



Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report

May 2000, NCJ 179999

Drug Use, Testing, and Treatment in Jails

By Doris James Wilson
BJS Statistician

In 1998 an estimated 417,000 jail inmates (70% of all inmates in local facilities) had committed a drug offense or used drugs regularly, compared to 261,000 (67%) in 1989. About 138,000 convicted jail inmates were under the influence of drugs at the time of the offense. About 72,000 convicted jail inmates had used marijuana or hashish and 59,000 had used cocaine or crack cocaine.

Offenders in local jails reported a history of prior drug use similar to that of State prison inmates. Over half of jail (55%) and State inmates (57%) said they had used drugs in the month before the offense. About a fifth of these jail inmates and a third of State inmates had participated in substance abuse programs or treatment since admission. Compared to offenders on probation (32%), jail inmates were more likely to report using drugs in the month before the offense. A higher percentage of probationers than jail inmates had participated in treatment since beginning their sentence (42%).

This report, the third in the series on prior drug use and treatment of offenders, focuses on local jail inmates and jail jurisdictions. Past BJS reports include *Substance Abuse and Treatment, State and Federal Prisoners, 1997*, and *Substance Abuse and Treatment of Adults on Probation, 1995*.

Highlights

In 1998 an estimated 7 in 10 local jail inmates had used drugs regularly or had committed a drug offense

	Percent of inmates ^a	Estimated 1998
All inmates		
Drug offense/regular use	70.3%	417,000
Any drug offense	25.6	152,000
Convicted inmates		
Under the influence at time of offense	35.6%	138,000
Use in month before	55.0	213,000
Drugs used at time of offense		
Marijuana or hashish	18.5%	72,000
Cocaine/crack	15.2	59,000
Heroin	5.6	22,000
Active drug involvement ^b	65.5%	253,000

^aBased on personal interviews, 1996.

^bSee page 3 for definition.

- An estimated 61,000 (16%) convicted jail inmates committed their offense to get money for drugs.
- Two-thirds of convicted jail inmates were actively involved with drugs prior to their admission to jail.
- Overall, 71% of local jail jurisdictions reported that they had a policy to test inmates or staff for drug use in 1998. In June, a fourth of the jails tested samples from inmates.

About 10% of drug tests conducted on jail inmates in June 1998 showed drug use

	Samples for drug tests collected from inmates during June 1998 ^a	Percent positive
	Number	
Total	36,215	10.5%
Random only	3,776	7.6
Indication of use only	2,904	13.6
Random/indication of use	9,190	12.7
Combined methods	20,344	9.6

^aMultiple samples may have been collected from one inmate.

• Local jail jurisdictions with 1,000 or more inmates collected 48% of the samples for drug testing in June 1998. Seven percent of the samples from these larger jurisdictions were positive.

- Among jurisdictions that tested for drugs, 70% reported loss of privileges as the usual response to a positive test. Over half said that they take away good time.
- Nearly 5 in 10 jurisdictions that test staff reported dismissal from employment as the only action taken when staff test positive for drug use.
- On June 30, 1998, about 92,600 jail inmates had participated in drug and alcohol programs or substance abuse treatment, including inmates who may have been enrolled in more than one program.

Jails are correctional facilities operated by cities, counties, or other local authorities. Jail inmates are persons usually sentenced to a short term (generally under a year) but may include any detention status, such as sentenced to more than a year to be served in jail, held for State prisons due to overcrowding, awaiting trial or sentencing, or not yet arraigned.

Data on drug testing and treatment in local jail jurisdictions are from the 1998 Annual Survey of Jails. A special addendum on drug testing, sanctions, and interventions was included with the standard survey questions on supervised population and inmate counts and movements. A representative sample of 820 jail jurisdictions out of 2,890 provided information on policies for conducting drug tests on inmates and staff, criteria for selection for testing, number of positive tests for inmates, sanctions for positive test results, and substance abuse programs or treatment. (See *Methodology* for sample description.)

Other findings in this report are based on data from the Survey of Inmates in Local Jails, 1996. Over 6,100 inmates from 431 jails in personal interviews answered a series of questions on their current and past offense history, drug and alcohol use and treatment, family background, and conditions of confinement. (Data on these topics with comparison to surveys conducted in 1989 and 1983 are available in *Profile of Jail Inmates, 1996*, NCJ 164620).

BJS surveys and special collections provide a national perspective on the prevalence of drug use and drug crimes among local jail inmates. (See adjacent box.) In 1996, 82% of all jail inmates said they had used drugs at least once in their life. Among convicted jail inmates, 55% said they had used illegal drugs in the month before the offense. A quarter of jail inmates had a current drug offense, and over a quarter had a prior conviction for drug law violations.

55% of convicted jail inmates were using drugs in the month before the offense; 36% at the time of the offense

- A quarter of jail inmates had a current charge or conviction for drug law violations. About 15% had a charge or conviction for drug possession and 9% for trafficking.
- 30% of convicted jail inmates had been previously sentenced or incarcerated for drug possession, trafficking, or other drug offenses, compared to 21% of unconvicted jail inmates.
- About 82% of all inmates said they had ever used drugs at least once and 64% said they had used drugs regularly (that is, at least once a week for at least a month).
- 18% of convicted jail inmates said they had used intravenous drugs in the past, compared to 15% of unconvicted inmates.
- Nearly 1 in 6 of convicted jail inmates committed their offense to get money for drugs.

Drug involvement of jail inmates, 1996

	Percent of jail inmates		
	All	Convicted	Unconvicted
Current drug offenses^a	25.6%	28.4%	22.1%
Possession	14.6	16.6	11.9
Trafficking	9.3	9.7	9.0
Prior sentence for drug offenses^b	26.6%	29.6%	21.4%
Prior drug use			
Ever used drugs	82.4%	84.5%	79.0%
Ever used regularly ^c	64.2	67.2	59.8
Intravenous drug use	17.0	18.3	14.5
Used in the month before the offense	/	55.0	/
Used at time of the offense	/	35.6	/
Committed offense to get money for drugs	/	15.8%	/

Note: Based on the Survey of Inmates in Local Jails, 1996. Of the estimated 507,026 jail inmates in 1996, 62.7% were convicted on their current offense or serving a sentence for a prior offense; 33.4% were unconvicted, awaiting trial, on trial, or not yet arraigned; and 3.9% had an unknown conviction status. /Not reported.

^aExcludes inmates for whom the offense was unknown.

^bExcludes inmates for whom the offense of a prior probation or incarceration was unknown.

^cUsed drugs at least once a week for at least a month.

In recent years drug testing and treatment have increasingly become the focus of efforts to detect and control drug use in jails. In assessing who should be tested and treated for drug use, jurisdictions may consider past drug involvement or active drug involvement prior to the current admission.

Jail inmates reported high levels of drug involvement

On specific measures of reported past drug involvement, 64% of jail inmates had used drugs regularly, 42% had received treatment, 17% had used intravenous drugs, and 27% had a prior sentence for drug law violations. In combination, 74% of all jail inmates reported some past involvement with drugs.

In the 1996 inmate survey only convicted jail inmates were asked about the level of drug use immediately prior to the current offense. An estimated 66% of convicted jail inmates reported active involvement with drugs. For this report, active drug involvement is defined as those who had used drugs in the month before the offense (55%) or at the time of the offense (36%), committed the offense for money for drugs (16%), had received treatment since admission (13%), or had a current drug charge (26%).

Nearly a third of convicted jail inmates who had been involved with drugs in the past were not using drugs in the month before the offense. Among convicted inmates about 37% said they were using marijuana or hashish a month before their offense, and 24% said they were using cocaine or crack cocaine.

Actively drug-involved jail inmates younger and more likely to be black than other inmates

The proportions of actively drug-involved jail inmates varied across gender, racial or ethnic groups, and age categories. Males made up the

Assessing the need for testing and treatment in jails

Drug use of jail inmates, 1996

Percent of inmates

Past drug involvement of all inmates

73.7%

- Includes persons who —
- regularly used drugs in the past
- received drug treatment in the past
- may not currently use drugs regularly
- used intravenous drugs
- were sentenced for past drug offenses

Active drug involvement prior to current admission of convicted inmates

65.5%

- Includes persons who —
- used drugs in month before the offense
- used drugs at the time of the offense
- committed the offense for money for drugs
- were sentenced for a current drug offense
- had received treatment since admission

Type of drugs used by convicted jail inmates, 1996

	Used drugs —	
	In month before offense	At time of the offense
Any	55.0%	35.6%
Marijuana or hashish	36.8%	18.5%
Cocaine or crack	24.1	15.2
Heroin or opiates	8.8	5.6
Depressants ^a	5.9	2.4
Stimulants ^b	10.4	6.1
Hallucinogens ^c	4.6	1.6
Inhalants	1.0	0.3

Note: Details may add to more than total because inmates may have used more than one drug.

^aDepressants include barbiturates, tranquilizers, and Quaalude.

^bStimulants include amphetamine and methamphetamine.

^cHallucinogens include LSD and PCP.

Selected characteristics of convicted jail inmates, 1996

	Percent of convicted jail inmates	
	Active drug involvement	Other
Gender		
Male	89.0%	91.3%
Female	11.0	8.7
Race/Hispanic origin		
White non-Hispanic	38.2%	42.3%
Black non-Hispanic	41.2	34.5
Hispanic	17.9	19.2
Other*	2.7	4.0
Age		
17 or younger	1.3%	1.4%
18-24	29.0	25.9
25-29	20.3	18.2
30-34	20.2	17.4
35-44	24.6	24.4
45-54	4.2	9.2
55 or older	0.4	3.4

*Other includes Asians, Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders, American Indians, and Alaska Natives.

majority of both actively drug-involved and other inmates. However, women were a larger percentage of actively drug-involved inmates (11%) than of other inmates (9%).

Black or African American inmates were 41% of actively drug-involved inmates, compared to 35% of other inmates. Nearly equal percentages of actively drug-involved (18%) and other inmates (19%) were Hispanic.

About 65% of actively drug-involved inmates were between ages 25 and 44, compared to 60% of other inmates. Inmates between 18 and 24 were 29% of actively drug-involved inmates and 26% of other inmates.

Jails emphasized testing to control drug use

In response to the inmates' high levels of drug involvement, many jail jurisdictions have established drug testing policies to help control drug use in their facilities. In 1998 about 7 in 10 jail jurisdictions reported that they had a policy to conduct urinalysis or other tests, such as blood, hair, and saliva analysis, to determine drug use by inmates or staff (table 1). (For details on drug testing methods and procedures, see *Integrating Drug Testing into a Pretrial Service System: 1999 Update*, Bureau of Justice Assistance, NCJ 176340.)

Small jurisdictions (with fewer than 50 inmates) were less likely than jurisdictions with 1,000 inmates or more to have a policy to conduct tests for drugs. Six in ten small jurisdictions said they tested inmates or staff for drugs, compared to 8 in 10 large jurisdictions. The size of jail jurisdiction is based on the average daily population for the 12 months ending June 30, 1998, and reported in the Annual Survey of Jails.

Over a fifth of the jurisdictions said they tested inmates only, while nearly a quarter tested staff only. A quarter said they tested both inmates and staff.

Table 1. Jail jurisdictions reporting drug testing policies, by size of jurisdiction, 1998

Size of jurisdiction*	Number of jurisdictions	Percent of jurisdictions with testing policies		
		Inmates or staff	Inmates	Staff
Total	2,890	71.1%	46.9%	49.2%
Fewer than 50 inmates	1,462	61.1%	37.5%	38.3%
50-99	519	80.4	57.7	51.4
100-249	473	79.0	50.3	61.0
250-499	188	86.1	65.9	67.5
500-999	125	87.0	62.6	73.2
1,000 or more	123	82.0	56.6	70.5

*Based on the average daily population between July 1, 1997, and June 30, 1998. See *Methodology* for definition of average daily population.

Table 2. Criteria for selecting jail inmates for drug tests, by size of jurisdiction, 1998

Size of jurisdiction*	Percent of jurisdictions with testing policies			
	Random	Indication of use	All at admissions	Other
Total	48.9%	68.8%	4.7%	30.1%
Fewer than 50 inmates	40.0%	74.0%	1.8%	19.0%
50-99	43.3	57.3	6.0	39.7
100-249	59.7	66.4	4.6	35.7
250-499	66.1	69.4	8.1	33.9
500-999	62.3	81.8	11.7	37.7
1,000 or more	59.4	71.0	10.1	42.0

Note: Jurisdictions may use multiple methods to test for drugs.

*Based on the average daily population between July 1, 1997, and June 30, 1998.

Half of all inmates were in jails that tested for drug use

Relative to the average daily population, nearly 54% of all inmates (an estimated 318,100 jail inmates) were in jails that tested for illegal drug use. Four percent of the inmates subject to drug testing policies were in small jurisdictions, although these jurisdictions represented 40% of those with a policy to test inmates for drugs.

Size of jurisdiction*	All jail inmates	Jail inmates in jurisdictions that test for drugs	
		Number	Percent
Total	593,808	318,110	53.6%
Fewer than 50 inmates	31,088	12,907	41.5%
50-99	35,289	19,862	56.3
100-249	73,421	37,419	50.1
250-499	64,063	42,511	66.4
500-999	87,731	55,208	62.9
1,000 or more	302,216	150,204	49.7

*Based on the average daily population between July 1, 1997, and June 30, 1998.

In contrast, the largest jurisdictions (with 1,000 inmates or more) represented 5% of jurisdictions that tested inmates and held 47% of inmates subject to drug testing.

69% of jurisdictions test inmates mainly on indication of use

Jurisdictions use a variety of methods to select inmates for drug testing. All inmates in some facilities may be tested upon entry for the first time; inmates in other facilities may be selected at random after a set length of stay or at unpredictable times or may be tested upon indication of use of an illegal drug. Some jurisdictions also test all inmates upon reentry into a facility after an absence for activities such as a work release, furlough, or court visit.

Table 3. Number of samples collected in jails from June 1 to June 30, 1998, and the percent positive for one or more drugs

Size of jurisdiction*	Jail jurisdictions testing for drugs		Samples collected	
	Number	Percent with at least one positive test	Number	Percent positive
Total	712	68.8%	36,215	10.5%
Fewer than 50 inmates	229	62.5%	1,328	28.1%
50-99	141	65.3	2,149	20.9
100-249	146	65.5	4,855	12.3
250-499	85	77.7	4,680	8.8
500-999	59	84.8	5,983	11.4
1,000 or more	53	81.1	17,218	7.4

Note: Excludes jurisdictions that did not collect samples during June 1998. Multiple samples may have been collected from one inmate.
*Based on the average daily population between July 1, 1997, and June 30, 1998.

In 1998 over two-thirds of the jurisdictions selected inmates for testing on indication of use; about half selected inmates at random; and 5% had a policy to test all inmates at admission (table 2).

Jurisdictions that specified other criteria for selecting inmates for testing (30%) generally reported that they systematically tested all offenders who returned to the facility from a temporary absence from custody. They also tested inmates when requested or required by another agency, such as the courts, probation or parole departments, or medical services.

Nearly 60% of jurisdictions with 100 or more inmates said they tested inmates randomly, compared to 40% of jurisdictions with fewer than 100 inmates. Seven in ten of both small jurisdictions and those with 1,000 or more inmates reported that they tested on indication of use. About 2% of the jurisdictions with fewer than 50 inmates, compared to 10% of those with 1,000 or more inmates, reported testing all inmates at admission.

Over two-thirds of the jails that tested inmates had at least one positive test

Of the jail jurisdictions that had a policy to conduct urinalysis or other tests on inmates for drug use, 712 jurisdictions collected over 36,200 samples from inmates between June 1 and June 30, 1998 (table 3). Multiple samples may have been taken from one inmate. Jurisdictions with fewer than 50 inmates collected 4% of the samples; however, they comprised about a third of the jurisdictions that tested samples for drugs. About half of the samples were collected in jurisdictions with 1,000 inmates or more.

10% of tests conducted in June 1998 were positive for one or more drugs

Ten percent of the samples overall (3,800) were positive for one or more drugs. Over two-thirds of jurisdictions that tested inmates had at least one positive test, while the rate of positive tests in jurisdictions with 1,000 inmates or more (7%) was lower than that for jurisdictions with fewer than 50 inmates (28%).

The percentage of tests found positive for drug use varied by testing policy. Samples that were selected on indication of use only had the highest rate of positive results (14%), followed by both random or indication of use (13%). Within jurisdictions that tested only randomly, 8% of samples were positive for drugs.

Criteria for testing	Samples collected	
	Number	Percent positive
Random only	3,776	7.6%
Indication of use only	2,904	13.6
Random/indication of use	9,190	12.7
Other combined methods	20,344	9.6

Most jurisdictions take away inmate privileges for a positive test result

Among the legal and administrative sanctions that may be imposed when inmates test positive for drugs, 70% of the jurisdictions reported that they usually take away inmates privileges, while about half said they take away good time or reclassify the offender to a higher security level (table 4). Twenty percent of the jurisdictions reported that they add time to the inmate sentence for a positive test result, compared to 39% that charge the offender with a new offense. Around a quarter of all jurisdictions said they increase drug testing after a positive test.

Table 4. Sanctions imposed by jurisdictions after inmates test positive for drugs, 1998

Type of sanctions	Percent of jurisdictions
Legal sanctions	
Charge with offense	39.3%
Add time to sentence	20.3
Administrative sanctions	
Loss of good time	52.2%
Loss of privileges	69.9
Reclassify security level	48.9
Separation	30.0
Increased testing	25.4
Mandatory treatment	8.0
Other sanctions	19.9%

Jail inmates were more likely to be reclassified to a higher security level in large jail jurisdictions after a positive test for drugs. About 7 in 10 jurisdictions with 1,000 or more inmates reclassified offenders, compared to almost 2 in 6 jurisdictions with fewer than 50 inmates.

Size of jurisdiction*	Type of sanctions		
	Reclassify security level	Separation	Mandatory treatment
Fewer than 50 inmates	34.9%	18.5%	6.9%
50-99	45.7	25.3	6.3
100-249	67.6	42.9	10.1
250-499	59.7	43.5	4.0
500-999	66.7	48.1	9.1
1,000 or more	71.0	52.2	21.7

*Based on the average daily population between July 1, 1997, and June 30, 1998.

Across all jurisdictions, only a small percentage said that they imposed mandatory treatment for a positive test. About 22% of larger jurisdictions imposed mandatory treatment for inmates who tested positive for drugs, followed by 10% of jurisdictions with 100 to 249 inmates, and 9% of those

with 500 to 999 inmates. Seven percent of jurisdictions with fewer than 50 inmates mandated treatment. About 19% of small jurisdictions reported that they separate inmates from the general population after a positive test, compared to 52% of large jurisdictions.

70% of jail jurisdictions tested all staff; 20%, new employees only

Drug testing policies to detect and control drug use in jails also include jail employees. About 49% of jurisdictions said they tested staff, and 47% test inmates. Among the 1,418 jail jurisdictions that had a policy to test staff, 70% said that all staff were subject to testing

Size of jurisdiction	Percent of jurisdictions with testing policies	
	Inmates	Staff
Total	46.9%	49.2%
Fewer than 50 inmates	37.5%	38.3%
50-99	57.7	51.4
100-249	50.3	61.0
250-499	65.9	67.5
500-999	62.6	73.2
1,000 or more	56.6	70.5

for illegal drug use, including supervisors, administrative staff, corrections officers, and program or treatment personnel. A fifth of the jurisdictions tested only prospective employees as a condition of employment, and 1% tested corrections officers only. Around 7 in 10 large jurisdictions had a policy to test staff, compared to 4 in 10 small jurisdictions.

Jail jurisdictions were similar to other employers with regard to testing staff for illegal drug use. In general, employers nationwide have implemented workplace drug testing programs to comply with Federal regulations or insurance requirements, to protect the organization from safety problems and costs associated with illegal drug use on the job, or for a variety of other reasons.

In the 1997 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, 49% of employees who were working 35 hours or more a week at the time of the interview said their workplace had a drug testing program.* The survey also included prevalence estimates of drug testing in the workplace by the number of employees at an establishment. About 74% of employees at large establishments (500 or more employees) said their workplace had at least one type of workplace drug testing program, compared to slightly more than 28% for small establishments (24 or fewer employees).

*See, SAMHSA, *The National Household Survey on Drug Abuse, Workplace Drug Testing Programs, 1997*, <http://www.samhsa.gov/oas/NHSDA/A-11/WrkplcPly2-06.htm>

Table 5. Criteria for testing jail staff for drugs, by size of jurisdiction, 1998

Size of jurisdiction*	Percent of jurisdictions that test staff			
	Random	Indication of use	All at least once a year	Other
Total	63.1%	39.9%	9.0%	24.0%
Fewer than 50 inmates	72.5%	36.6%	9.5%	16.3%
50-99	50.4	31.8	12.7	31.1
100-249	64.2	40.6	9.4	24.0
250-499	59.8	48.0	7.9	25.8
500-999	50.0	51.1	1.1	34.4
1,000 or more	55.8	60.5	3.5	39.5

Note: Excludes jurisdictions that did not test staff. Jurisdictions may use one or more criteria.

*Based on the average daily population between July 1, 1997, and June 30, 1998.

Table 6. Sanctions imposed on jail staff after a positive test for drug use, by size of jurisdiction, 1998

Sanctions	Percent of jurisdictions that test staff, by size of jurisdiction*						
	Total	Fewer than 50 inmates	50-99	100-249	250-499	500-999	1,000 or more
Dismissal	70.7%	72.2%	65.2%	72.2%	66.9%	71.1%	77.9%
Temporary suspension	19.9	22.3	6.7	21.5	23.4	27.8	26.7
Continued employment with —							
Referral to internal affairs or police	28.8%	19.6%	24.3%	35.8%	37.5%	37.8%	57.0%
Referral to treatment	29.1	28.4	18.7	30.9	34.6	38.9	40.7
Increased urinalysis surveillance	10.9	11.8	0.4	11.1	15.0	16.9	24.4
Restrictions on inmate contact	3.8	3.4	2.6	3.5	5.5	6.7	5.8
Other actions	8.4	5.2	11.2	7.3	17.2	7.8	11.6

Note: Excludes jurisdictions that did not test staff. Jurisdictions may impose multiple sanctions on staff.

*Based on average daily population between July 1, 1997, and June 30, 1998.

Most jail employees are tested at random

About 63% of jail jurisdictions reported that they tested staff at random, followed by 40% that tested on indication of use (table 5). Nearly three-quarters of jurisdictions holding fewer than 50 inmates said that staff were selected at random for drug testing, compared to over half of jurisdictions with 1,000 or more inmates. Small jurisdictions were less likely to select staff on indication of use (37%) than large jurisdictions (61%).

Around 45% of jurisdictions said that they used a combination of criteria to select staff for testing. About 41% selected staff at random only, and 15% selected on indication of use only.

In 7 in 10 jail jurisdictions a positive test was grounds for dismissal

Jurisdictions usually fired staff or did not hire prospective employees after a positive result on a test for drugs. About 71% percent overall reported that dismissal was the usual action

taken after a positive test result. Nearly half (49%) of the jurisdictions used dismissal as the only disciplinary action for an employee who tested positive for drugs.

In establishing policies to test staff or inmates for drugs, jurisdictions have adopted rules and procedures to ensure that disciplinary actions are not imposed for false positive test results or for legitimate reasons such as over-the-counter or prescription medications that can cause a positive test. Drug testing procedures generally include chain of custody documentation, a confirmation test after the initial positive test, drug cut-off levels for positive or negative results, and a medical review to certify that testing procedures were followed. During the review and confirmation process, sanctions may be imposed while an employee continues working.

Among the sanctions that permitted jail staff to continue working after a positive test for drugs, about 4% of jurisdictions said they allowed staff to

continue to work with restrictions on contact with inmates. An equal percentage (29%) said they referred staff either to internal affairs or the police or to substance abuse treatment (table 6). About 11% increased drug testing of staff after a positive test.

Over half of the jurisdictions with 1,000 or more inmates said they referred employees to internal affairs or police after a positive test for drugs, compared to nearly a fifth of small jurisdictions. About 3 in 8 jurisdictions in each category between 100 and 999 inmates said they referred staff for legal actions after a positive drug test.

Across all jurisdictions, a larger percentage said they referred staff to treatment after a positive test than required mandatory treatment for inmates. About 41% of large jurisdictions and 28% of small jurisdictions referred staff to treatment. Except jurisdictions with 1,000 inmates or more, around 10% or less in each size category mandated treatment for inmates.

Table 7. Substance abuse treatment or programs in local jails, by size of jurisdiction, 1998

Type of treatment	Percent of jurisdictions with treatment or programs by size of jurisdiction*						
	Total	Fewer than 50 inmates	50-99	100-249	250-499	500-999	1,000 or more
Any treatment or program	72.8%	63.2%	75.0%	83.9%	91.0%	91.9%	90.2%
Substance abuse treatment^a	42.8%	33.5%	38.7%	53.3%	62.2%	70.2%	73.8%
Detoxification	32.1	26.0	26.2	39.7	48.1	51.2	56.6
Other programs^b	67.5%	57.3%	70.1%	77.0%	87.8%	88.0%	89.4%
Education or awareness	29.6	20.2	30.0	32.0	46.8	61.8	72.1
Self-help programs	63.7	52.1	67.8	73.5	86.2	87.8	88.5

Note: Jurisdictions may have more than one program.
 *Based on the average daily population between July 1, 1997, and June 30, 1998.
^aIncludes residential facilities, detoxification units, professional group or individual counseling, rehabilitation, and maintenance drug programs.
^bIncludes drug or alcohol education or awareness programs, self-help groups, such as Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous, and other peer counseling groups.

Self-help programs like Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous common in jails

Although jurisdictions were unlikely to mandate treatment for inmates after a positive drug test, almost three-quarters provided substance abuse treatment or other programs for their inmates (table 7). Substance abuse treatment includes detoxification, professional counseling, a residential stay, or maintenance drug programs. Other programs include Alcoholics Anonymous (AA), Narcotics Anonymous (NA), and other self-help groups, and drug or alcohol education or awareness.

About 43% of jurisdictions provided substance abuse treatment, while 68% provided other programs. Within the specific types of substance abuse programs provided in jails, self-help groups (such as AA, NA, and other peer group counseling) were the most common (64%). About 30% had education or awareness programs.

Overall, 12% of jail jurisdictions provided all types of programs and treatment, and about 22% had only AA, NA, or other self-help programs.

Smaller jurisdictions were less likely to have substance abuse treatment or programs than larger jurisdictions. About 63% of jurisdictions with fewer than 50 inmates had some type of treatment or program. About 26% of jurisdictions with fewer than 50 inmates and of those with 50 to 99 inmates had a detoxification unit. These jurisdictions primarily had self-help groups, 52% and 68%, respectively.

About 90% of jurisdictions that held 250 or more inmates provided some type of treatment or program. Over half of large jurisdictions had a detoxification unit. Seven in ten jurisdictions with 1,000 or more inmates provided education or awareness, and 8 in 10 provided self-help groups.

Table 8. Substance abuse treatment history of jail inmates, by reported prior drug use, 1996

Type of treatment	All jail inmates		Convicted jail inmates used—	
	Ever used	Ever used regularly ^a	In month before offense	At time of offense
Any treatment or program^b	51.4%	55.7%	58.3%	61.4%
Participated while under correctional supervision	35.1%	38.7%	43.7%	46.6%
In prison/jail	25.2	28.4	31.7	34.3
On probation/parole	23.4	26.2	30.3	32.8
Participated since admission	12.5%	14.0%	16.9%	19.0%
Any treatment ^c	3.9	4.7	5.5	6.9
Detoxification	0.9	1.0	1.0	1.4
Special facility	1.9	2.3	3.0	3.9
Counseling	1.4	1.7	2.2	2.5
Other programs^d	10.8%	12.0%	14.6%	16.0%
Self-help	9.3	10.4	12.5	13.7
Education or awareness	3.8	4.5	5.5	6.5

Note: Details add to more than total because inmates may have participated in more than one type of program.

^aRegularly is defined as once a week for at least a month.

^bIncludes alcohol or drug treatment or programs.

^cIncludes detoxification units, professional group or individual counseling, rehabilitation, and maintenance drug programs.

^dIncludes drug or alcohol education or awareness programs, self-help programs, such as Alcoholics Anonymous and Narcotics Anonymous, and other peer counseling groups.

Large jails had three-quarters of the total capacity for substance abuse treatment

In the Annual Survey of Jails, jurisdictions were asked to report the capacity for substance abuse treatment, including detoxification, professional counseling, rehabilitation, and maintenance drug programs. About 10% or 282 jurisdictions reported that they had the capacity to provide substance abuse treatment. Nearly three-quarters of the reported capacity was in jurisdictions with 500 or more inmates.

92,600 inmates participated in drug or alcohol programs or treatment

As of June 30, 1998, an estimated 92,600 inmates had participated in substance abuse treatment or programs. This included 42,100 in AA, NA, or other self-help groups, 27,000 in drug or alcohol education or

awareness, 2,100 in detoxification, and 21,400 in other substance abuse treatment. Inmates may have been in more than one program.

61% of inmates who had used drugs at the time of the offense had received treatment in the past

Based on self-reported information in the jail inmates survey, over half of jail inmates who said they had ever used drugs and those who used regularly had participated in substance abuse treatment or programs in the past (table 8). Among convicted inmates 58% of those who had used drugs in the month before the offense and 61% of those who had used drugs at the time of the offense had participated in substance abuse treatment or programs.

Overall, an estimated 10% of jail inmates said they had participated in substance abuse treatment or programs since their admission to jail. Of jail inmates who had ever used drugs or had ever used them regularly, 13% and 14%, respectively, had participated in substance abuse treatment or programs since admission. About 17% of inmates who had used in the month before the offense had participated since admission. Around 19% of jail inmates who had used drugs at the time of the offense had participated in substance abuse treatment or programs.

Self-help programs were the most common activity since admission (around 13%) for each category of convicted jail inmates. Among all jail inmates who had ever used drugs or used regularly, 10% or fewer had participated in self-help programs.

A small percentage of jail inmates who had ever used drugs or used regularly (4%) had received substance abuse treatment since admission. Around 7% of convicted jail inmates who were using drugs at the time of the offense and 6% who had used drugs in the month before the offense had participated in substance abuse treatment.

Among convicted jail inmates who were actively involved with drugs prior to their admission to jail, 20% had participated in substance abuse treatment or programs since admission.

Criminal history profile of actively drug-involved jail inmates

72% of convicted jail inmates who had an active involvement in drugs were on criminal justice status at arrest

	Percent of convicted jail inmates	
	Active drug involvement ^a	Other
Status at arrest		
None	27.8%	41.2%
Status	71.8	58.1
On parole ^b	19.3	10.9
On probation	44.1	39.6
Pretrial	4.7	5.1
Bail/bond	15.1	11.6
Escape	1.4	0.6
Criminal history		
None	19.5%	27.9%
Priors	80.5	72.1
Violent recidivists	35.2	35.5
Drug recidivists only	12.7	0.0
Number of prior sentences to probation or incarceration		
0	13.3%	18.3%
1	19.9	23.9
2	12.4	14.7
3-5	23.1	20.9
6-10	18.9	16.0
11 or more	12.4	6.2
Location to serve current sentence		
Prison	20.9%	15.1%
Jail	57.6	69.1
Median maximum sentence		
Prison	60mos.	60mos.
Jail	11	6

- About 20% of actively drug-involved offenders were on parole; 44% were on probation prior to their current admission to jail.

- 8 in 10 actively drug-involved offenders had a prior offense or sentence to incarceration, compared to 7 in 10 other offenders.

- Over a third of actively drug-involved jail inmates had been convicted of a violent crime in the past, while about 13% had only prior drug sentences.

- Over half of drug-involved jail inmates had served three or more sentences to probation or incarceration.

- 21% of actively drug-involved offenders were sentenced to served time in prison, compared to 15% of other offenders.

- Actively drug-involved offenders who were sentenced to jail had a median sentence of 11 months, compared to 6 months for other offenders.

Note: Based on self-reported data in the Survey of Inmates in Local Jails, 1996. Data on convicted jail inmates only.

^aIncludes jail inmates who used drugs in the month before the offense, had a current drug offense, committed the offense for money for drugs, or had received treatment since admission to jail.

^bIncludes mandatory supervised release.

Methodology

Survey of Inmates in Local Jails

The 1996 Survey of Inmates in Local Jails was conducted from October 1995 through March 1996 in personal interviews with 6,133 inmates. Similar surveys of jail inmates were conducted in 1972, 1978, 1983, and 1989.

The sample for the 1996 survey design was a stratified two-stage selection from a universe of 3,328 jails. In the first stage, six separate strata were formed based on the size of the male and female populations. In two strata all jails were selected – those jails housing only females and those with more than 1,000 males or more than 50 females or both.

In the remaining four strata, each jail within a stratum had an equal probability of selection in the sample. Overall, 462 jails were selected. Interviews were conducted in 431 jails; 19 refused, 8 were closed, and 4 were on the universe list in error.

In the second sampling stage, interviewers visited each selected facility and systematically selected a sample of male and female inmates using predetermined procedures. Approximately 1 in every 100 males were selected in 4 strata, and 1 in 83 in the male stratum. Depending on the stratum, 1 in 50, 25, 24, or 21 females were selected.

Estimates from the 1996 Survey of Inmates in Local Jails are affected by sampling and measurement errors. Sampling error may occur by chance because a sample rather than a complete enumeration of the population was conducted. Measurement error can be attributed to nonresponse, differences in the interpretation of questions among inmates, recall difficulties, and processing errors. In any survey the full extent of the measurement error is never known.

Estimates of the standard errors for jail inmates identified as drug-involved have been calculated for the 1996 survey of jail inmates (see appendix

tables 1 and 2). These standard errors may be used to construct confidence intervals around percentages. For example, the 95% confidence interval around the percentage of convicted jail inmates who had active involvement with drugs is approximately 65.5% plus or minus 1.96 times 0.90% (or 63.7% to 67.3%).

	Percent of jail inmates	Standard error
Drug-involved in past	73.7	0.68%
Actively drug-involved*	65.5	0.90

*Convicted inmates only.

Appendix table 1. Standard error estimation for measures of drug involvement of jail inmates, 1996

	Standard errors for estimated percentages		
	All jail inmates	Convicted	Unconvicted
Current drug offense			
Possession	0.54%	0.72%	0.86%
Trafficking	0.45	0.55	0.81
Prior drug offense	0.71%	0.89%	1.13%
Prior drug use			
Ever used drugs	0.59%	0.71%	1.06%
Ever used regularly	0.74	0.90	1.32
Intravenous drug use	0.60	0.77	0.95
Used in the month before	...	0.95	...
Used at the time of the offense	...	0.89	...
Committed offense to get money for drugs	...	0.70%	...
...Not applicable.			

Appendix table 2. Standard errors for selected characteristics of drug-involved jail inmates, 1996

Selected characteristics	Standard errors for estimated percentages	
	Active drug involvement	Other
Male/female	0.47%	0.50%
Race/Hispanic origin		
White non-Hispanic	1.56%	2.02%
Black non-Hispanic	1.52	1.96
Hispanic	1.01	1.39
Other	0.42	0.79
Age		
17 or younger	0.30%	0.41%
18-24	1.05	1.43
25-29	0.88	1.21
30-34	0.93	1.17
35-44	1.00	1.36
45-54	0.45	0.94
55 or older	0.13	0.58
Status at arrest		
None	1.07%	1.57%
On parole	0.96	0.99
On probation	1.23	1.60
Pretrial	0.47	0.74
Bail/bond	0.84	0.99
Escape	0.26	0.24
Criminal history		
None	0.94%	1.41%
Priors	1.16	1.55
Violent recidivists	1.19	1.69
Drug recidivists only	0.45	...
Number of prior sentences to probation or incarceration		
0	0.79%	1.21%
1	0.94	1.38
2	0.73	1.18
3-5	1.00	1.21
6-10	0.94	1.21
11 or more	0.74	0.77
...Not applicable.		

These standard errors may also be used to test the statistical significance of the difference between two sample statistics by pooling the standard errors of the two sample estimates. For example, the standard error of the difference between actively drug-involved inmates on criminal justice status and other inmates would be 1.90% (or the square root of the sum of the squared standard errors for each group). The difference would be 1.96 times 1.90 (or 3.72%). Since the observed difference of 13.7% (71.8 minus 58.1%) is greater than 3.72%, the difference would be considered statistically significant.

Annual Survey of Jails (ASJ)

Since 1982 the Annual Survey of Jails has provided baseline data to estimate characteristics of the Nation's jails and jail inmates. The reference date for the 1998 survey was June 30. A representative sample of jails was based on

information from the 1993 Census of jails. The sample included jails in 795 jail jurisdictions and 25 multi-jurisdiction jails.

A *jurisdiction* is a county (parish in Louisiana) or municipal government that administers one or more local jails. A *multi-jurisdiction jail* is one in which two or more jurisdictions have a formal agreement to operate the facility.

All of the multi-jurisdiction jails were included in the survey. The remaining jurisdictions were stratified into two groups: jurisdictions with jails authorized to hold juveniles and jurisdictions with jails holding adults only. All jails in 204 jurisdictions were included in the survey if in 1993 the jurisdiction held juveniles and had an average daily population of 250 or more inmates, or if it held only adults and had an average daily population of 500 or more. The

other jurisdictions (591) were selected based on stratified probability sampling. The *average daily population* is the sum of the number of inmates in jail each day for a year, divided by the number of days in the year.

Data were obtained by mailed questionnaires. After followup telephone calls to nonrespondents, the response rate for the survey was 100%.

Estimates based on data from the Annual Survey of Jails have associated sampling errors. The estimated relative sampling error for the number of jurisdictions that had a policy to test inmates on June 30, 1998, was 2.23% and for staff 2.22% (see appendix table 3).

Appendix table 3. Standard error estimation for measures of drug testing and treatment in jail jurisdictions, 1998

Size of jurisdiction	Standard errors for estimated percentages							
	Percent of jurisdictions testing		Method of testing inmates			Method of testing staff		
	Inmates	Staff	Random	On indication of use	All at admission	Random	On indication of use	All at least once a year
Total	2.23%	2.22%	1.73%	2.07%	0.44%	2.85%	2.88%	1.90%
Fewer than 50 inmates	3.69%	3.70%	2.73%	3.41%	0.61%	5.44%	5.86%	3.52%
50-99	5.46	5.45	4.64	5.28	1.67	7.80	7.24	5.62
100-249	3.83	3.68	3.48	3.51	0.51	4.60	4.79	3.33
250-499	2.33	2.63	2.66	2.53	0.53	2.79	2.82	1.35
500-999	1.19	1.56	1.41	1.36	0.45	1.23	1.20	0.03
1,000 or more	4.20	5.23	2.49	2.99	0.43	0.20	0.18	0.02

The Bureau of Justice Statistics is the statistical agency of the U.S. Department of Justice. Jan M. Chaiken, Ph.D., is director.

BJS Special Reports address a specific topic in depth from one or more datasets that cover many topics. This Special Report presents the findings from 1998 Annual Survey of Jails with a special addendum on drug testing and treatment.

Doris James Wilson wrote this report under the supervision of Allen J. Beck. Paula M. Ditton provided statistical

review. Tom Hester edited the report. Jayne Robinson administered final production.

Data collection and processing for the Annual Survey of Jails were carried out by Lisa McNelis, with assistance from Henrietta Herrin, Martha Greene, and Duane Cavanaugh, under the supervision of Stephanie Brown, Governments Division, U.S. Census Bureau.

May 2000, NCJ 179999

The primary sources of data for tables presented in this report are the Annual Survey of Jails, 1998, and the Survey of Inmates in Local Jails, 1996.

Data can be obtained from the archive through 1-800-999-0960 or <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/NACJD/home.html>

The archive may also be accessed through the BJS website, where the report, data, and supporting documentation are available: <http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/bjs/>

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Bureau of Justice Statistics

Washington, DC 20531

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300

PRESORTED STANDARD MAIL
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/BJS
Permit No. G-91