicates the variable was not found to be significant in the model for a specific sanction type and was, therefore, not retained

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table C.4

Final GEE Model including the Moderating Effect of Serious Offences by Type of Sanction

Final model variables		Sanction type					
		B (SE)					
		Fine	Suspension considered	Warning	Segregation	Other	
Serious offences	Women vs. men	-0.21 (0.10)*	-0.65 (0.10)***	1.38 (0.13)***	--	0.59 (0.14)***	
	Aboriginal vs. non-Aboriginal	0.11 (0.05)*	--	--	--	--	
	Security level						
	Maximum vs. Minimum	-0.85 (0.11)***	--	-1.04 (0.21)***	--	1.09 (0.29)***	
	Medium vs. minimum	-0.79 (0.10)***	--	-0.74 (0.19)***	--	1.37 (0.28)***	
	Number of institutional offences	0.00 (0.00)	--	0.00 (0.00)	--	0.01 (0.00)***	
	Days since most recent admission	--	--	--	--	--	
	Region						
	Atlantic vs. Pacific	0.74 (0.07)***	-1.25 (0.08)***	-0.72 (0.21)***	--	0.53 (0.11)***	
	Quebec vs. Pacific	-0.93 (0.08)***	0.51 (0.07)***	-0.55 (0.17)***	--	-1.30 (0.14)***	
	Ontario vs. Pacific	0.16 (0.07)*	0.03 (0.07)	-0.38 (0.16)*	--	-0.57 (0.12)***	
Prairies vs. Pacific	0.75 (0.07)***	-0.65 (0.06)***	-0.40 (0.15) **	--	0.08 (0.10)		

Note. "--" indicates the variable was not found to be significant in the model for a specific sanction type and was, therefore, not retained
 * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table C.5

Final GEE Results by type of Sanction with Static and Dynamic Risk included

Final model variables	Sanction type				
	B (SE)				
	Fine	Suspension considered	Warning	Segregation	Other
Women vs. Men	0.03 (0.06)	-0.35 (0.08)***	-0.34 (0.10)***	0.41 (0.16)*	0.15 (0.09)
Aboriginal vs. non-Aboriginal	0.07 (0.03)*	--	--	--	--
Security level					
Maximum vs. minimum	-0.36 (0.05)***	--	0.09 (0.06)	0.58 (0.23)*	1.23 (0.13)***
Medium vs. minimum	-0.46 (0.04)***	--	0.35 (0.05)***	0.39 (0.22)	1.51 (0.12)***
Charge					
Minor vs. serious	0.52 (0.03)***	-1.74 (0.03)***	2.54 (0.05)***	-4.03 (0.24)***	0.32 (0.05)***
Number of institutional offences	0.00 (0.00)**	--	-0.02 (0.00)***	0.01 (0.00)**	0.01 (0.00)***
Days since most recent admission	--	--	--	--	--
Region					
Atlantic vs. Pacific	0.11 (0.05)*	-0.87 (0.07)***	-0.41 (0.08)***	0.60 (0.15)***	1.39 (0.09)***
Quebec vs. Pacific	-0.38 (0.04)***	0.43 (0.05)***	-0.13 (0.06)*	1.09 (0.13)***	-0.17 (0.10)
Ontario vs. Pacific	-0.28 (0.04)***	0.30 (0.05)***	-0.04 (0.06)	-0.10 (0.15)	0.14 (0.09)
Prairies vs. Pacific	0.19 (0.04)***	-0.22 (0.05)***	-0.40 (0.06)***	-0.67 (0.16)***	0.49 (0.09)***
Static Risk					
Low vs. high	--	--	-0.14 (0.07)	--	0.56 (0.10)***
Medium vs. high	--	--	-0.14 (0.04)***	--	0.16 (0.05)**
Dynamic Risk					
Low vs. high	-0.12 (0.09)	0.16 (0.11)	0.29 (0.11)**	-0.30 (0.38)	-0.78 (0.23)***
Medium vs. high	-0.07 (0.03)*	-0.08 (0.04)*	0.18 (0.04)***	0.13 (0.10)	-0.01 (0.06)

Note. "--" indicates the variable was not found to be significant in the model for a specific sanction type and was, therefore, not retained.

* $p < 0.05$. *** $p < 0.01$. **** $p < .001$.