

Research in Review

Bureau of Planning, Research, Statistics and Grants

Editors: Gary Zajac and Kristofer Bret Bucklen (717)214-8959

Summary and Major Findings of Articles Reviewed

Ashley G. Blackburn, et al. 2008. "Sexual Assault in Prison and Beyond: Toward an Understanding of Lifetime Sexual Assault Among Incarcerated Women." *The Prison Journal*, 88(3), 351-377. Page 2

This article examines the prevalence of sexual victimization among female offenders over the lifecourse and while incarcerated. This research finds that approximately two-thirds of female offenders in the sample reported some sort of sexual abuse at some point in their lives, but that a much smaller proportion (less than 20%) reported any sort of sexual abuse while incarcerated.

Troy J. Allard, et al. 2008. "The Effect of CCTV on Prisoner Behavior." *The Prison Journal*, 88(3), 404-422. Page 4

This article reports on an evaluation of the impact of closed circuit television (CCTV) monitoring on prison misconduct. It finds that CCTV is most effective in deterring non-violent prison misconduct. It also finds that CCTV is able to deter planned prison violence (e.g. retaliatory prison "hits"), but that it is ineffective in deterring spontaneous violence. Given that much prison violence is thought to be spontaneous, the value of CCTC as a violence prevention tool within prison is questioned.

Karen K. Parhar, et al. 2008. "Offender Coercion in Treatment: A Meta-Analysis of Effectiveness." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(9), 1109-1135. Page 5

This article reviews the research on the relative effectiveness of coerced versus voluntary treatment among offenders. It finds that both voluntary and mandatory treatment delivered in community settings can be effective, but that within custodial settings (e.g. prisons) only voluntary treatment is effective.

Andrew L. Spivak, et al. 2008. "Inmate Recidivism as a Measure of Private Prison Performance." *Crime & Delinquency*, 54(3), 482-508. Page 7

This study reports on an analysis of recidivism data for inmates from public and private inmates in Oklahoma. It finds that inmates released from private prisons have as much as a 17 percent greater likelihood of recidivating than inmates released from public prisons.

Index to *Research in Review* – Volume 11 – 2008 Page 10

Ashley G. Blackburn, Janet L. Mullings and James W. Marquart. 2008. "Sexual Assault in Prison and Beyond: Toward an Understanding of Lifetime Sexual Assault Among Incarcerated Women." *The Prison Journal*, 88(3), 351-377.

The number of incarcerated females has risen sharply over the past decade, increasing by more than 57% for those housed in state or federal correctional facilities in the United States. As a result, correctional officials are faced with a multitude of issues that have accompanied this dramatic population growth. Specifically, one issue that has received a significant amount of academic and administrative interest is the impact of past sexual victimization on female inmates. Prior research indicates that female victims of sexual assaults and violence are at an increased risk of engaging in numerous risky behaviors, including substance abuse and involvement in various criminal activities. As a result, these behaviors and their consequences can accompany a female offender once they enter prison. Moreover, the impact of sexual victimization can significantly affect a female offender's classification, programming, and custody needs.

While female offenders may have been sexually victimized before entering prison, they are also at risk of becoming victims once they begin their incarceration. Since the passage of the Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) in 2003, much more attention has been given to in-prison sexual victimization. However, much of this attention has focused on the difficulties and plights of male inmates, as well as consensual sexual activities among both male and female inmates. In addition, the authors of this study indicate that estimates of the prevalence of sexual victimization among women seem to vary greatly depending on the source of information.

In order to bridge the gap in the literature on incarcerated females, the current study attempted to gain a better understanding of both outside-of-prison sexual victimization experiences along with those experiences occurring within prisons. Furthermore, background characteristics of female inmates who indicated they were in-prison victims of sexual victimization were explored, as well as the specific type of victimization and place of occurrence.

The present study was based on self-report data gathered from a random sample of 436 incarcerated females in a Southern prison system. The researchers indicate that the self-report survey tool that was utilized in this study contained many sensitive questions dealing with sexual victimization. Creation of the survey began with face-to-face interviews with female inmates who were asked specific questions dealing with perceptions and experiences dealing exclusively with in-prison sexual victimization. The information collected from this group enabled the researchers to create a more in-depth and relevant survey, which was subsequently distributed to a different group of inmates. Despite the sensitivity of the survey instrument, the researchers achieved a response rate of 61%, which is commendable given the nature of the issue being discussed.

Due to the fact that the researchers sought to determine potential victimization characteristics among female offenders, they mention that careful consideration was given to the sample in order to assure that it was representative of national and state incarcerated female populations. Second, data was analyzed using bivariate and multivariate analyses to determine if any significant differences existed

between the abused and nonabused groups based on demographic characteristics. Two logistic regression models were developed to determine if any of the demographic variables (race, marital status, sexual orientation, etc.) were significant predictors of which inmates were more likely to be victimized. In addition, the researchers stress that the variable “lifetime” sexual victimization is inclusive of “in-prison” sexual victimization. Furthermore, the definition of sexual victimization included penetration, attempted penetration, touching, kissing, and harassment.

Data analysis indicated that the descriptive statistics for demographics of the 436 sampled female inmates reflected national and state-level data regarding demographic characteristics of incarcerated females. One exception, however, was that African-Americans represented 39.2% of the sample while Caucasians composed 37% and Hispanics 17.4%. National statistics show that the majority of female inmates in custody are Caucasian (44.2%), thus indicating that African-American women may have been overrepresented in the study sample. The average age of female inmates in the sample was 38, while 58% reported being married, 73.6% were heterosexual, 64.4% said that they had finished high school, and 67.2% indicated that this was their first time incarcerated.

A total of 68.4% of the sample reported some sort of lifetime sexual victimization. In addition, 17.2% of female inmates indicated that they experienced some type of in-prison sexual victimization. The researchers did ask participants to delineate among the types of sexual victimization that they have experienced, noting a difference between completed sexual assault and other types of sexual abuse. It is important to note that the researchers were not discrediting certain types of victimization, but were focused primarily on recognizing completed penetration as the worst sexual victimization experience when compared to the other options given to the participants.

A vast majority of the lifetime victims (63.1%) reported a completed penetration without consent. Additionally, 43.1% of the entire study sample indicated that they were the victim of a completed sexual assault at some point during their life. A total of 17.3% of in-prison victims reported that they experienced a completed sexual assault. Essentially, this means that 3.0% of the entire sample indicated that they were the victims of a completed sexual assault while incarcerated, which is consistent with the findings from other empirical studies. Also consistent with prior research findings is that this study found no significant predictors of in-prison sexual victimization between in-prison abused and nonabused groups. While inmates reporting lifetime sexual victimization were significantly more likely to be younger, Caucasian, and either homosexual or bisexual when compared to their nonabused counterparts, logistic regression analysis revealed no significant predictors based upon the independent demographic variables.

Overall, the findings of this study provide information into the occurrence and sexual victimization experiences reported by incarcerated females. The authors also mention that perhaps the most important finding centers on the high frequency of reported sexual victimization by the overall sample, as well as the reported frequency of in-prison sexual victimization. Furthermore, 43.1% of the overall sample reported being a victim of a completed sexual assault at some point in their lifetime. Although these percentages are much higher than those found in prior studies dealing with these issues, they illustrate the importance of educating correctional administrators on the magnitude and scope of sexual victimization among female offenders. More importantly, the findings give

insight into potential programming needs that must be more gender-specific and attuned to the needs to female inmates, particularly those who have been sexually victimized during their lifetime.

Troy J. Allard, Richard K. Wortley and Anna L. Stewart. 2008. "The Effect of CCTV on Prisoner Behavior." *The Prison Journal*, 88(3), 404-422.

The use of closed-circuit television (CCTV) cameras inside correctional facilities is not a new concept. Many correctional systems have incorporated the use of CCTV in both the designs of newer facilities and the remodeling of older facilities in order to improve security, elevate the level of control officers have in their environment and increase the level of supervision over inmates. Interestingly, there are very few empirical studies that have examined the impact of CCTV on inmate behavior. The minimal amount of prior research that does exist suggests that CCTV may produce some deterrent effects on non-violent crime, but its impact on violent crime and behaviors are negligible.

The researchers indicate that CCTV seems to have a differential impact on crime that is dependent on the setting in which it is implemented. Furthermore, although the inability of CCTV to affect violent behavior in public areas has been attributed to the spontaneous nature of the majority of violent behavior, this contention has never been empirically tested. Thus, the need for research conducted on CCTV in a prison environment is readily apparent. This particular study explores two specific questions pertaining to the impact of CCTV on inmate behaviors: 1) Does CCTV have a greater preventative effect on nonviolent than violent inmate misbehavior? And 2) Does CCTV have a greater preventative effect on planned as opposed to unplanned inmate-on-inmate assaults?

The current study was based on the analysis of archived administrative data relating to 1,116 incidents involving both male and female inmate misbehavior occurring in Queensland, Australia during a six-year period from October 22, 1997 to November 6, 2003. Four separate correctional facilities were selected, each with varying levels of security and CCTV surveillance. As a result, data analyses were undertaken for the four prisons on an aggregated basis.

Findings from the study suggest that CCTV had a greater impact on non-violent than violent prisoner misbehavior. In addition, camera surveillance affected planned violent misbehavior by inmates to a greater extent than unplanned violent misbehavior. Nonviolent prisoner misbehavior was found to take place relatively more frequently in locations inside the correctional facilities that were not under camera surveillance, while violent behavior was found to be more randomly distributed. Moreover, particular types of prison misbehaviors, such as escape and inmate-on-officer assaults were also more randomly distributed in areas with and without camera surveillance.

In general, planned inmate-on-inmate assaults were found to occur in areas *not under* CCTV surveillance. This finding lends itself to the belief that CCTV is unable to impact violent behavior due to the overall spontaneity and unplanned nature of the large majority of prison assaults. Essentially, those violent behaviors that were already planned and organized were deterred, and

CCTV is most effective when behavior is pre-meditated and motivated. Moreover, the authors mention that strategies which specifically address the factors in the environment that contribute to increases in unplanned misbehavior should be implemented in conjunction with CCTV in order to reduce opportunities for inmate misbehavior.

Despite the study's limitation of utilizing archived administrative data and a less than ideal methodology of exploring the distribution of inmate misbehavior, the overall findings suggest that studies conducted in public spaces appear transferable to the prison environment. While support was found for the argument that CCTV *does not* impact violent inmate behavior due to its spontaneous nature, much more research is needed to substantiate this contention. Furthermore, consideration should be given to adopting pre-and post CCTV installation comparisons or cross-sectional comparisons of correctional facilities with and without camera surveillance.

Karen K. Parhar, J. Stephen Wormith, Dena M. Derkzen and Adele M. Beauregard. 2008. "Offender Coercion in Treatment: A Meta-Analysis of Effectiveness." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(9), 1109-1135.

The issue of voluntary versus mandated treatment has become one of the most discussed and debated topics in correctional treatment literature. This is especially true given the increased use of legally mandated treatment programs for offenders and additional attention paid to the concept of coercive treatment. While prior research has extensively addressed these issues, the findings present mixed conclusions about how mandated, coerced, and voluntary treatment affect recidivism. These previous findings present conflicting evidence including, for example, that offenders in legally mandated programs are more likely to participate in treatment longer, that court-mandated treatment has a higher rate of treatment failure, that voluntary treatment results in better treatment retention and compliance and that there are really no outcome differences between mandatory and voluntary treatment programs.

Given these mixed results, Parhar, Wormith, Derkzen, and Beauregard conducted an extensive analysis to determine what overall conclusions can be drawn from this prior research related to mandated treatment. Through a meta-analysis of 129 studies related to mandated and voluntary offender treatment, Parhar et al. examine how voluntary, coerced, and mandated correctional treatment in community and custody settings affect treatment outcomes. Using treatment retention and recidivism as the primary measures of analysis, the study aims to understand how the level of treatment coerciveness impacts overall treatment success.

As the foundation of their study, Parhar et al. reviewed prior studies related to mandated and nonmandated offender treatment programs. For inclusion in the meta-analysis, the studies had to meet three specific criteria: studied legally mandated or nonmandated treatment; included a comparison or control group; and measured recidivism outcome with the required statistical method (Pearson correlation coefficient r). For each of the 129 studies involved in the meta-analysis, the authors assigned coding that determined the degree to which the program involved mandated,

coerced, or voluntary participation. As the authors explain, coerced treatment occurs when participants are not required to participate in treatment; however, they feel pressure from an external party (probation officer, drug court judge, or correctional policy, for example) to attend, understanding it may affect their parole status or release date.

The studies included in the analysis were all published between 1970 and 2005. The majority were conducted in either the United States or Canada, focused on nonmandated treatment rather than mandated treatment (64.3% compared to 35.7%, respectively) and involved a community rather than custody setting (71.7% compared to 23.9%, respectively). The most common types of treatment programs under review were substance abuse, sex offending, juvenile delinquency, and violence. Furthermore, the programs most often relied on cognitive-behavioral, therapeutic community, and general counseling techniques for program delivery.

To determine relationships between treatment type and outcome, Parhar et al. calculated effect sizes for three different types of recidivism. This included general recidivism, which was based on studies reporting overall recidivism figures; specific recidivism, based on studies reporting recidivism data corresponding to specific programs, such as sexual recidivism for a sex offender treatment program; and any recidivism, based on both general and specific recidivism (if general recidivism figures were unavailable, specific recidivism data were used). In most cases, recidivism data were based on official records reporting arrest, incarceration, and conviction data.

Through an analysis of treatment effect sizes, Parhar et al. found that treatment settings played a substantial role in treatment outcomes. Custody settings were effective only for voluntary treatment, whereas community settings were effective for all three types of treatment (mandated, coerced, and nonmandated/voluntary). In other words, voluntary treatment programs were effective regardless of the treatment setting. In contrast, mandated and coerced treatment in custodial settings resulted in little to no treatment effects. One of the key findings of this analysis is that voluntary treatment produced the strongest effect on outcome, and mandated treatment produced the weakest effect. In fact, voluntary treatment in community settings for specific recidivism produced the strongest effect. These results question prior studies concluding that mandated treatment is more effective than nonmandated or voluntary treatment.

Given these results, Parhar et al. suggest caution when applying treatment programs in custodial environments, as coercion or mandatory programming may negatively affect treatment outcomes. Offenders required to attend custody-based treatment may receive no benefit from the treatment. In regard to voluntary treatment, the researchers try to explain why voluntary treatment appeared effective in all environments. They specifically suggest that offenders in more custodial settings may feel they have no choice in treatment participation, and this perception may actually make them feel as if they are “forced” to participate in treatment programs. Offenders in community settings may feel that opting for treatment is a personal choice, free from external forces.

In addition to the study conclusions, of particular value is the authors’ discussion of issues related to this area of research. This includes problems with defining truly voluntary or truly mandated

treatment and questions about whether truly voluntary treatment programs can exist in correctional environments, given that offenders are almost always subject to some pressure or coercion to participate in treatment. They also provide a comprehensive review of literature discussing internal and external motivation. Relying on prior literature, they define intrinsic motivation as the absence of external rewards, where behavior is motivated by personal interest or psychological needs and external motivation as involving external rewards or contingencies. As the authors note, studies show that treatment participation guided by intrinsic motivation more often results in positive, long-term success than participation encouraged by external sources.

Frequently, offenders attending mandated treatment are externally motivated to participate, whereas offenders attending voluntary treatment are intrinsically motivated. That said, however, Parhar et al. are apt to point out that this distinction is normally not so clear-cut. Voluntary treatment, for example, could be encouraged by family and friends (i.e. influence from external motivation sources); and mandated treatment programs can include a mixed group of offenders—those who would voluntarily participate, even if not mandated; and those who would not participate if not required to participate.

As the authors note, there are some limitations to this analysis. One of the core limitations involves the concepts of mandatory versus voluntary treatment. For the current study, these concepts were particularly problematic, as the meta-analysis relied on definitions provided by multiple independent studies. Offender motivation is another issue. As the authors state from the beginning, prior findings indicate that intrinsic and external motivation significantly impact treatment success. However, in the current analysis, individual offender motivation is unknown—offenders in the studies under review may have voluntarily entered mandated treatment, or they may have received pressure from external parties to attend. As a result, it is difficult to determine the specific effect of motivation on treatment outcome. In addition, only a small number of studies reported specific recidivism, which reduced the possibility of determining statistically significant differences among coercion levels. As the researchers suggest, further research in this area is needed to draw additional conclusions about how specific and general recidivism affect treatment outcome.

Andrew L. Spivak and Susan F. Sharp. 2008. "Inmate Recidivism as a Measure of Private Prison Performance." <i>Crime & Delinquency</i> , 54(3), 482-508.

Over the past decade, numerous Departments of Corrections throughout the United States have turned to contracting private prisons to accommodate growing inmate populations. Private institutions claim that they are able to operate at lower costs and build institutions faster and more cost effectively than states are capable of. Anti-privatization organizations attribute this to the lack of unionization among private institutions and argue that states actually incur more costs due to privatization as the result of private prisons incurring a greater number of lawsuits resulting from alleged civil rights violations and a lack of inmate services. Indeed, a 1992 study of private prisons revealed that prisoners preferred public prisons. The main reasons cited were substandard food services and higher than expected drug use as well as a high staff turnover rate among security

officers in private institutions. Finally, private prisons have been viewed as not actively rehabilitating inmates because an empty bed (parolee) is ultimately a loss in profit; as a result, many private institutions have been accused of allowing inmates to max out on their sentence instead of granting early parole.

Prior to this study, outcome evaluations of privately run correctional institutions were limited primarily to the state of Florida. Overall, findings revealed that inmates released from privately operated prisons were at a greater risk of recidivism than those released from state run institutions. Using data from the Florida Department of Corrections (FDOC), four major recidivism studies were conducted in the last decade. In a 1999 study, researchers conducted a 12 month recidivism evaluation of 396 male offenders (198 pairs matched by age, race and number or prior incarcerations). Findings indicated that there was no difference between the two types of institutions with regard to technical parole violations and time to rearrest but did uncover higher frequencies among public prisoners when all types of recidivism (parole violations, rearrest, reconviction and absconding) were combined. A follow up study conducted in 2001 matched 149 pairs of male inmates, even more closely matched than the 1999 study, and followed them over a four year period. Evaluation results revealed a lower rate of recidivism among private prison releases for both technical violations and new offenses. However, the director of the FDOC who oversaw this research was later found to have taken a sizeable consulting fee from the private correctional institutions which seriously called into question the validity of the findings.

A 2002 study continued to build upon the previous two studies by expanding the research group to 8,848 matched pairs using age, race, number of previous incarcerations, offense type, custody level, education and time served. However, unlike previous studies, researchers assigned the inmate as private or public based on where they spent the last six months of their incarceration as opposed to previous studies which assigned affiliation based on institutional assignment at time of release. Using a proportional hazard regression model and a three year follow up period, researchers found no difference in recidivism among male offenders. However, among female offenders, women who spent the last six months of their incarceration in a private institution were 25% less likely to reoffend and 34% less likely to be re-incarcerated than their public prison counterparts. Finally, a 2005 study compared inmates released from private and public institutions between 1995 and 2001. This study took into account the amount of time spent at each type of facility and unlike previous studies, researchers created multiple control and treatment groups for comparison. Using a follow up time of 60 months, results indicated no significant difference between any research group (male, female or youthful male offenders) when comparing private and public release offenders.

The current evaluation uses the methods employed in the 2005 study in Florida to track offenders released from Oklahoma state prisons between 1997 and 2001. Oklahoma was also deemed the best selection for a follow up study because it ranked fourth in the nation for funds allocated to house private institutions (30% of their correction's budget) and ranked sixth in the nation for the number of privately incarcerated inmates.

All private prisons in Oklahoma are medium security; that is defined as having particular fencing and lockdown capability requirements to include individually locking cell doors and electronically

monitored perimeters. Researchers controlled for age, education, race, prior incarceration, offense type, probation, parole, discharge release, sentence length, time served, number of days in private medium security prison, number of days in public medium security prison and proportion of sentence served. For the purpose of this study, recidivism included all parole violations, rearrests, reconvictions and absconders.

Fifteen percent of the released inmates were female; this is higher than most states in the U.S. The average offender age was 34 years old. Approximately three-fifths were released for the first time during this study, one quarter were released for the second time about one in seven were being released for the third or more time. Just under half held an education level of less than a high school equivalency diploma. Offenses were ranked in the following order: drugs, property offenses, violent offenses and sex offenses; the average length of incarcerating being 2.5 years.

Of 27,094 Oklahoma *releases* between June 1, 1997 and May 31, 2001, 23,114 *releases* were used for the current evaluation. It must be noted that researches used number of *releases* not the number of actual individual inmates released; the 23,114 *releases* accounted for 22,359 actual inmates. Inmates from private inmates were more likely to recidivate than inmates released from public prisons in every analysis undertaken for this study. In some analyses, private prison inmates were nearly 17 percent more likely to recidivate than publicly managed inmates. More time spent in a private prison was associated with a greater likelihood of recidivating, whereas more time spent in a public prison was associated with a lower likelihood of recidivating.

The authors conclude that even the most conservative interpretation of their findings supports the conclusion that time spent in private prisons is associated with an increase in recidivism. Given the importance of this question for correctional policy making, though, the authors urge that rigorous research continue to be conducted on this topic in a wider variety of settings and jurisdictions.

Index to *Research in Review* – Volume 11 – 2008

PA DOC Research Project Summaries

Evaluation of the Pilot Test of the *Changing Offender Behavior* Program. (Number 3).

Evaluation of the Pilot Test of the *Criminal Attitude Program*. (Number 3).

Preliminary Evaluation of the *Thinking For A Change* Program. (Number 3).

Evaluation of the Pilot Test of the *Reinforcing Positive Behavior* Course. (Number 3).

Journal/Research Article Reviews

Troy J. Allard, Richard K. Wortley and Anna L. Stewart. 2008. "The Effect of CCTV on Prisoner Behavior." *The Prison Journal*, 88(3), 404-422. (Number 4).

Robert Apel and Catherine Kaukinen. 2008. "On the Relationship Between Family Structure and Antisocial Behavior: Parental Cohabitation and Blended Households." *Criminology*, 46(1), 35-70. (Number 2).

Ashley G. Blackburn, Janet L. Mullings and James W. Marquart. 2008. "Sexual Assault in Prison and Beyond: Toward an Understanding of Lifetime Sexual Assault Among Incarcerated Women." *The Prison Journal*, 88(3), 351-377. (Number 4).

Dana Jones Hubbard and Betsy Matthews. 2008. "Reconciling the Differences Between the 'Gender-Responsive' and the 'What Works' Literatures to Improve Services for Girls." *Crime & Delinquency*, 54(2), 225-258. (Number 2).

Darrick Joliffe and David P. Farrington. 2007. *A Rapid Evidence Assessment of the Impact of Mentoring on Re-offending: A Summary*. British Home Office Online Report. (Number 2).

Megan C. Kurlychek, Robert Brame and Shawn D. Bushway. 2006. "Scarlet Letters and Recidivism: Does an Old Criminal Record Predict Future Offending?" *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5(3), 483-504. (Number 1).

Karen F. Lahm. 2008. "Inmate-on-Inmate Assault: A Multilevel Examination of Prison Violence." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(1), 120-137. (Number 1).

Calvin M. Langton, Howard E. Barbaree, Leigh Harkins, Tamara Arenovich, Jim Mcnamee, Edward J. Peacock, Andrea Dalton, Kevin T. Hansen, Duyen Luong and Heidi Marcon. 2008. "Denial and Minimization Among Sexual Offenders: Posttreatment Presentation and Association with Sexual Recidivism." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(1), 69-98. (Number 1).

Christopher T. Lowenkamp, Edward J. Latessa and Paula Smith. 2006. "Does Correctional Program Quality Really Matter? The Impact of Adhering to the Principles of Effective Intervention." *Criminology & Public Policy*, 5(3), 575-594. (Number 2).

Doris L. MacKenzie, David Biere and Ojmarrh Mitchell. 2007 "An Experimental Study of a Therapeutic Boot Camp: Impact on Impulses, Attitudes and Recidivism." *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 3(3), 221-246. (Number 1).

Karen K. Parhar, J. Stephen Wormith, Dena M. Derkzen and Adele M. Beauregard. 2008. "Offender Coercion in Treatment: A Meta-Analysis of Effectiveness." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35(9), 1109-1135. (Number 4).

Andrew L. Spivak and Susan F. Sharp. 2008. "Inmate Recidivism as a Measure of Private Prison Performance." *Crime & Delinquency*, 54(3), 482-508. (Number 4).