

BEHAVIORAL CLASSIFICATION FOR FEMALE OFFENDERS

Research Report

U.S. Department of Justice  
National Institute of Corrections  
July 1989

TITLE OF PROJECT:

Behavioral Classification of Female Offenders

NAME AND ADDRESS OF GRANTEE:

South Carolina Department of Corrections  
Division of Classification  
Post Office Box 21787  
Columbia, South Carolina 29221

PROJECT DIRECTOR:

Sammie D. Brown, Director  
South Carolina Department of Corrections  
Division of Classification  
Post Office Box 21787  
Columbia, South Carolina 29221

GRANT NUMBER: 88POLGHA4  
PROGRAM NUMBER: 88POL  
CONCEPT PAPER: 88POLA024  
AMOUNT OF AWARD: \$25,000  
PERIOD OF AWARD: July 5, 1988 through July 4, 1989  
AWARD DATE: June 29, 1988  
APPLICANT CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT: 02

"This document (or parts thereof) was prepared under grant number 88POLGHA4 from the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice. The National Institute of Corrections reserves the right to reproduce, publish and use, all or any part of the copyrighted material contained in this publication."

This report was prepared by the project consultants:

Dr. Herbert C. Quay

Dr. Craig T. Love

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Adult Internal Management System (AIMS) was developed by Dr. Herbert C. Quay and has been successfully used in a number of prison systems as a tool in the management of male offenders. The South Carolina Department of Corrections has selected AIMS as its internal classification system and currently has implemented the system in 15 major institutions throughout the state. Studies have demonstrated that the AIMS helps reduce the number of serious incidents committed in institutions housing AIMS classified inmates. There is currently no comparable internal classification system for female offenders.

The SCDC proposed this project to build on the development of the AIMS system to develop a behavioral classification system for female offenders in the SCDC. There were two specific objectives of the project. The first was to determine whether there are reliable and meaningful behavioral categories of female offenders. The second was to identify the differential needs of women classified in each of the categories established.

The expected results were to provide a basis for assigning inmates in a manner that reduces management problems, to establish a reliable way to help identify the specific needs of each offender, and to provide additional information regarding the female offender that will contribute to an improved understanding of the characteristics of female offenders.

Our own experience, and the research literature, in the development of reliable, valid and useful behaviorally-based classification systems clearly indicates that certain principles are most important. First and foremost is that those present and past behaviors upon which the system is based must be as open to observation as possible and items which require a high degree of inference should be avoided. For example one can observe "assaults on other inmates" but to rate "aggressive behavior masks a depressive mood" requires a great deal of

inference about an internal personality dynamic that is unlikely to be done reliably from rater to rater. While some amount of inference may be unavoidable it should, as a matter of established principle, be minimized.

The items of the correctional adjustment checklist (correctional officers rating) are also constrained by the requirement that there be an opportunity for the behavior to occur in the setting in which it is to be observed. There are behaviors that are relevant to classification but since they cannot occur to be observed in most correctional settings, they are of little utility. This is one reason for using historical information in developing behavioral classification procedures.

All other things being equal, past behavior is the best predictor of future behavior so that a systematic assessment of behavior which has characterized the offender's "life history" is an important component in classification. An obvious problem here is how to obtain this behavioral picture. Ideally, one would have available considerable collateral data to support (or refute) the picture presented by the offender him or herself in an intake interview. The availability, objectivity and reliability of this collateral data are all often in question so that most of the items on past behavior should lend themselves to being elicited in an interview in which some confidence can be placed in the offenders responses.

It must also be recognized that everyone can be subdivided into even more narrow groupings. The extreme variability of behavior from one individual to another means that we could eventually develop such narrow classes that many would have few members. Again, our experience and that of other suggest that the greatest reliability and utility comes from a relatively few rather broad categories that are meaningfully related to behavior in an correctional institution. Thus, we seek to discover only a limited number of categories into which female offenders can be classified for more effective correctional management and programming.

The research has clearly identified five patterns of behavior in institutionalized female offenders that are observable, psychologically meaningful, statistically homogenous, and are, at least conceptually, similar to patterns in male offenders that have been shown to have relevance to correctional management (Quay, 1984). The measurement of these patterns, using the five scales of the CACLF, appears to be adequate. These behavior patterns-aggressive, manipulative, dependent, inadequate, depressed/anxious-can, on the basis of past experience with males, be utilized to classify female offenders into behaviorally homogenous subgroups.

While the results of this project are obviously relevant to the differential classification of female offenders in South Carolina, it must be recognized that generalization beyond the SCDC is unwarranted at this time without further research to replicate the patterns in other samples of female offenders.

Development of the Correctional Adjustment Checklist for Female Offenders (CACLF) and the Checklist the Analysis of Life History Records of Female Offenders (CALHF).

These two instruments were developed in order to systematize data collection and to permit multivariate statistical analysis of the data obtained. The purpose of the CACLF was to permit the behavior of newly admitted inmates to the SCDC Women's Center to be assessed by correctional officers during the first two to three weeks of incarceration. The 85 items on the CACLF were designed to measure those aspects of behavior likely to be related to institutional adjustment and program participation. Items were adapted from extensive prior research with male offenders (See Quay, 1984) and from interviews with correctional administrators and line staff with extensive experience with female offenders.

The 72-item CALHF was similarly designed to assess the female offender's behavior over her life history with respect to those behaviors likely to affect institutional adjustment. As with the CACLF, the items were adapted from earlier studies with male offenders and derived from interviews with those with extensive experience with female offenders. The CALHF permitted systematic information to be obtained and recorded during an intake interview done shortly after admission to the SCDC Women's Center by one of two staff interviewers. The CACLF and CALHF may be found in Appendix I.

Data Collection

Data were collected from November 1, 1988 until June 9, 1989. Subjects were newly admitted inmates to the SCDC Women's Center.

Because of the possibility that different behaviors might occur as a function of time of day (due principally to the opportunity for different behaviors to occur at different times of day) our strategy

was to obtain CACLF ratings from both day shift (8 AM to 4 PM) and evening shift (4 PM to 12 PM) correctional officers. The 37 different officers involved in making ratings were trained in the rating procedures by a staff member of the Division of Classification of the SCDC.

CALHF ratings were made by one of two interviewers who were responsible for an intake interview with all newly admitted women. These raters were familiarized with the CALHF by the SCDC classification staff and project consultants.

During the study period there were 538 admissions to the Women's Center. Usable CACLF data were obtained on 477 (89%) while CALHF's were obtained on 523 (97%).



## Results

### Checklist for the Analysis of Life History Record (CALHF)

Requiring that an item be endorsed for at least 15% but not more than 85% of the cases resulted in the loss of 32 items from the original 72. Additionally, item 22 was exclusive of item 68 and item 58 was the opposite of item 47, so that both items 22 and 47 were dropped from further analysis. For the remaining 38 items, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .70, an acceptable value. Bartlett's test of Sphericity was 3923.0, significant beyond the .000001 level. Using the principal axis method with  $R^2$  as the initial communality estimate and the conventional eigenvalue greater than one criteria, 13 factors were extracted accounting for 60% of the total variance. The first five factors accounted for 34% of the total variance: Factors 6 and 7 had only one loading greater than .30, and factors 8-13 had none. A scree test indicated that only five factors should be retained. These five were then subjected to a varimax rotation. Rotated factor loadings (greater than .30) for these five factors are presented in Table 1.

Factor I' clearly represents history of aggressive, impulsive defiant, criminal behavior, coupled with a lack of concern for others. This pattern is clearly akin to the aggressive-psychopathic pattern found for male offenders (CALH Scale I, Quay, 1984, p.74).

Factor II' reflects a pattern of dependence and ineptness in coping and is also similar to a dimension previously found in males (CALH Scale IV, Quay, 1984, p.74).

Factor III' (obviously bipolar) is comprised of items that suggest that the criminal involvement was related to drug smuggling/sales in the context of a group. The negatively loaded items suggest an absence of precipitating factors in family financial problems.

Overall, this pattern suggest an involvement in drug-related crime-for-profit.

Factor IV' suggests drug-dependence with criminal activity a result thereof, with accompanying guilt and self-condemnation.

Factor V' relates exclusively to marital status and illegitimate rather than legitimate children.

#### Correctional Adjustment Checklist (CACLF)

Prior to analysis of the CACLF the two ratings (day and evening shift) were combined in such a way that for any subject, any item had a plus (1) rating if either rater checked it as "true of the inmate." If neither rater checked the item, it was scored zero. If both raters checked it, it was given a plus (1) rating. Thus, the results are generalizable only to situations in which day or evening ratings are both obtained and the ratings combined in the same manner.

Of the 85 CACLF items, 29 did not meet the frequency of endorsement criteria. Eight other items were eliminated because of high positive (greater than .50) correlations with other items with similar meaning - thus eliminating obviously multiple collinear items. The Keyser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .88 and the Bartlett test value was 7009.97 (p less than .000001). The use of the principal axis method with  $R^2$  as the initial communality estimate resulted in 12 factors with eigenvalues greater than unity. However, there was only one loading of greater than .30 beyond factor V so that only 5 factors were rotated to the varimax criteria. Those five factors accounted for 33% of the total variance. Rotated factor loadings (.30 or greater) are provided in Table 2.

Factor I' is a clear representation of the aggressive-psychopathic pattern found in the CACLH and in earlier research with male offenders (Quay, 1984).

Factor II' also reflects non-compliant behavior but of a much more manipulative nature. This dimension is apparently the female counterpart of the manipulative dimension found earlier in males (see Quay , 1984, p.70, Scale II).

Factor III' reflects a passive, dependent, inept pattern similar to one found in males (Quay, 1984, p.70, Scale IV).

Factor IV' appears to represent a pattern of depression and social withdrawal also found in male offenders (Quay, 1984, p.70, Scale V).

Factor V' has elements of ineptness, passivity and resistance plus an unwillingness to assume responsibility for one's actions.

#### Conversion of obtained factors to scales

The basis for constructing the scales for the CACLF was, of course, to use those items loading on the factors at .30 or greater. However, to avoid building in correlations among the scales the same item was not permitted to appear in more than one scale. To avoid problems posed by negatively loaded items (The item score would have to be subtracted from the total scale score), item 7 was dropped from scale IV. The items of the CACLF making up each of the five scales are given in Table 3.

Scale scores for the total sample (477) were then obtained giving each item equal weight and simply counting the number of "yes " (1) responses. Thus, the minimum score for all five scales is zero and the maximum score in the number of items in the scale.

Internal consistency (Cronbach's Alpha) reliabilities were then obtained for the five scales. These may be found in Table 4. Descriptive statistics for the CACLF may also be found in Table 4. The inter correlations among the scales are given in Table 5.

Some observations can be made. All five scales are somewhat, but not markedly skewed; these are relatively more very low scores than very high scores. There is an adequate range of scores and considerable variability - conditions necessary for the scales to have utility in classifying individuals. The intercorrelations suggest considerable independence among the scales with the exception of scales I and II, they are very independent. The correlation between Scale I (Aggressive) and Scale II (Manipulative), where a positive correlation is consonant with the psychology of these two scales - both involve acting out non-compliant, troublesome behavior.

Constructing scale scores for the CALHF presented problems. After considering alternatives it was decided to permit an item to appear one scale only, to omit all negatively loaded items, to split bipolar Factor III' into two scales, and to disregard the three-item Factor V'. Items comprising the five scales of the CALHF may be found in Table 6.

Scale scores were obtained for all 536 cases and Alpha reliabilities calculated. These may be found in Table 7. Descriptive statistics on the five scales are also presented in Table 7.

It is obvious that the internal consistencies (Alphas) of all of the scale of the CALHF are very modest and are cause for concern. These reliabilities and the small number of items making up scales III, IV and V will limit the relationships that can be obtained between these scales and other variables and limit their utility in classification.

These two factors may also limit the utility of the scales in the assignment of individual female offenders to categories derived from these scales.

The intercorrelations among the five scales are given in Table 8. All of the scales are quite independent.

#### Correlations between the scales of the CACLF and CALHF

The correlations between the scales of the two instruments were obtained for the 476 cases for which both the CALHF and CACLF had been completed. Since some of the scales in the two instruments appear to measure similar behavior patterns, [even though in the past (CALHF) vs in the present (CACLF)] some relationships might be expected. The two aggressive scales would be expected to be positively related as would the two inadequate scales. However, it can be seen in Table 9, there are no relationships between any of the scales of the two instruments. As was noted earlier, the low reliability of the CALHF scales and their small number items will attenuate any correlations with other measure.

On the other hand, the absence of relationships means that each scale will add independent information to predicting whatever criteria (e.g. a classification) is desired.

## Relationships of Scale Scores to other measures

Since there was other relevant information about many of our subjects available in SCDC records, correlations were obtained between all CACLF or CALHF scale scores and 1) Age, 2) Beta IQ, 3) Reading achievement, 4) Spelling achievement and 5) Arithmetic achievement. As there were 40 correlations computed, a corrected Alpha level of .001 was used.

None of the correlations of the scales with age approached significance. The only significant correlations between scale scores and Beta IQ was negative relationship with CALH scale II ( $r = -.22$ ,  $p=.0001$ ). Reading achievement was significantly positively related to CALHF Scale IV ( $r=.15$   $p=.001$ ). Spelling achievement was significantly negatively related to CALH Scale II ( $r=-.24$ ;  $p=.0001$ ). While all of the significant correlations are modest in size, the negative correlations with the Inadequate Scale (II) of the CALHF are in keeping with the interpretation of that scale. The positive correlation of reading achievement with the "financial problems" Scale (IV) given that writing bad checks is involved, is also reasonable.

## Race

None of the differences between the means for white vs blacks for the scales of either instrument approached significance. The largest absolute difference was less than one-third of one scale score point.

## Criminal History

Given that a small number of the items on the CALHF scales have to do with prior involvement in criminal activity, some relationships between the scales and criminal history variable would be expected. When subjects (for whom the data were available) were dichotomized as having been arrested before age 17 ( $n=75$ ) or not ( $n=75$ ) the former had significantly higher mean scores on CALHF Scales I (Aggressive), Scale

II (Inadequate) and Scale IV (Financial problems). The no arrest before age 17 group had a significantly lower mean scores on CALHF Scale III (Drugs for Profit). With respect to having been incarcerated as a juvenile, the group who had (n=47) had higher means on CALHF I or II than the group who had not (n=377).

With regard to whether or not the extant offense had been committed without (n=282) or with others (n=169), as expected, those whose offense involved others had higher scores on CALHF Scale III (Drugs for Profit) and lower scores on CALHF Scale IV (Financial problems)

### Victim of Abuse

During the intake interview at the Women's Center questions were asked about a history of having been abused. The group reporting having been physically abused in childhood (n=71) obtained higher means on CALHF Scales I (Aggressive) and II (Inadequate) than the group who did not report abuse (n=387). The group reporting having been sexually abused by a stranger (n=61) also had higher means on the same two scales than those who had not (n=394). Those reporting having been sexually abused by a loved one (n=72) had a higher mean score only a CALHF Scale II. Finally, those reporting sexual abuse in their present relationship (n=60) also had higher mean scores on CALHF Scale II as compared to those who did not so report (n=296). Thus reported physical or sexual abuse occurs most often among those with an inadequate dependent history, but childhood abuse, both sexual or physical, is also associated with the aggressive pattern.

### Conclusions

The research has clearly identified five patterns of behavior in institutionalized female offenders that are observable, psychologically meaningful, statistically homogenous, and are, at least conceptually, similar to patterns in male offenders that have

been shown to have relevance to correctional management (Quay, 1984). The measurement of these patterns, using the five scales of the CACLF, appears to be adequate. These behavior patterns-aggressive, manipulative, dependent, inadequate, depressed/anxious-can, on the basis of past experience with males, be utilized to classify female offenders into behaviorally homogenous subgroups.

On the other hand, the CALHF can be considered to be, at best, only marginally adequate. Almost one-third of the items were not endorsed at a high enough frequency (15% or above) to permit further analysis. It is impossible to know whether or not this was due to a truly low prevalence of these behaviors in the lives of female offenders in general, incompleteness of case history information coupled with an unwillingness on the part of the offenders studied to admit to having engaged in the behaviors, inadequate interview procedures under the pressure of very heavy caseloads, or idiosyncrasies in our sample.

Of those 56 items that were analyzed, only 28 appeared on the four major factors with loadings of conventional size ( $\geq .30$  or greater). The resulting scales, while making sense psychologically, were of low internal consistency.

A number of potentially corrective approaches could be taken. One could assume that if data were collected using more complete case histories and more in-depth interviews then fewer items would have to be deleted, a better factor structure would emerge, and more homogenous scales could then be constructed.

One could assume that the analysis of the CACLF has revealed the relevant patterns. An attempt could then be made to write new items for the CALHF to measure these patterns as they might be revealed in the life histories of female offenders.

Finally, an attempt could be made to improve the measurement of the



existing CALHF scales by adding items to the CALHF that would, hopefully, measure the patterns past behavior now assessed by the scales.

All three alternatives would require collecting additional data (at least 300 cases and reanalyzing). While the results of this project are obviously relevant to the differential classification of female offenders in South Carolina, it must be recognized that generalization beyond the SCDC is unwarranted at this time without further research to replicate the patterns in other samples of female offenders. Given the nature of the patterns found there is every reason to be optimistic about replication of the patterns (factor structure) in other samples. However, since classification of the individual depends upon the relationship of the individual's scale scores to scores of the reference group, the means and standard deviation of the reference group, are also critical. It could be, for example, that while female offenders in New York would exhibit the same behavior patterns of those in South Carolina, New York inmates might exhibit them in different degrees of severity. Thus to classify female offenders in New York on the basis of norms developed solely on female offenders in South Carolina would be invalid.

Those outside of the SCDC contemplating usage of either CACLF or CALHF should be very hesitant to do so prior to research that would replicate the patterns in both (or establish new ones) or construct norms (T scores) based on the data obtained.

## Footnotes

1. As a check in the effects of combining the ratings we analyzed the frequency of endorsement (greater than 15%) for the 85 CACLF items for the two shifts separately. Using only day shift ratings, 59 (69%) items did not meet the criteria and would have been eliminated from further analysis. Using only night shift ratings, 42 (47%) items did not meet the above criteria and would have been eliminated.

2. While the factors are uncorrelated (orthogonal) the factor scores are estimated of the factors (underlying dimensions) and may be correlated by virtue of shared method variance and other possible influences.

## References

Quay, H.C. Managing Adult Inmates, College Park, Md: American Correctional Association, 1984.

Table 1

Rotated Factor Loadings for the Checklist for the Analysis of Life History Records for Female Offenders (CALHF).

## Factor I'

Item Number	Items	Rotated Factor Loading
13	Previous incarceration	.54
15	Tough, defiant	.53
23	Impulsive	.37
27	Physically aggressive	.40
40	Deliberate use of aliases	.42
54	History of drug abuse	.47
55	Assumed responsibility	-.36
61	History of shoplifting	.38
65	Unconcerned about impact	.47
67	Offense to support drug habit	.46

## Factor II'

9	Has attempted suicide	.35
12	Weak, indecisive	.40
16	Irregular work history	.57
19	Impression of ineptness	.40
20	Supported husband/children	-.45
47	Economically dependent	.54
55	Assumed responsibility	-.37

## Factor III'

17	Offense involve other participants	.35
18	Sold out by someone else	.38
21	Offense motivated by family problem	-.56
24	Selling or smuggling	.33
28	Feels justified in offense	-.39

Table 1 (cont'd)

36	Suffered financial reverses	-.46
64	Was co-defendent	.49
72	History of fraudulent or bad checks	-.32

Factor IV'

6	Has expressed guilt	.54
7	Has expressed need for self-improvement	.47
54	History of drug abuse	.34
67	Offense committed to support habit	.47

Factor V'

14	Multiple legal marriages	-.54
56	Has had illegitimate children	.42
68	Has offspring for legal marriage	-.56

Table 2

Rotated Factor Loadings for the Correctional Adjustment Checklist for Female Offenders (CACLF).

Item No.	Items	Factor I'
		Rotated Factor Loading
16	Acts tough	.45
18	Takes advantage	.59
23	Cons staff	.54
29	Lies to protect self	.52
34	"Professional" criminal	.54
39	Talks aggressively	.53
42	Accepts no blame	.39
43	Accuses unfairness	.47
49	Rejects authority	.48
51	Talks aggressively to staff	.52
56	Has quick tongue	.58
57	Holds grudges	.58
61	Plays staff	.57
66	Forms clique	.36
67	Out of bounds	.56
69	Openly disobeys	.47
72	Aiding others in breaking rules	.53
73	Unjustly confined	.59
74	Negative influence	.52
83	Feels superior	.61
Factor II'		
4	Fakes physical illness	.43
14	Cannot be trusted	.60
15	Latches on to stronger inmate	.33

Table 2 (cont'd)

17	Needs constant supervision	.31
23	Cons staff	.46
28	Doesn't trust staff	.58
29	Lies	.35
43	Continually complains	.44
61	Plays staff against one another	.36
69	Openly disobeys	.37
72	Aiding others breaking rules	.33

Factor III'

2	Cannot follow directions	.39
3	Tense	.47
5	Asks for help	.41
13	Sluggish and drowsy	.55
17	Needs constant supervision	.41
38	Physical complaints	.45
48	Will not stand up for self	.42
60	Puts forth little effort	.43

Factor IV'

7	Gets along with tougher inmates	-.32
30	Afraid of other inmates	.56
33	Afraid of staff	.50
35	Easily taken advantage of	.52
46	Withdrawn, shy	.41
70	Often sad and depressed	.53

Table 2 (cont'd)

Factor V'

8	Does not get to work on time	.42
37	Has no friends	.41
42	Accepts no blame	.34
52	Does not keep area clean	.68
54	Cannot be given responsibility	.62
58	No concern for personal appearance	.45

Table 3

Items making up the five scales of the CACLF

	<u>Scale I</u>	<u>Scale II</u>	<u>Scale III</u>	<u>Scale IV</u>	<u>Scale V</u>
	16	4	2	30	8
	18	14	3	33	37
	23	15	5	35	42
	34	23	13	46	52
	39	28	17	70	54
	49	43	38		58
	51	61	48		
	56		60		
	57				
	66				
	67				
	69				
	73				
	74				
	83				
No. of items	15	7	8	5	6



Table 4

Descriptive statistics for the five scales of the CACLF

Scale	Alpha	Mean	50	Mode	Median	Range	No Items
I	.87	4.41	4.05	0.00	3.00	0-15	15
II	.77	2.63	2.14	2.00	2.00	0- 7	7
III	.68	2.90	2.05	1.00	3.00	0- 8	8
IV	.67	1.82	1.54	1.00	1.00	0- 5	5
V	.67	1.60	1.60	0.00	1.00	0- 6	6

Table 5

Intercorrelations among the five scales of the CACLF

	Scale				
	I	II	III	IV	V
II	.68		.22	-.26	.21
III	.22	.36		.26	.23
IV	-.26	-.14	.26		.01
v	.21				

Table 6

Items making up the five scales of the CALHF

	Scale I	Scale II	Scale III	Scale IV	Scale V
	13	9	17	21	6
	15	12	18	28	7
	23	16	24	36	54
	27	19	64	72	67
	40	34			
	54	47			
	61				
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
No. of	7	6	4	4	4
items					

Table 7

Descriptive statistics for the five Scales of CALHF

Scale	Alpha	Mean	50	Mode	Median	Range	No. of items
I	.64	1.92	1.46	2.00	2.00	0-6	7
II	.60	2.06	1.54	2.00	2.00	0-6	6
III	.52	.91	1.06	0.00	1.00	0-4	4
IV	.53	1.06	1.12	0.00	1.00	0-4	4
V	.56	1.43	1.25	0.00	1.00	0-4	4

Table 8

Intercorrelations among the five scales of the CALHF

	Scale				
	I	II	III	IV	V
II	.30		.02	-.14	.14
III	-.09	.01		-.28	.09
IV	-.09	-.14	-.28		-.10
V	.40				

Table 9

Correlations between Scales of the CACLF and CALHF

CALH	CACLF				
	I (Aggressive)	II (Manipulative)	III (Dependent)	IV (Anxiety/ Depression)	V (Inadequate)
I (Aggressive)	.06	.06	.03	-.06	.00
II (Inadequate)	.03	-.02	.05	.08	-.03
III (Drugs for Profit)	.00	.01	.01	.07	-.04
IV (Financial. Problems)	-.02	.00	.00	.01	-.02
V (Drug Abuse)	.00	.04	.02	.00	.00

Checklist for The Analysis of Life History  
of Female Offenders

South Carolina Department of Corrections in collaboration  
with Herbert C. Quay, Ph.D. and Craig T. Love, Ph.D.

1. Name of Inmate \_\_\_\_\_
2. Inmate Number \_\_\_\_\_
3. Name of person completing this checklist \_\_\_\_\_
4. Position title of person completing this checklist \_\_\_\_\_
5. Date checklist completed \_\_\_\_\_

INSTRUCTIONS

Please place a check mark in front of each item that is true of the inmate based on records and initial interview.

Checklist for the Analysis of Life History Records

1. Has few, if any, friends
2. Has values and opinions in line with crime as a career
3. Openly bisexual, or lesbian
4. Thrill-seeking
5. Psychiatric diagnosis of anxiety or depression
6. Has expressed guilt or remorse over offense
7. Has expressed need for self-improvement
8. Has had common-law relationship with men
9. Has attempted suicide
10. Was juvenile gang member
11. Socially withdrawn
12. Weak, indecisive, easily led
13. Previous local, state or federal incarceration
14. Multiple legal marriages
15. Tough, defiant
16. Irregular work history outside the home
17. Offenses always or almost always involve other participants
18. Claims apprehension due to being sold out by someone else
19. Gives impression of ineptness, incompetence in managing everyday problems in living
20. Supported husband and/or children
21. Claims offense motivated by family problems
22. Never legally married
23. Impulsive
24. Selling or smuggling illegal drugs
25. Conflict with husband, parents or both
26. Has assaulted law officers or other official personnel
27. Physically aggressive (strong arm, assault, reckless, homicide, attempt murder, mugging, etc.)
28. Feels justified in committing current offense
29. Involved with organized racketeering
30. Excessive gambling
31. Single marriage (either legal or common law)
32. Expresses feelings of inadequacy, worthlessness
33. Psychiatric diagnosis of psychopathy or antisocial personality disorder
34. Difficulties in the public schools
35. Escape from custody
36. Suffered financial reverses prior to commission of offense for which incarcerated
37. Pushes drugs but is not a user
38. History of excess use of alcohol
39. Passive, submissive
40. Deliberate use of aliases
41. Bravado, braggart
42. Involved in confidence schemes
43. Guiltless, blames others
44. Flight to avoid prosecution
45. Stable family life in childhood and youth



Checklist for the Analysis of Life History Records

- \_\_\_ 46. No significant relationships with men or women
- \_\_\_ 47. Economically dependent on others
- \_\_\_ 48. Lived a nomadic existence prior to offense
- \_\_\_ 49. Sees self as in the rackets as a career
- \_\_\_ 50. Threatens law enforcement officials
- \_\_\_ 51. Expresses lack of concern for others
- \_\_\_ 52. Frequent moves from state to state
- \_\_\_ 53. Raised in urban slum area
- \_\_\_ 54. History of drug abuse
- \_\_\_ 55. Assumed responsibility as mother and homemaker
- \_\_\_ 56. Has had illegitimate children
- \_\_\_ 57. History of prostitution
- \_\_\_ 58. Economically independent (self-supporting)
- \_\_\_ 59. History of psychosis
- \_\_\_ 60. History of use of hallucinogenic drugs
- \_\_\_ 61. History of shoplifting
- \_\_\_ 62. Pathological lying
- \_\_\_ 63. Frequent runaway
- \_\_\_ 64. Was codefendent with male on current offense
- \_\_\_ 65. Unconcerned about impact of offense on others
- \_\_\_ 66. History of being sexually abused
- \_\_\_ 67. Offense committed to support drug habit or addiction
- \_\_\_ 68. Has offspring from legal marriage
- \_\_\_ 69. Masculine in dress and appearance
- \_\_\_ 70. Psychiatric diagnosis of psychosis
- \_\_\_ 71. Expected length of incarceration 10 years or more

The Correctional Adjustment Checklist for  
Female Offenders

South Carolina Department of Corrections in collaboration  
with Herbert C. Quay, Ph.D. and Craig T. Love, Ph.D.

1. Name of Inmate \_\_\_\_\_
2. Inmate Number \_\_\_\_\_
3. Name of person completing this checklist \_\_\_\_\_
4. Position title of person completing this checklist \_\_\_\_\_
5. Shift of person completing checklist \_\_\_\_\_
6. Date checklist completed \_\_\_\_\_

INSTRUCTIONS

Please indicate which of the following behaviors the above named inmate exhibits. If the behavior is true of the inmate, circle the "1". If it is not, circle the "0". Please complete every item.

Correctional Adjustment Checklist

No	Yes	
0	1	1. Worried, anxious
0	1	2. Tries, but cannot seem to follow directions
0	1	3. Tense, unable to relax
0	1	4. Fakes physical illnesses to avoid work
0	1	5. Continually asks for help from staff
0	1	6. Seeks help from other inmates
0	1	7. Gets along with the "tougher inmates"
0	1	8. Does not get up, get to work, or to other duties on time
0	1	9. Refuses to do assigned work
0	1	10. Uses leisure time to cause trouble
0	1	11. Continually uses profane language, curses and swears
0	1	12. Overly cautious and precise
0	1	13. Sluggish and drowsy
0	1	14. Cannot be trusted at all
0	1	15. Latches on to a stronger inmate for protection
0	1	16. Acts tough but backs down when confronted
0	1	17. Needs constant supervision
0	1	18. Takes advantage of weaker inmates
0	1	19. Assaultive toward staff
0	1	20. Possession of contraband - weapons
0	1	21. Is an agitator about racial issues
0	1	22. Sexually aggressive toward other inmates
0	1	23. Continually tries to con staff
0	1	24. Impulsive, unpredictable
0	1	25. Assaultive toward other inmates
0	1	26. Has attempted suicide since admission
0	1	27. Awkward, clumsy
0	1	28. Doesn't trust staff
0	1	29. Lies to protect herself
0	1	30. Afraid of other inmates
0	1	31. Purposely does not do as told
0	1	32. Tampers with equipment, locks, food, etc.
0	1	33. Afraid of staff
0	1	34. Speaks of crime as a way of life (sees self as "professional" criminal)
0	1	35. Easily taken advantage of by other inmates
0	1	36. Caught in possession of alcohol
0	1	37. Has no friends
0	1	38. Has many physical complaints
0	1	39. Talks aggressively to other inmates
0	1	40. Expresses guilt for what she has done
0	1	41. Possession of drugs
0	1	42. Accepts no blame for any of her troubles
0	1	43. Continually complains; accuses staff of unfairness
0	1	44. Has a reputation as a big time criminal among other inmates
0	1	45. Involved in gambling
0	1	46. Withdrawn; shy; does not approach other inmates

Correctional Adjustment Checklist

- 0 1 47. Daydreams; seems to be mentally off in space
- 0 1 48. Will not stand up for herself
- 0 1 49. Doesn't want to be a part of the system; rejects society and authority
- 0 1 50. Has made tatoos or marks on self
- 0 1 51. Talks aggressively to staff
- 0 1 52. Does not keep her area clean
- 0 1 53. Attempts to bribe staff
- 0 1 54. Cannot be given responsibility
- 0 1 55. Invites sexual advances from other inmates
- 0 1 56. Has a quick temper
- 0 1 57. Holds grudges; seeks to "get even"
- 0 1 58. Shows no concern about personal appearance
- 0 1 59. Forgery of institutional forms
- 0 1 60. Puts forth as little effort as possible
- 0 1 61. Attempts to play staff against one another
- 0 1 62. Extorts money and/or property from other inmates
- 0 1 63. Resistant; has to be forced to participate in activities
- 0 1 64. Can't seem to get anything right
- 0 1 65. Destroys property
- 0 1 66. Tries to form a clique (tightly-knit group)
- 0 1 67. Out of bounds (out of place)
- 0 1 68. Has plotted escape, attempted escape or aided others in same
- 0 1 69. Openly disobeys regulations and rules
- 0 1 70. Often sad and depressed
- 0 1 71. Stirs up trouble among inmates
- 0 1 72. Aiding or abetting others in breaking the rules
- 0 1 73. Considers herself unjustly confined
- 0 1 74. Negative influence on other inmates
- 0 1 75. Associates with a select few
- 0 1 76. Refuses to help other inmates
- 0 1 77. Seductive toward staff
- 0 1 78. Respected by other inmates
- 0 1 79. Borrows money from "loan sharks"
- 0 1 80. Has developed at least one close friendship
- 0 1 81. Adopts masculine dress and appearance
- 0 1 82. Makes sexual advances toward other inmates
- 0 1 83. Feels superior to most other inmates
- 0 1 84. Cries frequently
- 0 1 85. Thought to be dealing drugs

ASSESSMENT INTERVIEW

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_ SCDC# \_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

OFFENSE(S): \_\_\_\_\_

SENTENCE LENGTH: \_\_\_\_\_ REPEATER: Y N Last Date Tested: \_\_\_\_\_

MIA1 - Recommendations

1. Court Order: Y N \_\_\_\_\_
2. Area Responsible: 1. Medical 2. Psychiatric 3. Psychological  
4. Social Work
3. Program (Use Program Codes)  
Client/Worker Plan
- 4 \_\_\_\_\_ 7 \_\_\_\_\_
- 5 \_\_\_\_\_ 8 \_\_\_\_\_
- 6 \_\_\_\_\_ 9 \_\_\_\_\_

- Marital/Personal Information

1. How old are you? \_\_\_\_\_ DOB: \_\_\_\_\_ RACE: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Are you married (includes common-law), single, separated, divorced or widowed? (CIRCLE ONE)
3. Have you ever been married? Y N How many times? \_\_\_\_\_
4. (If applicable) How long have you been separated/divorced/widowed? \_\_\_\_\_
5. How many children do you have? AGES: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Do you have any family member(s) incarcerated or have been incarcerated?  
Y N How many? \_\_\_\_\_
7. Will you have family/friends visiting? Y N

MIA2 - Education/Juvenile

1. What is the highest grade you completed in school? \_\_\_\_\_ GED? Y N
2. What was the reason you did not finish high school? \_\_\_\_\_  
Were you ever suspended or expelled from school? Y N #times: \_\_\_\_\_  
For what reason(s)? \_\_\_\_\_  
Did you ever have to repeat an entire grade? Y N Which one? \_\_\_\_\_
3. Were you ever in special education/remedial classes? Y N  
(If IQ is low, ask: How many months in a year? \_\_\_\_\_ How many weeks in a year? \_\_\_\_\_  
If you buy \$7.00 worth of gas and give the cashier \$10.00 how much change would you get back? \_\_\_\_\_  
If you were the first person to see smoke and fire in a store, what would you do? \_\_\_\_\_
4. Have you ever completed or been certified in a vocational training course?  
Y N Area(s) \_\_\_\_\_
5. Year Certified: \_\_\_\_\_  
Do you have an Associate, Bachelor or Master Degree? Y N  
In what? \_\_\_\_\_

Were you ever arrested before you turned 17 years old? Y N

# Juvenile Arrests: \_\_\_\_\_

Age at first arrest: \_\_\_\_\_

Did you ever serve time as a juvenile? Y N # times: \_\_\_\_\_

When, what for, and how long? \_\_\_\_\_

Was your time ever extended? Y N Why: \_\_\_\_\_

Were you ever on probation as a juvenile? Y N # times: \_\_\_\_\_

When, what for, and how long? \_\_\_\_\_

Were you ever placed in a foster home? Y N #homes: \_\_\_\_\_

How would you describe the area you were raised in: upper, middle, low income, slum? \_\_\_\_\_

MIA3 - Employment

1. Did you have a job when you were arrested? Y N

2. What kind of work do you usually do? \_\_\_\_\_

3. How many months have you worked in the past year? \_\_\_\_\_

4. How many months do you usually work each year? \_\_\_\_\_

5. What was your take home (net) pay per week? \_\_\_\_\_

(If not working, ask: How were you supporting yourself/family? i.e. Welfare, SSI, AFDIC, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

Were you ever fired or laid off from a job in the past 2 years? Y N

What for? \_\_\_\_\_

Who supports the children, if any? \_\_\_\_\_

Are they receiving any public assistance? Y N TYPE: \_\_\_\_\_

6. (Nature of job) 1. Unskilled; 2. Semi-skilled; 3. Skilled; 4. Professional

MIA4 - Mental Health History

1. Have you ever seen a psychiatrist, social worker or counselor for personal problems or bad nerves? Y N

2. Have you ever had out-patient counseling/treatment? Y N

3. Where? \_\_\_\_\_

How long did you go? \_\_\_\_\_ From \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

Reason: \_\_\_\_\_

4. Medication: Y N

Have you ever been hospitalized for mental health treatment/evaluation? Y N

Where? \_\_\_\_\_

How long did you stay? \_\_\_\_\_ From \_\_\_\_\_ to \_\_\_\_\_

Reason: \_\_\_\_\_

Medication: Y N # Admissions: \_\_\_\_\_

Has a psychiatrist or other doctor ever given you medication for your nerves? Y N

What kind? \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_

5. Were you in any counseling/treatment when arrested? Y N

6. Do you feel you have any mental health problems now? Y N  
 7. Do you need to talk with someone? Y N

Have you recently/in the past had problems falling asleep? Y N

Has there been any recent changes in your weight or eating habits? Y N

Do you ever feel like someone or something is controlling your actions and you can do nothing about it? Y N

Have you ever tried to hurt yourself? Y N

8. How many times? \_\_\_\_\_

9. How did you try to hurt yourself? 1. Laceration 5. Drug Overdose  
 2. Hanging 6. Combination of Above  
 3. Asphyxiation 7. Does not apply  
 4. Auto Accident 8. Gunshot Wound

10. When was your last attempt? \_\_\_\_\_ (Estimated - Actual)  
 MO DA YR

How were you stopped? \_\_\_\_\_

Is there a history of mental illness/nervous breakdowns in your family? Y N

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

- Substance Abuse/Health

1. (Drug Related Offense) 1. Alcohol/drug use 5. Obtain money  
 2. Alcohol use 6. Buy or Sell Drugs  
 3. Drug Use 7. Possession at Crime  
 4. DUI 8. Not applicable

Have you ever been convicted of: (#times)

2. DUI? \_\_\_\_\_

3. Drugs? \_\_\_\_\_

4. Public Drunk? \_\_\_\_\_

Were you under the influence or alcohol or drugs at the time of this crime? Y N What type: \_\_\_\_\_

Have you ever had times when you were drinking or using drugs when you couldn't remember what happened? Y N

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Has your spouse ever threatened to leave you because of your use of alcohol or drugs? Y N

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Have you ever lost a job because of alcohol or drug use? Y N

How much do you spend on drugs per day/week? \_\_\_\_\_

What kind? \_\_\_\_\_

How much do you usually drink per day/week? \_\_\_\_\_

5. Do you feel you have a problem with alcohol or drugs? Y N

- |                                     |                                   |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Admits Past Drug Problem         | 5. Admits Present Alcohol Problem |
| 2. Admits Past Alcohol Problem      | 6. Admits Alcohol/Drug Problem    |
| 3. Admits Past Alcohol/Drug Problem | 7. Denies any substance abuse     |
| 4. Admits Present Drug Problem      | 8. No apparent substance abuse    |

6. Have you ever participated in any alcohol/drug treatment program? Y N  
 # times: \_\_\_\_\_ Where/what type? \_\_\_\_\_
7. Were you in a treatment program when arrested? Y N
8. Do you feel you need help? Y N
- Is there a history of alcohol/drug abuse in your family? Y N
9. How is your health? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Do you now or have you ever had any serious physical problems? Y N  
 What kind? \_\_\_\_\_
- Have you ever been hospitalized for major illness/surgery? Y N  
 #times \_\_\_\_\_ Most recent surgery/illness: \_\_\_\_\_
- Are you presently on any medication? Y N Kind \_\_\_\_\_
10. Is there any (health) limitations to the kind of work you can do? Y N
11. (Family Relationships)

- Adult Record

Since you turned 17 years old, have you ever been on probation, paid a fine(s) or been sentenced to serve time? Y N  
 When, charge, disposition: \_\_\_\_\_

Tell me what happened when you got into trouble this time: \_\_\_\_\_

Was there anyone else involved with the crime? Y N How many? \_\_\_\_\_  
 (If sexual misconduct was involved ( Y N ) Who do they (courts) say was the victim?

Sex \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_ Stranger Friend Family (whom) \_\_\_\_\_  
 Sex \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_ Stranger Friend Family (whom) \_\_\_\_\_

Do they (courts) say a weapon was used or was the person hurt? Y N  
 Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Have you ever been in trouble because of your sexual behavior before?  
 Y N When? \_\_\_\_\_

Have you ever been physically hurt by spouse/boyfriend/girlfriend? Y N

Were you ever physically hurt as a child? Y N \_\_\_\_\_

Were you ever sexually molested by a stranger? Y N

Were you ever sexually molested by a friend/family member? Y N

Whom: \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_



MIA6 - Test Data

\_\_\_\_\_ BETA II  
 \_\_\_\_\_ WAIS  
 \_\_\_\_\_ WRAT READING  
 \_\_\_\_\_ WRAT SPELLING  
 \_\_\_\_\_ WRAT ARITHMETIC

TEST RESULTS

01 No significant problems  
 02 Test scores affected by\*  
 03 Lack of motivation  
 04 Poor Cooperation  
 05 Problems with directions  
 06 Language Barrier  
 07 Vision impairment  
 08 Hearing Problem  
 09 Physical disability  
 10 Educationally/Culturally Deprived  
 11 Chronic Alcohol/Drug Abuse  
 12 Psychological Disorder  
 13 Situational Stress  
 14 Possible Neurological Problem  
 15 Test scores indicate\*  
 16 Intellectual retardation  
 17 Borderline intelligence  
 18 Average intelligence  
 19 Above-average intelligence  
 20 Academic skills below capacity  
 21 Scores inaccurate  
 22 Limited basic life skills  
 23 Cannot count money  
 24 Cannot tell time  
 25 Limited basic information  
 26 Poor hygiene  
 27 Below average IQ

SUMMARY COMMENT CODES

01 No complaints/comments  
 02 Appears withdrawn  
 03 Appears defensive  
 04 Appears manipulative  
 05 Appears uncooperative  
 06 Appears passive  
 07 Has speech impediment  
 08 Seems angry  
 09 Seems anxious  
 10 Seems highly agitated  
 11 Seems depressed  
 12 Thinks of suicide  
 13 Definite plan for suicide  
 14 Recent suicide gesture  
 15 Disoriented environment  
 16 Reports hallucinations  
 17 Presents delusions  
 18 Disorganized thoughts  
 19 Drug/alcohol withdrawal  
 20 Seems highly suspicious  
 21 Refer to Special Education  
 22 Refer to SLU (Hab Unit)  
 23 Refer to MHU (Gilliam Psy. Unit)  
 24 No interest in programs  
 25 Appears to use alcohol/drugs  
 26 Psychotropic drugs prev. prescribed  
 27 Victim of spouse abuse  
 28 Victim of child abuse  
 29 Reported child abuser  
 30 Reported spouse abuser

"TEST RESULTS - If Code 02 is used, you must also use at least one of the Codes 03 through 14. If Code 15 is used, you must use at least one of the Codes 16 through 20.