

**WOMEN'S JAILS: AN INVESTIGATION OF OFFENDERS,
STAFF, ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAMMING**

Mary K. Stohr, Ph.D.

and

G. Larry Mays, Ph.D.

Department of Criminal Justice
New Mexico State University
Box 30001, Dept. 3476
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003

April 30, 1993

This document was prepared under grant number 92JO4GHP5 from the National Institute of Corrections, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

ABSTRACT

Until the mid-1980s, jails in the United States were largely unstudied institutions. The nation's 3,316 jails remained generally overcrowded, under-funded, and ignored by policy makers and researchers alike. This study reports on a year-long research effort aimed at examining one of the most unique segments of jails in the U.S.: exclusively women's jails. This report examines the facility profiles, programming efforts, staffing patterns and characteristics, and inmate characteristics of five moderate-sized, exclusively women's jails. Three of these facilities are located in the Western U.S. and two are located on the East Coast.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

WOMEN'S JAILS: AN INVESTIGATION OF OFFENDERS, STAFF, ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAMMING

Jails in the United States are unique and often under-studied institutions. They house diverse groups of offenders, and increasingly these populations reflect many of society's most serious problems (drugs, mental illness, and AIDS for example). Of the 3,316 jails identified in the 1988 National Jail Census, one group--exclusively women's jails--is especially unique. Through several sources, we were able to identify 18 exclusively women's jails. These facilities range in size from fewer than 50 to over 2,000 inmates. Although these 18 jails may not represent the total universe of women's jails in the United States, every effort was made to identify and locate these institutions.

The research design called for site visits to the maximum feasible number of women's jails. Because of time and budgetary constraints, the decision was made to apply three criteria to the site visit selection process: (1) the jail had to be verified as a women's-only facility, (2) the jail had to house 100 or more inmates (to maximize the number of inmate and staff questionnaires distributed), and (3) to the extent possible, the jails should be geographically representative. Unfortunately, from the original list of 18 jails, two of the largest facilities indicated that they could not participate because of logistical or political concerns over questionnaire administration. In the end, five jails--known throughout the report by the pseudonyms of Pacific Shores, Port City, Central Valley, Atlantic Shores, and Bay View--were selected for site visits. These jails, like most of the exclusively women's jails in the nation, are located in major urban areas on the East and West

Coasts.

Data were gathered from these facilities in several ways. First, each jail administrator was sent a Profile Form which elicited general information on the facility's organization, operations, and programming. Specific questions addressed the facility's size, its age, the level of budgetary support, the numbers and types of staff members employed, and general information on the numbers and types of inmates housed.

Second, during each site visit the jail administrator (and sometimes his immediate assistant) was interviewed. These interviews consisted of a core of 20 questions, and while they were scheduled to last one hour, typically they lasted two to three hours. The interviews included questions relating to the facility's background and history, the nature of the inmates and staff, and something of the administrator's managerial philosophy.

Third, each research team member was given a Jail Observation Form to be completed at the end of the site visits. These forms were used to record impressions of staff, inmate, and facility appearance; attitudes and opinions expressed by the staff and inmates; the medical facilities available; visiting practices and facilities; the extent of crowding; the availability and nature of staff and inmate programming; staff and inmate interactions; inmate and staff complaint procedures; and whether the jail was podular/direct supervision or traditional/linear in design and operation.

Fourth, during the site visits questionnaires were administered to all staff members and inmates who were available to the research team. Exact return rates for both groups at each of the five jails are available in the full report. Staff questionnaires gathered socio-demographic information (such as age, gender, race/ethnicity, job titles, and length of employment). Staff members were also quizzed about attitudes toward inmates, the availability of staff and inmate programming, job satisfaction and job design, staff

training, and reports of sexual harassment.

In terms of the inmate survey, a total of 566 inmates returned completed questionnaires. These questionnaires addressed socio-demographic characteristics such as age, race/ethnicity, education level, marital status, employment status and income. They were also asked to indicate something of their criminal histories, their status (sentenced or not, and length of sentence) within the jail, victimization history, and use/abuse of alcohol and drugs prior to incarceration. A critical issue for many female inmates is their children and, especially, the arrangements they must make for child care while they are incarcerated. Related to child care, the female inmates were asked the extent to which they were able to maintain contacts (through phone calls, letters, and visits) with friends and family members on the outside. Finally, in light of their needs, the inmates were asked about the program availability in the jails and the extent to which they had taken advantage of these programs.

The project's site visits and data collection produced a number of findings. For example, four of the five jails were overcrowded. The jail managers expressed concerns over meeting inmates' health care and other programming needs. Additionally, they were concerned about staff needs for training, stress reduction, and the number of officers available to manage the inmate population. The profiles also indicate that some jails are providing or facilitating a variety of programs for the female inmates. However, frequently these programs are limited to sentenced inmates and many of the work programs are sex-role stereotyped (e.g., sewing and cosmetology).

In terms of the staffs of these five exclusively women's jails, several interesting features are apparent. All five of the jails were headed by male administrators. This fact is notable given the custody staffs, which were overwhelmingly female. Most of the respondents to the staff questionnaire (N=141) were white (Caucasian), fairly well-educated, and reasonably young. A

large percentage had worked at their present facility for fewer than two years and most work in custody positions. Additionally, most of the staff members indicated that they received a moderate amount to a great deal of initial training. Many had been exposed to a variety of in-service training opportunities as well. Given the relative youth, educational levels, and training of these staff members, one of the major challenges for administrators in the coming years will be to keep these employees satisfied in their jobs. A critical factor seems to be the flat organizational patterns of most jails, which means that there is a general lack of promotional opportunities.

Finally, it is apparent from this research that the inmates in exclusively women's jails suffer from a number of personal and social needs. Some of the jails offer a variety of programs to meet inmate needs; some of the inmates take advantage of these programs; however, in many instances jails do not offer enough programs or they do not offer the programs seen as most desirable from the inmates' point of view. In the future, women's jails should try not only to keep inmates busy, but also they should strive to meet the personal, educational, and vocational needs of inmates. For most jails, there are still major space and funding obstacles in the way of achieving this goal.

As a result of this year-long research project, the following recommendations are offered:

- (1) Additional research on various aspects of women's jails is still needed. The present effort serves to remind us of how little we know about women in jail, particularly regarding those in exclusively women's jails.
- (2) One crucial piece of future research would seem to be a comparison of the status of inmates in exclusively women's jails with female inmates in mixed population jails. In essence, the question is: what is the most appropriate or effective model?
- (3) There should be a national conference of women's jail administrators. This group needs to meet face-to-face to

discuss common problems and possible solutions to those problems.

(4) With this initial assessment of some of the problems of women's jail inmates, it is incumbent on jail administrators and policy makers to see that every effort is made to address these inmates' needs and deficiencies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
The Unique Circumstances of Women in Jail	3
A National Study of Women's Jail.	5
INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES	8
Staff and Inmate Characteristics.	13
Staff Employment Status	16
Inmate Status and Programming	16
Inmate Visiting Privileges.	20
Additional Interview and Observational Data	21
Summary	23
STAFF PROFILES	25
Job Titles.	27
Ages.	27
Staff Gender.	27
Staff Race/Ethnicity.	28
Educational Levels.	28
Length of Service	29
Staff Work Descriptors.	29
Staff Training.	31
Staff Perceptions of Inmate Programming	34
Summary	35

INMATE PROFILES.	37
Age	39
Race/Ethnicity.	40
Education	41
Marital Status.	41
Employment Status/Income.	42
Inmate Criminal Histories	42
Institutional Status.	44
Victimization History	45
Family Status	47
Outside Contacts.	48
Inmate Programs	49
Summary	51
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	52
REFERENCES	55

TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Jail Descriptors	58
2	Staff Characteristics	59
3	Inmate Characteristics	60
4	Inmate Programming	61
5	Medical Screening and Programming	62
6	Visiting Privileges	63
7	Personal Characteristics of Staff	64
8	Staff Career/Work Descriptors	65
9	Staff In-Service Training	66

10	Staff Perceptions of Inmate Programming Offered	67
11	Staff Ranking of Most Useful Inmate Programming	68
12	Inmate Personal Characteristics	69
13	Inmate Criminal Justice System Contact History	70
14	Inmate Institutional Status Information	71
15	Inmate Victimization History	72
16	Inmate Family Status Information	73
17	Inmate Contact With Outside World	74
18	Inmate Program Participation	75
19	Inmate Ranking of "Useful" Programming	76
20	Inmate Ranking of "Needed" Programming	77
21	Inmate Aggregate Rankings of "Needed" Programming	78

INTRODUCTION

Local jails in the United States are unique institutions. Like prisons they serve as places of incarceration, and most are plagued by problems of overcrowding, under-funding, and understaffing. Unlike prisons, jails have not received much national attention as a result of riots and litigation. They remain largely invisible institutions, which is curious given their common locations in central business districts near the courts. Again, unlike prisons, jails house very diverse populations: males and females, adults and juveniles, pretrial detainees as well as convicted and sentenced misdemeanants and felons, the mentally ill, persons with AIDS, and the list could go on.

Factors such as these combined with the "double whammy" of political and fiscal conservatism (Clear and Cole, 1990) say something about the stresses under which jails operate. These stresses would suggest that jails would be fruitful areas for study and research for academics and policy makers alike. However, until the mid-1980s, relatively little in-depth, systematic research was being done on jails. In fact, this lament frequently served as the introduction for most of the articles and books written after about 1985.

Recent research, however, has addressed issues such as small jails (Mays and Thompson, 1988), the mentally ill in jail (Kalinich et al., 1988, 1991; Jerrell and Komisaruk, 1991), inmates with AIDS (Lawrence and Zwisohn, 1991; Welch, 1989), jail deaths (Winfrey, 1988; Wooldredge and Winfrey, 1992), and a variety of

personnel concerns (e.g., Pogrebin and Poole, 1988; Poole and Pogrebin, 1991; Zupan and Menke, 1988). Nevertheless, the topic of women in jails--particularly those serving time in the very small number of exclusively women's jails--remains largely unexamined. Therefore, the objective of this report and the grant from which it emanates is to study the organization, staffing patterns, programming efforts, and inmate characteristics of exclusively women's jails in the United States.

A literature review on women incarcerated in jails reveals that there have been no recent attempts to undertake a national study of exclusively women's jails. A report entitled "Tabulation of a Nationwide Survey of Local Government Jail Facilities for Women" (Crawford, 1988), sponsored by the American Correctional Association, did examine the attributes of the jails in which women are housed, but there was no particular emphasis on exclusively women's jails.

Nationwide, the growth of general jail populations has been paralleled and exceeded by growth in the number of female inmates (Abadinsky and Winfree, 1992; Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1990; Church, 1990; Dale, 1990; DeCostanzo and Scholes, 1988). For example, in 1983 women comprised about 7% of all adult jail inmates in the United States; by 1988 the number of women inmates had risen to 9% of the total (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1990). Increases in admissions for adult females also occurred during this period: women's admissions increased 56.2% compared to men's admissions which increased 16.8% (Abadinsky and Winfree, 1992: 18).

Despite their expanded presence in America's jails, there is

surprisingly little known about women in jail or the facilities in which they are housed (Bigman, 1980; Chesney-Lind, 1978; Crites, 1976; Crowley and Adrian, 1990; Glick and Neto, 1982; Jalbert, 1987; Mann, 1984; Ryan, 1984; Simon and Landis, 1991; Wood, 1982). When such research has been conducted, generally it has focused on one locality or region (see, e.g., Crites, 1976; Glick and Neto, 1982).

Most scholars attribute the lack of research on women in jail to the fact that women traditionally have constituted only about 6% (and more recently about 10%) of the total jail population (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1990; Chesney-Lind, 1982; Glick and Neto, 1982). Because they represent only a small fraction of most jails' populations, women receive less attention than men from academics, jail administrators, policy makers, and the citizenry. Because they are less likely than their male counterparts to call attention to their conditions of confinement through disturbances, women receive less media attention (Church, 1990; Simon and Landis, 1991). Since they are in jail (perhaps the most hidden and least researched portion of the criminal justice system) *and* female, women may be less likely to have their health care and other programming needs met (Bigman, 1980; Chesney-Lind, 1978). Therefore, the label "the forgotten few" really is appropriate, as it has been applied to women incarcerated in jails.

The Unique Circumstances of Women in Jail

Women in jail suffer from a variety of problems related to their gender. For example, in some instances female inmates have

been subjected to physical and sexual abuse by male correctional officers and inmates because no female correctional officer was on the staff or the shift to supervise them (Sims, 1976). In an attempt to remedy this, women have been confined in jails' out of the way places in order to maintain a separation from the male inmates. Although this arrangement is ostensibly well-intentioned, it has meant that women have been denied the same recreation, social and programming opportunities that men have been afforded in the same facilities (Chesney-Lind, 1978; Glick and Neto, 1982; National Coalition for Jail Reform, 1982; Wirtzfeld, 1985).

Additionally, women have not always had their unique medical and familial needs met in jails designed to incarcerate men. This has been a particular problem for pregnant inmates and for female inmates with dependent children (Baunach, 1987; McGaha, 1987; National Coalition for Jail Reform, 1982; Mann, 1984). The quality of confinement conditions for such women is further diminished if the inmate is both pregnant and addicted to drugs or alcohol.

The few studies of incarcerated women indicate that many are mothers who had primary responsibility for their dependent children prior to their incarceration (Baunach, 1987; Glick and Neto, 1982; National Coalition for Jail Reform, 1982; Wood, 1982). Yet visiting restrictions may threaten the relationship between mother and child and consequently disrupt the essential bonding process.

Since the "typical" woman jail inmate is a high school dropout, has few job skills, has little or no work experience,

tends to abuse drugs and alcohol, and has low self esteem, it is likely that she is in need of programming to address such needs (McGaha, 1987; Wood, 1982). Unfortunately, often it is the case that jails are not equipped to meet these needs. In general, the limited information we have had in the past indicates that women's jail programming is extremely limited and when it does exist it tends to be sex-role stereotyped (Baunach, 1987; Neto, 1981).

A National Study of Women's Jails

Given the absence of some information and the incompleteness of other information, it seemed that the time was right to conduct an in-depth, nationwide research project on exclusively women's jails. This approach was taken for two reasons. First, as has been detailed, most of the jail inmate research has focused on males. And second, in order to be able to closely examine the particular needs and circumstances of female inmates, with out the "clutter" and "background noise" of a mixed population, exclusively women's jails were targeted.

The first phase of the project involved an attempt to identify all of the exclusively women's jails in the United States. As the research staff quickly came to realize there are not a lot of these facilities--fewer than two dozen by our count--but they are not always easy to locate. In the end we settled on what seemed like a reasonable course of action. We consulted with Ken Kerle, editor of *American Jails* magazine, and obtained a copy of *Who's Who in Jail Management* from the American Jail Association and scoured the pages looking for the names of women's jails in every state. The good news was that most of these facilities

identified themselves as women's jails. The bad news was that a number of the jails were small (under 100 inmates), and most were located on the East Coast or West Coast with few in between. This initial survey turned up the names and locations of 18 exclusively women's jails ranging in size from fewer than 50 inmates to over 2,000. While we cannot guarantee that this number constitutes the entire universe of women's jails in the United States, the diligence of our search leads us to believe that we were able to identify virtually all such facilities.

In the second phase of the project, the research team identified jails for potential site visits. Given the budgetary and time constraints involved in this project, the following three criteria were established to assist in this effort. First, we had to verify that the facility did, indeed, house only female inmates. Second, we chose to focus on those facilities housing 100 or more inmates. This was done in order to maximize the number of staff and inmate questionnaires that could be distributed and collected at one time. Third, each of the jails had to be geographically representative. This criterion was the most difficult to assure since the majority of the exclusively women's jails are located in the Western United States, and most are found in one state.

From the original list of 18 jails, 12 met the size criterion and the chief administrator or another appropriate party at each institution was contacted by phone to ascertain a willingness to participate in the study. All were assured of anonymity and all were promised copies of the results once the project was completed. Three of the medium sized jails declined to partici-

pate indicating that budgetary constraints, staff shortages, construction, and inmate privacy concerns prevented them from doing so. Two of the largest women's jails were eventually excluded from the list because of perceived logistical or political problems by high-level facility or county administrators. In fairness to these institutions, both offered the project staff the opportunity for a walk-through tour and one of these jails which housed about 1,700 inmates was examined on this basis. For the sake of time and expenses five of the remaining jails were chosen for two to three day site visits.

The following sections will detail the results of this year-long study of women's jails. Information will be provided on the five facilities through what we call an institutional profile. This profile includes a general description of each jail, and particularly addresses the programming efforts of these institutions. The next section addresses the characteristics of the staff members working in the five exclusively women's jails. We provide an overview of their ages, educational backgrounds, training, and gender breakdowns. Next we outline the characteristics of the women incarcerated in these five facilities. We examine the criminal charges against them and their criminal histories, family situations, and demographic profiles, including age, education, income, and so forth. Finally, this report concludes with a summary of the research results and a series of recommendations for future research needs and policy efforts.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES

The Profile Form (see Appendix A) developed for this re-

search was constructed after reviewing similar instruments employed by Glick and Neto (1977); Lovrich, Stohr-Gillmore, Zupan, Menke, Stohr-Gillmore, and Goldman (1990); and the Bureau of Justice Statistics (1990). The profile questions included were considered essential to developing a comprehensive picture of the organization, operations, and programming of exclusively women's jails.

In order to adequately assess these dimensions, the questions included addressed the "Facility Status and Operations" such as the facility's age, the types of inmates held, and the programming provided. We also included questions on the types of personnel working for the particular facilities. In retrospect it is clear that some questions included in the form were unnecessary, and some other important ones were omitted. However, every effort was made to include the most significant areas of concern related to women's jails in a succinct format.

To supplement the profile form, the project staff developed a "Jail Interview Form" (see Appendix B) containing a list of questions to ask the facility administrators. These interviews were structured so that the same core of 20 questions was asked of all of the jail managers. Nevertheless, the questions were not arranged in a particular sequence, and they did not necessarily follow from one to another. Additionally, a number of follow-up questions were asked that related to the jail's particular locale or status. In this semi-structured format we asked questions relating to the background and history, current status and future prospects for the jails, their inmates and staff. Beyond these questions there were a variety of others dealing

with topics such as administrative styles, staff training, and whether the nation's drug wars had any effect on inmate populations. Originally these interviews were scheduled to take one hour, but invariably they took two to three hours and covered a wide range of issues related to jails generally, women's jails particularly, and managing staff and inmates.

A third instrument--a "Jail Observation Form"--also was developed to gauge the organizational nature of the jails visited (see Appendix C). This form was loosely constructed and was designed to elicit impressionistic information by the research team as each jail was visited. The 15 items included observations on staff/inmate and facility appearance, attitudes and opinions expressed by the staff and inmates, medical facilities available, visiting practices, the extent of crowding, staff and inmate programming, staff/inmate interaction, inmate and staff complaint procedures, and whether the jail was podular/direct supervision or traditional/linear in design and function.

All jail site visits, interviews and observation forms by two or more project staff were completed in July and August, 1992. All profile forms were completed in July, 1992 and covered the year August, 1991 to July, 1992. For purposes of anonymity, the five jails included in this report are numbered one through five in the following tables and are identified through the corresponding pseudonyms of Pacific Shores (Jail 1), Port City (Jail 2), Central Valley (Jail 3), Atlantic Shores (Jail 4), and Bay View (Jail 5).

Our analysis indicates that the jails are similar on a number of characteristics, but there are differences as well.

For example, all of these jails were overcrowded, except the Atlantic Shores Jail; three (Pacific Shores, Port City, and Bay View) were almost 50% over rated capacity, and one (the Bay View Jail) was almost 104% over capacity. These numbers are derived from Table 1 where rated capacity can be compared with the actual number of inmates housed. As a result of these numbers, all of these jails were under court order to limit inmate populations, with the exception of the Bay View Jail.

We know from the research team's observation forms that general crowding figures rarely provide a complete picture. For instance, it was not uncommon to find some housing units in the "crowded" facilities that actually had excess space. However, the same facilities had some housing units that were filled with two to three times the number of inmates they were built to contain. We conclude from this that aggregate capacity figures may be misleading and that a true sense of jail crowding needs to be examined by living units.

Among the differences in the jails, it is notable that there was one "old" jail (Port City opened in 1957) and one "new" jail (Atlantic Shores opened in 1991). The Atlantic Shores Jail is unique in that it is really a combined women's jail and state prison. This is an unusual arrangement and it is found only in a small number of states. This combined status makes Atlantic Shores an exceptional case on a number of different variables. Nevertheless, we included Atlantic Shores in this research both *despite* and *because* of its unique status. "Because" for states and counties that are highly urbanized, but compact, the Atlantic Shores Jail may serve as a model for program provision to county

and state female inmates who may be shortchanged due to numbers if they are housed separately or in men's facilities. Also "because" we as jail researchers had never had the opportunity to visit such a facility, and we were frankly curious about its operation. "Despite" as the Atlantic Shores Jail is not comparable in some areas, but given the small number of exclusively women's jails and their dispersion nationwide, it is likely that there are as many exceptions as norms in the status of these jails.

The other three jails are less than 15 years old and were opened within three years of each other, from 1977 to 1980. Three of the jails (Pacific Shores, Port City, and Central Valley) are part of a sheriff's department, a common arrangement nationwide, and the other two jails (Bay View and Atlantic Shores) are part of separate corrections departments.

Only one jail, Pacific Shores, indicated that they were not under court order regarding the general conditions of confinement, were not awaiting the outcome of such a lawsuit or had not made a settlement within the last year. Of the four jails providing information on "disruptions" (e.g., altercations and infractions), the Pacific Shores Jail particularly and, to a lesser extent, the Port City Jail report the greatest number of inmate-to-inmate infractions and the most inmate-to-staff altercations. Given its smaller size, compared to the other four jails, the number of altercations reported by the Port City Jail seems out of line. Also of importance is that for all the jails reporting this information, the number of inmate-to-staff altercations is always much less than that of inmate-to-inmate. In

addition, we know from our interviews with the facility managers and our observations of inmate-to-staff and staff-to-inmate interactions that it was a rare event when an altercation became physical.

Relatedly, all of the jail managers observed that women and men present different inmate management challenges. They also noted, and we observed, that the women questioned staff a great deal and enjoyed verbal interaction with the staff and research project personnel. The managers reported that women, unlike men who "snitch," were not afraid to report infractions by other inmates to the staff, often openly before the offending inmate.

There appears to be no linkage across the jails on common types of minor infractions (see Table 1). In fact, the only minor infraction mentioned by two jails (Port City and Bay View) is relative to abusive/profane language. There is slightly more agreement across the jails on major infractions: all of the jails mentioned "fighting/assaults" as one of the three most common major infractions and two jails (Pacific Shores and Central Valley) mentioned "dangerous contraband" as another common major infraction.

The jails were also asked to provide information on the number of deaths, diagnosed mentally ill, and HIV-positive inmates (see Table 1). The number of mentally ill jail inmates is perhaps reflective of the national trend to incarcerate those people who are too mentally disturbed to remain on the streets, but who are not so severely disabled to merit space in mental health facilities. Notably, the largest jails examined (Pacific Shores and Bay View) had the staff equipped to diagnose, were

located in more urbanized areas, and reported more mentally disturbed people in their care.

The HIV figures are probably not reflective of actual incarceration levels of such afflicted persons in these jails. The facility managers often remarked that they purposefully did not pursue investigating the prevalence of this disease in their facilities, as they feared such inmates would receive unfavorable treatment from other inmates and staff alike; the exception was the Bay View Jail in this regard. The primary health management concern expressed by several of the managers was not HIV/AIDS, but rather the spread of a new and resistant strain of tuberculosis that they feared was finding fertile ground in their jails.

Staff and Inmate Characteristics

Tables 2 and 3 present the staff and inmate characteristics provided by the institutional profiles. Interestingly, most of the jail staffs are predominately female (more will be discussed on this in the following section on the staff). Although in all of the jails the chief administrator was a white male and many of his top assistants were also male (although not necessarily white), we did observe that many women, particularly African-American and Hispanic women, held supervisory positions in a number of these jails. In two jails (Atlantic Shores and Bay View) an African-American woman was the second-in-command, and in the Bay View Jail the vast majority of supervisory and lower level correctional officer positions were occupied by African-American women.

Staff race/ethnicity, as indicated in Table 2, is predomi-

nately white for the four jails providing this information, but with significant representation by African-Americans in two of these jails (Atlantic Shores and Bay View), and secondary representation by Hispanics in two jails (less than whites, but more than African-Americans in the Port City Jail and less than African-Americans, but more than whites in the Bay View Jail).

These figures are given more context when staff race/ethnicity (Table 2) is viewed in conjunction with inmate race/ethnicity (Table 3). As indicated on Tables 2 and 3, African-Americans are the predominate inmate racial group in the two jails for which their staff numbers are highest (Atlantic Shores and Bay View). However, among the four jails providing both staff and inmate race/ethnicity information, African-American staff members are under-represented in three jails (Port City, Central Valley, and Atlantic Shores) and over-represented in one jail (Bay View). The finding of over-representation of African-American personnel in the Bay View Jail is quite unique in criminal justice, especially when one also considers that females are this staff's predominate gender.

As noted in Table 3, Hispanic inmates are the largest ethnic group in only one jail (Pacific Shores), but they are the second largest group in two others (Port City and Central Valley). As indicated in Table 2, Hispanics were significantly represented on the jail staff at only one of the four facilities providing this information (Bay View), and at this jail they may be slightly over-represented. At the Bay View Jail the project staff had some concern that the designations "Hispanic," "white," and "African-American" are not distinctive enough to capture the

differences among those persons who in one context might consider themselves "Hispanic," but who might look like another racial or ethnic group. We believe that given the unique location of the Bay View Jail it is possible that inmates and staff who would choose the designation "white" or "African-American" in one context, might also be considered "Hispanic" in another context. Nevertheless, based on the figures available, it appears that Hispanics are also under-represented on three jails' staffs (Port City, Central Valley, and Atlantic Shores), when inmate ethnicity is considered.

As Table 3 indicates, white inmates are the predominate group in the Port City, Central Valley, and Atlantic Shores Jails. The staff ethnicity figures in Table 2 would indicate that although whites are the predominate inmate group in two of the jails in which they are also the largest staff ethnicity grouping (Port City and Central Valley Jails), it is clear that they are disproportionately over-represented here. That is, although whites constitute only 39% and 67% of the Port City and Central Valley inmate populations respectively, their staffs are 70% and 90% white. Whites are also over-represented on the Atlantic Shores Jail's staff, relative to inmate populations, but under-represented in the Bay View Jail.

Staff Employment Status

Staff employment status is also delineated in Table 2. Clearly, most staff members are on full-time payroll status, and the largest group is full-time correctional (custodial) staff. In the larger jails, particularly Pacific Shores and Bay View,

there are more staff designated in other than correctional roles, indicating a greater diversity in programming options and services available in these facilities. Significantly, the bulk of the programming staff, such as educational and medical (with the exception of Pacific Shores and its payroll medical staff) are nonpayroll, and thus programming needs, if they are met, are provided by ancillary city, county, state, or federal agencies.

Inmate Status and Programming

Illustrated on Table 3 is the status of the female inmates. In the Port City and Bay View Jails, 70% and 59% of the inmates respectively are awaiting arraignment or trial and in the Pacific Shores, Central Valley, and Atlantic Shores Jails, 52%, 44%, and 78% of the inmates respectively are serving sentences. This is not a surprising finding for the Atlantic Shores Jail given its combined status as a women's jail and prison. However, these are unusual distributions for jails nationally as the *Annual Survey of Jails* (1989, 1990) indicates that approximately 49% of adult jail inmates are convicted and 51% are unconvicted (see also Jankowski, 1992: 8).

Inmate status is important, especially in regard to program types and amounts that are available. On Table 4 the programming offered by the jails in this study is listed. As indicated by this table, all of the jails have some sort of inmate work release available, whether administered by the facility itself or by some other connected jail or correctional institution. We know from the jail manager interviews, however, that work release was only available to women who were convicted and sentenced, had

a moderate amount of time left to serve, and who were low risks in terms of escapes and offense seriousness.

Exercise facilities were limited in the Port City and Central Valley Jails (see Table 4). In the Port City Jail there was no indoor recreation, although outdoor recreation was available; in the Central Valley Jail there was no indoor or outdoor recreation specifically provided, although an "other" category was marked and unspecified on the profile form. The three other jails indicated that they provided both indoor and outdoor recreation, albeit limited by staff, space, and time constraints.

In reality, we know from personal observations and the jail manager interviews that recreational opportunities were quite limited in the jails, with the possible exception of the Pacific Shores Jail. Even in this jail, where there were numerous and quite interesting recreational opportunities offered, the inmates complained that most of the time, and except for sentenced inmates, recreation consisted of sitting in the sunshine on a picnic table. It is possible that the formal offerings in this and the other jails did not always translate into regularly scheduled events. But it is also possible, as one jail manager observed, that the women cannot get enough programming. In general, he thought that the women, unlike many of the male inmates he had supervised, are very receptive to learning, improvement, and a variety of programming opportunities.

Of the regular programming indicated in Table 4, all of the jails note that they provide or facilitate the following: GED, Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, church services, law library, self esteem/self worth classes, and information on

sexually transmitted diseases. None of these jails provide or facilitate college level courses or daycare for inmates' children.

Only a few jails provide or facilitate correspondence courses (Atlantic Shores), work training (Pacific Shores and Bay View), anger management (Pacific Shores), stress management (Pacific Shores and Port City), and communication skills (Pacific Shores). Based on these reported data, our interviews with managers, and site observations, the Pacific Shores Jail does appear overall to provide the most inmate programming. The Pacific Shores Jail's administrator attributed this level of programming to the activity of community groups who have taken an intense interest in this women's jail.

It should be noted that access to virtually all of the programming, particularly that which involves facility money and which cannot be delivered within the space of a few hours is restricted. All of the jails reported that access is granted based on inmate requests, with two jails (Pacific Shores and Atlantic Shores) also citing other factors such as need and seniority. But the reality for these jails is that they have limited programming resources, and they tend to focus these resources on women who will be at the jail long enough to complete the specific program(s). Therefore, pretrial, unconvicted, or unsentenced women, or those women presumed to be innocent, are disadvantaged by their status relative to the generally more serious and convicted inmates.

On Table 5 medical screening and programming for all facilities is reported. As this table indicates, all jails except

Pacific Shores provide a mix of medical/physical exams and lab tests, including at least blood tests and chest x-rays. In the Pacific Shores Jail such medical care is restricted to only the obviously sick and may be an artifact of this jail's large inmate population relative to the other four jails.

All jails indicate daily scheduling of doctors, nurses, and mental health personnel, with the exception of Atlantic Shores which schedules only the nurse daily and the doctor and mental health personnel weekly. Dental scheduling is done on a weekly basis with the exception of the Port City Jail which schedules the dentist monthly. Again, short-term, or presumed short-term, inmates, because of their status, may be disadvantaged in those jails which do not schedule medical personnel daily.

With the exception of Pacific Shores, and a daytime infirmary in the Atlantic Shores and Bay View Jails, none of the jails provide medical facilities for their incarcerated women. We know from the jail manager interviews, however, that all of the jails have agreements with local medical facilities to care for inmates with serious medical conditions. Not having a facility on the premises, especially with the generally poor health and low economic resources of the inmates, gives these women an added burden in securing adequate medical care.

Inmate visiting privileges

Table 6 indicates who may visit, how long they may visit, and whether the policies allow contact or only noncontact visits. Visiting ranges from 26 hours per week in the Pacific Shores Jail to 56 hours in the Bay View Jail. Anyone may visit in all the

jails, although the number of times one may visit per week and the number of minutes of each visit may be restricted. Emergency visits are allowed in these jails, but contact visits are limited to lawyers in all the jails, and to children and spouses in most (the Port City Jail allows inmates contact visits with children and the Pacific Shores and Port City Jails allow contact visits with spouses). Significant others are allowed contact visits only in the Central Valley and Bay View Jails. No conjugal visits are allowed in any of the jails, although the Atlantic Shores Jail does allow overnight visits for convicted women's children.

However, we know from the jail manager interviews and our observations that visiting and contact with the outside world may be more restricted than these figures indicate. For instance, contact visits in the Pacific Shores Jail with children were limited to mothers and babies, but not older children. In the Central Valley Jail contact visits were allowed only for women at the honor farm. Also, all of these jails had installed collect phone call systems, even for local calls, as both cost cutting and inmate fund-generating measures. Bay View installed this system the week before our visit and the inmates bitterly complained about such a system. In fact, many of the inmates complained that they could have little or no meaningful contact with their children as it was too expensive for their children's caretakers to accept their calls.

Additional Interview and Observational Data

The interview and observation data provide additional infor-

mation about the status of these five jails. Similar responses and observations indicate that all of these jails were financially strapped. Their counties, and the state in the case of Atlantic Shores, were in budgetary crises, and the jail managers were not hopeful of garnering additional finances in the short term. Therefore, the managers were considering "creative" and low cost solutions to space and programming needs that the jails and inmates might have.

Four of the managers considered themselves "participatory managers," but said that lower level supervisory and other correctional staff were "more directive" or "authoritarian." The Pacific Shores manager, who had only been in his position for six months, indicated that he was a "transition" manager. The facility administrators attributed the management style differences among the various levels to the day-to-day, task-related requirements of lower staff positions (i.e., getting people fed or to sick call), differences in education and experience (the administrators generally had more of both), and the administrator's elevated vantage point.

Our observations indicate that these are intelligent, proactive managers who were familiar with the current corrections literature. All of them belonged to and participated in state, regional, and national jail associations, and all of them had several years of college credit, a bachelor's degree, or a master's degree. We did note, however, that whatever their intentions were some were more participatory in their approach to management than were others. This especially became clear as we toured the facilities and saw that some managers were more aware

of how the facility operated, who the staff and inmates were by name, and by their answers to our questions. The Atlantic Shores Jail manager put it best when he explained, as we were eating lunch in the inmate dining room, "You don't see all of the inmates lining up to see me because they know that I'm always around, they can talk to me anytime."

Another question included in the structured interview had to do with the federal drug war's impact on inmate populations. Although all of the managers believed that the vast majority of the women inmates were incarcerated for drug violations, or that their offense was in some way related to drugs, none of the managers believed that the drug war in-and-of itself was having an effect on their populations. As three of the managers explained, the drug war was having no effect on their jails because it seemed to be having no effect on drug usage in the larger community.

When asked why their county had a separate women's jail, most of the managers were not sure, with the exception of the Atlantic Shores Jail and its combined jail/prison population. Some noted that the critical mass of inmates had been reached at some point so that economies of scale would allow a separate women's jail, or that state law required separation of men and women. Most were also unsure as to whether having a separate women's jail was really beneficial in terms of programs or staff treatment. Although one of the managers did remark that when women were housed at the central jail, which housed men and women before the separate women's facility opened, women were considered a "nuisance" and that it was only after opening the women's

jail that inmates received specific programming.

Summary

Our jail profile indicates that these facilities, their staffs and inmates have a number of unmet needs. Four of the five jails in this study were overcrowded, and all of the jail managers were concerned about meeting inmates' health care and other programming needs. Some managers and staff expressed concerns about their ability to meet staff needs for training, stress reduction, and more officers to share the workload. The inmates were concerned about facility operations, but they also were worried about how to keep their families together (given visiting and phone restrictions), how to deal with their legal concerns, and how they were going to support themselves and their children once released from jail.

Our profile also indicates that some jails are providing or facilitating a wide variety of program options for female inmates. But, in general, programming for women in jail remains limited primarily to sentenced inmates and the work programs tend to be sex-role stereotyped (e.g., sewing and cosmetology), with some computer operations for those in need of remedial educational help.

There are several possible explanations for the types of programs offered for women. First, most of the traditional women's programs (e.g., sewing) are low in cost and take relatively little jail space. Second, it is possible that these efforts are viewed stereotypically as "appropriate" programs for women by facility administrators. If this is the case, many

programs put in place decades ago may persist based on institutional inertia alone. Finally, programming efforts such as sewing and cosmetology may be seen not so much as providing job skills, but simply as providing something for inmates to do. There was clearly an indication of this in one jail where sewing classes were offered at the advanced level, but not for those learning to sew.

Our profile also indicates that the women's jails we visited are headed by men, but operated largely by women. Their staffs are still white-dominated, but there appears to be a healthy mix of racial and ethnic groups among the staff. This is likely to increase, and in some jails the keepers reflect the population of those being kept.

Our profile of these exclusively women's jails also reflects the larger social, political, and economic realities that create and sustain them. These are jails and inmates beleaguered with a number of problems typical of mixed population jails and their inmates. Mixed population jails also wrestle with overcrowding, understaffing, poor programming, and inadequate facilities. A central difference is that since these jails incarcerate only women, inmate needs and behaviors are different, just as to some extent the needs and behaviors of men and women in the larger society vary.

The final issue addressed by the profiles is the future of exclusively women's jails. Two of the counties included in this research are in the process of moving into new, podular design direct supervision jails. In doing this, the exclusively men's and women's jails will be merged. It remains to be seen whether

this move will significantly improve the status of female inmates.

STAFF PROFILES

The staff profile developed in this section is based on the results of questionnaires sent to the facilities prior to the research team's arrival. An attempt was made to provide staff members in all assignments and on all shifts with questionnaires. In most facilities the administrator or his designated representative was responsible for distributing the questionnaires. To insure confidentiality, staff members were asked not to include their names on the forms and they were allowed to return them in sealed envelopes directly to the research team in person or by mail. In most instances employees were permitted to complete the forms while they were on duty.

The overall staff response rate was 37.8% but rates varied greatly by facility: at the Pacific Shores Jail 156 questionnaires were distributed and 62 were returned (a return rate of 40%); at the Port City Jail 30 questionnaires were distributed and 24 were returned (an 80% response rate); Central Valley distributed 29 questionnaires and had 16 returned (a 55% response); the Bay View Jail had a 39% response rate (20 of 56 questionnaires administered); and the Atlantic Shores Jail only had an 18% response rate (19 of 110 questionnaires administered). Several factors apparently contributed to the divergent response rates. The jails' custody staffs work quite a few different shift arrangements, including 10 or 12 hour shifts at some jails. The particular shift assignments made questionnaire distribution,

collection, and follow-up difficult. Some of the employees were on sick leave or days off when the site visits were scheduled (we would estimate about 10%). The jurisdiction one jail was in suffered a major natural disaster that interrupted all governmental services shortly after our visit. And, finally, the managers differed in their interest in the results and emphasis on employees completing the questionnaires.

The questionnaires were quite extensive (12 pages in length) and in them we asked for a variety of socio-demographic information (including age, gender, race/ethnicity, job title, and length of employment). Also of interest were attitudes toward inmates, staff and inmate programming, job satisfaction and job design questions, staff training questions, and reports of sexual harassment.

Job Titles

In Table 7 the responses by jail according to the respondents' job titles/ranks are shown. As is apparent, the vast majority of the respondents--123 or slightly over 87%--were correctional officers. Uniformed custody personnel of all ranks comprised 96.5% of the respondents. While the percentages varied by jail, in each facility more than three-fourths of those who returned questionnaires were correctional officers, or some variant of that title.

Ages

Table 7 also contains information on the respondents' ages.

Most could be described as young to median-age adults: 53 (37.6%) were between the ages of 22 and 29; another 50 reported being between 30 and 39; altogether, 73% of the respondents were younger than 40.

Staff Gender

In terms of staff gender, the best available evidence to date has indicated that the percentage of female correctional officers in jails ranges from 21.5% (Zupan, 1992: 328) to 22.6% (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1991: 22-23). However, these figures include all jails and not just exclusively women's jails.

As is indicated on Table 7, 80% of the respondents (113) were female. The two largest jails visited, Pacific Shores and Bay View, employed roughly 70% female staffs. The Atlantic Shores Jail had 100% female respondents. The gender percentages of the respondents were within 2-3% of the total staff percentages reported in the facility profiles, with the exception of the Atlantic Shores Jail. Again, the most notable deviations on gender were the chief administrators of the facilities, all five of whom were white males.

Staff Race/Ethnicity

In terms of race/ethnicity, nearly 54% of the staff respondents were white (Caucasian). The second most common group, slightly more than one-fourth, was African-Americans. Three jails were notable in terms of their racial/ethnic compositions. The Central Valley Jail had 16 staff respondents and all 16 of these individuals were white. In the Atlantic Shores Jail the

majority of the staff members were African-American (10 of 19, or 52.6%). The largest proportion of minority staff members was present at the Bay View Jail: 70% African-American, 15% Hispanic, and 5% other. For this jail 90% of the respondents represent racial/ethnic minority groups. As previously mentioned, the conspicuous exception at this jail was the chief administrative officer.

Educational Levels

The final staff characteristic examined dealt with education levels. First, as Table 7 illustrates, the staff members responding to the questionnaire are a relatively well-educated group. This may be a function of the number of female staff members, many of whom tend to be better educated than their male counterparts (see, especially, Zupan, 1992: 328-329). Only six people had not earned a high school diploma or GED and only one respondent out of the 141 had only a high school diploma. If we combine some of the categories of responses we see that about two-thirds had some college or an associate's degree, 14% had a bachelor's degree, and 12.8% had some graduate credits or a graduate degree. The total of all those indicating some college attendance is 93%. It is important to remember, however, that these jails, unlike many others, are located in major metropolitan areas which offer a variety of educational opportunities.

Length of Service

The last section of Table 7 provides information on length of employment. It is apparent from the employees' ages, since

most are reasonably young, that there are few long-term staff members in most of these jails. For example, the most frequently mentioned length of employment was between 0-12 months (31.2%), followed by 13-24 months (25.5%). In fact, almost 83% of the respondents had worked in the present facility fewer than four years.

Staff Work Descriptors

Table 8 contains a variety of factors associated with the respondents' jobs and assignments. For example, the first part of the table shows that a majority of respondents in three jails (Pacific Shores, Atlantic Shores, and Bay View) work the day shift. The most common response for the Port City and Central Valley Jails was the swing (afternoon) shift: 33.3% and 25% respectively. These slightly skewed responses are most likely the result of two factors: (1) because of court visits and inmate movement many jails have more custody officers working the day shift than any other shift, and (2) we typically visited the jails during the day shift and collected most of the staff questionnaires at this time. The small number of "other" responses can be explained by those employees who work fill-in or replacement shifts and those who are assigned to facilities with 10 or 12 hour shift assignments.

Table 8 also illustrates that the vast majority of the staff members had not worked in a jail prior to their present position. Furthermore, most of the respondents had not held any other position in the criminal justice system prior to their current employment.

Negative inmate interactions are also reported in Table 8. These range from fairly mild sorts of events (e.g., having a grievance filed against them by an inmate to those rare events with very grave consequences (e.g., being taken hostage by an inmate or receiving an injury requiring hospitalization). As can be seen from the table, quite a few staff members (especially those in the Port City, Central Valley, and Atlantic Shores Jails) have had grievances filed against them. A majority of the respondents from the Port City and Central Valley Jails (65.2% and 56.3% respectively) noted receiving a minor injury. By contrast, very few respondents have received an injury requiring hospitalization or been sued by an inmate. Only one respondent (from the Bay View Jail) indicated that he/she had been taken hostage by an inmate.

Staff Training

While the respondents' educational levels were remarkably high, another measure of job-preparedness involves the types, amounts, and utility of the training provided. The most global assessment of training was addressed by the question: "How would you describe the training you received when first hired at this facility?" Respondents were given a scale ranging from 1 (Not much training) to 7 (A great deal of training). They were also given the option of answering "undecided." Table 9 shows that only 15.6% (22) of the respondents indicated that they had not received much training when they were first employed (Categories 1, 2, 3). Although the percentages differ by facility, the

absolute values are remarkably similar (the apparent exception was the Bay View Jail where 30% of the respondents felt they had not received much initial training). Almost equal numbers of respondents indicated that they had received moderate amounts (Categories 4 and 5) to a great deal (Categories 6 and 7) of initial training (39% and 39.7% respectively).

Staff members were also asked: "In which of the following areas have you received in-service training?" Table 9 lists the responses by category and by facility. One response category ("Other--specify") is omitted from this table because of the range of responses. Respondents could check as many answers as applicable, and while there was some variety in responses, there clearly were topics that seemed to form a consistent core of in-service jail training subjects. For example, at least 70% of the respondents had been given the following types of in-service training: (1) first aid (82.9%), (2) facility policies and procedures (80.1%); (3) report writing (73.8%); (4) physical restraint techniques (73%), and (5) self defense (72.3%). None of these topics seems unusual for a jail setting, and each one addresses a specific skill area normally associated with day-to-day jail operations.

In addition to indicating the in-service training information they had received, the survey respondents were asked: "Of the job training subjects listed above, which three do you believe are the most important for an employee in your position in this facility?" It is vital to remember that although there were a few exceptions, the vast majority of the subjects completing the questionnaires were involved in the custody function within

the jails.

For the first most important in-service training subject, the two most commonly occurring answers were "interpersonal skills" and "facility policies and procedures," with 36 and 32 responses respectively (see Table 9) . The largest second most important training topic categories were "problem solving and decision making" and "interpersonal skills" again. The third most important job training subject responses were "report writing" and "facility policies and procedures."

It is interesting to note that of the five most common in-service training topics included in Table 9, only "facility policies and procedures" and "report writing" show up among those ranked most valuable. The "mechanical" or "technical" kinds of training were joined by the people-oriented subjects of "interpersonal skills" and "problem solving and decision making" (subjects in which 69.5% and 63% of the respondents received training). This finding highlights the social service and professional attributes of the correctional officer job in modern jails and appears to be a common sentiment expressed by officers in mixed gender facilities as well (see, e.g., Stohr, 1990).

Additionally, the staff members were asked: "Overall how would you evaluate the usefulness of the in-service training you have received?" As was the case with initial training, respondents were given a seven-point scale for answers ranging from not very useful to very useful (or undecided). The last section of Table 9 shows that 9.9% (14) of the respondents felt that their in-service training was not very useful (Categories 1, 2, and 3). Fifty-two (36.9%) responded that in-service training has been

moderately useful (Categories 4 and 5), and 69 (48.9%) felt that such training was very useful.

These results are consistent with jail managers' opinions in a National Institute of Justice survey (Guynes, 1988). The following list shows the percentages of managers identifying these topics as training needs in their jails (Guynes, 1988: 4-5):

Stress management	75%
Special problem inmates	69%
Liability issues	64%
Interpersonal relations	62%
Crisis intervention	61%
Management training	48%
Handling persons with AIDS	47%
Security	44%
Emergency medical procedures	41%

The fairly low percentages for "security" and "emergency medical procedures" may indicate the degree to which these particular areas are part of traditional and contemporary jail training. However, as Guynes (1988: 5) notes, an increase in professionalism by jail managers and custodial employees may necessitate a change in training orientation to include topics such as stress management, crisis intervention, and dealing with special problems inmates.

Staff Perceptions of Inmate Programming

One way to measure attentiveness to or awareness of inmates' needs is to ask staff members about their facility's inmate pro-

grams. This can become particularly telling when staff opinions are compared with inmate perceptions of the types and levels of programming available.

As Table 10 illustrates, staff respondents are aware of inmate programming at differing levels (perhaps corresponding to the actual presence of these programs). Based on staff perceptions, the most consistently offered programs (90%+) across the jails include GED preparation, Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous (with one exception), church services, and law library/legal reference materials.

Table 11 shows that the programs' perceived utility varies from jail to jail. However, the most frequently occurring answers for program utility include GED preparation, vocational training, and "other alcohol" (meaning alcohol treatment programs other than Alcoholics Anonymous). In all likelihood, these programs are consistent with both staff perceptions of inmates' needs and inmates' perceptions of their own programming needs.

Summary

We can now summarize some of the staff characteristics of the five exclusively women's jails from the baseline data developed from the staff survey. Given the relative lack of information on these facilities' staffs, this information is important for future hiring, training, and retention efforts.

First, the survey respondents are overwhelmingly female, white, and fairly well-educated. They are reasonably young, most have worked in their present facility for fewer than two years and, as one might expect, most are correctional officers or are

assigned to the custody role in some capacity, including supervisors. Many of them were working the day shift at the time of the site visits, and most had not held another position in the criminal justice system prior to being employed in their present facility.

Second, in terms of training, most respondents indicated that they had received a moderate amount to a great deal of initial training, and many acknowledged being exposed to a variety of in-service training courses as well. The most common in-service training subjects can be classified as "technical" or "mechanical" in nature (first aid, report writing, self defense, etc.). Overwhelmingly, the staff respondents indicated that their in-service training was moderately to very useful.

Third, it is apparent that the traditional assumptions about jail custodial personnel being stuck in dead-end jobs with few employment prospects are inappropriate here. Given the training and the staff educational levels in the five jails in this study, many of the employees had a variety of employment options open to them (for example, we met one correctional officer who had a college degree in accounting) and most were working in the jails because they chose to be there.

Fourth, with a relatively young and well-educated staff, one of the challenges facing the facility administrators is keeping these employees satisfied once they have gained experience. Because of the somewhat flat organizational patterns of most jails, there is a lack of promotional opportunities. Over half of the managers in a national survey (Guynes, 1988: 4) cited low salaries and lack of career advancement potential as contributing

to personnel retention problems.

Fifth, in almost every jurisdiction where these jails are located there were additional, and often more lucrative, employment prospects with state or federal prison facilities. It is important to note once again that over one-half of the staff members who returned questionnaires had been in their present institutions fewer than two years; for them the job was still new and interesting. The clear implication of such a situation is that jail administrators must have well-articulated career development plans in place and they should be prepared to involve staff members at all levels in the decision-making process.

Sixth, top-level jail executives must carefully examine the types of initial and in-service training programs offered. It goes without saying that certain types of basic training procedures must be provided (e.g., first aid, policies and procedures, self defense, and physical restraint techniques), but jail custody work is very people-intensive, people-oriented work. Therefore, jail personnel need more than a token amount of training in interpersonal skills and problem solving and decision making.

Finally, staff respondents recognize that inmates are provided a variety of programs within their jails. Among the apparently most useful programs are those aimed at educational achievement (GED preparation), job training (vocational programs), and substance abuse treatment and counseling (particularly programs aimed at dealing with alcoholism).

INMATE PROFILES

A total of 566 individuals filled out and returned the

inmate questionnaires. Response rates to the questionnaires varied somewhat from facility to facility. Sometimes these differences were attributable to our timing in reaching inmate housing units (e.g., in a couple of instances inmates were called to meals during administration of the questionnaires) or at other times inmates and their units (or some part of the unit) might be at the infirmary for medication or other medical assistance, and some were called for visits or court in the middle of the questionnaire administration.

The Pacific Shores Jail had a return rate of 82% with 285 questionnaires distributed and 244 complete and usable questionnaires returned (62% of the inmate count for that day were included). A reasonably high return rate was also achieved in three other jails with return rates of 88% in Port City (92 distributed, 81 returned and 85% of facility inmates included), 70% in Central Valley (91 distributed, 63 returned and 96% of facility inmates included), and 74% in Bay View (179 distributed, 133 returned and 64% of facility inmates included). The exception was the Atlantic Shores Jail (the combined jail and prison) where our return rate and percent of inmates included was lower than in the other facilities with a 68% return rate (66 distributed, 45 returned and 34% of facility inmates included). We attribute these lower percentages in Atlantic Shores to miscommunication with the facility administrator about the questionnaire distribution plan, happenstance and poor timing on the research team's part in reaching some of the housing units. Notably, in all of the jails we made every effort to include as many inmates in this research as was possible. There was not systematic exclusion of

any inmates or group of inmates that we could discern, except in a couple of facilities when we were not allowed to survey any or all of the inmates in segregation who were believed to be too dangerous or disruptive to participate, or some medically impaired inmates who were too ill or contagious to include. The number of identified dangerous/disruptive or medically impaired inmates in a given jail was usually quite low, so that their exclusion is unlikely to impact the validity of these responses. As a result of our efforts there was a better response rate for the inmates than for staff members because the research team distributed the forms in individual housing units and waited until the inmates completed them.

A small, but apparent, number refused to accept or complete the forms. In most instances, we learned from staff members and other inmates, the refusals were the result of inmates being under the influence of medication or, more frequently, the inability to adequately read and comprehend the questions. To enhance the return rate we offered to read the questions to inmates who could not read them themselves, and we also had questionnaires available in Spanish in all of the facilities.

Many inmates took great delight in completing the questionnaires, and in most of the housing units the research team's presence could be described as something of a social event. What should have taken 20 to 30 minutes often took longer than one hour as a result of inmates discussing and commenting upon the survey with other inmates, the correctional staff, and especially with the researchers.

As Table 12 illustrates, and as our own observations con-

firm, the Pacific Shores (Jail 1) and Bay View (Jail 5) facilities had moderately large average daily populations (see also Table 1). The other three jails should be considered medium-to-small in size.

Age

Table 12 also shows the similarities in inmates' average ages across jails. In comparison with Table 7, the inmate and staff average ages are similar in the Pacific Shores and Port City Jails, and depart by only four to five years in the other three jails. For the inmates, the range in the means is only from 30.0 (Atlantic Shores) to 33.9 (Bay View) years of age. We saw some young women in their late teens or early-20s and, on occasion, we would see an inmate in the 60+ age group. However, as the standard deviations indicate, most inmates were in their late-20s to late-30s.

Race/Ethnicity

The race/ethnicity variable already has been discussed in the institutional profile section. However, those figures were supplied by the facility administrators. As a verification of these figures and perhaps as a more accurate measure of this variable (especially for inmates who might fall into the Hispanic or "other" categories), we asked inmates personally to indicate their race/ethnicity on the inmate survey forms. The following list (taken from Table 12) shows the dominate racial/ethnic group in each of the five jails:

Pacific Shores -- white (Caucasian) 39.7%

Port City --	white (Caucasian)	42.3%
Central Valley --	white (Caucasian)	51.6%
Atlantic Shores --	African-American	76.2%
Bay View --	African-American	48.4%

With only two exceptions (clearly Atlantic Shores and Central Valley to a slight extent), the jails seldom had a majority racial/ethnic group. In some instances (e.g., Pacific Shores) the jails were very racially/ethnically diverse.

Education

One of the most persistent concerns about male and female jail inmates in the United States is their lack of educational achievement and the impact this may have on vocational suitability and job-preparedness. As Table 12 clearly shows, slightly more than one-third of the inmates in all of the jails did not possess a high school diploma or GED (40% in the Atlantic Shores Jail and nearly as many in the Pacific Shores Jail). The remaining percentages cannot be summed since multiple answers were allowed.

Two other observations concerning education seem warranted. First, it is interesting to note that over one-half (except in the Central Valley Jail) of the inmate respondents acknowledged receiving some vocational training; this could have come, for a few, during periods of incarceration. Second, between one-in-five and one-in-three inmates said they had accumulated some college credits. Assuming the accuracy of these answers, the

jail populations represent extremes: those relatively poorly educated and those reasonably well-educated.

Marital Status

With the exception of the Atlantic Shores Jail, where 61.4% of the inmates are single, no clear pattern of marital status emerges in the other four jails. Discounting Atlantic Shores, roughly equal numbers are legally married (17.5-26%), in a common law relationship (14.3-20.6%), single (20.8-34.7%), or separated or divorced (20.6-27.3%).

Employment Status/Income

The final sections of Table 12 contain the data on inmates' employments status and their monthly/yearly incomes prior to their arrests. Consistently, across the five jails, nearly two-thirds of the inmates were unemployed at the time of arrest. Although the distinction is not made here, the employment figures include those employed both full time and part time.

As a follow up to employment, inmates were asked "Prior to your arrest what was your usual monthly income?" and "Prior to your arrest what was your total income for the previous year?" Median monthly income ranged from \$525 (Atlantic Shores) to \$800 (Pacific Shores). Median yearly income was in the range of \$8,808 (Port City) to \$12,000 (Atlantic Shores and Bay View). Although these figures do not distinguish between those women working part time and those working full time, the absolute dollar amounts place many of these women in the lowest economic strata of their communities.

Inmate Criminal Histories

Table 13 provides data on the respondents' criminal histories. The average ages at first arrest are remarkably similar: the average for two jails (Pacific Shores and Atlantic Shores) is the same, and four jails are within 1.5 years of each other (Bay View being the exception). However, the standard deviations here indicate that a number of these women were first arrested as juveniles.

Another indicator of criminal history is the number of times the respondents have been in jail or prison before. From 15% (Central Valley) to 38.9% (Bay View) of the respondents said they had never been incarcerated before. Of those with previous periods of incarceration, the averages were between 3.0 (Atlantic Shores) and 7.3 (Central Valley) times each.

Fewer than one-in-five (17.7%) inmates in the Central Valley Jail had never served time as an adult before. This number reached a majority (54.5%) for Atlantic Shores. The notable features concerning whether the respondents had served time as adults include: fairly small numbers had been on "probation only" (from 1.3-11.4%); except for Atlantic Shores and Bay View, many of the women in the other three jails had done "jail only" time (42.6-52%); very small numbers had done "prison only" time (Atlantic Shores and its unique status being the exception here); and varying numbers of the women (between 2.3-10.7%) had served more than one type of adult disposition.

The final sections of Table 13 deal with probation dispositions. While relatively few women (1.3-11.4%) had served "proba-

tion only" sentences, a sizable number (between 43.0-67.9%) had been on probation at some time. Most had not been placed on probation as juveniles (from 76.2-93.7%), and a majority or nearly a majority had never been on probation as adults.

The figures reported in Table 13 lead us to conclude several things. Many of the inmate respondents, like the jail correctional officers, are in their early-20s. From about one-sixth to one-third had never been in prison or jail before, but of those who had, multiple periods of incarceration (e.g., five or six times) were not unusual. Some of these women have been on probation, a few have been to prison, and some have served more than one type of sentence as an adult. Most, however, have served jail time only or have never served any adult sentence. For the latter group, and for those who had only been on probation, adjustment to incarceration can prove fairly difficult.

Institutional Status

Table 14 contains a variety of information on the inmates' statuses within the five jails examined. First, on average, the inmate respondents had been incarcerated from just over one month (about 43 days in the Port City Jail) to over four months (almost 123 days) in the Atlantic Shores Jail).

Second, for nearly one-third of the respondents, the most common offense was possession or sale of drugs. The next most common offenses for most of the jails were petty theft and "other." There are some notable exceptions, however. For example, a sizable number (16.2%) of the women in the Port City Jail were charged with traffic or other minor offenses. This was a

much greater number than in the other four jails. Another notable exception was the number of women (17.9%) in the Bay View Jail charged with offenses against the person.

Third, most of the inmates are in an unsentenced status (this would include pretrial detainees as well). For all except the Bay View Jail, these numbers depart substantially from the Bureau of Justice Statistics' (1992: 11) most recent national figures of 51% unconvicted. Differences in sentenced and unsentenced statuses reflect something of what Klofas (1987, 1991) has to say about county-by-county variation in jail usage.

Finally, consistent with Klofas' (1987, 1991) jail usage typology, the average sentence lengths for respondents ranged from 8.6 months (Port City) to 32.1 months (Atlantic Shores). The high mean for Atlantic Shores is something of a function of its unique jail/prison combined status. For the other jails, low means may be indicative of high volume, processing jails used for short-term detention, while high average sentences may indicate jails used primarily to house longer term convicted misdemeanants (see, especially, Klofas, 1987).

Victimization History

One of our primary areas of concern was to get beyond simply what these females inmates had done, to be able to describe who they are in terms of personal characteristics. Information is presented in Table 15 that describes the inmate respondents in the most personal terms possible. The bulk of the information in this table concerns the degree to which these women have suffered sexual assaults. Comparable free world figures are relatively

difficult to come by, however the institutionalized population figures seem high. Between 21.4% and 42% of the respondents indicated that they had been sexually assaulted sometime before their eighteenth birthday. Virtually identical numbers--between 24.4% and 41%--said they had been sexually assaulted since turning 18.

For those who had suffered childhood sexual assaults, the average number varied between two and five times. A small number in each jail indicated that they had been sexually assaulted so many times they could not remember the exact number.

The majority of inmates indicated that they had not been adult victims of sexual assaults. For those reporting adult victimization, the average number of times was smaller (2.1-3.0) than for childhood victimization.

In terms of alcohol use prior to incarceration, from roughly one-fourth to one-third of the women reported never using alcohol (this was the largest response category for the Atlantic Shores and Bay View Jails). For three of the jails (Pacific Shores, Port City, and Central Valley) the most common response on alcohol use is "infrequently." Perhaps the most crucial numbers, in terms of inmate problems and programming needs are the regular and frequent use responses combined: the percentages for these two categories are remarkably similar across jails and ranged from a low of 32.2% (Central Valley) to a high of 37.9% (Pacific Shores).

Drug use patterns are divergent and interesting for these populations as well. Again, for two jails (Atlantic Shores and Bay View) the most common use category is "never." The percent-

ages of responses in the infrequent and regular use categories are quite similar across jails. However, frequent use percentages varied from a low of 22.7% (Atlantic Shores) to 51.3% (Pacific Shores). This amazingly high percentage of frequent drug users in the Pacific Shores Jail may be a function of law enforcement practices or, more likely, the location of the county in which this jail is situated. Whatever the causes may be, these numbers clearly are indicative of the need for alcohol and drug treatment programs in most jails.

Family Status

Another dimension of who these women are is measured by their home and family situations. Three facets of parental status are reported in Table 16. First, roughly 20-25% of the women said they had no children. Second, of those with children, the averages were between two and three children each. Third, the children averaged between six and eight years of age. And, finally, the children under 18 were living with their mothers prior to the mother's arrest [note the same percentages for average number of children and number of children living with the respondents prior to their arrests].

One of the major areas of concern for these women is who will get custody of their children while they are incarcerated. As seen from Table 16, the most common interim caregivers are: the inmate's mother, friends or other relatives, and some combination of people.

Most of these women had a home prior to their arrest. However, a conspicuous number (from 15.3-20.0%) considered them-

selves homeless.

Finally, the degree to which these women were supporting others (children, husband, boyfriend, or other family members) varied greatly among the jails. For example, in the Atlantic Shores Jail 71.1% of the respondents indicated they were providing others with financial support. Even in the two jails with the lowest percentages (Central Valley and Pacific Shores) nearly half of the women were contributing to the financial support of others. This factor, combined with parenting and child care responsibilities would indicate that incarceration for these women also impacts a variety of other people as well.

Outside Contacts

Incarcerated women are somewhat at the mercy of the jail or others in the outside world to help them maintain their community and family ties. In this regard, Table 17 reports information on the degree to which the inmate respondents can maintain outside contacts.

The majority of the respondents make or receive three or more calls from family members each month. A majority in all of the jails except Atlantic Shores make or receive three or more calls from friends each month as well. For some reason, the Central Valley Jail inmates lead in percentages for both categories.

As we reported previously, the issue of access to phone service was a point of contention for the inmates in most of the jails. Virtually all of the jails had converted from coin-operated pay phones to phones that could only be used to make

collect calls, even locally. The jail administrators said there were two primary reasons for the use of such systems: (1) it controls access to the phones and minimizes disputes over who gets the phone and for how long, and (2) the system generates money for the jails' inmate fund (used to buy supplies, recreation equipment, etc.). Bay View had just converted to this system prior to our visit, and clearly it was a sore spot for most of the inmates, some of whom complained bitterly about lack of access to the outside world since many of their contacts (including family members) would no longer accept collect calls from them.

Questions about sending and receiving mail are also reported in Table 17. During the site visits, we learned very quickly about the importance of mail to the inmates. Two of our research supply items--pencils and envelopes--were prized greatly, and we had numerous requests to leave both of these items behind.

The final sections of Table 17 indicate the responses for the numbers of visits by families and friends per month. As can be seen, most of these women receive on average between two and four visits from family members and between one and three visits from friends each month. These numbers can be reflective of a number of factors. However, we know from the site visits, institutional profiles, and managers' interviews that some of the jails are more "visitor friendly"--in terms of both management philosophy and architecture--than others. Also, given the location of some of the jails (i.e., away from the central business districts), it is probably difficult for some families to visit. This particularly may be true for the Pacific Shores Jail which

is located in a small residential community within a sprawling urban county.

Inmate Programs

Tables 18, 19, 20, and 21 contain information on one of the primary focuses of this research: inmate programming. Table 18 lists the variety of programs available in the five women's jails. Obviously, some jails (notably, the Pacific Shores Jail) offer a wide range of programs to address inmate needs. In fact, the manager of the Pacific Shores Jail characterized his facility's programming menu as almost too diverse and unstructured. He believed that programs in this jail had grown with little planning or thought toward gaps that might exist or program duplication.

In terms of inmate participation, the five most frequently mentioned programs seem to be: GED preparation, Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, other drug treatment, and church services. As can be seen in this table, for some of the jails (particularly Central Valley and Atlantic Shores) many programs are not being offered, or the inmates are not participating in certain programs.

Inmates were asked on their questionnaires to identify the most useful programs among those offered in their jails. These results are reported in Table 19. The most interesting features of this table are: (1) the congruence in responses across jails, and (2) the remarkable consistency of inmates' opinions with those of the staff in regard to program utility.

Table 20 reports the results of the inmates' responses on

the most needed programs. As we would anticipate, the most frequently given answers here are among the least frequent responses on Table 18 (inmate program participation). Especially noteworthy in Table 20 are the responses in regard to the need for work training and stress management programs. The remaining responses cover a variety of program options.

Table 21 is an aggregate listing of programming needs identified by the respondents from all five jails. These responses can be collapsed into two large categories: entertainment/activities and training/self improvement.

Once again, working training appears to be the primary need identified by these inmates. The other most needed programs include arts, crafts, and music activities, mostly for entertainment purposes. College and vocational courses rank next and properly should be considered along with work training. Many of the remaining programs fit into the categories of coping/life management skills and self improvement.

Summary

It is apparent that our inmate respondents suffer from a number of personal and social needs and deficiencies. The good news is that some of the women's jails offer programs to meet these inmates' needs, and the inmates seem to take advantage of the programs offered. The bad news is that most of the jails do not offer enough programs, or they do not offer the programs that are the most desirable from the inmates' points of view.

The challenge for the future is to not only keep inmates busy with activities (a worthy goal in-and-of itself), but also

to address some of the severe deficiencies of these inmates, particularly in the areas of remedial education, vocational education, and job training programs. Given the lengths of some of the sentences being served, these programs seem both feasible and desirable. The major obstacle for all of these jails, however, seems to be the lack of adequate space or funding.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report provides an overview of the results from the most comprehensive, in-depth study ever undertaken of exclusively women's jails in the United States. However, we consider this to be the beginning rather than the end. Given our role as researchers, we would be remiss if we did not discuss the missing pieces in the puzzle and the future paths we and others should follow. Since most of the major findings have been discussed and summarized throughout the body of the report, this section will take a more future oriented approach.

This project reminded research staff members of something about which we have been painfully aware: there are many areas of potentially fruitful research concerning jails, about which little investigation has taken place. In addition, we were also reminded again that research on most jail topics is a difficult process, at best. We found it difficult to identify all of the exclusively women's jails at the very beginning of the project, for example. Once these facilities were identified, we found it difficult to secure permission to do site visits at several of the jails, including a number of the medium-sized jails and particularly two of the nation's largest. Therefore, one useful

future effort would be for the National Institute of Corrections Jail Center or the American Jail Association to catalog in easily retrievable form jails of different types, especially the exclusively women's jails.

Another future initiative might be to have a national conference of managers of exclusively women's jails. We found in this research that from coast to coast there are some striking similarities in women's jails, but that there are some major differences as well. A meeting such as this would provide a network and forum for women's jail managers to exchange ideas and suggestions on areas of mutual concern. We found in many of our site visits that these jail managers were operating with relatively little contact to the larger jail management or research communities in the United States.

Two final issues need to be addressed as a result of this research project: one is very practical in nature and the other involves additional research. As a practical concern, now that some of the programming needs and deficiencies have been identified, it seems incumbent upon policy makers at all levels nationwide to see that incarcerated women, such as those doing time in the exclusively women's jails we examined, have their programming needs met. Among the most pressing needs are those involving medical care, chemical dependency treatment and counseling, psychological and emotional counseling, and remedial education and job training.

In terms of future research, this project sets the stage for a much more ambitious project. Now that we have examined the status of women (staff and inmates) in exclusively women's jails,

it seems particularly compelling to study how women (staff and inmates, again) fare in mixed population jails. If it appears that women function better in segregated facilities, it would seem reasonable for more jurisdictions to move toward separate institutions. A final note in this regard is that two of the exclusively women's jails we examined (Port City and Central Valley) were on the verge of moving into new direct supervision facilities soon after our site visits. It would seem especially fruitful to return to these facilities to see how both the staffs and inmates have made the transition to these mixed population facilities. If women do not fare better in segregated jails, we may see the demise of these unique institutions by the next century.

REFERENCES

- ABADINSKY, Howard and L. Thomas WINFREE, Jr. (1992). *Crime and Justice: An Introduction*, 2nd ed. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- AMERICAN JAIL ASSOCIATION (1991). *Who's Who in Jail Management*. Hagerstown, MD: American Jail Association.
- BAUNACH, Phyllis Jo (1987). "Women Offenders: A Commentary On(?) Current Conceptions on Women in Crime." *Quarterly Journal of Corrections*, 1(4): 14-18.
- BIGMAN, Paul (1980). *A Cage, Not a Pedestal: Services for Women at the Cook County Jail*. Chicago: Chicago Law Enforcement Study Group and the Illinois Prisons and Jails Project of the John Howard Association.
- BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS (1990). *Jail Inmates, 1989*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS (1991). *Census of Local Jails, 1988*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS (1992). *National Update*, Vol. II, No. 1. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- CHESNEY-LIND, Meda (1978). "Chivalry Reexamined: Women and the Criminal Justice System." *Women, Crime, and the Criminal Justice System*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- CHESNEY-LIND, Meda (1982). "Guilty by Reason of Sex: Young Women and the Juvenile Justice System." In Barbara Raffel Price and Natalie J. Sokoloff, eds. *The Criminal Justice System and Women*, pp. 77-103. New York: Clark Boardman Company.
- CHURCH, George J. (1990). "Girls and Status Offenses: Is Juvenile Justice Still Sexist?" *Criminal Justice Abstracts*, 34(2): 144-165.
- CLEAR, Todd R. and George F. COLE (1990). *American Corrections*, 2nd ed. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co.
- CRAWFORD, Jackie (1988). "Tabulation of a Nationwide Survey of Local Government Jail Facilities for Women." Prepared for the Task Force on the Female Offender of the American Correctional Association. Denver, CO: National Institute of Corrections Information Center.
- CRITES, Laura (1976). *The Female Offender*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

- CROWLEY, Joan E. and Lynne M. ADRIAN (1992). "Women Misdemeanants in the Allegheny County, Pennsylvania Jail, 1892-1923." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 20(4): 311-331.
- DALE, Michael J. (1990). "The Female Inmate: An Introduction to Legal Rights and Issues." *American Jails*, 4(4): 56-58.
- DE COSTANZO, Elaine and Helen SCHOLLES (1988). "Women Behind Bars: Their Numbers Increase." *Corrections Today*, 50: 104-108.
- GLICK, Ruth M. and Virginia V. NETO (1977). *Research: National Study of Women's Correctional Programs*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.
- GLICK, Ruth M. and Virginia V. NETO (1982). "National Study of Women's Correctional Programs." In Barbara R. Price and Natalie J. Sokoloff, eds. *The Criminal Justice System and Women*. New York: Clark Boardman Company.
- GUYNES, Randall (1988). *Nation's Jail Managers Assess Their Problems*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- JALBERT, Amy (1987). "Holding Patterns: A Report on Women, the Forgotten Offenders in the Nassau County Jail." Nassau Coalition for Safety and Justice. Denver, CO: National Institute of Corrections Information Center.
- JERRELL, Jeanette M. and Richard KOMISARUK (1991). "Public Policy Issues in the Delivery of Mental Health Services in a Jail Setting." In Joel A. Thompson and G. Larry Mays, eds. *American Jails: Public Policy Issues*, pp. 100-115. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- KALINICH, Dave, Paul EMBERT, and Jeffrey D. SENESE (1988). "Integrating Community Mental Health Services into Local Jails: A Policy Perspective." *Policy Studies Review*, 7(3): 660-670.
- KALINICH, David, Paul EMBERT, and Jeffrey SENESE (1991). "Mental Health Services for Jail Inmates: Imprecise Standards, Traditional Philosophies, and the Need for Change." In Joel A. Thompson and G. Larry Mays, eds. *American Jails: Public Policy Issues*, pp. 79-99. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- KLOFAS, John (1987). "Patterns of Jail Use." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 15: 403-411.
- KLOFAS, John (1991). "Disaggregating Jail Use: Variety and Change in Local Corrections over a Ten-Year Period." In Joel A. Thompson and G. Larry Mays, eds. *American Jails: Public Policy Issues*, pp. 40-58. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- LAWRENCE, James E. and Van ZWISOHN (1991). "AIDS in Jail." In Joel A. Thompson and G. Larry Mays, eds. *American Jails: Public Policy Issues*, pp. 116-128. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.

- LOVRICH, Nicholas P., Mary K. Stohr-Gillmore, Linda L. Zupan, Ben A. Menke, Michael W. Stohr-Gillmore, and John Goldman (1990). ***Staff Turnover and Stress in New Generation Jails: Technical Report***. Washington, DC: National Institute of Corrections.
- MANN, Coramae Richey (1984). ***Female Crime and Delinquency***. University, AL: University of Alabama Press.
- MAYS, G. Larry and Joel A. THOMPSON (1988). "Mayberry Revisited: The Characteristics and Operations of America's Small Jails." ***Justice Quarterly***, 5(3): 421-440.
- MC GAHA, Glenda S. (1987). "Health Care Issues of Incarcerated Women." ***Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation***, 12(1): 53-59.
- NATIONAL COALITION FOR JAIL REFORM (1982). "Women in Jail: Special Problems, Different Needs." Denver, CO: National Institute of Corrections Information Center.
- POGREBIN, Mark and Eric D. POOLE (1988). "Work Orientations of Jail Personnel: A Comparison of Deputy Sheriffs and Career Line Officers." ***Policy Studies Review***, 7(3): 606-614.
- POOLE, Eric D. and Mark POGREBIN (1991). "Changing Jail Organization and Management: Toward Improved Employee Utilization." In Joel A. Thompson and G. Larry Mays, eds. ***American Jails: Public Policy Issues***, pp. 163-179. Chicago: Nelson-Hall Publishers.
- RYAN, T.A. (1984). ***State of the Art Analysis of Adult Female Offenders and Institutional Programs***. Denver, CO: National Institute of Corrections.
- SIMON, Rita and Jean LANDIS (1991). ***The Crimes Women Commit, The Punishments They Receive***. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- SIMS, Patsy (1976). "Women in Southern Jails." In Laura Crites, ed. ***The Female Offender***. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- STOHR, Mary K. (1990). ***Staff Turnover and Correctional Management in 'New Generation' Jails: Key Implementation Issues for a Significant Correctional Policy Innovation***. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Pullman, WA: Washington State University.
- WELCH, Michael (1989). "Social Junk, Social Dynamite and the Rabble: Persons with AIDS in Jail." ***American Journal of Criminal Justice***, 14(1): 135-147.
- WINFREE, L. Thomas, Jr. (1988). "Rethinking American Jail Death Rates: A Comparison of National Mortality and Jail Mortality, 1978, 1983." ***Policy Studies Review***, 7(3): 641-659.

- WIRTZFELD, Roy (1985). "New Women's Jail Treats Inmates As 'Humans'." *Law and Order*, 33(5): 23, 60.
- WOOD, Dorothy (1982). "Women in Jail." Prepared for the National Coalition for Jail Reform. Milwaukee, WI: The Benedict Center for Criminal Justice.
- WOOLDREDGE, John D. and L. Thomas WINFREE, Jr. (1992). "An Aggregate-Level Study of Inmate Suicides and Deaths Due to Natural Causes in U.S. Jails." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 29(4): 466-479.
- ZUPAN, Linda L. (1992). "The Progress of Women Correctional Officers in All-Male Prisons." In Imogene Moyer, ed. *The Changing Role of Women in the Criminal Justice System*, pp. 323-343. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- ZUPAN, Linda L. and Ben A. MENKE (1988). "Implementing Organizational Change: From Traditional to New Generation Jail Operations." *Policy Studies Review*, 7(3): 615-625. -

Table 1					
Jail Descriptors					
Jail:	1	2	3	4	5
Opened	1977	1957	1980	1991	1978
Official Capacity	288	64	83	200	168
Average Daily Population	501	94	98	189	342
Maximum Capacity Allowed under Court Order	478	95	151	200	NA
Average Cost to House an Inmate Per Year	\$20,899	\$19,954	\$18,980	\$20,000	\$19,276
Altercations					
inmate-to-inmate	152	31	5	4	X
inmate-to-staff	12	19	0	2	X
other	0	1	3	0	X
Three Most Common Minor Infractions	1,11,11	2,3,4	4,5,6	7,8,9	3,10,11
Three Most Common Major Infractions	1,2,8	1,3,4	2,1,5	6,7,1	1,8,8
Deaths	1	0	0	0	0
Mentally Ill	300	75	X	6	1332
HIV	2	17	X	X	134

Jails: 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores, 5=Bay View

Minor Infraction Codes: 1=unspecified rule violations, 2=smoking, 3=abusive/profane language, 4=disorderly conduct, 5=failure to work, 6=disrespect, 7=off limits, 8=disobey orders, 9=nondangerous contraband, 10=verbal argument, 11=none mentioned

Major Infraction Codes: 1=fighting/assaults, 2=dangerous contraband, 3=staff endangerment, 4=arson, 5=escape, 6=serious disorderly behavior, 7=sexual misconduct, 8=none mentioned
X=Data were not reported NA=Not applicable

Table 2

Staff Characteristics

Jail:	1	2	3	4	5
N:	156	30	29	56	110
Gender of Correctional Staff					
Female	62	28	26	37	66
Male	24	1	3	19	25
Race					
African-American	X	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	24 (43%)	85 (77%)
White	X	21 (70)	26 (90)	26 (46)	10 (9)
Hispanic	X	7 (23)	2 (7)	1 (2)	15 (14)
Native-American	X	0	0	2 (4)	0
Other	X	0	0	1 (2)	0
Status					
Fulltime/Payroll	156	31	X	56	110
Fulltime/Payroll Correctional	96	29	24	41	81
Fulltime/Payroll Clerical-Main	21	2	2	4	9
Fulltime/Payroll Education	0	0	0	0	0
Fulltime/Nonpayroll Education	2	0	0	0	0
Parttime/Nonpayroll Education	15	1	2	0	6
Fulltime/Payroll Medical	18	0	5	4	0
Fulltime/Nonpayroll Medical	0	2	0	0	14
Other Professional/Technical	12	0	5	6	3

Jails: 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores, 5=Bay View

X=Data were not reported

Table 3**Inmate Characteristics**

Jail:	1	2	3	4	5
N:	500	108	115	190	413
<hr/>					
Ethnicity					
African-American	120 (24%)	17 (16%)	13 (11%)	131 (69%)	196 (47%)
White	180 (36)	42 (39)	77 (67)	55 (29)	124 (30)
Hispanic	190 (38)	32 (30)	25 (22)	3 (2)	93 (23)
Native-American	0	0	0	0	0
Other	10 (2)	0	0	1 (.5)	0
Status					
Awaiting Arraignment or Trial	227 (45%)	76 (70%)	44 (38%)	45 (24%)	243 (59%)
Convicted and Awaiting Sentencing	0	1 (1)	3 (3)	0	0
Serving Sentence	258 (52)	29 (27)	51 (44)	148 (78)	66 (16)
Technical Probation or Parole Violator	3 (1)	0	0	6 (3)	1 (.2)
Other	1 (.13)	0	0	2 (1)	5 (1)

Jails: 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores, 5=Bay View

Table 4					
Inmate Programming					
Jail:	1	2	3	4	5
Work release					
in jail	no	no	yes	no	yes
separate	yes	yes	no	yes	no
Exercise					
indoors	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
outdoors	NA	yes	NA	NA	NA
both	yes	NA	NA	yes	yes
other	NA	NA	yes	NA	NA
Regular Programming					
GED	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
AA or similar	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
NA or similar	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Church	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
college	no	no	no	no	no
law library	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
library books	or				
visitation	yes	yes	no	no	yes
preventive					
medical	yes	yes	no	no	yes
daycare	no	no	no	no	no
self esteem/ self worth	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
correspondence					
courses	no	no	no	yes	no
work training	yes	no	no	no	yes
anger manage	yes	no	no	no	no
stress manage	yes	yes	no	no	no
parenting					
skills	yes	no	yes	yes	no
communication					
skills	yes	no	no	no	no
preventive					
health	no	yes	yes	no	yes
sexually transmitted					
diseases	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
other	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
Access to Programming					
earned	no	no	no	no	no
need	yes	no	no	yes	no
request	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
seniority	yes	no	no	no	no

Jails: 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores, 5=Bay View

Table 5

Medical Screening and Programming

Jail:	1	2	3	4	5
Intensive Screening					
Medical/Physical Exam	only sick	all	other	all	all
Lab tests done	none	1,2,3	2,3	1,2,3	2,3
General Screening					
physical	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
mental	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
suicide	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
alcohol intoxication	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
drug influence/consumption	yes	no	yes	yes	yes
other	no	no	yes	no	yes
Medical Personnel Scheduled Daily					
Doctor	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
Nurse	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mental Health	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
Medical Personnel Scheduled Weekly					
Doctor	no	no	no	yes	no
Dentist	yes	no	yes	yes	yes
Mental Health	no	no	yes	yes	no
Medical Personnel Scheduled Monthly					
Dentist	no	yes	no	no	no
Medical Facilities Available in the Jail					
infirmary	yes	no	no	yes	yes
infirmary for overnight detoxification unit	yes	no	no	no	no
psychiatric unit	yes	no	no	no	no
other	no	yes	yes	no	yes

Jails: 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores, 5=Bay View

Lab Test Codes: 1=urine, 2=blood, 3=chest x-ray

Table 6
Visiting Privileges

Jail:	1	2	3	4	5
Hours Per Week for Visiting	26	36	34	28	56
Who May Visit	anyone	anyone	anyone	anyone	anyone
How Often Per Week	1	6	2	1	2
Number of Minutes Per Visit	45	30	60	60	30
Emergency Visits Allowed	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Contact Visits Allowed for					
Children	yes	no	yes	yes	yes
Spouse	no	no	yes	yes	yes
Significant Others	no	no	yes	no	yes
Lawyer	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Average Number of Visitors Per Month	X	3	3	7	3
Conjugal Visits Allowed	no	no	no	no	no
Furloughs	no	yes	no	yes	yes

Jails: 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores, 5=Bay View
X=Data not reported

TABLE 7

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF STAFF

RAILS:	1	2	3	4	5
NUMBER:	62	24	16	19	20
JOB TITLE*:					
CO	90.3%	100.0%	75.0%	84.2%	75.0%
Supervisor	8.0	0.0	25.0	10.5	10.0
Support Staff	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	15.0
AGE*:					
**22-29	50.0	29.2	31.3	36.8	15.0
30-39	32.3	54.2	25.0	26.3	40.0
40-49	9.7	16.7	37.5	21.1	25.0
50-61 ^a	1.6	0.0	6.3	10.5	10.0
Mean	30.8	32.8	36.2	34.7	38.2
SD	6.8	6.8	7.9	10.0	9.8
SENDER:					
Male	30.6%	4.2%	12.5%	0.0%	30.0%
Female	69.4	95.8	87.5	100.0	70.0
RACE/ETHNICITY*:					
African/American	17.7	8.3	0.0	52.6	70.0
Caucasian	60.0	58.3	100.0	36.8	10.0
Hispanic	12.9	20.8	0.0	5.3	15.0
Other ^b	8.1	12.5	0.0	0.0	5.0
EDUCATION:					
No HS or GED	0.0	4.2	0.0	5.6	0.0
HS/GED	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Some College	66.1	62.5	81.3	77.7	55.6
Bachelors Degree	12.9	25.0	18.8	0.0	16.7
Some Graduate	6.5	8.3	0.0	5.6	0.0
Graduate Degree	8.1	0.0	0.0	11.1	0.0
Other	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6
NUMBER MONTHS EMPLOYED AT THIS FACILITY					
Less than 6	16.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.0
6 to 12	28.9	25.0	0.0	33.4	5.0
13 to 24	27.4	29.2	37.7	11.2	20.0
25 plus	27.3	46.1	62.8	55.8	60.0

Jail 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores, 5=Bay View

*These columns will not sum to zero due to missing cases.

**Youngest age reported.

^aOldest age reported.

^bIncludes Asian Americans, American Indians and those who chose "other".

TABLE 8

STAFF CAREER/WORK DESCRIPTORS

DESCRIPTORS:	1	2	3	4	5
NUMBER:	62	24	16	19	20
SHIFT:					
Day	50.8%	41.7%	43.8%	50.0%	70.0%
Swing	4.9	33.3	25.0	16.7	20.0
Graveyard	34.4	20.8	31.3	22.2	5.0
Other	9.8	4.2	0.0	11.1	5.0
WORKED IN JAIL BEFORE:					
Yes	17.7	20.8	37.5	21.1	40.0
No	82.3	79.2	62.5	78.9	60.0
WORKED IN OTHER CRIMINAL JUSTICE POSITIONS:					
Yes	19.4	16.7	18.8	5.3	30.0
No	80.6	83.3	81.3	94.7	70.0
NEGATIVE INMATE INTERACTIONS:					
Minor Injury	35.5(22)	65.2(15)	56.3(9)	5.3(1)	30.0(6)
Injury Requiring Medical Attention	14.4(9)	17.4(4)	25.0(4)	5.3(1)	30.0(6)
Injury Requiring Hospitalization	0.0	4.3(1)	0.0	0.0	5.0(1)
Victim Hostage	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0(1)
Inmate Grievance	43.5(27)	60.9(14)	81.3(13)	73.7(14)	35.0(7)
Inmate Sued	3.2(2)	0.0	12.5(2)	5.3(1)	5.0(1)
None of the above	43.5(27)	17.4(4)	0.0	26.3(5)	47.4(9)
STAFF SANCTIONING ACTIVITY*:					
Formal Write-ups					
Mean	4.6	4.7	2.1	4.1	2.9
SD	3.7	6.4	1.5	3.6	1.5
Lockdown					
Mean	3.3	2.1	6.3	2.5	2.3
SD	3.9	1.0	6.1	3.0	1.6
Restraints					
Mean	2.5	2.9	1.9	1.5	1.7
SD	2.1	3.9	1.4	.7	.6

Cell 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores, 5=Bay View
 *Includes only those staff engaging in these activities.

TABLE 9

STAFF IN-SERVICE TRAINING

RAILS:	1	2	3	4	5
NUMBER:	62	24	16	19	20
INSERVICE TRAINING RECEIVED:					
IPC Skills	34	24	12	15	13
Problem Solving	36	15	12	14	12
Crisis/Conflict	33	12	13	10	9
Report Writing	49	18	14	12	11
Physical Restraints	48	22	15	11	7
Facility Policies/ Procedures	48	24	15	11	15
Inmate Classification	44	12	8	6	6
Criminal law	35	10	6	5	9
Self Defense	50	18	15	11	8
Observation Skills	32	16	12	12	5
First Aid	50	24	16	12	15
Supervision Skills	32	12	9	11	9
Data Entry	19	12	5	1	5
Nursing/Health	16	3	5	3	2
Office Equipment	23	11	10	5	4
MOST IMPORTANT JOB TRAINING:					
IPC	10	10	6	4	6
Facility Policies/ Procedures	11	8	6	3	4
Problem Solving	10	3	4	1	2
Crisis/Conflict	6	0	0	4	0
SECOND MOST IMPORTANT JOB TRAINING:					
Problem Solving	12	4	5	7	2
IPC	8	5	2	0	4
Facility Policies/ Procedures	6	4	1	4	2
Crisis/Conflict	7	2	2	1	2
Physical Restraint	8	2	1	2	0
USEFULNESS OF INSERVICE TRAINING:					
Not Useful	6	2	0	1	5
Moderately Useful	25	10	1	9	7
Very Useful	27	11	15	8	8

Jail 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores, 5=Bay View

TABLE 10					
STAFF PERCEPTIONS OF INMATE PROGRAMMING OFFERED					
CELLS:	1	2	3	4	5
NUMBER:	62	24	16	19	20
ARTS, CRAFTS, MUSIC					
Yes	38.7%	91.7%	56.3%	73.7%	42.1%
RECREATION					
Yes	98.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	94.7
HIGH SCHOOL CLASSES					
Yes	66.1	41.7	18.8	63.2	52.6
COLLEGE COURSES					
Yes	11.3	4.2	0.0	36.8	5.3
VOCATIONAL COURSES AND TRAINING					
Yes	62.9	8.3	0.0	73.7	84.2
ALCOHOLICS ANONYMOUS					
Yes	100.0	100.0	100.0	94.7	94.7
OTHER ALCOHOL					
Yes	58.1	45.8	31.3	21.1	42.1
MARIJUANA ANONYMOUS					
Yes	95.2	83.3	100.0	42.1	84.2
OTHER DRUG TREATMENT					
Yes	74.2	50.0	75.0	68.4	47.4
CHURCH SERVICES					
Yes	98.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	94.7
LAW LIBRARY					
Yes	98.4	95.8	93.8	100.0	89.5
LIBRARY BOOKS					
Yes	90.3	87.5	31.3	31.6	89.5
DAYCARE FOR INMATE CHILDREN					
Yes	9.7	8.3	0.0	5.3	5.3
SELF ESTEEM/SELF WORTH					
Yes	77.4	91.7	62.5	36.8	47.4
CORRESPONDENCE COURSES					
Yes	16.1	12.5	0.0	15.8	10.5
WORK TRAINING PROGRAMS					
Yes	67.7	20.8	0.0	36.8	26.3
ANGER MANAGEMENT					
Yes	38.7	16.7	18.8	5.3	5.3
STRESS MANAGEMENT					
Yes	40.3	16.7	18.8	5.3	5.3
PARENTING SKILLS					
Yes	90.3	20.8	31.3	57.9	0.0
COMMUNICATION SKILLS					
Yes	51.6	12.5	25.0	5.3	10.5
PREVENTIVE HEALTH CARE					
Yes	50.0	29.2	25.0	57.9	42.1
STD PREVENTION PROGRAMMING					
Yes	74.2	75.0	75.0	94.7	52.6

Jail 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores, 5=Bay View

TABLE 11

STAFF RANKING OF MOST USEFUL INMATE PROGRAMMING

AILS:	1	2	3	4	5
NUMBER:	62	24	16	19	20

TOP FIVE RANKINGS (EXCEPT WHEN TIED):

Arts/Crafts/ Music					
GED	1	3	1	1	1
High School College Courses				2	2 ^c
Vocational	2	5 ^a	2 ^b	3	3 ^c
AA NA					
Other Alcohol	3	2	3 ^b	4	4 ^c
Other Drug	5				5 ^c
Church				5 ^d	
Law Library Library Books and Visits					
Preventive Medical Daycare	4	1	4		
Self-Esteem Work Training Anger Management Stress Management					
Parenting Skills				6 ^d	
Preventive Health		4 ^a	5		
STD Prevention Other None					

TEN PROGRAMS RANKED MOST USEFUL ACROSS JAILS:

1. GED
2. Vocational
3. Other alcohol
4. Daycare
5. Other Drug
6. College courses
7. Preventive health
8. Stress management
9. High school classes
10. Correspondence courses

Jail 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores, 5=Bay View

^a4 and 5 tied County 2

^b2 and 3 tied for County 3

^c3,4, and 5 tied for County 5

^dTied with parenting

TABLE 12
INMATE PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

AILS:	1	2	3	4	5
NUMBER:	244	81	63	45	133
AGE:					
Mean	30.8	31.7	30.5	30.0	33.9
SD	7.6	7.2	6.0	6.8	8.9
RACE/ETHNICITY:					
African-American	24.5%	19.2%	17.7%	76.2%	48.4%
White	39.7	42.3	51.6	21.4	11.5
Hispanic	21.5	16.7	12.9	00.0	32.0
Native American	3.8	7.7	8.1	2.4	2.5
Other	10.6	14.1	9.7	00.0	5.7
EDUCATION:					
No High School Diploma or GED	39.7	35.5	33.9	40.0	34.2
GED	11.6	13.2	8.1	20.0	9.2
High School	17.7	11.8	19.4	17.8	20.0
Some Vocational Training	60.5	57.9	46.0	60.0	58.8
Some College	22.4	32.9	30.6	22.2	25.8
Bachelor Degree	4.3	1.3	00.0	00.0	2.5
Some Graduate Courses	4.3	3.9	1.6	00.0	8.3
MARITAL STATUS:					
Legally Married Common Law	19.7	26.0	17.5	13.6	25.8
Married	17.6	14.3	20.6	18.2	14.5
Single	33.0	20.8	25.4	61.4	34.7
Separated or Divorced	21.9	27.3	20.6	4.5	23.4
Widowed	3.9	6.5	6.3	2.3	1.6
Combination of Above	3.9	5.2	9.5	0.0	0.0
EMPLOYED AT TIME OF ARREST:					
No	66.7	65.41	65.1	61.0	64.7
Yes	33.3	34.6	34.9	39.0	35.3
MONTHLY INCOME PRIOR TO ARREST:					
Median	800.00	652.00	700.00	525.00	600.00
YEARLY INCOME PRIOR TO ARREST:					
Median	9800	8808	10,000	12,000	12,000

Jail 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores,
5=Bay View

TABLE 13

INMATE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM CONTACT HISTORY

AILS:	1	2	3	4	5
NUMBER:	244	81	63	45	133
AGE AT FIRST ARREST:					
Mean	23.9	22.4	23.4	23.9	26.7
SD	8.7	7.7	6.8	8.6	11.0
TIMES IN JAIL OR PRISON BEFORE:					
Never	23.9%	21.9%	15.0%	37.2%	38.9%
Mean	5.5	6.7	7.3	3.0	6.9
SD	5.7	8.2	9.8	3.3	9.7
SERVED TIME AS ADULT BEFORE:					
Never	28.9%	21.3%	17.7%	54.5%	45.6%
Probation Only	6.4	1.3	6.5	11.4	2.4
Jail Only	42.6	52.0	50.0	6.8	24.0
Jail and Prison	12.3	14.7	19.4	11.4	19.2
Prison Only	2.1	0.0	0.0	13.6	3.2
More than One	7.7	10.7	4.8	2.3	5.6
EVER BEEN ON PROBATION:					
Yes	62.4	67.9	60.3	47.6	43.0
No	37.6	32.1	39.7	52.4	57.0
TIMES ON PROBATION AS JUVENILE:					
Never	76.6%	76.2%	88.1%	80.5%	93.7%
Mean	1.8	4.5	3.0	2.1	1.7
SD	2.8	8.4	3.2	2.4	.8
TIMES ON PROBATION AS ADULT:					
Never	50.0%	46.0%	45.8%	64.1%	62.5%
Mean	1.9	2.8	1.8	2.4	1.5
SD	1.9	5.7	1.4	2.3	.8

Jail 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores, 5=Bay View

TABLE 14
INMATE INSTITUTIONAL STATUS INFORMATION

RAILS:	1	2	3	4	5
NUMBER:	244	81	63	45	133
DAYS AT THIS FACILITY:					
Mean	73.3	42.4	74.1	122.5	102.7
SD	62.5	52.6	78.7	149.8	136.7
TYPE OF CRIME HELD FOR:					
Traffic or Minor					
Offense	7.6	16.2	11.4	2.1	5.5
Petty Theft	14.2	15.2	5.1	10.6	9.0
Forgery or					
Fraud	4.5	10.1	13.9	8.5	7.6
Burglary	7.6	4.0	3.8	6.4	5.5
Prostitution	2.4	1.0	5.1	6.4	9.0
Offense Against					
Person	7.3	9.1	8.9	14.9	17.9
Possession or Sale					
of Drugs	34.4	33.3	39.2	34.0	28.3
Homicide	1.4	0.0	0.0	6.4	3.4
Other	20.5	11.1	12.7	10.6	13.8
SENTENCE STATUS:					
Unsentenced	29.4	31.1	30.6	41.9	50.1
LENGTH OF SENTENCE (IN MONTHS):					
Mean	19.0	8.6	11.3	32.1	28.5
SD	55.6	16.4	15.4	33.6	50.7

Jail 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores,
5=Bay View

TABLE 15
INMATE VICTIMIZATION HISTORY

RAILS:	1	2	3	4	5
NUMBER:	244	81	63	45	133
TIMES SEXUALLY ASSAULTED BEFORE 18:					
NA	67.3%	58.0%	61.4%	78.6%	72.1%
Mean*	4.5	4.3	4.1	2.2	5.0
SD	12.4	6.7	5.4	1.1	6.3
SEXUALLY ASSAULTED MOST OF CHILDHOOD**					
	2.3%	5.1%	1.7%	0.0%	.9%
SEXUALLY ASSAULTED SO MANY TIMES AS CHILD CAN'T REMEMBER					
	4.1	6.4	3.3	2.3	1.8
TIMES SEXUALLY ASSAULTED 18 OR OLDER:					
NA	59.8	59.0	65.1	75.6	60.2
Mean*	3.0	2.8	2.1	2.8	2.7
SD	3.2	1.8	2.1	1.9	2.5
AS ADULT SEXUALLY ASSAULTED 98 TIMES OR MORE**					
	1.2%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	1.5%
ALCOHOL USE PRIOR TO INCARCERATION:					
Never	25.5	23.4	27.4	33.3	37.2
Infrequently	36.6	39.0	40.3	31.1	28.1
Regularly	19.6	26.0	16.1	20.0	16.5
Frequently	18.3	11.7	16.1	15.6	18.2
DRUG USE PRIOR TO INCARCERATION:					
Never	15.7	18.2	19.4	34.1	41.8
Infrequently	15.7	14.3	16.1	18.2	12.3
Regularly	17.4	22.1	16.1	25.0	19.7
Frequently	51.3	45.5	48.4	22.7	26.2

Trail 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores, 5=Bay View

*Means include only those reporting sexual abuse

**Persons in these categories were not included in the means for "TIMES SEXUALLY ASSAULTED BEFORE 18" OR "18 OR OLDER."

TABLE 16

INMATE FAMILY STATUS INFORMATION

CELLS:	1	2	3	4	5
NUMBER:	244	81	63	45	133
NUMBER OF CHILDREN:					
None	21.0%	13.0%	17.5%	25.0%	20.2%
Mean*	2.6	2.4	2.8	2.3	2.7
SD	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.3	1.3
AGE OF CHILDREN 18 AND UNDER**:					
Mean	7.8	6.3	6.7	7.7	7.2
SD	5.2	3.8	4.4	6.0	4.8
NUMBER OF CHILDREN 18 AND UNDER LIVING WITH YOU PRIOR TO ARREST**:					
Mean	2.6	2.4	2.8	2.3	2.7
SD	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.3
PRIMARY CAREGIVER OF CHILDREN WHILE INCARCERATED:					
Mother	22.4%	24.2%	18.8%	25.0%	25.9%
Father	3.6	3.2	2.1	12.5	9.4
Husband	13.3	12.9	10.4	6.3	12.9
Boyfriend or Child's					
Father	4.8	3.2	6.3	0.0	3.5
Child's Grand-					
parents	12.1	6.5	4.2	3.1	3.5
Friends or Other					
Relatives	23.0	19.4	20.8	37.5	28.2
Foster Parents or Other Social					
Service	7.3	12.9	12.5	3.1	1.2
Combination	13.3	17.7	25.0	12.5	15.3
HOMELESS BEFORE ARREST:					
No	81.7	73.3	79.0	81.0	81.4
Yes	17.0	20.0	19.4	19.0	15.3
Other	1.3	6.7	1.6	0.0	3.4
SUPPORTING OTHERS BEFORE ARREST:					
No	49.3	36.0	50.8	28.9	39.1
Yes	50.7	64.0	49.2	71.1	60.9

Jail 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores, 5=Bay View

*Means include only those who report having children.

**These figures include only responses by persons who report having children.

TABLE 17

INMATE CONTACT WITH OUTSIDE WORLD

AILS:	1	2	3	4	5
NUMBER:	244	81	63	45	133
HOW OFTEN MAKE OR RECEIVE FAMILY CALLS MONTHLY:					
Never	16.0%	18.1%	13.2%	13.2%	24.2%
< 1 time	4.1	2.8	1.9	0.0	7.1
1 time	2.8	4.2	0.0	0.0	6.1
2 to 3 times	20.6	9.7	3.8	15.8	4.0
> 3 times	56.4	65.3	81.1	71.1	58.6
HOW OFTEN MAKE OR RECEIVE FRIENDS CALLS MONTHLY:					
Never	13.0	14.7	14.7	22.2	16.7
< 1 time	5.2	8.8	2.9	5.6	8.3
1 time	6.1	5.9	0.0	11.1	6.3
2 to 3 times	17.4	8.8	8.8	22.2	12.5
> 3 times	58.3	61.8	73.5	38.9	56.3
HOW OFTEN WRITE OR RECEIVE MAIL FROM FAMILY MONTHLY:					
Mean	5.6	4.1	6.5	4.1	3.2
SD	7.6	6.5	7.2	5.9	4.8
HOW OFTEN WRITE OR RECEIVE MAIL FROM FRIENDS MONTHLY:					
Mean	6.2	4.6	7.1	3.9	2.5
SD	8.0	7.0	8.6	4.8	4.4
HOW OFTEN IN A MONTH VISITED BY FAMILY:					
Mean	2.3	3.6	3.5	2.1	3.2
SD	2.9	5.9	2.1	2.4	5.0
HOW OFTEN IN A MONTH VISITED BY FRIENDS:					
Mean	1.8	2.9	1.8	1.4	2.1
SD	2.4	4.1	2.0	2.4	4.4

Jail 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores, 5=Bay View

TABLE 18

INMATE PROGRAMMING PARTICIPATION

AILS:	1	2	3	4	5
NUMBER:	244	81	63	45	133
INMATE PARTICIPATION IN:					
Arts/Crafts/					
Music	1.0%	9.4%	1.1%	2.7%	1.4%
GED	1.7	7.7	7.4	13.7	6.1
High School	1.5	2.6	0.0	5.5	0.0
College Courses	.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Vocational Courses	.5	.9	0.0	5.5	4.7
AA	13.4	11.1	16.8	12.3	9.5
NA	17.6	10.3	12.6	1.4	14.2
Other Alcohol	1.2	.9	0.0	0.0	2.0
Other Drug	4.9	.9	1.1	8.2	3.4
Church	10.5	20.5	29.5	20.5	22.3
Law Library	1.7	.9	1.1	6.8	6.8
Library Books and					
Visits	2.0	7.7	2.1	0.0	2.0
Preventive Medical	.2	.9	1.1	0.0	.7
Self-Esteem	2.9	6.8	0.0	0.0	.7
Work Training	1.5	0.0	1.1	1.4	4.1
Anger Management	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stress Management	.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Parenting Skills	7.8	1.7	0.0	2.7	0.0
Preventive Health	.7	.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
STD Prevention	4.9	1.7	6.3	4.1	.7
Other	8.3	0.0	1.0	1.4	2.7
None	14.4	15.4	18.9	13.7	18.9

Cell 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores, 5=Bay View

TABLE 19

INMATE RANKINGS OF "USEFUL" PROGRAMMING

RAILS:	1	2	3	4	5
NUMBER:	244	81	63	45	133
TOP FIVE RANKINGS (EXCEPT WHEN TIED):					
Arts/Crafts/ Music					4 ^c
GED	3	4*	4	1	1
High School	5				
College Courses					
Vocational Courses				3 ^b	
AA	2	1	2 ^a	4 ^b	
NA	1	3*			3
Other Alcohol					
Other Drug		5**		5 ^b	
Church	4	2	3 ^a	2	2
Law Library				6 ^b	
Library Books and Visits					
Preventive Medical					
Daycare					
Self-Esteem		6**			
Correspondence Courses					
Work Training			5		5 ^c
Anger Management					
Stress Management					
Parenting Skills					
Communication Skills					
Preventive Health					
STD Prevention					
Other					

Jail 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores, 5=Bay View

*3 and 4 tied County 2

** 5 and 6 tied County 2

^a2 and 3 tied County 3

^b3,4,5,6 tied County 4

^c4 and 5 tied County 5

TABLE 20

INMATE RANKINGS OF "NEEDED" PROGRAMMING

AILS:	1	2	3	4	5
UMBER:	244	81	63	45	133
OP FIVE RANKINGS (EXCEPT WHEN TIED):					
Arts/Crafts/ Music	3	5**	1 ^a		5 ^d
GED					
High School College Courses	2		2 ^a		
Vocational Courses	4	6**	3 ^a		
AA					
NA				2	
Other Alcohol					
Other Drug					
Church					
Law Library					
Library Books and Visits					3 ^c
Preventive Medical Daycare			5	4 ^b	
Self-Esteem	5	3*			2
Correspondence Courses					
Work Training	1	2		1	4 ^c 6 ^d
Anger Management					
Stress Management		1	4 ^a		1
Parenting Skills		7**			
Communication Skills				5 ^b	
Preventive Health					
STD Prevention		4			
Other					

Rail 1=Pacific Shores, 2=Port City, 3=Central Valley, 4=Atlantic Shores,
 5=Bay View
 *3 and 4 tied County 2
 ** 5,6 and 7 tied County 2
 †1,2,3 and 4 tied County 3
 ‡3,4, and 5 tied County 4
 §3 and 4 tied County 5
 ¶5, and 6 tied County 5

TABLE 21

INMATE AGGREGATE RANKINGS OF "NEEDED" PROGRAMMING

TOP TEN RANKINGS

Arts/Crafts/ Music	2
GED	
High School	
College Courses	3
Vocational Courses	4*
AA	
NA	
Other Alcohol	
Other Drug	
Church	
Law Library	
Library Books and Visits	10
Preventive Medical	
Daycare	8
Self-Esteem	6
Correspondence Courses	
Work Training	1
Anger Management	7
Stress Management	5*
Parenting Skills	
Communication Skills	9
Preventive Health	
STD Prevention	
Other	

4 and 5 programs tied in ranking.

Women's Jail Organizational Profile Form

Project Title:

Women's Jails: An Investigation of Offenders, Administration and Programming

Study Conducted by:

Researchers affiliated with the Department of Criminal Justice at New Mexico State
University

This study is funded by:

A technical assistance grant from the National Institute of Corrections.

Instruction Sheet for the Women's Jail Organizational Profile

Dear Colleagues:

We are researchers affiliated with the Criminal Justice Department at New Mexico State University conducting a study funded by the National Institute of Corrections of exclusively women's jails around the country. We would appreciate it if you could fill out the Jail Organizational Profile as completely as possible. To ensure that the data gathered are comparable from jail to jail, we ask that you please adhere as much as possible to the following guidelines:

- Provide data for the most recent 12 month period or provide data for the most recent fiscal year period.
- Provide information only on personnel who are full-time, paid by the facility (as opposed to contractors) and non-volunteers.
- If the back of the form is used or additional pages (or forms) are added, please indicate which question is being responded to.
- Please feel free to contact us if there is some question about the information we are requesting.
- Because of the time constraints of the grant period, we are asking that you give us the completed forms and surveys, at the time of our visit.
- Direct all questions regarding these forms and the surveys, to: Mary K. Stohr or G. Larry Mays or Carol Clark in the Criminal Justice Department, New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico 88003-0001; (505) 646-3316.

WOMEN'S JAIL ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE FORM

Unless the question indicates otherwise, please provide data covering only the most recent 12 month period for this jail or the most recent fiscal year period (use the fiscal year only if this jail has been in operation for at least one fiscal year).

Facility Status and Operations

1. What is the date that this form was filled out (the first day if it takes more than one day to complete)? _____
2. What 12 month period or fiscal year period is covered here?

3. What is the name of the jail? _____
(Please fill out a separate set of forms for each jail if more than one facility is involved.)
4. Name of person supplying the data? _____
5. Title and phone number of person supplying the data? _____

6. Is this jail a part of the sheriff's department?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
7. If "No" is this jail part of a separate Department of Corrections?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Other (please specify) _____
8. Does this facility hold only adult female inmates?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
9. If the facility has held juveniles within the last 12 month or fiscal year period, indicate the number of juveniles held? _____

10. Is this facility designed for sight and sound separation of juveniles from adult inmates?
- a. yes
 - b. no
 - c. sight only
 - d. sound only
 - e. not applicable, juveniles not held
11. What month and year was the jail opened? _____
12. What is the rated capacity of the jail? _____
13. What is the actual population of the jail on a weekday? (please indicate the population and the date) _____
14. What is the actual population on a Saturday? (please indicate the population and the date)

15. What is the average daily population of the jail? _____
16. Is the facility under court order to limit the number of inmates that can be housed?
- a. yes
 - b. no
17. If yes, what is the maximum number the facility is allowed to house?

18. Do you have a daily work-release program in your facility?
- a. Yes, number of inmates participating in the work-release program?

 - b. No
19. Is there a separate facility for work release in another location?
- a. Yes, Please give the name, address and telephone number of each such facility in the comments section at the end of the questionnaire or on the back of this page.
 - b. No
20. Does your facility have a weekend sentence program?
- a. Yes, on a typical weekend, how many persons are usually serving a weekend sentence?

 - b. No

21. Of the persons admitted to your institution, indicate those that are given a medical physical examination.

	Unsentenced <u>Inmates</u>	Sentenced <u>Inmates</u>
a. All	_____	_____
b. Only obviously sick	_____	_____
c. Other - Specify _____		
d. None (skip to next question)		

22. Are laboratory tests included in admission physical (please indicate by putting an X in the appropriate space)?

	Unsentenced <u>Inmates</u>	Sentenced <u>Inmates</u>
a. Urine sample taken	_____	_____
b. Blood sample taken	_____	_____
c. Chest X-Ray given (or other TB Test)	_____	_____

23. What kinds of screening or assessments are made of inmates upon admission into your facility (please indicate by putting an X in the appropriate space)?

	Unsentenced <u>Inmates</u>	Sentenced <u>Inmates</u>
a. Physical health	_____	_____
b. Mental health	_____	_____
c. Suicide potential	_____	_____
d. Alcohol intoxication	_____	_____
e. Drug influence/consumption	_____	_____
f. Other screening - specify _____		
g. None		

24. Mark the appropriate boxes if this facility routinely provides inmates with exercise activities for at least 1 hour a day outside their sleeping quarters.

	Unsentenced <u>Inmates</u>	Sentenced <u>Inmates</u>
a. Indoors only	_____	_____
b. Outdoors only	_____	_____
c. Both indoors and outdoors	_____	_____
d. Other - specify _____		
e. None		

25. What medical facilities are available in the jail (circle all that apply)?

- a. None (Skip to next question)
- b. Infirmary - without beds for overnight stay
- c. Infirmary - with beds for overnight stay
- d. Detoxification Unit
- e. Psychiatric Unit
- f. Other - specify _____

26. Typically, how often are the following personnel available within the jail? (please indicate by putting an X in the appropriate space)

<u>Availability</u>	<u>Doctor</u>	<u>Dentist</u>	<u>Nurse/PA</u>	<u>Mental Health Personnel</u>
a. Scheduled daily	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Scheduled weekly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Scheduled bimonthly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Scheduled monthly	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. On Call, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Never - inmates sent to hospital emergency room				
g. Other - specify _____				

27. Is your facility under court order with respect to general conditions of confinement?

- a. Yes
- b. No

28. Is your facility a regional jail serving two or more counties?

- a. Yes
- b. No

Please give the names of all counties you serve below:

29. How many lawsuits were filed against the facility during the time period covered in this study? _____

30. How many settlements were made during the time period covered in this study? _____

31. Was the facility under court order that mandated program or facility operational changes?

32. How many recorded altercations of each type occurred?

- a. inmate to inmate _____
- b. inmate to staff _____
- c. other (please specify) _____

33. What are the rules concerning visiting? (If you have a copy of the rules please attach them to this form.)

- a. When are visiting hours? _____
- b. Who may visit? _____
- c. How often? _____
- d. How long? _____

34. What are the most common infractions?

Minor Infractions

Disciplinary Action Likely To Result

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

Major Infractions

Disciplinary Action Likely To Result

_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

35. What are the procedures for handling major infraction?

36. How are minor infractions handled and by whom? _____

37. What kinds of inmate programs were available? (circle all that apply):

- a. GED classes
- b. Alcoholics Anonymous or a similar program
- c. Narcotics Anonymous or a similar program
- d. church services
- e. college level courses
- f. law library
- g. library books/library visitation
- h. preventive medical programming
- i. day care programming for inmate children
- j. self-esteem/self-worth programming
- k. correspondence courses
- l. work training programs (please specify) _____
- _____
- m. anger management training
- n. stress management training
- o. parenting skills training
- p. communication skills training
- q. preventive health care programming (please specify) _____
- _____
- r. sexually transmitted disease prevention programming (please specify) _____
- _____
- s. other (please specify) _____
- _____

38. How is access to inmate programs gained? (circle all that apply):

- a. earned through good behavior over a period of time
- b. based on need
- c. based on request of inmate
- d. based on seniority
- e. other (please specify) _____
- _____

39. If you provide work training programming, please indicate the type of work and the agency that sponsors it (put NA if not applicable):

- a. work _____
- b. agency _____

- a. work _____
- b. agency _____

- a. work _____
- b. agency _____

- a. work _____
- b. agency _____

- a. work _____
- b. agency _____

Staff

40. How many full time correctional employees are there at this facility?

41. How many of the total number of full time employees are:

- a. African-American/Black _____
- b. White _____
- c. Hispanic _____
- d. American Indian _____
- e. Other (incl. Asian-American, etc.) _____

42. Count each staff member only once - in the position that person primarily fills.

Payroll staff - Full-time and part-time staff on the payroll of this facility.

Nonpayroll staff - Full-time and part-time staff who are NOT on the payroll of this facility; also include personnel paid under contractual agreements or Federal grants, and college interns who receive class credit for their work at the facility. (Exclude community volunteers.)

Community volunteers - Full-time and part-time personnel who receive NO compensation of any type, such as salaries, payments, or class credit, for their services at the facility.

	Payroll Staff		Nonpayroll Staff		Community Volunteers	
	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time	Full Time	Part Time
a. Total staff on						
b. Administrators . . .						
c. Correctional Officers						
d. Clerical and Maintenance Personnel						
e. Educational						
f. Medical						
g. Other Professional and Technical						
h. Other (specify) . . .						

43. Who is in charge of recruitment of staff? For instance, does the jail handle this or is it done by an outside agency (e.g., the Civil Service Commission)?

44. Who is in charge of selection processes for staff? Is it handled by the jail or is it handled by an outside agency (or some combination of both)?

Inmate

45. How many of the total number of inmates are?

- a. African-American/Black _____
- b. White _____
- c. Hispanic _____
- d. American Indian _____
- e. Other (incl. Asian-American, etc.) _____

46. What is the total cost of detention per inmate per year? _____

- a. How is this figure calculated? _____

47. What was the number of inmates in the facility on May 30, 1992, in each of the following categories?

- a. Awaiting arraignment/trial or being tried at this time?

- b. Convicted and awaiting sentence? _____
- c. Serving sentence? (whether appealing or not) _____
- d. Technical probation or parole violators only, with no new charges

- e. Juveniles housed for juvenile authorities (i.e., runaways, awaiting transfer to juvenile facility, etc.) _____
- f. Other - Specify _____

48. What was the number of inmates placed in segregation for (please indicate the number for each):

- a. disciplinary reasons _____
- b. administrative reasons _____
- c. protective custody reasons _____
- d. other reasons (please specify) _____

49. Who decides whether an inmate should be placed in disciplinary segregation?

- a. the detention/correctional officer
- b. the detention/correctional officer in conjunction with supervisors
- c. other (please specify) _____

50. Who decides whether an inmate should be placed in administrative segregation?

- a. the detention/correctional officer
- b. the detention/correctional officer in conjunction with supervisors
- c. other (please specify) _____

51. Who decides whether an inmate should be placed in protective custody?

- a. the detention/correctional officer
- b. the detention/correctional officer in conjunction with supervisors
- c. other (please specify) _____

52. How many formal disciplinary actions were taken against inmates? (please include only those disciplinary actions that required written documentation)

53. How many suicides and deaths of inmates occurred? (if death other than suicide, please indicate the cause) _____

54. During the past 12 month period, what number of inmates have been diagnosed as severely mentally ill? _____

55. During the past 12 month period, what number of inmates have been diagnosed as HIV positive? _____

56. Are there special visiting arrangements for emergencies?

57. Are contact visits permitted?

- a. yes
- b. no

58. If contact visits are allowed who may visit? (circle all that apply)

- a. children
- b. spouse
- c. significant other
- d. lawyer
- e. spouse and children
- f. spouse, children and lawyer
- g. other family members (other family members)

59. What is the average number of visitors per month per inmate?

60. What is your policy regarding furloughs? _____

61. If you permit conjugal visits, please describe the program (who is eligible, how often, where, etc.) _____

62. Do you provide contraceptives?

- a. yes
- b. no

63. Is any type of counseling available before or after visits?

- a. yes
- b. no

64. Are inmates permitted to visit in each others' room?

- a. yes, if yes are there any restrictions? _____
- b. no

We are grateful for the time each of you has devoted to this research and are confident that the findings we will share with you will be of real use to your organization. Again, please feel free to contact us if you have nay questions or comments regarding this research.

Comments Section (please feel free to provide any additional information here or to comment on this form or this research).

**WOMEN'S JAIL STAFF SURVEY
1992**

Women's jail facilities have been all but ignored in the study of correctional institutions. In particular, little is known about the situation and circumstances of staff within these facilities. In this survey we want to find out what you think about your employment in this facility.

This study is being conducted by members of the Department of Criminal Justice at New Mexico State University and is funded by a grant from the National Institute of Corrections. Your participation is very important because we hope to be able to develop a profile of exclusively women's jails, their staff and inmates through this research effort. The individuals conducting the research are Dr. Larry Mays, Dr. Mary K. Stohr, and Research Associates Carol Clark and Shannon Henry.

Your participation in this survey is completely VOLUNTARY; however, in order to gather a fair impression of how staff feel about their work in this facility, it is IMPORTANT that as many people as possible respond to the survey.

YOUR ANSWERS WILL BE KEPT COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL. Your answers will be treated anonymously and the data will be handled so that no individual or group of individuals can be identified.

It is important that you consider these questions carefully and answer them as fairly and as accurately as possible. Upon completion of the questionnaire, please seal it in the envelop provided and return it to the researchers.

PLEASE DO NOT DISCUSS THE QUESTIONNAIRE OR YOUR ANSWERS
UNTIL ALL SURVEYS ARE RETURNED TO THE RESEARCHERS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

***NOTE:** Questions appear on both the front and the back of each page. Please ensure that you answer the questions on both sides of the page.

SECTION ONE:

These questions deal with aspects of your personal background and circumstances. This information is needed in order to allow the proper interpretation of results with respect to groupings of employees (for example, recent hires versus 5-year correctional veterans, etc.)

1. Age _____
2. Ethnicity: (Check one)
_____ African American/Black
_____ Asian American
_____ Caucasian/White
_____ Mexican American/Hispanic/
_____ Latino
_____ Native American/Indian
_____ Other
3. Gender: (check one)
_____ Male
_____ Female
4. Please check the blank for the highest level of schooling you have completed:
- | | |
|--|--|
| _____ No High School Diploma
or GED | _____ Bachelor Degree |
| _____ GED | _____ Some graduate
course work (degree
not completed) |
| _____ High School Graduate | _____ Graduate Degree |
| _____ Some College (degree
not completed) | _____ Other (please
specify) |
| _____ Associate Degree | |
5. How long have you been employed at this facility? _____
6. What is your current job title? _____
7. To what shift are you presently assigned?
- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|
| _____ 1. Day shift | _____ 3. Graveyard |
| _____ 2. Swing shift | _____ 4. Other |
8. Prior to your current position, have you ever worked in a jail?
_____ 1. Yes
_____ 2. No
- If yes, what was your last position? _____
How long were your employed? _____

9. Prior to your current position, have you ever worked in an area of corrections other than jails?
- ____ 1. Yes
 ____ 2. No

If yes, what was your last position? _____
 How long were you employed? _____

10. Prior to your current position, have you ever worked in an area of criminal justice other than corrections?
- ____ 1. Yes
 ____ 2. No

If yes, what was your position? _____
 How long were your employed? _____

11. How would you describe the training you received when first hired at this facility? (Circle your response)

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----9

Not much training	A moderate Amount of training	A great deal of training	Undecided
----------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------	-----------

12. In which of the following areas have you received in-service training (check as many as apply)

____ Interpersonal skills	____ Inmate classification
____ Problem solving and decision making	____ Criminal law
____ Crisis management/ conflict management	____ Self defense
____ Report writing	____ Observation skills
____ Physical restraint techniques	____ First aid
____ Facility policies and procedures	____ Supervision skills
____ Other (please specify) _____	____ Data entry
	____ Nursing/health care techniques
	____ Use of office equipment

13. Of the job training subjects listed above, which three do you believe are the most important for an employee in your position in this facility? Please place the number 1 by the most important , 2 by the second most important and 3 by the third most important from the list above.

1. _____
 2. _____
 3. _____

SECTION TWO:

Listed below are a number of statements which could be used to describe a job. Please indicate whether each statement is an accurate or an inaccurate description or your job.

Write a number in the blank beside each statement, based on the following scale:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very	Mostly	Slightly	Uncertain	Slightly	Mostly	Very
In-	In-	In-		Accurate	Accurate	Accurate
Accurate	Accurate	Accurate				

- _____ 1. The job requires me to use a number of complex or high-level skills.
- _____ 2. The job requires a lot of cooperative work with other people.
- _____ 3. The job is arranged so that I do not have the chance to do an entire piece of work from beginning to end.
- _____ 4. Just doing the work required by the job provides many chances for me to figure out how well I am doing.
- _____ 5. The job is quite simple and repetitive.
- _____ 6. The job can be done adequately by a person working alone --without talking or checking with other people.
- _____ 7. The supervisors and co-workers on this job almost never give me any "feedback" about how well I am doing in my work.
- _____ 8. This job is one where a lot of people can be affected by how well the work gets done.
- _____ 9. The job denies me any chance to use my personal initiative or judgment in carrying out the work.
- _____ 10. Supervisors often let me know how well they think I am performing the job.
- _____ 11. The job provides me the chance to completely finish the pieces of work I begin.
- _____ 12. The job itself provides very few clues about whether or not I am performing well.
- _____ 13. The job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work.
- _____ 14. The job itself is not very significant or important in the broader scheme of things.

SECTION THREE:

This section is divided into five subsections, each concerned with a different aspect of your job. Each part contains a number of words or phrases which could describe your job. Put a 1 in the blank before each word or phrase that does describe your job, a 2 in the blank if the word or phrase does not describe your job, or a 3 if you cannot decide.

This part of the questionnaire is called the Job Descriptive Index, c Bowling Green State University, 1975

WORK ON PRESENT JOB: Think of your present work. What is it like most of the time?

1=Yes, does describe 2=No, does not describe 3=Cannot decide

_____ Fascinating	_____ Useful
_____ Routine	_____ Tiresome
_____ Satisfying	_____ Healthful
_____ Boring	_____ Challenging
_____ Good	_____ On your feet
_____ Creative	_____ Frustrating
_____ Respected	_____ Simple
_____ Hot (temperature)	_____ Endless
_____ Pleasant	_____ Give sense of accomplishment

PRESENT PAY: Think of the pay you get now. How well does each of the following words describe your present pay?

1=Yes, does describe 2=No, does not describe 3= Cannot decide

_____ Income adequate for normal expenses	_____ Insecure
_____ Barely live on income	_____ Less than I deserve
_____ Bad	_____ Highly paid
_____ Income provides luxuries	_____ Underpaid

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PROMOTION: Think of the opportunities for promotion that you have now. How well does each of the following words describe these?

1=Yes, does describe 2=No, does not describe 3= Cannot decide

<input type="checkbox"/> Good opportunities for promotion	<input type="checkbox"/> Unfair promotion policy
<input type="checkbox"/> Opportunity somewhat limited	<input type="checkbox"/> Infrequent promotions
<input type="checkbox"/> Promotion on ability	<input type="checkbox"/> Regular promotions
<input type="checkbox"/> Dead-End job	<input type="checkbox"/> Fairly good chance for promotion
<input type="checkbox"/> Good chance for promotion	

MANAGEMENT AT PRESENT JOB: Think of the kind of management you have on your job. How well does each of the following words describe this supervision?

1=Yes, does describe 2=No, does not describe 3= Cannot decide

<input type="checkbox"/> Asks my advice	<input type="checkbox"/> Tells me where I stand
<input type="checkbox"/> Hard to please	<input type="checkbox"/> Annoying
<input type="checkbox"/> Impolite	<input type="checkbox"/> Stubborn
<input type="checkbox"/> Praises good work	<input type="checkbox"/> Knows job well
<input type="checkbox"/> Tactful	<input type="checkbox"/> Bad
<input type="checkbox"/> Influential	<input type="checkbox"/> Intelligent
<input type="checkbox"/> Up-to-date	<input type="checkbox"/> Leaves me on my own
<input type="checkbox"/> Doesn't supervise enough	<input type="checkbox"/> Around when needed
<input type="checkbox"/> Quick tempered	<input type="checkbox"/> Lazy

PEOPLE ON YOUR PRESENT JOB: Think of the majority of the people that you work with now. How well does each of the following words describe these people?

1=Yes, does describe 2=No, does not describe 3= Cannot decide

<input type="checkbox"/> Stimulating	<input type="checkbox"/> Talk too much
<input type="checkbox"/> Boring	<input type="checkbox"/> Smart
<input type="checkbox"/> Slow	<input type="checkbox"/> Lazy
<input type="checkbox"/> Ambitious	<input type="checkbox"/> Unpleasant
<input type="checkbox"/> Stupid	<input type="checkbox"/> No privacy
<input type="checkbox"/> Responsible	<input type="checkbox"/> Active
<input type="checkbox"/> Fast	<input type="checkbox"/> Narrow interests
<input type="checkbox"/> Intelligent	<input type="checkbox"/> Loyal
<input type="checkbox"/> Easy to make enemies	<input type="checkbox"/> Hard to meet

INMATES WOULD MOST OFTEN PREFER

- | | | | |
|-----|--|----|--|
| 9. | Staff who help a woman
who's depressed | or | A shop where they
teach you skills |
| 10. | Being myself | | Learning something |
| 11. | Inmates I know well from
the streets | | Officers who act the
same every day |
| 12. | Getting a good job in jail | | Being safe in jail |
| 13. | Knowing that I am loved | | Getting peace and
quiet |
| 14. | Staying in my cell | | Feeling safe |
| 15. | Having no officers around | | Having lots of friends |
| 16. | A place with no crowds | | A place where you are safe |
| 17. | Keeping active | | Loving someone |
| 18. | A job where I have friends | | A job where I work alone |
| 19. | Staff who advance my
interests | | Not having a boss |
| 20. | Having a good time | | Being close to someone |
| 21. | Having consistent rules | | Being busy all day |
| 22. | Teachers from whom I learn | | Officers who protect me |
| 23. | Housing where I know
everybody | | Housing in which I
keep busy |
| 24. | Rules that tell me
what to expect | | As few rules as possible |
| 25. | A place with friends | | A quiet place |
| 26. | A very busy day | | A message of love |
| 27. | A friendly game | | No supervision |
| 28. | An active program | | Time by myself |
| 29. | No one to disturb me | | No one to forget me |
| 30. | No one checking up on me | | No time to be bored |

SECTION FIVE:

This section addresses some of the types of programs within jail facilities.

1. In this institution, which of the following activities or programs are available? (check all that apply)

- 1. Arts, crafts, music
- 2. GED classes
- 3. High school classes
- 3. College courses
- 4. Vocational courses or training
- 5. Alcoholics anonymous
- 6. Other alcohol treatment programming
- 7. Narcotics Anonymous
- 8. Other drug treatment programming
- 9. Church services
- 10. Law library
- 11. Library books/library visitation
- 12. Day care programming for inmate children
- 13. Self-esteem/self-worth programming
- 14. Correspondence courses
- 15. Work training programs (please specify) _____
- 16. Anger management training
- 17. Stress management training
- 18. Parenting skills training
- 19. Communication skills training
- 20. Preventive health care programming (please specify) _____
- 21. Sexually transmitted disease prevention programming (please specify) _____
- 22. Other (specify) _____
- 23. None of the above

2. Which of the activities or programs listed in number '1' exist in this facility? (please indicate with the number(s) of the activity or program in the above)

3. In this institution, which of the programs listed in number '1' do you believe would be most useful? (please indicate by numbers) _____

4. In this institution, which of the programs listed in number '1' do you believe are needed by the inmates, but are not currently offered at this institution? (please indicate by numbers) _____

SECTION SIX:

Much has been written about AFFIRMATIVE ACTION and SEXUAL HARASSMENT in the work place. The next questions are designed to gather information on your PERSONAL experiences and thoughts on these subjects.

1. Attitudes about affirmative action differ greatly among employees. How would you describe your feelings about affirmative action in the jail you work? (check one of the answers below)
- _____ MUCH MORE should be done to promote affirmative action than is done now.
- _____ ABOUT THE SAME amount of attention should be given to promoting affirmative action in the future as has been given in the past five years.
- _____ MUCH LESS attention should be devoted to affirmative action in the future than has been the case in the past.
2. Sexual harassment may include "unwelcome verbal or physical contact of a sexual nature inhibiting one's work" which comes from your coworkers and/or supervisors. Have you ever been the victim of sexual harassment during your period of employment with this jail? (check one)
- _____ Yes
- _____ No
3. If you answered YES above, what action did you take? (check all that apply)
- _____ Politely asked the offender to stop
- _____ Made an informal complaint to a "higher up"
- _____ Made a formal complaint to the Personnel Office
- _____ Told other workers or friends about the incident
- _____ Asked to be transferred to another department
- _____ Other (please specify) _____

4. If you answered YES above, how long ago did the incident occur? (check one)
- less than two years ago
 - 2 to 5 years ago
 - 5 or more years ago
5. If you REPORTED HARASSMENT, was the matter resolved?
- Yes
 - No
6. If you were a victim of repeated sexual harassment by a fellow employee or boss, what action would you be likely to take? (you can mark MORE THAN ONE)
- Politely asked the offender to stop
 - Made an informal complaint to a "higher up"
 - Made a formal complaint to the Personnel Office
 - Told other workers or friends about the incident
 - Asked to be transferred to another department
 - Other (please specify) _____
- _____

COMMENTS:
Please feel free to comment on this survey/research or to provide further information in this section.

Thank you very much for your time and effort
in filling out this survey.

WOMEN'S JAIL INMATE SURVEY

Women's jail facilities have been all but ignored in the study of correctional institutions. In particular, little is known about the situation and circumstances of inmates within these facilities. In this survey we want to find out what you think about your incarceration in this facility.

This study is being conducted by members of the Department of Criminal Justice at New Mexico State University and is funded by a grant from the National Institute of Corrections. Your participation is very important because we hope to be able to develop a profile of exclusively women's jails, their staff and inmates through this research effort. The individuals conducting the research are Dr. Larry Mays, Dr. Mary K. Stohr, and Research Associates Carol Clark and Shannon Henry.

Your participation in this survey is completely VOLUNTARY; however, in order to gather a fair impression of how inmates feel about this facility, it is IMPORTANT that as many people as possible respond to the survey.

YOUR ANSWERS WILL BE KEPT COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL. Your answers will be treated anonymously and the data will be handled so that no individual or group of individuals can be identified.

It is important that you consider these questions carefully and answer them as fairly and as accurately as possible. Upon completion of the questionnaire, please seal it in the envelope provided and return it to the researchers.

PLEASE DO NOT DISCUSS THE QUESTIONNAIRE OR YOUR ANSWERS
UNTIL ALL SURVEYS ARE RETURNED TO THE RESEARCHERS

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

*NOTE: Questions appear on both the front and the back of each page. Please ensure that you answer the questions on both sides of the page.

SECTION ONE: What goes on in jail differs from one facility to another. The rules are different. Inmates have more freedom, privacy, and activities in some jails than in others. There is less violence in some facilities. At some places the staff are more supportive.

We are interested in life at this facility. We want to know what goes on here, what it is like to live and work here.

We particularly want to know what it is like to live in your particular housing unit (cell block, tier or dormitory).

We will give you a statement about something that might happen in your housing unit. We ask that you indicate if that event never happens, seldom happens, often happens, or always happens on your unit.

Place a "1" on the line before the statement if that event never happens, a "2" if it seldom happens, a "3" if it often happens, or a "4" if it always happens on your unit.

Some choices will be easy. Others will not. Even if you have a hard time deciding, let us know what best describes what goes on here. Do not skip any questions.

Remember to answer the questions about what it is like on your cell block, tier or dormitory and use the following numbers to describe how things are.

1-----	2-----	3-----	4-----
Never Happens	Seldom Happens	Often Happens	Always Happens

-
1. _____ Inmates know what will happen if they violate the rules.
 2. _____ The correction officers tell inmates when they do well.
 3. _____ There is at least one type of entertainment scheduled each week such as a movie, etc.
 4. _____ An inmate is sexually attacked on this unit.
 5. _____ Inmates spend several hours each day talking with friends.
 6. _____ Inmates fight with other inmates.
 7. _____ The correction officers ask inmates about their personal feelings.
 8. _____ Inmates are with their friends at night.

1-----2-----3-----4
 Never Seldom Often Always
 Happens Happens Happens Happens

9. _____ If an inmate tries a new hobby or art, the correction officers will encourage her.
10. _____ Inmates know the rules.
11. _____ Inmates are with more than three friends at a time.
12. _____ Someone's cell is robbed on this unit.
13. _____ This unit is quiet.
14. _____ Inmates feel free to go up and talk to other inmates even if they are strangers.
15. _____ Inmates stay in their cell if they want.
16. _____ Inmates receive visitors any time during the day.
17. _____ Jail officials help inmates with problems.
18. _____ An inmate obtains training if she wants.
19. _____ Weaker inmates are sexually attacked.
20. _____ Inmates read without being disturbed.
21. _____ Inmates care about one another.
22. _____ Inmates see their close inmate friends when they want to.
23. _____ A weaker inmate is physically attacked.
24. _____ Inmates can be alone without being disturbed.
25. _____ Inmates do not have to work if they do not want to.
26. _____ A person learns new skills here.
27. _____ Inmates have something to do every night.
28. _____ Inmates can exercise when they want to.
29. _____ Correction officers tease depressed inmates.
30. _____ Inmates talk freely with the correction officers.
31. _____ Each inmate can exercise at least one hour each day.
32. _____ Inmates know what will get them written up by the correction officers.
33. _____ Inmates talk to one another about their feelings.
34. _____ Inmates keep busy by participating in sports.
35. _____ An inmate's cell is robbed.
36. _____ If an inmate lets other people know she does not want to be bothered, they will not bother her.
37. _____ Inmates know when the recreation yard is open.
38. _____ Inmates let their friends know they care about them.
39. _____ Inmates are allowed to read when they want.
40. _____ Inmates know when they can take a shower.
41. _____ Inmates who do favors for their friends are liked.
42. _____ Jail programs teach inmates new skills.
43. _____ Inmates keep busy with their hobbies.
44. _____ Inmates know when the commissary is open.
45. _____ Jail programs help inmates get an early release.
46. _____ Inmates stay up as late as they want.
47. _____ Inmates have at least one hour of uninterrupted time to themselves each night.
48. _____ Inmates have television when they want.

SECTION TWO:

No one likes doing time. There are some things that can make life in jail easier, and some that make it harder. We would like to know some of the things you like most and dislike most about jail. First we will give you a list of things you can choose from, and we would like to know which of them you prefer

Here is an example:

	I'D PREFER	
A release date		Chicken next Sunday

We'd like you to circle the one you prefer. If you are like most people, you'll want the release date. If you do, please circle it; your answer will look like this:

	I'D PREFER	
A release date		Chicken next Sunday

Some of the choices will be tougher than this one, but please try your best. Even if you have a hard time deciding, or you only have a slight preference, let us know which way you lean. Remember to CIRCLE the one you LIKE BEST, and DON'T SKIP ANY.

	I'D PREFER	
1. Officers who are consistent		Housing that keeps noise out
2. Housing in which no one can harm me		Staying away from officers
3. Inmates who know their rights		Inmates who make no noise
4. Housing where people talk freely		A friend who shares my problems
5. Knowing my people still love me		An officer who overlooks infractions
6. Educational advancement		Protection from danger
7. Staff who stick to their rules		Staff who care how how I feel
8. Staff who let me run my life		Staff who are honest
9. Staff who help a woman who's depressed		A shop where they teach you skills
10. Being myself		Learning something
11. Inmates I know well from the streets		Officers who act the same every day
12. Getting a good job in jail		Being safe in jail
13. Knowing that I am loved		Getting peace and quiet
14. Staying in my cell		Feeling safe
15. Having no officers around		Having lots of friends
16. A place with no crowds		A place where you are safe

I'D PREFER

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 17. Keeping active | Loving someone |
| 18. A job where I have friends | A job where I work alone |
| 19. Staff who advance my interests | Not having a boss |
| 20. Having a good time | Being close to someone |
| 21. Having consistent rules | Being busy all day |
| 22. Teachers from whom I learn | Officers who protect me |
| 23. Housing where I know everybody | Housing in which I keep busy |
| 24. Rules that tell me what to expect | As few rules as possible |
| 25. A place with friends | A quiet place |
| 26. A very busy day | A message of love |
| 27. A friendly game | No supervision |
| 28. An active program | Time by myself |
| 29. No one to disturb me | No one to forget me |
| 30. No one checking up on me | No time to be bored |

SECTION THREE:

These questions deal with aspects of your personal background and circumstances. Please indicate the appropriate response or mark the appropriate category.

1. Age: _____

2. Ethnicity: (check one)

- _____ African American/Black
_____ Asian American
_____ Caucasian/White
_____ Mexican American/Hispanic/
_____ Latino
_____ Native American/Indian
_____ Other

3. How many days have you been in this facility? _____

4. How old were you when you were arrested for the first time?

5. Not including your current incarceration, how many times have you been in jail or prison? _____ Does not apply _____

6. As an adult, have you ever served time before?
- 1. No prior time served
 - 2. On probation only
 - 3. Served time in jail only
 - 4. Served time in both jail and prison
 - 5. Served time in prison only
7. What type of crime are you being held for?
- 1. Traffic or minor criminal offense (e.g. drunk driving, disorderly conduct, etc.)
 - 1. Shoplifting, petty theft, or larceny
 - 2. Forgery or Fraud
 - 3. Burglary
 - 5. Prostitution
 - 6. Offense against another person (e.g. robbery, assault, etc.)
 - 7. Possession or sale of drugs
 - 8. Manslaughter, homicide, or murder
 - 9. Other (specify) _____.
8. What sentence were you given by the court? (indicate the number of days, months and/or years)
- Unsentenced Days Months Years
9. Please check the highest year in school that you completed?
- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> No High School Diploma | <input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor Degree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> or GED | <input type="checkbox"/> Some Graduate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> GED | <input type="checkbox"/> Course Work (degree not completed) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> High School Diploma | <input type="checkbox"/> Graduate Degree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Some College (degree not completed) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Degree | |
10. Besides your regular schooling, did you ever have any vocational training? (mark all that apply)
- 1. No
 - 2. Yes, vocational school (indicate type)
 - 3. Yes, in jail or prison (indicate type)
 - 4. Other _____
11. Just before you came here, with whom did you live or who lived with you? (mark all that apply)
- 1. With legal husband
 - 2. With common law husband/boyfriend
 - 3. With children
 - 4. With other relatives
 - 5. With friends
 - 6. Lived alone

12. Right now, are you considered:

- 1. Legally married?
- 2. Common law married (boyfriend)?
- 3. Separated or divorced?
- 4. Widowed?
- 5. Single, never married?

13. How many children do you have? _____
What are their ages? _____

How many of your children, under the age of 18, were living with you just before you came here? _____

14. Who is primarily taking care of your children under the age of 18 while you are here?

- 1. Your mother
- 2. Your father
- 3. Your husband
- 4. Your boyfriend
- 5. Other relatives
- 6. Friends
- 7. Foster parents, ward of the court, social service agency.

16. In this institution, which of the following activities or programs are available? (Check all that apply)

- 1. Arts, crafts, music
- 2. GED classes
- 3. High school classes
- 4. College courses
- 5. Vocational courses or training
- 6. Alcoholics Anonymous or a similar program
- 7. Other alcohol treatment programming
- 8. Narcotics Anonymous or a similar program
- 9. Other drug treatment programming
- 10. Church services
- 11. New library
- 12. Library books/library visitation
- 13. Preventive medical programming
- 14. Day care programming for inmate children
- 15. Self-esteem/self-worth programming
- 16. Correspondence courses
- 17. Work training programs (please specify) _____
- 18. Anger management training
- 19. Stress management training
- 20. Parenting skills training
- 21. Communication skills training
- 22. Preventive health care programming (please specify) _____
- 23. Sexually transmitted disease prevention programming (please specify) _____
- 24. Other _____
- 25. None of the above.

17. Of the activities listed in number 16, which programs do you participate in? (indicate with numbers of the activity or program in the above)

18. In this institution, which of the activities listed in number 16 do you believe are most useful? (indicate with numbers) _____

19. In this institution, which of the activities listed in number 16 do you feel are needed but are not available. (indicate with numbers)

20. When you were arrested, were you put on probation, parole, released on bail or any other type of pretrial release?

- _____ 1. No
- _____ 2. Yes, probation
- _____ 3. Yes, parole
- _____ 4. Yes, out on bail
- _____ 5. Yes, pretrial release

21. Have you ever been on probation as a juvenile or as an adult?

- _____ 1. Yes
How many times as a juvenile _____
How many times as an adult _____
- _____ 2. No

22. How often do you make or receive telephone calls from:

- | <u>Family or relatives?</u> | <u>Friends or others?</u> |
|--|---------------------------|
| _____ 1. More than three times a month | _____ 1. |
| _____ 2. Three times a month | _____ 2. |
| _____ 3. Twice a month | _____ 3. |
| _____ 4. Once a month | _____ 4. |
| _____ 5. Less than once a month | _____ 5. |
| _____ 6. Never | _____ 6. |
| _____ 7. Do not know | _____ 7. |

23. How often in a month's time do you write or receive mail from:

- Your family or relatives? _____
Friends or others? _____

24. How often in a month's time are you personally visited by:

- Your family or relatives? _____
Friends or others? _____

25. Do you have a work assignment here?

- 1. No
- 2. Yes (describe)
 - General janitorial duties (cleaning)
 - Grounds or road maintenance
 - Food preparation or related duties (kitchen, etc.)
 - Laundry
 - Hospital, infirmary, or other medical services
 - Farming/forestry
 - Goods production (e.g. furniture manufacturing, etc.)
 - Other services (library, stockroom, store, office help, etc.)
 - Maintenance or repair
 - Other (Specify) _____

How many hours a week are you assigned to this job? _____

26. Where you employed at the time of your arrest?

- 1. No
- 2. Yes: _____ Full time _____ Part time

27. Prior to your arrest what was your usual monthly income?
\$ _____

30. Prior to your arrest what was your total income for the previous year? \$ _____

31. Were you supporting any other persons besides yourself?

- 1. No
- 2. Yes -- how many? _____

32. What was their relationship to you? (mark all that apply)

- 1. Husband
- 2. Children
- 3. Parents
- 4. Brothers/sisters
- 5. Other relatives
- 6. Non-relatives

33. Prior to your arrest, were you homeless?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Other (please specify) _____

