



## 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.

# **LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Federally Sentenced**

**Women Program**

**August 18, 1994**

HV  
8738  
L4  
1994

Copyright of this document does not belong to the Crown.  
Proper authorization must be obtained from the author for  
any intended use.

Les droits d'auteur du présent document n'appartiennent  
pas à l'État. Toute utilisation du contenu du présent  
document doit être approuvée préalablement par l'auteur.

HV  
8738  
L4  
1994

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this project is to review the literature on classification of inmates. In particular, what does the literature say about the classification of women inmates. The body of literature available is mainly American in context, however; there are some similarities in regards to specific issues with Canadian corrections, specifically female inmate profiles and the method in which female offenders are housed, which is primarily in a single institution. These similarities therefore make the available literature applicable to the Canadian experience and may provide a useful starting point. Similar to Canada, women represent a very small percentage of the incarcerated population, this has meant that for the most part the same tools and regulations used to manage male inmates are used for the female population. However, recently there has been an attempt by several institutions to validate their classification system for female inmates. The majority of the literature reviewed concludes that female inmates, with most of the present classification systems, tend to be over classified. The literature however, provides few concrete explanations as to why. Some of the reviewed literature provided brief descriptions of some of the approaches used by institutions, this has been particularly useful and therefore has been included in this discussion paper. As well, some of the literature identified risk predictors that may be useful for the classification of female offenders, as well this literature provided useful discussion and insight that will aid in assessing the utility of some of the variables presently used in the classification process. As a whole, nevertheless, the literature reviewed did not provide the complete necessary tools and instruments for a women centered classification, it does however provide a useful beginning.

This document will outline three main themes present in the literature reviewed. First, what is the overall problem with the present classification system and why it does not work for the classification of female inmates. Second, and related to the first, what are some of the risk predictors that work in assessing female inmate future behavior and what are the ones that do not. Third, some models of classification and their suitability for assessing female inmates will be briefly outlined. Two other areas will also be

LIBRARY  
SOLICITEUR GENERAL CANADA  
SEP 4 1997  
SOLICITEUR GENERAL CANADA  
OTTAWA (ONTARIO)  
K1A 0P8

considered as additional useful information. First, classification approaches used by different institutes that house female inmates will be outlined, since they provide some guidance into the development of classification systems. Second, some of the conclusions and recommendations of the various research will be described. Finally, a brief overview and evaluation of the findings in the literature will be provided. This overview will attempt to determine the usefulness of the literature in providing new ideas for the classification of female inmates.

## **PROBLEMS WITH PRESENT CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS**

There is a clear consensus in the literature reviewed that women tend to be over classified when the classification designed for males is applied to them. As mentioned, the literature often does not provide clear concise examples of why women are over classified, in other words reasons are not clearly articulated. Nevertheless, there are some explanations provided that may provide some insight into the problem of classification. For instance, Burke and Adams<sup>1</sup> state that many concerns have been voiced over the classification of female offenders because their security/custody designations seems inappropriately high. Some speculative reasons for this phenomenon, provided by these authors, are that:

1. Where tools are based in the collective judgment of staff, there is simply more knowledge of male offenders than female offenders.
2. Because so many systems are heavily weighted by severity of offense, they tend to over-classify women.
3. In the case of research based tools one can speculate that the research did not include women.

These reasons however are speculative and therefore are not very useful in providing concrete explanations as to why women tend to be over classified. The reality, on the other hand, is that there is a

---

<sup>1</sup> Peggy Burke and Linda Adams. Classification of Women Offenders in State Correctional Facilities: A Handbook for Practitioners. (Washington: Cosmos Corp, 1991.)

tremendous body of literature dealing with the issue of the appropriateness of the present classification for male inmates. Up to now it has been difficult to assess whether the tools classifying males are appropriate. It is of course, more difficult to assess classification for women due to their small numbers which prevent adequate statistical analysis.

Other explanations offered that are significant are:

4. Classification of inmates is usually done initially to sort prisoners into Maximum, Medium, and Minimum security institutions. Since women tend to be housed in one institution the initial objective of the classification is lost.
5. Classification must take into account the needs of the institution. Therefore, most state wide prison classification systems are built primarily to keep order and to ensure safety within institutions. For these institutions, the main objective is security. Most women's institutions are able to focus more upon rehabilitation than security because, overall, women present a lower rate of violent incidents within the institution.

The major problem with the classification of women offenders is that virtually all statewide classification systems are designed to support the kind of emphasis that is mainly security driven, yet the classification is being used for offenders where the emphasis is mainly rehabilitation. It seems therefore, according to Burke and Adams, that what may be needed is not necessarily the development of better, women oriented risk classification tools, but rather an approach to classification that supports an emphasis on rehabilitation. The shortfalls of the analysis presented by Burke and Adams is that it fails to move beyond issue identification. In other words, there is no guidance on how the new approach to classification can be achieved.

## **RISK PREDICTORS:**

The literature reviewed did not address extensively the question of which predictors are suitable for classification of female inmates. Nevertheless, there was some discussion of some commonly used predictors. Jack Alexander in his working paper, Security Classifications Guidelines for Females, asserts that there is a need for different tools for assessing risk among female inmates. He begins by outlining several conclusions arrived at by the literature review conducted for the study.

- 1. Female inmates have lower rates of serious disciplinary infractions than the male inmates.**
- 2. Prison conditions are themselves an important influence on inmate disciplinary adjustment.**
- 3. The only inmate characteristic consistently related, though weakly, to disciplinary adjustments is age. Older female inmates have slightly lower infraction rates than younger female inmates.**
- 4. Escape has been studied too rarely to draw reliable conclusions.**
- 5. Suicide and suicide attempts have been studied too rarely to draw reliable conclusions, though there is some evidence that female inmates are more recidivistic than men in this area.**
- 6. Female inmates pose less of a risk to the public than male inmates, because they have lower rates of violent crime and recidivism.**

This study provides insight into why some of the commonly used predictors are not useful for women. Also, it identified a new factor to be included in assessing risk for female inmates, isolated personal violence. This factor is defined as an act of violence stemming from relationships, and therefore receives a lower score on the grounds that the inmate is not a danger to the community at large.

According to this study predictors such as escape are difficult to validate because there is not enough cases to study. There are a few more cases of *failed to return from temporary release*. However failure to return, according to the study, is not a good predictor of escape as they are both different in context. Risk to the community is also difficult to predict mainly due to the fact that there are not enough escape instances to be studied. However, studying criminal behavior of females on the street may give some insight into the potential risk to the community. Alexander's study on this subject suggests the following:

1. Females commit far fewer crimes than males.
2. Of the crimes females do commit, a much smaller percentage are violent.
3. Females have a much lower recidivism rate than males.
4. The most serious violent crime, murder, is usually a crime of passion and has an extremely low recidivism rate.

Disciplinary adjustment is another desirable criteria that needs to be predicted. This can be accomplished by using two variables in conjunction:

- Frequency of disciplinary problems and
- Severity of the disciplinary problem.

These two variables need to be measured together since according to the sentiments of most practitioners, female inmates were found to be more 'troublesome' but the severity of the problems were lower in comparison to male inmates. In other words, the problems created by female inmates do not often translate into disruption to the institution. Other predictors that showed a strong relationship to disciplinary adjustment are age (shown as the strongest predictor), marital status, and other family ties. Substance abuse and criminal behavior on the other hand, seem unrelated to disciplinary adjustment. Overall, the study concludes that there are three variables that together give some ability to predict disciplinary

adjustments during the first six month. These variables are: age, length of sentence, and marital status.

Public risk is another desirable criteria that needs to be predicted. Since there is no data that can be examined to predict the public risk, (as mentioned before escapes are too few to study therefore it follows that identifying risk to the community due to escape is also not possible) the study conducted interviews with staff and inmates. The findings from the interviews are as follows:

1. The more violent the inmates' criminal history; the more likely it is that the inmate will be violent were she to escape. Keeping in mind that if this isolated violence arises out of a personal relationship it would be considered less of a risk to society and would be assessed accordingly.
2. The frequency in which the inmate has attempted to flee would be a good indicator that she will attempt to flee in the future.
3. The longer the inmates' time to release, the more incentive she has to escape.
4. The higher the stability of an inmates' street life, the more likely she is to abide by the prison rules and not escape. Thus, the inmate who has completed school, held a full time job and been married is a better risk. This predictor however is not desirable because of its correlation with race, which would tend to classify younger non-whites at a higher security level, this of course has ethical and legal complications and therefore is best excluded from the public risk scale.

The study conducted by Alexander is somewhat helpful in that it provides some discussion as to why some of the commonly used indicators are not suitable for assessing risk of female offenders. As well, it provides an alternative indicator of violence that may be useful in the classification of female inmates (isolated personal violence). The study also highlights that the main problem with any type of indicators is that their validation potential is low. If indeed there is not sufficient data to conduct validation, then it is perhaps necessary to evaluate the utility of the factors that are being

measured. For example, escape may not be a factor that is necessarily essential to measure when assessing female inmates. However, other constraints such as political and legal ones may force this factor, for instance, to remain in the classification assessment.

## **MODELS OF CLASSIFICATION SUGGESTED BY THE LITERATURE**

There is a significant amount of models and approaches to classification of inmates. However, the literature reviewed did not fully assess some of these models in terms of how they apply to female inmates. Nevertheless, Argento and Nesbitt in their study Female Classification and Identification of the Issue describe the recent classification development efforts in female offender classification.<sup>2</sup> Their study outlines three models which they recommend as potentially suitable for female classification these are:

The Michigan Department of Correction which conducted a study using the Automatic Interaction Detection Analysis procedure to develop a unique set of risk factors for the female prisoner. There were three levels of risk identified: high, middle, and low. The predictors used were age, previous felony convictions and type of crime.<sup>3</sup> According to Argento and Nesbitt this model has not been validated for female inmates.

The second model examined is the system developed by Megargee and Bohn.<sup>4</sup> This model is based on the Minnesota Multiphase Personality Inventory (MMPI), a test that provides an assessment of personality status and emotional adjustment. There is some advantages to using this system, mainly its objectivity and uniformity.<sup>5</sup> However, like the previous model this system has not yet been validated for women. Also these types of psychological assessments are found, by some studies, to show weak correlation

---

<sup>2</sup> Charlotte Nesbitt and Angela R. Argento. Female Classification: An Examination of the Issues. (College Park, Maryland: American Correctional Association, 1984.)

<sup>3</sup> For a more detail account of this model refer to appendix 1.

<sup>4</sup> Edwin I. Megargee and Martin J. Bohn Jr. Classifying Criminal Offenders: A New System Based on the MMPI. (1979).

<sup>5</sup> For more information on this model see appendix 1.1

between personality variables and disciplinary problems, hence its utility remains in question.<sup>6</sup>

The last model examined by this study is the classification system developed by Herbert C. Quay<sup>7</sup>, based on individuals past and current behavior the inmates are assigned into three combined groups Heavy (groups I and II together) Light (groups III and IV) and Middle (group V). This method uses two checklists that are completed by the staff; The *Checklist for Analysis of Life History* records of adult offenders and the *Correctional Adjustment Checklist*. The results are combined to make the classification. The highest final score determines to which group the inmate will be assigned. Quay has a typology for each grouping, briefly they are the following:

**Group I** consists of inmates who have a history of hostile, aggressive, violent behavior.

**Group II** prisoners are characterized as being con artists.

**Group III** are immature, dependent and easily victimized.

**Group IV** are excitable, constantly worried, anxious and very nervous.

**Group V** feels that even though they are incarcerated they are not criminals. They are viewed by staff as reliable.

This typology according to Argento and Nesbitt has not been updated so that it applies to female offenders nor has it been validated. Nevertheless; it is the authors' recommendation that this typology can be applied to female inmates<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> Tim Brennan "Classification for Control." Prediction and Classification Criminal Justice Decision Making. Ed. Don M. Gottfredson and Michael Tonry. (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1987.) pg. 339.

<sup>7</sup> Herbert C. Quay, "Administrators and users Manual for the Behavioral Classification System for Adult Offenders." August 1983.

<sup>8</sup> For more detail information about this model see appendix 1.2

Overall, the main problem that can be identified in these different models examined by Argento and Nesbitt is that the models have been created for a male inmate population. It is unclear what sort of modification would be required in order to make these models work in assessing female inmate behavior. Nesbitt and Argento fail to analyze and scrutinize these models of classification. Hence, their assessments of these approaches is limited to indicating whether they have been validated for female offenders. All of the ones examined in this study were not, yet they were all recommended as potentially useful models for the classification of women offenders.

Argento and Nesbitt do provide some recommendations regarding the objectives of a classification system for female offenders. They argue that matching agency resources (facility, staff, programs, and services) with the explicit correctional goals is the overall purpose of classification. They argue that agency goals can be many but frequently there are two broad concerns: public safety and humane care. This requires that the classification system be concerned with concepts of both risk and need, individually and collectively for the female inmate population. The relationship between department and classification goals may be displayed as follows:

<b>DEPARTMENT GOALS:</b>	To Protect Public safety	To provide humane care	Efficient use of resources
<b>CLASSIFICATION GOALS:</b>	Make accurate security assessments (inmates resources)	Make accurate special needs assessments (Inmate resources)	Initial placement/ later transfers (administrative concerns)

The study also outlines some of the risk factors that have been used for classification of female offenders, these are the following:

#### Risk Predictors

Age at current conviction  
 Expected Length of stay  
 History of escape  
 History of violence  
 Prior institutional misconduct

#### Need Factors

Children/family Stability  
 Drug and alcohol abuse  
 Education deficits  
 Emotional stability  
 Mental capacity

**Prior supervision  
 Failures  
 Severity of Current  
 offense  
 Substance abuse history**

**Total Volume of past  
 criminal history**

**Marital Concerns**

**Physical health**

**Post-Release Survival  
 Skills**

**Vocation/training deficits**

**There is no further information provided regarding the utility or validity of the factors outlined above, this is problematic since as other literature points out, some of the indicators that are commonly used may not work well when used to classify female offenders. The study does provide a copy of the assessment forms used by Dwight Correctional Institution of Illinois and Chillicothe Correctional Center of Missouri, institutions that house female inmates for further assessment. ( See appendix 2)**

**As a whole, the study conducted by Argento and Nesbitt does not provide tangible solutions to the problems with classification for female inmates, it merely provides insight into some of the issues and some possible variables that may be used. However, because of the lack of analysis regarding the usefulness of these variables it remains questionable whether these variables are desirable in a classification for female inmates.**

## **DESCRIPTION OF CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS**

**Adams and Burke in their study provided a few examples of approaches taken by some female Institutions in the area of classification assessment. These will be outlined briefly to provide an idea of what sort of classifications tools are being presently used In Georgia, Illinois, New York, and Wyoming.**

### **A. The classification of women offenders in Georgia:**

**Inmates in these facilities are classified into five security designations: trusty, minimum, medium, close, and maximum. For males, this classification is mainly used for the assignment of housing. For women, on the other hand, this does not apply since they are housed in a single unit. Women are housed, assigned to programs, and placed in jobs without regard to security classification. The initial security classification considers pending**

charge, severity of offense, projected length of incarceration, prior commitments, history of escapes, and history of violence. The first four of these six items are directly related to the nature of the current and past offenses. As a result, the heaviest weight in establishing security classification is determined by the offense, rather than by violence and escape potential. Inmates are also classified using Correctional Classification Profile which focuses on the needs of the offender. The eight areas included in this profile are: medical needs, public risk, institutional risk as both a victim and a predator, treatment needs, educational needs, vocational needs, work needs, and drug/ alcohol problems as needs. Overrides are also used, this means that exemptions can be made to the initial classification instrument when warranted, both to increase and decrease the security rating.

**Reclassification:** Is done by a committee that meets weekly, they reclassify on needs basis and by departmental policy (after 12 months for inmates classified as closed, 6 month for medium and minimum).

Adams and Burke noted several issues with this system.

1. While the instruments used to assess risk are objective, they are based upon collective judgment of experienced staff rather than in empirical research.
2. Some women do not have access to job assignments due to the initial classification although they do not present a risk of escape to the community.
3. Classification has little impact on women's day to day routine however it is clear that the institution's emphasis is upon security concerns.

#### **B. The classification of women offenders in Illinois:**

Classification in the Illinois Department of Corrections occurs at two levels, both statewide and within individual institutions. Statewide, initial classification of both women and men offenders is conducted using a set of scales to determine an adjustment score, a danger

score, and an escape risk. The first two of these are empirically based and have been validated. The third scale, escape risk, is constructed with factors based upon judgment of practitioners regarding indicators of escape risk. The three assessment scales together yield a security classification; maximum, medium, or minimum. For women, this classification has traditionally determined to which cottage they will be assigned. Classification may also result in the requirement to wear a certain color badge identifying the inmate as a high escape risk.

Also operating statewide is a system of "Grades". All inmates begin at A level and are eligible for all institutional privileges. Inmates may be demoted to Grade B or C if they are found guilty of certain types of disciplinary infractions. Upon grade demotion, offenders lose eligibility for privileges; transfer to community facilities and amenities such as attendance at special events, telephone privileges, and so on. Inmates are automatically promoted back up after a specific period of time. Each institution develops its own supervision classification which includes: staff escort, close, intermediate, limited and external. The administration and criteria is left to the discretion of the individual institutions.

Adams and Burke note that the main problem with this system is that the institution for women is geared at programming, addressing the factors that brought the women to be incarcerated, while the statewide classification focuses mainly on security. Therefore, the classification may not be useful in the assignment of programs.

#### **C. The classification of women offenders in New York:**

Staff utilizes assessment tools including interviews, test and narrative assessment reports to complete the security, medical, and mental health recommendations. One of the tools used to assign a security designation is a risk assessment instrument. The risk assessment instrument and accompanying security classification are different for women and men prisoners. Research conducted indicated that the incidents of escape and institutional violence among women inmates was so limited that the most effective policy was to predict that all female inmates would adjust well. Thus, the decision was made to assess the risk of repeat criminal behavior in the community should the woman escape or be released. (in the case

of males the risk of institutional violence and rule breaking is also assessed). The institutional conduct rules and penalties are independent from the classification process, though certain rule infractions can precipitate a re-evaluation of a woman's security classification designation. The classification in this instance is mainly used for housing and program designation.

Adam and Burke note that in this system classification has little effect on a woman's daily routine, clearly the emphasis in this institution is on programming. Therefore, they argue that the question remains how can the classification system be more supportive of the objectives of the institution which in this case are more of a rehabilitation nature rather than security driven.

#### **D. The classification of women offenders in Wyoming:**

**Housing units within the center, which only houses women offenders, are designated as maximum, medium, and minimum security. Each woman 'earns' her way from maximum to minimum levels based upon performance in programs, general adherence to rules of the institution, and demonstration of personal responsibility. Programs are designed for each women individually.**

**The institution has four security/custody levels: maximum, close, medium, and minimum and pre-release. These levels are defined by the housing unit in which a women may reside, the level of staff supervision, and access to or restrictions on movement outside the institution. Movement through custody levels is based upon an extensive Behavioral Assessment Instrument, work reports, educational reports, progress in special programs, legal status, and institutional adjustment. The Behavioral Assessment Instrument is the most unique element of this system. It consists of ratings of inmates by correctional officers. Ratings are conducted using an objective instrument which is applied randomly on selected days during the month. The assessment includes control, attitude, social, and personal responsibility dimensions. Other elements of the classification system (work, education, special programs, etc.) are also rated on an objective scale. In order to reinforce positive inmate behavior, a woman is required to meet acceptable behavior performance at a custody/security level before she is approved to move to the next less restrictive greater privilege level.**

**Burke and Adam's note that in this system there is a unique departure from the way most classifications systems operate. Classification in this system is based on demonstrated offender behavior and individual progress, contrary to the objectives of most classifications systems which is geared at predicting future behavior empirically derived from risk assessment instruments. This system handles risk management through the physical environment which controls movement and assures close staff observation. Once within that environment, risk is managed by gradually granting greater levels of movements and independence with a carefully constructed set of Incentives to encourage acceptable behavior. Violence is rare**

and the atmosphere within the facility is relaxed and supportive.<sup>9</sup> This approach seems to work well for institutions with small population (the average yearly population is 65), and perhaps this system sets the standard for similar facilities.

## **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDIES REVIEWED:**

Recommendations provided by the studies that directly dealt with classification of female inmates may be of some utility when developing and/or assessing classification systems.

Adams and Burke<sup>10</sup> for instance arrived at three overarching conclusions stemming from their research, these briefly are:

- 1. Each institution should undertake the development of its own approach to classification, so that it can take into account the objectives as well as physical and legal restraints.**
- 2. Classification should be gender neutral, to avoid legal issues of parity. Objectives of the institution/population should be the guiding principle of classification.**
- 3. The practitioner should ask whether and to what extent the state classification system supports the objectives held for women offenders (mainly rehabilitation).**

Nesbitt and Argento also provide some conclusions drawn from their research, the most significant are:

- 1. Practitioners should use a statewide classification system for all offenders, but additional variables should be identified and validated to better sort and match female offenders.**
- 2. As most female offenders are housed in a single institution, the perimeter of the institution should provide high level of security and housing units should be classified as to security**

---

<sup>9</sup> Adams and Burke, pg. 67.

<sup>10</sup> Adams and Burke also provide a worksheet to aid practitioners in assessing classification systems, these are provided in appendix 3.

and custody levels. Program needs of female offenders can be and should be emphasized (This recommendation is a departure from what other studies say about security, that it should not be the main emphasis).

3. Many practitioners can make a good case that the majority of female offenders do not need high security and that the statewide systems do tend to over classify female offenders. It is also agreed that there are some female offenders who are not over classified and who do require a very high level of security and supervision.
4. Institutions for women prisoners need assistance in addressing classification concerns.

The conclusions and recommendations outlined above are characteristic of many of the other studies that looked at the issue of female inmate classification.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

Overall, the literature reviewed provided few answers to the question of appropriate classification for female offenders. Nevertheless, there are a few assertions that can be made:

- Some risk factors that are commonly used in classification can not be validated for female offenders because of the limited amount of cases which prevent a statistical sound study.
- Classification systems need to be sensitive to the physical needs of the institution, as well as meet the objectives desired for the population it houses.
- There is no classification system presently in use that can with certainty be labeled an appropriate system of classification for female offenders. However, there are some that on the surface seem better than others. Hence, it seems that the best results will be achieved by constantly validating the systems of classification

**chosen for facilities. Therefore, it is important to create a system that supports flexibility.**

**In assessing the contribution of the literature, it can be argued that the gains accomplished from the review are few but nevertheless, significant. These are:**

- **Identification of a new indicator of violence, *Isolated Personal Violence*.**
- **Good description of classification processes and systems that are being presently used by some institutions housing female offenders.**

**The most significant contribution of the literature review however, is that it provides discussion on some of the changes needed. This discussion will provide useful guidance for the assessment of present classification systems as well as aid in their development.**

## WORKS CITED

Alexander, Jack. Working Paper XVI: Initial Security Classification Guidelines for Females. New York Department of Correctional Services, 1988.

Brennan, Tim. "Classification for Control." Prediction and Classification Criminal Justice Decision Making. Ed. Don M. Gottfredson and Michael Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1987.

Burke, Peggy and Linda Adams. Classification of Women Offenders in State Correctional Facilities: A Handbook for Practitioners. Washington: Cosmos Corp, 1991.

Gottfredson, Don M. and Michael Tonry ed. Prediction and Classification: Criminal Justice Decision Making. Vol. 9. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Megargee, Edwin I. and Martin J. Bohn Jr. Classifying Criminal Offenders: A New System Based on the MMPI. (1979).

Nesbitt, Charlotte and Angela R. Argento. Female Classification: An Examination of the Issues. College Park, Maryland: American Correctional Association, 1984.

Quay, Herbert C. "Administrators and users Manual for the Behavioral Classification System for Adult Offenders." August, 1993.

## BIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Jack. "Classification Objectives and Practices." Crime & Delinquency. Vol. 21, No. 2, 1994. pp. 256-272.
- Alexander, Jack. Working Paper XVI: Initial Security Classification Guidelines for Females. New York Department of Correctional Services, 1988.
- Alexander, Jack and J. Austin. Handbook for Evaluating Objective Prison Classification Systems. San Francisco: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1992.
- Baird, S. C. and J. Austin. Current State of the Art in Prison Classification Models: A Literature Review for the California Department of Corrections. San Francisco: National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 1985.
- Bonta, J. and L. Motiuk. "Inmate Classification." Journal of Criminal Justice. Vol. 20, No. 4. 1992. pp. 343-353.
- Brennan, Tim. "Classification for Control." Prediction and Classification Criminal Justice Decision Making. Ed. Don M. Gottfredson and Michael Tonry. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1987.
- Brennan, Tim. "Importance of Inmate Classification in Small Jails." American Jails. Vol. 6, No 2. May-June 1992. pp. 49-52.
- Buchanan, Robert A., Karen L. Whitlow, and James Austin. "National Evaluation of Objective Prison Classification Systems: The Current State of the Art." Crime & Delinquency. Vol. 21, No. 2, 1994. pp. 256-272.
- Burke, Peggy and Linda Adams. Classification of Women Offenders in State Correctional Facilities: A Handbook for Practitioners. Washington: Cosmos Corp, 1991.
- Forcier, M. W. "Development of Modern Classification System." Issues in Correctional Training and Casework. Vol. 4, ed. Bruce I. Wolford and Pam Lawrenz. Kentucky, 1988.

- Gottfredson, Don M. and Michael Tonry ed. Prediction and Classification: Criminal Justice Decision Making. Vol. 9. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.**
- Lerner, Kenneth., G. Arling and S. C. Baird. "Client Management Classification Strategies for Case Supervision." Crime & Delinquency. Vol. 21, No. 2, 1994. pp. 256-272.**
- Megargee, Edwin I. and Martin J. Bohn Jr. Classifying Criminal Offenders: A New System Based on the MMPI. (1979).**
- Nesbitt, Charlotte and Angela R. Argento. Female Classification: An Examination of the Issues. College Park, Maryland: American Correctional Association, 1984.**
- Proctor, Jon L. "Evaluating A Modified Version of the Federal Prison System's Inmate Classification Model: An Assessment of Objectivity and Predictive Validity." Criminal Justice and Behavior. Vol. 21, No. 2, 1994. 256-272.**
- Quay, Herbert C. "Administrators and users Manual for the Behavioral Classification System for Adult Offenders." August, 1993.**
- Rodgers, Karen M.A. The Political Discourse on Women Prisoners and the Issue of Co-Corrections in Canada. November 1992.**
- Steiger, J. C. and D. Guntham, Inmate Classification: A Review of the Literature. United States: 1986.**
- Wolford, Bruce and Pam Lawrenz. Classification: Innovative Correctional Programs. Richmond, Kentucky: Department of Correctional Services, 1988.**

## APPENDIX 1

### DIFFERENT MODELS OF CLASSIFICATION

Argento and Nesbitt In their study " Female Classification and Identification of the Issue" present the recent efforts in developing a female offender classification.<sup>1</sup>

One of the studies reviewed was conducted by the Michigan Department of Corrections. The profile that emerged from this study, which collected data from a number of female inmates, was of individuals that were poor, from a racial minority and often were responsible for the support of children. Typically, they had limited work experience and were usually unemployed at the time of their arrest. More than half of the female inmates had drug problems at the time of the arrest. This report (Final report (CC-1) Michigan Female Risk Prediction Study. Michigan Department of Corrections, Program Bureau, 1981) was conducted by Terrence H. Murphy. This study used what is called the Automatic Interaction Detection Analysis procedure, to develop a unique set of risk factors for the female prisoner. This analysis revealed three subgroups, low risk, middle risk and high risk which have probabilities of committing new felony crime on parole.

The low risk group included persons not incarcerated for larceny, burglary, forgery or fraud, who were arrested for the first time at 21 years of age or over. The middle risk group had the same basic criteria, however they were arrested for the first time before 21 years of age; or they had less than two prior felony convictions. The high risk group consisted of those persons with two or more prior felony convictions.

The final Unique Female Risk Variable list was organized according to three institutional time factors. Pre- Institutional, Institutional and Parole Variables. Based on an array of individual correlation, each criteria was given regression weight.

---

<sup>1</sup> Angela R. Argento and Charlotte Nesbitt, Female Classification: An Examination of the Issues. (College Park, Maryland: American Correctional Association, 1984).

**The variables were:**

- **No juvenile history**
- **Pre-prison drug problem**
- **Serving a sentence for larceny, burglary, forgery, or fraud.**
- **Never married**
- **Number of prior non prison sentences.**

**The literature does not provide further explanation or analysis of why these factors are seen to be good predictors of behavior.**

**Nevertheless, Argento and Nesbitt do point out that although they believe that this method of classification can be designed for female population it has not been validated for such.**

## **APPENDIX 1.1**

**Another classification model examined by Argento and Nesbitt is the system developed by Edwin I. Megargee and Martin J. Bohn Jr. (Classifying Criminal Offenders. A new system based on the MMPI). Megargee and Bohn developed a classification system which was designed with 3 major purposes in mind. First, to ensure that the offender is safe within the institution, protected against bodily harm. Second, that prisoners are treated humanely. And last, to enhance the opportunity for offenders to participate in programs to better themselves which will encourage them to be law abiding citizens following release.**

**Megargee's system is based on the Minnesota Multiphase Personality Inventory (MMPI)--a standard personality test of 566 true-false statements. When completed, the test provides an assessment of personality status and emotional adjustment. The MMPI is devised of fourteen different scales. Ten are clinical scales and four are validity scales-- the latter measures test-taking attitudes which could influence scores on the clinical scales.**

**Combining statistical and clinical analysis, 10 groups were distinguished. Each has been given a neutral alphabetical name-- Able, Baker, Charley etc.- to help reduce any detrimental effect due to negative labels.**

**Among the advantages of the MMPI-based system over other existing classification systems are the following:**

- 1. The MMPI employs a Uniform Data Base which does not vary from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.**
- 2. The data can be easily and quickly obtainable due to administration efficiencies of the MMPI.**
- 3. Many agencies already use the MMPI, therefore the necessary information is already in their files, i.e., the system will be of no additional cost.**
- 4. Once scored the MMPI data are ready for classification decision making.**

**5. The MMPI has been designed for adults although it can also be used for juvenile offenders.**

**6. The MMPI can reflect changes in individuals over a period of time because it can be readily re administered.**

**As with the previous approach, this too has been created mainly for the male population, as well Argento and Nesbitt feel that this method can be altered to apply to female offenders. However, it has not been validated for the female population. Further, these types of psychological assessments are found, by some studies, to show weak correlation between personality variables and disciplinary problems, hence the utility of such tool remains in question.<sup>2</sup>**

---

<sup>2</sup> Tim Brennan, "Classification for Control." Prediction and Classification: Criminal Justice Decision Making. Ed. Don M. Gottfredson and Michael Tonry. (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1987.) pg. 343.

**unreliable and very manipulative. Group II inmates generally operate from behind the screen, manipulating others to cause a wide range of institutional problems.**

**The third group is described as immature, dependent or 'weak sisters' and are easily victimized. They are viewed as weak, indecisive and withdrawn. The staff generally describes group III offenders as whiners and very demanding on their times.**

**Inmates in group IV are excitable, constantly worried, anxious and very nervous. They find it hard to relax and are easily victimized by others although they can become explosively violent when pushed too far. Group IV inmates are usually referred to as neurotic-anxious.**

**The last group of prisoners in Quay's Typology, group V feels that even though incarcerated they are not criminals. They are viewed by staff as reliable and will fight only as a last resort. Usually these offenders are in prison due to a build up of situational pressures which led to their law violation. They are referred to as situational and are seen as falling between Heavy and Light groups i.e.; the Middles.**

**This typology according to Argento and Nesbitt has not been updated for it to apply to female offenders. But it is their recommendation that this typology can be applied to Female inmates. However, one could argue that the typology in itself is oppressive as it tends to label inmates with a negative connotation. Further, what may have happened if this typology is used is that female offenders may fall into one or two categories. Argento and Nesbitt fail to analyze this model from a women centered perspective, therefore there is no analysis on how this model would be used for women, what are the advantages and disadvantages in using this typology.**

## APPENDIX 1.2

Another classification system examined by Argento and Nesbitt is the classification system developed by Hebert C. Quay<sup>3</sup>, based on an individual's past and current behavior characteristics. This system has been in operation in FCI's for fifteen years and has proven to be an effective management tool. It classifies inmates into five groups based on historical and present adjustment as rated by classification (case manager) and correctional officer personnel, respectively.

This system can be used in any correctional facility which houses prisoners in at least two separate living units. Most frequently the inmates are assigned into three combined groups Heavy (groups I and II together) Light (groups III and IV) and Middle (group V).

In order to obtain the necessary information, the case manager will read the pre-sentence report, interview the inmate and then complete the *Checklist for Analysis of Life History* records of adult offenders. The inmates current behavior is assessed following placement in an admissions and orientation history unit for at least two weeks. During that time, at least one regularly assigned correctional officer will observe the inmates' behavior and complete a *Correctional Adjustment Checklist* on the basis of this observation period. After the two forms are completed, they are scored by the case manager and the results are combined to make the classification. The highest final score determines which group the inmate will be assigned.

Group I consist of inmates who have a history of hostile, aggressive, violent behavior. Characteristically they are resentful of rules and regulations and of the authorities who try to enforce them. They become easily bored and are sensation seekers. They have little concern for others and are frequently involved in fights. Group 1 has been referred to as aggressive psychopath they victimize other inmates, staff generally label them as the tough guy or heavies.

Group II prisoners are characterized as being con artists. They often try to play off one staff member versus another or will set up other inmates for their own ends. Staff describes them as unworthy,

---

<sup>3</sup>Hebert C. Quay, "Administrators and Users Manual for the Behavioral Classification System for Adult Offenders." August 1983.

*CSC*  
**FEDERALLY SENTENCED WOMEN PROGRAM  
BIBLIOGRAPHY APRIL 1996**

**JANUARY 1996 - UPDATED BIBLIOGRAPHY**

*Correctional Program Strategy for Federally Sentenced Women, July 1994.*

*Stratégie des programmes correctionnels à l'intention des femmes purgeant une peine fédérale, juillet 1994.*

*Foreign Nationals: Needs Identification meeting with Foreign National Federally Sentenced Women, 1994.*

*Détermination des besoins des Délinquantes étrangères. Réunion avc les délinquantes étrangères purgeant une peine fédérale, 1994.*

*Literature Review Federally Sentenced Women Program, August 1994*

SOL GEN CANADA LIB/BIBLIO



000005645

HV 8738 L4 1994  
Literature review : Federal  
ly Sentenced Women Program,  
1994

**DATE DUE**

28 JUN 02

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

