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This Note describes the objectives and methodology of the Second Inmate Survey, the largest research effort conducted under Rand's Research Agreements Program studying criminal careers. This work was funded by the National Institute of Justice.

It should be useful to researchers who may wish to conduct similar research based on criminals' own descriptions of themselves and their crimes. More immediately, the Note is one of a series of six Rand publications documenting the Second Inmate Survey. The others are:


Analyzes the reliability of the survey's self-reported arrest and conviction data, using both the retest method and a comparison with official records.


Determines the proportion of prison inmates who have demonstrated a need for specific treatments while incarcerated, the proportion who actually receive such treatment, and the differences in these two figures (controlling for inmate characteristics). Also describes inmates' assessments of various programs and analyzes which inmates are disproportionately involved in prison violence.

Jan Chaiken and Marcia Chaiken, with Joyce Peterson, Varieties of Criminal Behavior: Summary and Policy Implications, R-2814/1-NIJ, August 1982.

Gives conclusions from analysis of the survey and official record data concerning identification of serious criminal offenders and the implications of their characteristics for public policy.

Identifies ten subgroups of offenders and describes their characteristics, with special reference to the most serious offenders. Shows how, and the extent to which, serious offenders and high-crime-rate offenders can be identified from their characteristics and criminal records. Appendixes describe (a) an analysis of internal consistency of survey responses and their correspondence with official record data, and (b) the construction of scaled predictor variables.


Uses the predictor and outcome variables constructed by Chaiken and Chaiken to produce a 7-item scale and draw conclusions about selective incapacitation. Also summarizes the entire research effort under Rand's Research Agreements Program.

This Note provides detailed background information for readers of the other publications about the method and content of the Second Inmate Survey. In addition, it is designed to aid researchers at Rand and elsewhere who will use data from the Second Inmate Survey to study criminals, criminal behavior, and criminal careers.
SUMMARY

In 1978, Rand carried out a survey of convicted male offenders housed in prisons and jails in California, Michigan, and Texas. Self-report data on criminal activity, personal characteristics, and criminal record were obtained from 2316 inmates by means of a group-administered written questionnaire. In addition, official record data were collected for 1214 prison inmates--more than 85 percent of the 1380 prisoners who responded to the survey.

The survey provided detailed information about crimes that inmates committed during a one- to two-year measurement period immediately before their arrest for their current sentenced crime. Inmates reported the date of their arrest and then followed questionnaire instructions to identify the beginning of the measurement period, which was January 1st of the year preceding this arrest. Inmates also completed information about time they spent in custody during the period and their employment, living arrangements, and other features of their lives.

Inmates then answered a series of questions about their activities during the measurement period related to commissions of the following crimes: burglary, robbery of a business, robbery of a person, assault or murder during a robbery, other assaults or murders, automobile theft, other thefts, fraud, drug trafficking, and forgery, check, or credit card offenses. Inmates indicated whether they committed each of these crimes and either the number of commissions (if less than 10) or the number of months during which they committed the crime and their rate of commission in those months. For each type of crime, they indicated how
many times (if at all) they had been arrested while committing the crime and the extent to which they used a weapon or had injured someone while committing the crime. Additional questions asked about all arrests during the measurement period and the degree of planning that inmates used in carrying out their crimes. The questionnaire also included a second, redundant set of questions about crime commissions that could be used to measure the internal consistency of inmates' responses. This second set was identical to the principal crime commission questions in Rand's First Inmate Survey.[1]

These questions provided the bases for measuring the prevalence of crime and rate of crime commission for each of these crimes and the probability of arrest for each commission. Additional questions elicited the total number of arrests during the measurement period and detailed information about the respondent's conviction offense, matters that could be compared with data obtained from official records to examine the reliability of survey responses.

To provide information on a more longitudinal basis, the survey questionnaire also asked briefly about crime commissions and the circumstances of inmates' lives during two periods before the measurement period. The instrument also included questions about inmates' criminal records; their commissions of crimes as juveniles; their age, race, and other personal information; and social-psychological characteristics found to be associated with criminal activity in Rand's First Inmate Survey.

The formats and procedures used for the survey were developed during a series of pretests at correctional facilities in southern California. These pretests led to substantial refinement and simplification of questions about crime commissions and for identifying the measurement period. We also conducted a methodological study in which we asked field patrol officers of the Santa Monica Police Department to recall the number of arrests and citations in which they had been involved. Because we were able to verify this information through Police Department records, we were able to explore alternative questionnaire formats. This study confirmed the value of forcing respondents to think about a specific calendar period and of using rate questions to obtain information about frequent activities.

The survey was administered in late 1978 and early 1979 at 12 prisons and 14 county jails in California, Michigan, and Texas. The institutions were selected to yield a broad sample of offenders active in both urban areas and smaller cities within each state. The prisons included all custody levels within each prison system. The jails were located in counties that included one or two major metropolitan areas in each state (Dallas, Detroit, San Diego, and San Francisco) and three or four other counties with moderately large cities (100,000 to 500,000 population). To permit comparisons of inmates sentenced to prison or jail, we sampled only prison inmates sentenced from one of the counties in which we were surveying jail inmates.

Our sample was drawn to approximate the characteristics of inmates coming into prison or jail during a limited period of time—an "incoming cohort." For the prison inmate sample, the probability for selecting
each inmate from the appropriate counties was proportional to the inverse of the length of his sentence. For jail inmates, we either sampled all or a random sample of all inmates serving sentences in the facility. Because inmates' participation in the survey was voluntary, we expected to find systematic nonresponse biases—distortions of our sample arising from inmates' refusal to participate. To ameliorate such biases among the prisoner respondents, we identified a "replacement sample." Each inmate in the original sample was matched with another inmate who was similar with regard to age, race, record, and most serious current conviction offense. This alternative inmate was called to take the survey if the original inmate failed to respond. The replacement procedure proved valuable for correcting biases in California and Michigan prisoners. In Texas prisons, the response rate was so high that replacement respondents were not needed.

A small subsample of the original sample of prisoners was prechosen to be asked to fill out the survey questionnaire a second time if they responded in the first instance. The retest candidates were selected randomly, except that retest sessions were not scheduled at every prison. Retests were held approximately one week after the original survey sessions. Replacement respondents were not retested.

The response rate was 70 percent for jail inmates in all five states, 50 percent in California and Michigan prisons, and 82 percent in Texas prisons. No statistically significant differences were found between responding and nonresponding inmates in any Michigan or Texas prison, in terms of inmates' age, race, record, or conviction offense. In three California prisons, Chicano inmates were less likely than others to participate, and in one California prison respondents and
nonrespondents also had considerably different conviction offenses. Inclusion of the replacement sample served to increase the sample size in Michigan and California and also helped to alleviate biases that arose from differential response rates among prison institutions within a state. In all three states, inmates with reading difficulties were included in the sample but were underrepresented. The response rates for retests were 64 percent in Michigan, 79 percent in California, and 93 percent in Texas. In total, 252 retests were available for analysis.

The survey was administered in groups containing usually between 10 and 30 inmates. Sampled inmates received a notice describing the survey several days before they were called to the survey session. Officials at each prison or jail directed selected inmates to attend the survey sessions, but there were substantial "no-shows" in Michigan and California prisons. Prison officials did not participate in survey sessions, which were conducted by two or more temporary Rand employees selected for their experience in working with incarcerated felons. When inmates arrived at a session, the survey administrators described the study and explained that participation was voluntary but would yield a $5.00 payment to inmate accounts. Inmates were free to leave at any time. Most of those who left did so at the beginning of the session.

The administrators read the informed consent form, general survey instructions, and instructions for completing the "calendar card" that identified the measurement period. Most inmates worked alone to complete the survey; however, administrators worked with inmates who had reading or other difficulties, conducting the questionnaire as an interview. The questionnaire and other survey documents were available in Spanish for inmates with greater literacy in that language.
Criminal justice data were coded from hard copies of prison records for 1214 prisoner respondents immediately after the completion of the survey field work. These data included information about past arrests and convictions (from rap sheets), current conviction offense, socio-demographic data, other adult and juvenile criminal information, and records of administrative difficulties.

Although the survey information was confidential, it did include identifiers. Therefore, survey information provides a basis for follow-up studies to validate survey analyses and to conduct longitudinal analyses for the respondents.
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I. OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY DESIGN

Rand's Second Inmate Survey is part of an extensive program of research on criminal careers.[1] The research attempts to provide increasingly refined information about the criminal behavior of offenders and about characteristics that are associated with criminal behavior (Petersilia, Greenwood, and Lavin, 1977; Peterson and Braiker, 1981).[2] In turn, this information about offenders is important for the development, evaluation and refinement of alternative criminal justice policies (Blumstein, Cohen, and Nagin, 1978; Greenwood, Petersilia, and Zimring, 1978; Peterson and Braiker, 1981; Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982; Greenwood, 1982).

Between October 1978 and January 1979, we surveyed nearly 2200 convicted offenders housed in prisons and jails in California, Michigan, and Texas (Table 1). We sampled both prison and jail inmates sentenced in San Diego, San Francisco, Wayne (Detroit) and Dallas Counties, as well as three or four counties within each state that contained a somewhat smaller city. Sampled inmates answered a self-administered

[1] This work has been supported by three research grants awarded by the National Institute of Justice (formerly the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration), United States Department of Justice, under that agency's Research Agreements Program.

[2] Most directly, this survey refines and extends a previous Rand survey of California prison inmates (Peterson and Braiker, 1981). The first survey obtained self reports of crime committed by 624 male inmates before their imprisonment. Those survey responses were used to describe the criminal activity of men incarcerated in California prisons, to estimate criminal activity for broad groups of offenders, to describe how criminal activity varied with inmates' ages, records, and conviction offenses, and to identify the characteristics of highly active "career criminals."
Table 1
COUNTRIES FROM WHICH INMATES WERE SAMPLED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Central City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Sa Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>Oxnard, Ventura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>Stockton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(coincides with county)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>Detroit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Genesee</td>
<td>Flint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>Grant Rapids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>Lansing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Washtenah</td>
<td>Ann Arbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
<td>Dallas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nueces</td>
<td>Corpus Christi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>Beaumont</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: All prison and jail inmates sampled in the second inmate survey were convicted in these counties. Jail inmates in Texas were not used in the final analyses. (See Sec. III.)

questionnaire in which they provided information about their commissions of crimes at various points in their lives, their arrests, their convictions and other contacts with the criminal justice system, their reasons for committing crimes, and certain other aspects of their lives that might be related to their criminality. For most prison inmates who answered the survey, we also recorded information about arrests, convictions, and other criminal justice involvement from rap sheets--reports of offenders' previous contacts with the criminal justice system--and prison records. This official record information permitted analyses exploring the validity of survey responses and
examinations of how well existing criminal justice files can be used to identify various types of offenders.

PURPOSES OF THE RESEARCH

The Second Inmate Survey was designed to achieve a number of different purposes, both through the analysis of the survey itself and through potential later studies that might follow up the survey respondents. First, offenders' self reports provide detailed information about criminal offenders: who they are, what kinds of crimes they commit, and why they commit them (Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982; Rolph, Chaiken, and Houchens, 1981). Second, the survey provided opportunities to make a thorough examination of the reliability of self-reported information provided by criminal offenders, so that evaluations can be made of the credibility of the present study and of the growing number of other studies that are using similar methods (Marquis, 1981; Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982, App. B). Third, the survey is a powerful means for developing and examining alternative criminal justice policies, including incapacitation policy, the attempt to reduce crime by separating criminal offenders from society; selective incapacitation, policies that attempt to reduce crime by tailoring jail and prison sentences so that they differentiate among criminal offenders; and various alternatives to incarceration (Greenwood, 1982; Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982). Fourth, answers by prison respondents and their associated official records provided information about how correctional institutions might deal with career criminals (Petersilia and Honig, 1980). Fifth, although the survey was not designed to test any particular criminology theories, it provides a rich data set for generating and testing further hypotheses about criminal behavior (Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982; Peterson and Braiker, 1981).
Measurements of Crime

Both popular and expert discussions of the crime problem are hampered by the absence of systematic information about how many people commit particular types of crime, how many crimes each offender commits (both the number of different types of crimes and the frequency with which they commit each type), and the probability that an offender with given characteristics who commits a particular type of crime will be arrested.

Average rates of criminal activity can be estimated using other methods (Blumstein and Cohen, 1978), but only a self-report survey can provide information about all crimes that criminals commit, whether or not they are arrested. Self-reports thus provide estimates of crime rates for individual criminals and the distribution of crime commission rates for the sampled population--how many offenders commit a great many crimes, how many commit relatively few crimes. To permit calculations of crime rates, the survey obtained incarcerated offenders' estimates of the number of times they committed each of 10 different types of crime during a one- to two-year period before their incarceration, the number of times they were arrested for committing each crime during that period, and other information about those crimes, such as whether weapons were used.

Criminal Characteristics

The survey was designed to examine the relationship between criminal behavior and a variety of offenders' characteristics, many of which could only be described by criminals themselves. The previous California prisoner survey indicated that offenders who reported the
greatest amount of crime tended to have distinctive social-psychological characteristics that support their criminal behavior. They have attitudes that crime is fun and that criminals are likely to continue committing crimes if they are good at it. They believed that they were good at committing crimes, thought they received many good outcomes from committing crimes, and saw high probabilities that they would return to crime. In addition, the previous survey found that the criminal justice system could use a combination of age, record, and history of drug use to identify the most active offenders (Peterson and Braiker, 1981).

The present study collected additional and more accurate data for exploring the relationship between criminal behavior and a variety of offenders' characteristics and for describing particularly active criminals. For surveyed prison inmates, the present study obtained information about offenders' records, conviction offenses, ages and other characteristics both from self-reports and from official records. For jail inmates, this information was obtained only through self reports. In addition, the survey obtained offenders' reports of reasons for committing their crimes, drug use, economic circumstances, attitudes and perceptions about the payoffs of crime, and criminal and noncriminal self identities.

Identification of Offender Types

Rand's previous research on criminal careers found great heterogeneity among criminal offenders. Even across prison inmates in one state, there are great differences in background and in the types of amounts and reasons for their crimes (Petersilia, Greenwood, and Lavin, 1977; Peterson and Braiker, 1981). A goal of the Second Inmate Survey was to provide data that could be analyzed to provide guidance to the
criminal justice system in identifying various subgroups of offenders. Criminal justice agencies are particularly concerned with identifying highly active "career criminals" whose incarceration might enhance public safety. Also interesting are offenders who are typically imprisoned under current policies but who do not commit serious crimes at high rates—inmates who might be candidates for early release or sentences other than incarceration.

The more thorough information about previous record obtained in the Second Inmate Survey, as well as the ability to examine the official record for prison inmates, provides a more satisfactory basis than the previous survey for determining how and to what extent highly active offenders could be identified. Further, because we sampled across three states and within different jurisdictions in each state, the generality of any proposed means of identification can be explored with the survey data.

Survey information about offenders' psychological characteristics, their drug and alcohol use, and their economic, employment, and family circumstances provides an opportunity for identifying groups of offenders who are appropriate candidates for work furlough, job training, drug programs, or other treatment programs either within or outside prisons and jails.

SURVEY DESIGN

In designing the Second Inmate Survey, we attempted to refine the methodology of Rand's previous California prison survey and to expand opportunities for evaluating the method and for generalizing from its results. Here we provide an overview of the methods used, and the remainder of the Note provides details. The sampling design for the survey is covered in Sec. III.
Reference Periods

Rand's previous research showed that most incarcerated offenders have been committing crimes for long periods of time and that their criminal behavior probably was quite variable over time (Petersilia, Greenwood, and Lavin, 1977). In designing the present survey, we did not expect that respondents could remember in detail their criminal activity over a long period of time, nor could they summarize activity that was variable over time. Therefore, we chose to "sample" the criminal behavior of each respondent during a limited period that was as near as possible to the time they completed the survey.

The most critical survey questions about crimes and correlates of crimes concentrated on a 13 to 24 month period of time, ending with the respondent's arrest for the crime for which he was now sentenced. A sequence of questions in the survey booklet and an associated separate calendar were intended to help each respondent identify this measurement period and think about important events that occurred during this time. A small number of questions covered two earlier reference periods.

Multiformat Self-Reported Crime Questions

Analyses of the previous California prison survey responses indicated satisfactory levels of reliability when self reports of crime were categorized to indicate great activity, slight activity, or no activity for particular crimes. However, there were substantial variations in the amounts of crimes reported for alternative question formats (Peterson and Braiker, 1981).

The format for self-reported crimes in the survey was redesigned so that respondents who committed a crime only a few times (up to 10)
reported the number of commissions, and those who committed the crimes often (more than 10 times) reported the rate of commission. These questions were also designed to separate certain types of crime (e.g., violence incidental to robbery or burglary, as opposed to other violence) and to obtain details about weapon use and arrests for each type of crime.

Means for Examining Validity and Reliability

This study was designed to provide multiple means for exploring the integrity of the inmates' responses. The survey instrument contained redundant questions to permit analyses of the reliability of responses. One format used to obtain self-reports of crimes was almost identical to the format used in Rand's first inmate survey; this provided a basis for examining how differences in the two surveys affected self reports of crime. The survey was readministered to over 250 prison inmates one week after they first completed the survey, providing a test of the stability of survey responses over time. The validity of some responses (primarily reports of arrests and convictions) can be explored by comparing inmates' answers with official record information. A separate data collection effort coded information from the official records of prisoners who responded to the survey. Finally, we have maintained a link file containing names and other identifiers of survey respondents, so that future projects may explore predictive validity—how well survey responses can be used to identify recidivists.
Cross-Sectional Design

Like the first inmate survey, the present study used a cross-sectional retrospective design. All questionnaires were completed within a four-month period. The reference periods differed among inmates, in regard to both starting date and length in months. Respondents, particularly those in prison, provided information about their activities for a period that was usually several years in the past. We recognize that respondents' memories would have decayed greatly during this period, particularly their memory for details. However, memory about generalizations (their rate of criminal activity) and about vivid events (e.g., crimes that led to their incarceration) suffer much less decay than memory for details, even after extended periods. (Peterson, 1976; Bartlett, 1932.) In designing the survey instrument, we attempted to ask questions only about general information or vivid events.

Because we collected data for inmates at only one point, here was no opportunity within the present survey to study changes in the criminal behavior of specific respondents as they aged, suffered further criminal convictions, and so forth. However, we did include a few questions asking about criminal activity and other behavior during reference periods up to four years before the inmate's primary measurement periods. Analyses of questions about these earlier periods provide limited information about the stability of criminal behavior over time. Longitudinal studies of criminal behavior could be obtained by following up survey respondents' records after their release from prison or jail.
Comprehensive Sampling of Inmates

At most prisons and jails in which we conducted the survey, we were permitted to include inmates in all custody conditions. (We were not permitted to interview the small number of Texas prisoners who were in segregated custody.) Thus, the survey includes inmates in the general population, in protective custody, in segregated or disciplinary custody, and in death row. For inmates with reading difficulties and some inmates in extreme segregation (i.e., California inmates who were in chains), the survey administrator read the questions to the inmate and recorded his responses. To further extend the generality of the sample, the questionnaire was available in both English and Spanish.

Pretest with Police Officer Respondents

Several of the important design issues for this survey were resolved partly with information obtained by preparing analogous survey instruments that asked police officers about the frequency of their making arrests and issuing traffic citations. Because the self-reports of the police officers on these issues could be compared with official police department records, it was possible for us to determine the accuracy of responses provided by the officers using various formats of the survey instrument (see Appendix A). The results demonstrated the value of using a calendar to define the measurement period and the desirability of asking about the rate (rather than the count) of high-frequency events.
RESPONDENTS' INFORMED CONSENT

The present study had to protect the confidentiality of the survey respondents and also to obtain their informed consent for participating in the survey. These considerations were particularly acute, because the survey inquired about crimes that respondents had committed in the past for which they had not been prosecuted, but for many of which they might still be prosecuted. The matter was further complicated by the fact that all survey respondents were housed in prisons or jails that were subject to the control and supervision of custodial staff whose powers included the right to search documents leaving the premises. Although Rand's first inmate survey faced a similar need to assure respondent confidentiality, the risk to confidentiality was greater in the present study which was no longer anonymous.

The Omnibus Crime Control and Street Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. Section 3701, as amended, requires that the survey information be kept confidential. That law provides criminal penalties for violation of confidentiality and protects the data from most legal process. Unfortunately, when the survey was undertaken, the law was ambiguous as to whether it provided immunity in all circumstances. Both the statute and the implementing Department of Justice regulations (28 C.F.R. Part 22, Confidentiality of Identifiable Research and Statistical Information) provided that the survey research would be immune from legal process and that information obtained in the survey could not be admitted as evidence in a judicial or administrative proceeding without the written consent of respondents. However, the statute did not prevent the admission of such information in legislative proceedings, apparently as an oversight in drafting the legislation.[3]

[3] The relevant portion of both the statute and the regulation
The possible limitation of immunity within the Omnibus Crime Act presented potential risks both to The Rand Corporation and to survey respondents who provided information about crimes. Rand's Institutional Review Board, which must pass on issues of confidentiality and treatment of research subjects, decided that the potential benefits of the survey outweighed the potential risks to subjects. Nonetheless, considerations of ethical research require that potential survey respondents consent to participate in the survey after having been informed both of the potential benefits from their participation and the potential risks to them as persons (see Gandara, 1978).

The research had potentially serious difficulties in maintaining the confidentiality of survey respondents and in informing and obtaining consent from the respondents to participate in the study. Procedures had to be designed to assure that prison and jail staff could not obtain the information in the survey and to inform respondents of the slight possibility that their answers might be subjected to legislative subpoena without so overstating that risk that respondents would refuse to participate.

We adopted a procedure in which respondents printed their name on an informed consent form that was separate from their survey instrument.

---

read as follows: "Copies of research or statistical information identifiable to a private person shall be immune from legal process and shall only be admitted as evidence or used for any purpose, in any action, suit, or other judicial or administrative proceeding with the written consent of the individual to whom the data pertains." 42 U.S.C. 3701. In 1979, this statutory section was replaced by similar language that extended immunity to legislative proceedings. 42 U.S.C. 3789g.

Although their reasoning was not stated, the Office of General Counsel of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration provided us with a written interpretation that this provision did not provide immunity from legislative subpoena.
The two forms could be linked by a common linking number, but they were collected separately and removed from the institutions. Even if the questionnaires were examined by prison or jail staff, responses could not be tied to particular inmates.

We developed this approach through tests of alternative informed consent procedures in two pilot tests of the survey conducted at the Orange County (California) Jail and the California Institute for Men at Chino (CIM).

Orange County Jail Pilot Test

The pilot test at the Orange County Jail was designed primarily to determine whether jail inmates would participate in a survey that included sensitive self-reported crime questions and whether differences in anonymity and in discussion of the study's risks affected participation.[4] Staff at the Orange County Jail were asked to provide a representative mix of 15 inmates at each of four sessions. Deputies asked for volunteers to participate in a survey for which they would be paid $5.00.

The principal researchers conducted each session and explained the study to inmates. This explanation differed in the sessions, presenting three different conditions: an anonymous questionnaire, an identified questionnaire with identities maintained for a short period, and an identified questionnaire with identities maintained indefinitely. (Two groups were run under the latter condition.) In all three conditions, the inmates were told that they could refuse to participate in the study but the discussion of risks to participating inmates and the wording and procedure for the informed consent differed among these conditions.

[4] In addition, this administration of the survey served as a pretest of the wording and format of survey questions. See Sec. II.
In the first procedure, we told the inmates the survey was anonymous, and they were not asked to sign an informed consent form. No mention was made of any risks of participation. In the second procedure, we told respondents that we would maintain a file of their names only for several weeks, long enough to link their questionnaires with information that we were also recording from official records. Then respondents signed informed consent forms, but because the identifier file would be maintained for only a short time, no mention was made of any risk of legislative subpoena.

For the third procedure, we told inmates that we would maintain the list of identifiers indefinitely, indicating that at some point we might come back to reinterview them. Under this procedure we informed the respondents of the possibility of the legislative subpoena, and the informed consent form explicitly mentioned this possibility.

Only two of the approximately 60 inmates who attended the session refused to participate in the survey, one because he did not have glasses and the second because he could not speak English. Although the sample was too small to permit quantitative analyses, there were no obvious differences in the pattern of responding to self-report questions about crime.

The Orange County pretest suggested that, like prison inmates, jail inmates would be willing to participate in a survey and that they were not discouraged from participating either because they had to provide their names on the questionnaire or by the possibility of a legislative subpoena. Unfortunately, we later learned that deputies' assignment of inmates to the study had not been random. Inmates for the four sessions
were taken from different cell blocks that differed in custody level. As a result, possibly important differences in inmate characteristics had been confounded with the three experimental conditions of informed consent. We were concerned that these differences might have accounted for our failure to observe different inmate reactions to the informed consent conditions.

Chino Pilot Test

We conducted a second test of the informed consent conditions at the California Institution for Men (CIM), a state prison at Chino. As a second purpose this pilot test also provided a training experience for the survey administrators. The sessions were introduced and explained by the newly trained administrators, with one principal researcher observing each session.

For the CIM pretest we asked prison authorities to identify a random sample of 150 inmates and call them for a voluntary survey for which each inmate would be paid $5.00. All inmates were to be called for the same time, and we randomly assigned each name on the list to one of the three conditions. To explain the study, we prepared and mailed to each named inmate a brief written description of the purpose and nature of the survey. This letter was distributed one week before the survey.

The CIM inmates were substantially more resistant to the study. Seventy-seven inmates attended the sessions. Those who came were skeptical and hostile to the study, perhaps because they had had a week to discuss the pending survey and speculate about its purpose. However, we did not find that refusal rate increased with the apparent risk of the three conditions. Seventeen of the 35 inmates in the anonymous
condition at CIM refused to take the survey. For the condition in which
the identifier file was to be destroyed within a short period of time,
nine of 20 refused to participate. Only two of 20 subjects in the full
disclosure alternative refused to participate. These variations may
reflect differences among the groups of inmates in each session.
Alternatively, the different participation rates could have reflected
the style of the survey administrators who were introducing the study
for the first time. In any event, the results did not suggest that
fuller disclosure harmed participation in the study.

Both of the pilot tests involved only a few respondents.
Nevertheless, the results of both pilot tests suggested that the
procedure involving indefinite retention of names and a full disclosure
and discussion would not lessen respondent participation in the study.
Rather, results of the pretests and comments made by the inmates both in
questions during the survey administration and in discussions afterward
suggested that they were reassured by greater disclosure. Many were
skeptical of the study and the protections available to them in any
event. When we were candid about the nature of the risks, the inmates
were more likely to believe us than when we merely asserted that we
would do everything possible to maintain anonymity.[5]

Because of these pilot tests, the final informed consent form used
in the study (Appendix B) not only discussed the possibility of
legislative subpoena, it also quoted the section of the Omnibus Crime
Act and the supporting regulations that provided immunity and that

[5] These findings are consistent with those of Singer (1978),
whose subjects were neither more nor less willing to complete a survey
on sensitive topics if they were offered complete anonymity. However,
Singer did find that nonresponse to individual sensitive items was
slightly reduced by the offer of anonymity.
raised the possibility of legislative subpoena. This permitted survey respondents to judge for themselves what risks seemed to be created by this legislation and provided survey administrators with an opportunity to discuss the possible risks on an informed basis.

The pretests also confirmed our experience: Inmates would participate in the survey and treat it seriously, but response rates would be low; perhaps half of those inmates selected would not participate. We developed our sampling procedure to replace inmates who did not participate because of this experience.
II. THE SECOND INMATE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

THE FIELD INSTRUMENT

The final survey instrument, reproduced in Appendix C, had six major parts and was 62 pages long:

- Part A contained 21 questions about the respondent's total lifetime history of arrests and incarcerations and about juvenile criminal activities and use of drugs and alcohol.

- Part B contained four different types of questions examining respondents' beliefs and attitudes about crime and the criminal justice system. These items were replicated from the first California prison survey (Peterson and Braiker, 1981), with minor changes. They included 16 statements measuring respondents' attitudes about crimes, two lists in which respondents indicated the probability that specified outcomes might result conditioned on criminal behavior or on noncriminal behavior, five questions in which respondents evaluated the results of their past criminal activities, and three questions in which respondents assessed the probabilities that they would be involved in crime after completion of their present term.

- Part C examined in detail the respondent's criminal activity during the period immediately before his present incarceration. The section began with 12 questions that led the respondent step by step through identification of his measurement period and completion of his calendar, which was a separate card enclosed with the survey booklet. All remaining questions in Part C referred to his measurement period, which was marked on his calendar.

Nine questions covered the respondent's military, educational, employment, and residential circumstances, six covered his use of drugs and alcohol, and one covered his criminal and noncriminal self-identity. Detailed questions followed about the number of commissions and arrests for each of ten different categories of crime. Part C ended with questions about the respondent's reasons for committing crimes, his planning and sophistication for these crimes, and questions about details of his current conviction offense. The section included redundant questions about respondent's crime commission during the measurement period to permit exploration of the internal consistency of responses.
Part D obtained information about the respondent's life and criminal activity during two separate two-year reference periods immediately before the measurement period examined in Part C. The same nine questions were repeated for each of these two periods, providing some retrospective information for analyses of the respondent's criminal behavior over different reference periods.

Part E contained five demographic questions about the respondent's age, race, schooling, and marital status.

Part F, filled out only by prison inmates, included questions about the respondent's activities and participation in various educational, vocational, drug abuse, or counseling programs during his present incarceration. If the respondent attended, he was asked about his reasons for participation and the benefits he obtained; otherwise he was asked his reasons for nonparticipation. These items were developed for a Rand study examining the treatment of career criminals (Petersilia and Honig, 1980).

SURVEYING SENSITIVE BEHAVIOR

The design of the survey instrument was intended to overcome a number of potential difficulties created by the survey's subject matter and its sample of incarcerated criminal offenders. The most critical survey questions dealt with sensitive issues about commissions of crimes, including violent crimes, and use of drugs. We were concerned that offenders would be unwilling to answer questions dealing with these sensitive issues or that they would provide false information. Despite a lengthy history of self-report studies concerning juvenile delinquency, many of them with associated validity studies (for reviews see Hardt and Bodine, 1965; Reiss, 1973; Alstyne and Laub, 1977; Hindelang, Hirschi, and Weis, 1981), little was known about the reliability and validity of self-reports of adult inmates. The design of our survey had to allow for a variety of reliability and validity checks.
We considered but rejected random responding devices in which only the respondent would know whether his answer applied to a sensitive question or to another innocuous question.[1] In addition to substantially increasing the variance of estimates and attenuating correlations that would be available from our sample, and posing serious problems of survey administration in large groups, the random responding devices could (as far as we could tell from the literature) potentially confuse or raise the anxiety of inmate respondents rather than reassuring them about the confidentiality of their answers.

Because we felt the first California inmate survey had successfully obtained responses to sensitive questions, we retained the important features of that study, conducting pretests to see if the lack of anonymity would discourage responses.

The order of questions in the present survey instrument is similar to that of the first inmate survey, beginning with questions about the respondent's juvenile criminal behavior and arrests and convictions. However, the initial questions were not chosen to be entirely nonsensitive, so that the instrument might desensitize respondents to the more critical questions in Part C of the questionnaire dealing with crimes they committed immediately before their present incarceration. Part B of the survey attempted to increase the respondents' sense of personal involvement in the survey. Several attitude items were

[1] In the random responding procedure, a respondent flips a coin or uses some other random device that indicates whether he is to answer a sensitive question (e.g., the number of robberies he committed) or a question that produces responses with known probabilities (e.g., in what month was he born). Knowing the probabilities of the random device and responses to the innocuous question permits responses to be appropriately adjusted during analysis. See, for example, Tracy and Fox (1981).
included mainly to provide respondents with an opportunity to air opinions about the criminal justice system, rather than to obtain information for the survey analysis. The most sensitive survey questions about drug use and criminal behavior were presented only after these two introductory sections.

In construction questions about sensitive matters, we attempted to minimize their sensitivity. For example, the question about homicide asked the respondents, "Do you think that any person you hurt might have died?" rather than a question in the form, "How many people did you kill?" We found in pretesting, as well as from the results of the previous California prison survey, that inmates were often reluctant to provide information about sex offenses. During interviews, inmates would refuse to talk about those crimes. Comparison of self-report in the first survey with California Department of Corrections data on conviction offenses suggested that sex offenses were most underreported.[2] Therefore, we excluded questions about sex offenses because we felt they might produce distorted data or at least data of highly questionable value.

Similarly, we learned during the pretest that survey items should avoid asking inculpatory information about a respondent's crime partners or other persons and that the questions should not place the respondent in a position of having to report about violence or other predation that occurred during his present incarceration.

[2] This omission of questions about sex offenses was supported by subsequent analyses of the validity of survey responses. The greatest distortion of self-reported conviction offenses occurred for inmates convicted of rape. Rape was underreported as a conviction offense; other sex offenses were overreported and there was a strong negative correlation between each (Marquis, 1981).
RECALL: DEFINING THE MEASUREMENT PERIOD

A retrospective survey of criminal behavior also involves the same kinds of problems of recall that arise in victimization surveys (Surveying Crime, 1976; Gottfredson and Hindelang, 1977; Sparks, Genn, and Dodd, 1977; Schneider, 1978). Respondents are likely to have limited information about the details of past events, particularly for events that are routine or frequent. Failure of recall is probably greater with increased passage of time. Further, questions that cover an extended period may create problems of telescoping: Respondents collapse events that in fact occurred over a long period of time into brief periods. These problems can be reduced if respondents can be forced to differentiate among periods of time and if they can be helped to remember related or contemporaneous events. Memory of such related events provides a context or frame of reference that increases the amount and the accuracy of remembered information.

To minimize problems of memory, the survey instrument asked each respondent to concentrate on a limited period of time before his present incarceration, a device also used in the first inmate survey. In the present study, we developed a much more specific step-by-step procedure to define this measurement period to increase the accuracy of data provided by respondents, based on a pretest described in Appendix A. Each respondent's measurement period began on January 1 of the year preceding his arrest for his current conviction crime and continued through the month of arrest. The total calendar duration of the measurement period ranged from 13 to 24 months. (Taking into account periods of incarceration, a respondent's "free" time in his measurement period could range between one and 24 months.)
To identify the measurement period, respondents completed a series of 12 questions on the survey instrument and an associated calendar card that was separate from the survey instrument. (See Appendix D for an example of a filled-in calendar.) First, each respondent identified the year and month in which he was first arrested for his current conviction offense. The respondent then crossed out months on the calendar card after the month of his arrest, as these were not relevant to the remainder of the survey. We did not ask about subsequent events because some respondents might have been in custody after the arrest. Only a nonrandom subsample of respondents would have been free on bail or their own recognizance after their arrest.

Respondents then identified the beginning of the measurement period on both their calendar card and the questionnaire, in all cases January of the year before their arrest. This calculation resulted in differing measurement periods for each respondent, varying between 13 months for respondents who were arrested in January to 24 months for those who were arrested in December. We defined the period with a fixed beginning and variable length after pretesting more complex procedures that allowed all respondents to have a period of the same length (e.g., one year or two years). Those procedures required each respondent to identify a variable beginning month and a variable end month for his reference period, and we found they were too difficult to explain and administer. Most inmates spend at least some time in custody during the months before their arrest for their conviction offense, so even if the reference period had been 24 months for each respondent, the actual number of months they spent on the street would have varied.
Conclusions about average or other features of crime rates for groups of offenders might be influenced by the fact that we sampled different periods of time for each respondent. Our continuing research explores the effect of this varying measurement period.

Finally, all respondents indicated the months during the period when they were incarcerated. Respondents crossed these months out on their calendar card, totaled the number of months during the period when they were free, and wrote the total on both the calendar card and the instrument. Throughout the remainder of the survey instrument, this total—the months during the period when the respondent was free—was repeatedly referred to in the survey instrument as "street months on the calendar." The respondent was instructed to keep the calendar card in front of him so that he could remind himself of the number of months he was free and which months these were.

Because of the complexity of the procedures involved in completing the calendar card and calculating street months, survey administrators provided considerable assistance with these tasks as part of the survey administration routine. Shortly after respondents began the instrument, the administrators read aloud and worked through the instructions printed in the survey booklet for completion of the calendar card. In addition to this group instruction, the administrator circulated throughout the testing room to answer questions and check that respondents had currently completed the procedures.

After they had completed the calendar, respondents answered a series of questions to recall the circumstances of their life during this period—where they were living, what they were doing, with whom they were living, and so forth. Recall of these circumstances was
intended to help strengthen respondents' recollection of their criminal activities during the same period.

The form of the instructions for completing the calendar and of the recall questions was developed during pretests of the survey. Before the Orange County and Chino pretests described above, we undertook an informal pretest with parolees in a California State Department of Corrections halfway house. For this informal pretest, each of the principal researchers worked with one or two parolees while they completed the draft of the survey instrument.

We used this iteration of pretests to test and modify the strategy for identifying a period in which we would inquire about respondents' crimes and to develop a format that was both simple and effective for identifying this period. For the first, Orange County pretest, alternative instruments were printed that identified specific calendar periods: either 1977-78 or 1976-77. Respondents who were arrested in 1978 completed the survey covering the period 1977-78; those arrested in 1977 completed instruments for the period 1976-77. For the second pretest, at Chino, the instrument used a "floating" calendar period that was defined for each survey respondent as the year in which he was arrested and the previous calendar year. The "floating" calendar proved to be somewhat more difficult for respondents; however, that procedure obviated the need for separate instruments for each year in which respondents were arrested, a requirement of the "Orange County" procedure. Moreover, the use of one form avoided administrative difficulties and potential errors that would have arisen from using instruments for each year of arrest.
The Chino pretest suggested that there were few complications in having respondents identify their own reference period. For any procedure, survey administrators needed to discuss the calendar with the respondents and instruct them on how to eliminate months during the reference period when they were in jail or otherwise removed from the street. As a result of the Chino pretest, we clarified the instructions for identifying the floating calendar period and developed the procedure in which the survey administrators would read the instructions for identifying that period to respondents and then circulate through the group to answer specific questions.

DEscribing Crimes For Respondents

The survey asked detailed questions about ten different crimes:

- Burglary
- Robbery of a business
- Robbery of a person
- Assault or murder during a robbery or burglary
- Other assaults or murders
- Theft other than auto
- Auto theft
- Forgery, bad checks or bad credit cards
- Frauds
- Drug sales

Questions for each of these types of crimes were presented separately, with the questions for each crime occupying (usually) two pages of the survey instrument.
Although respondents were all convicted offenders, many did not know what constituted burglary, robbery, or other legal categories of crimes. To lessen this problem, we defined each offense crime using lay descriptions that correspond to legal definitions.[3] The order of crimes covered in the survey also aided distinctions among offenses. We first defined ambiguous crime types and then explicitly excluded any commissions of crimes the respondent had already mentioned from later categories. The first set of questions asked if respondents had committed any burglaries, and then instructed them to "count any time you broke into a house or a car or a business in order to take something." Although this definition of burglary is slightly narrower than the legal definition,[4] it represents by far the most common form of burglary and one easily understood by respondents. The next set of questions asked if they had robbed any businesses, a description that had its own clear meaning to respondents. This category excluded break-ins that had already been mentioned. (A break-in could become legally a robbery if the offender encountered someone, but this was already counted in the first question.) The third set of questions asked about other common nonbusiness robberies and described these to include "muggings, street robberies, purse snatches, or holdups." That question explicitly excluded robberies that had been described in the previous section on business robberies. The fourth set of questions asked respondents if they had hurt or killed anyone during a burglary.

[3] Survey administrators also answered respondents' questions about legal definitions of crimes.
[4] It excludes break-ins accomplished for criminal purposes other than taking—e.g., to rape, injure someone, or plant telephone bugs.
(break-in) or a robbery. The fifth set of questions explicitly excluded anything that had happened during a robbery or burglary and asked respondents if they had assaulted, threatened, shot at, tried to cut, beat up, or strangled someone, even if no one had been hurt. The sixth set asked about thefts or "boosting" and explicitly included stealing from a till or cash register, shoplifting, picking pockets, or "taking something from someone without their knowledge." That question explicitly excluded car theft. The seventh set of questions asked about thefts of cars, trucks, or motorcycles. The eighth set of questions asked whether respondents had ever forged, used stolen or bad credit cards, or cashed a bad check. The ninth set asked if a respondent had committed a fraud or swindle (any "illegal cons") of a person, business, or the government. The tenth set asked the respondent if he ever dealt in drugs, which was explicitly defined as making, selling, or moving drugs.

Another problem with defining crimes arises because the same incident can involve several different crimes. For example, a burglary also becomes a robbery when the burglar confronts a homeowner and could become an assault or homicide if the homeowner is injured.

To permit comparison of survey responses with official crime reports, we wanted to identify the multiple crimes that might occur during a single event. To accomplish this, respondents described what they were doing (e.g., breaking in, mugging someone) and then indicated whether this incident created ancillary crimes--e.g., did the respondent confront someone during a burglary?
OBTAINING COUNTS OF CRIMES COMMITTED

For each set of questions for the ten types of crime, the first question explicitly asked whether the respondent had committed that crime during the "street months on the calendar." The respondents' "yes" or "no" response to this question provided a measure of criminal incidence separate from questions about the frequency or rate of commission for that crime.[5] The next question asked about frequency and (for most of the crimes) asked the respondent to indicate if he had done the crime only occasionally--from 1 to 10 times--or whether he had committed the crime 11 or more times during the street months on the calendar. A respondent's answer to this question led to a bifurcated procedure. Respondents who had committed the crime 10 or fewer times were asked to indicate the number of times they had committed the crime. Those who had committed the crime 11 or more times were not asked the number of commissions, but rather were asked questions that would provide a rough measure of their rate of activity. They were asked the number of months during the street months on the calendar when they committed the crime and how frequently they committed the crime during these months: whether it was "every day or almost every day," "several times a week," "every week or almost every week," or "less than every week." Within each of these categories they were asked how many times they committed the crime per day, week, or month. In addition, those who indicated that they committed the crime every day or almost every

[5] The analysis of the First Offender Survey was plagued by a question format that provided for respondents to check "zero" if they did not commit a certain crime. Respondents frequently left questions blank, which probably--but not definitely--indicated that they did not commit the crime.
day were asked how many days per week they usually committed the crime.

Questions about the rate of commissions for high-rate offenders were designed in this way under the assumption (guided by the pretests) that respondents could recall their general rate of activity even though they could not precisely remember each criminal act (Peterson, 1976). The wording of the questions about frequencies used general language (e.g., "almost every day") and was intended to provide data giving a range of estimates of the number of crimes committed by an individual, rather than a fictitiously precise estimate.

The two sets of questions for assault used a different format from that used for the other eight crimes. They asked respondents the total number of persons that they had hurt or killed during the street months on the calendar. We assumed that this number would generally be low, and that these events would be memorable, obviating the need for the frequency questions used for high rates of commission for other offenses.

The format and content of the self-report crime questions were modified substantially during the pretests of the instrument. We reduced and simplified those questions, eliminating items of questionable validity (the average "take" for robberies and burglaries and self-reports of rapes). The final instrument was much more readable and easy to follow than the pretest instruments. We placed questions for each crime type on two facing pages so that respondents could follow the same routine for all questions about crime. Few changes were made after the Chino pretest, which demonstrated that earlier problems of format and graphics had been eliminated.
OBTAINING COUNTS OF ARRESTS

In addition to obtaining information about self-reports of crime, we wanted to obtain information about respondents' arrests during the calendar period. The arrest questions involved subtle definitional problems because we were interested in two different types of self-report information about arrests: (1) the probability of arrests for commissions of various offenses, and (2) the number and rate of official arrests during the reference period (to be compared with official records--rap sheets--covering the same periods of time).

Part of the definitional difficulty is that the term "arrest" refers ambiguously to an incident in which a person is taken into custody or to a charge by the police that a person has committed a crime. Because a person can be charged with several different crimes when he is taken into custody once, or he can be taken into custody several times in connection with a single crime, complicated combinations of the possibilities can and do occur. Even with a long sequence of legally worded questions (and a respondent who has kept a detailed diary!), we probably could not obtain an unambiguous count of arrests under each definition.

Added to the semantic problem are the following practical ones:

- The respondent may have been arrested for a crime that he did not commit or that he claims not to have committed.

- The police may have charged the respondent with a crime that differs from his opinion of what he was doing when he was arrested (e.g., arrested during a burglary, charged with robbery; arrested during a burglary, charged with possession of a dangerous weapon; arrested when about to commit a robbery, charged with auto theft for the stolen vehicle he was using).
The arrest occurred during the measurement period, but the crime for which he was arrested did not (or vice versa).

Without attempting to resolve all these difficulties, we developed two sets of questions about arrests that reasonably capture the main distinctions that can occur. One set was intended to relate arrests to the crimes the respondent says he was committing when he was arrested (to measure the probability of arrest). The other set is intended to represent the respondent's self-report of the arrests he believes are in his official record, whether he concurs with their validity or not.

The first set of arrest information was obtained in conjunction with the questions pertaining to each of the ten types of crime. For example, after asking about burglaries committed by the respondent, we asked, "How many of these burglaries were you arrested for? (include all of the times you were arrested for committing a burglary even if you were charged with something else)."

Second, in a completely separate part of the survey booklet (see Appendix C), we asked respondents how many times they had been arrested and charged with various offenses during the measurement period. This question stated, "Count an arrest even if you did not actually do the crime you were arrested for."

**ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS ABOUT CRIMINAL BEHAVIOR AND RECORD**

The survey provided various ancillary information about crime commissions. We obtained information about weapon use for robberies, burglaries, assaults during robbery or burglary, and other assaults. The questions asked how frequently the respondent was armed during the commission of these offenses and the type of weapon that the respondent
used in these offenses. These questions were imbedded in the section of questions for the four types of offense. At the end of Part C, after questions about specific crimes, we asked several sets of questions that applied generally to the offenses: the respondent's reasons for committing crimes during the reference period, the percent of his income derived from crime, and the sophistication and planning involved with commissions of monetary crimes.

The instrument also asked eight questions about a respondent's present commitment--what he was convicted of; what crimes, if any, he felt he had actually committed; whether he was armed during this crime or injured a victim; the length of time he had already served and how long he expected to serve on this conviction.

The final set of questions about the measurement period again asked respondents about the total number of times they committed certain offenses during that period. These nine questions were essentially replications of the principal questions used to obtain self-reports of crimes for the First Inmate Survey (Peterson and Braiker, 1981). Their inclusion provided a way to compare the answers of the two studies and permitted analyses of the internal consistency of responses in the survey.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS IN INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

The survey was designed to be a self-administered questionnaire that would be given to a sample of often poorly educated inmates. Yet we wanted to obtain precise information that was often complicated. The form had to be clear and easily read. Also, considerations both of institutional requirements and respondent fatigue required that the instrument be completed within 60 to 90 minutes. Throughout the
pretesting and development of the instrument, we made every effort to simplify language and design the format so that questions could be followed as easily as possible. Many different skip patterns were tried during pretesting, and the format gradually evolved into its final obvious and repetitive arrangement. We expected that respondents would have some difficulty with the survey, so each group administration of the instrument was supervised by at least two administrators who could circulate throughout the room and answer questions. In addition, we expected that many inmates would have difficulty completing a written survey questionnaire, and we provided individual assistance for them.

ADMINISTERING THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Reading difficulties were a persistent problem for survey respondents. In large group sessions, survey administrators were pressed to assist all the men who asked for help in filling out the questionnaire. For the most part, respondents required the help of one of the administrators to calculate the correct measurement period on the enclosed calendar. Somewhat surprisingly, most respondents seemed eager to fill out the questionnaire correctly and asked questions to be sure they were doing it accurately. Many needed help in correctly following skip patterns in the questionnaire.

A few men in each session were able to complete the questionnaire on their own in about 35 minutes. A few others were very slow readers. Because we did not want to rush or intimidate the slower respondents, sessions were sometimes stretched into two hours, which delayed the start of the next scheduled session. Future surveys of inmates should try to concentrate on accommodating this problem, perhaps by greater attention to vision problems in questionnaire layout, and by notifying respondents to bring reading glasses to the sessions.
III. THE SAMPLE OF OFFENDERS

SAMPLING PLAN

As with Rand's previous surveys of criminal offenders, the present survey was administered to a sample of incarcerated, sentenced offenders. This sampling universe was selected for several reasons.

1. When the results of analyzing the survey data are used to examine the incapacitation effects of sentencing policies, such policies can be applied to convicted offenders but not to offenders who escape arrest and conviction.

2. Compared with sampling a general population and asking about commissions of crimes, it is more efficient to survey incarcerated offenders. Few people in the general population commit the street crimes that are the object of interest in this study; and the incidence of commission of street crimes is high among a population of jail and prison inmates. All respondents were convicted of a crime; a very large proportion of them admitted having been involved in the types of criminal activity that we wished to study.[1] By sampling only convicted offenders, we were unable to provide information about what proportion of the population commits street crimes.

3. Data from a sample of convicted offenders serving sentences can be extrapolated to describe a general population of offenders—all offenders who have some chance of being incarcerated, whether or not they are currently incarcerated (Rolph, Chaiken, and Houchens, 1981). Certainly there are types of criminal offenders who are rarely, if ever, incarcerated, and this survey does not help to describe them. However, no feasible and reasonably inexpensive procedure could possibly identify and survey "successful" offenders (those who evade detection by law enforcement agencies).[2]

[1] The sample presumably includes some respondents who committed no serious crimes during the time periods studied in the survey. Some were convicted of crimes that they did not commit. Others, particularly those serving jail sentences, were convicted for offenses that were not examined within the survey, and they may never have committed any of those offenses.

[2] In principle, previously undetected offenders can be identified by general population surveys. However, they are mixed among members of the general population who do not engage in the criminal activities examined in the survey, so there is no inexpensive way of contacting them. In addition, there is little reason to believe that successful criminals contacted in a general population survey would candidly report their criminality.
4. We limited the sample to incarcerated offenders who had already been sentenced, because we expected that unsentenced offenders might be more resistant and less candid than sentenced offenders to answering sensitive, self-report questions about criminal activities and drug use. Our thinking was that unsentenced offenders could reasonably be concerned that their responses would affect the outcomes of their current criminal proceedings. However, we assumed that sentenced offenders would perceive little risk that the survey information might be used to obtain a new prosecution. Discussions with respondents after they had completed the questionnaire were consistent with this assumption. Because they were already locked up, they did not think anyone would want to follow up other crimes they might have committed.

5. If the sample had been extended to incarcerated but unsentenced individuals, difficult to understand sampling biases would have been introduced, especially in comparisons across jurisdictions. For example, people who were actually criminals would be included in the sample or not according to whether they were free on bail or incarcerated at the moment. And such a sample could include a substantial number of people--differing from one study county to another--who were neither criminals nor convicted of any crime. (This topic was not the target of the study.)

The present study extends our previous work by including inmates who were in jail in addition to those in prison, who were studied earlier. The inclusion of jail inmates provides a broader sample of criminal offenders. It also allowed us an opportunity to compare the criminal behavior and other characteristics of offenders who served jail rather than prison sentences.

**SELECTION OF SURVEY SITES**

To broaden our sample of offenders we conducted the latest survey in three states. Rand's first offender survey had been conducted only among California prison inmates. We again included California prisons as sampling sites to permit comparisons with the earlier findings. Even within a single state we expected changes in the survey results because
of the passage of time (cohort effects), changing composition of prison populations, and variations in survey methodology. The inclusion of California prisoners permitted these effects to be distinguished from interstate differences.

Several considerations pointed to Michigan and Texas as our additional survey sites. First, Texas, Michigan, and California represent different regions within the country. Second, population centers in each of the three states permitted us to study the criminal activity of offenders active in major urban areas as well as of those who commit crimes in smaller cities. The major urban areas studied in these states are not especially close to boundaries with other states, allowing for the possibility that we could later conduct follow-up studies of recidivism using records within each state.\[3\] Third, the population of each of these states is large enough that we were able to obtain a sufficient number of respondents from among prison inmates. Fourth, the three states provided differences in correctional programs offered to inmates that could be examined in the study of criminals' prison experience, which used the same sample and survey instruments as the present work (see Petersilia and Honig, 1980). Finally, the Department of Corrections management information systems in these states contained the data we needed to identify and select the prison inmate sample.

We did not attempt to select three states whose criminals would somehow be "representative" of all U.S. criminals. Rather, we selected sites with a sufficient variety of demography and criminal justice

\[3\] Of course, Detroit's and San Diego's locations are on international borders. But crossing an international border to commit crimes is more difficult than crossing a state border.
systems so that any patterns found in all three states would not be the result of regional features or of similar criminal justice systems. We particularly wanted to know what patterns found in California were not found in other states.

Results of the previous survey of California prison inmates suggested that the second survey should allow us to distinguish criminal behavior of offenders in major urban areas from that of offenders in smaller cities. Comparisons between major urban areas and smaller cities were needed to rule out some unusual or indirect interpretations of findings from the first survey. For example, analyses of that survey data indicated that offenders who were repeatedly placed on probation were more likely to commit large numbers of crimes than were those who had not been on probation or were infrequently on probation (Peterson and Braiker, 1980, Ch. 8). This result could potentially have reflected the greater use of probation as a sentencing disposition in major urban areas in California than in the rest of the state. If offenders who commit their crimes in these major urban areas also have substantially higher crime commission rates than offenders in other parts of the states, these geographic differences could have explained the observation concerning frequency of probation. The data from the first survey did not include where offenders were sentenced, and that sample presumably contained only a few prisoners sentenced from locations other than major urban areas.

To permit making distinctions between major urban areas and other areas of the state, we stratified the prison sample for the second survey according to the geographical area from which the prisoner was sentenced. (Without stratification, the prisoners from major urban
areas would automatically dominate any sample.) The unit of stratification was necessarily a county (not a city) because the sentencing courts are organized by county (and offenders' mobility suggests that a finer stratification would not be meaningful anyway).

We wanted the number of prisoners from counties with major urban centers to be approximately half the sample, which could potentially have been accomplished by differentially establishing sampling weights for all prisoners according to the number of prisoners committed from each county. However, we also planned to survey jail inmates whose questionnaire responses could be compared with responses of prison inmates sentenced from the same county, and it was not feasible to collect data from jail inmates in a large number of counties.

Consequently, we designed the sample to consist of jail and prison inmates convicted in one or two counties with major urban areas in each state, and in three or four other counties that were outside the major urban areas but that contained cities with populations between 100,000 and 500,000. Table 1 above indicated the counties and cities that we selected within each state. The prison sample universe contained only prisoners committed from the counties in which we sampled jail inmates.

A variety of practical considerations intervened between selection of our "desired" counties and selection of the counties shown in the table. In Michigan, the situation was straightforward. We selected Detroit (Wayne County) and the counties for the next four largest cities (Grand Rapids, Lansing, Ann Arbor, and Flint). We were able to obtain access to the jails in the latter four counties and the major jail in Detroit. In Texas, we were able to conduct the survey in the Dallas County jail as well as county jails that included Beaumont, Corpus
Christi, and Austin. We also wanted to conduct the survey in county jails that included Waco, Lubbock, and El Paso, but access was not permitted for survey research because of crowded conditions and pending litigation. In California, we wanted to choose the largest urban county (Los Angeles), but the survey team was not permitted access to the jail. The Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department stated that the size of the central jail facility and administrative difficulties arising from the passage of Proposition 13 made it impossible for them to cooperate with the study.

As an alternative, we chose the San Francisco County jail and the San Diego County jails. We included both counties to assure that we would be able to obtain an adequate number of prison inmates from major urban counties. Further, neither county alone provided an urban/suburban mix characteristic of most major population areas in this country. San Francisco County includes only the city of San Francisco, a central city, and does not contain any suburban area. San Diego has a small central city area and contains a much larger suburban population than most metropolitan areas in the country. Together, these two counties provide a mix of central urban and suburban areas.

The net result of the site selection process is that the sample universe contained offenders who committed crimes in major urban areas and moderate sized cities in each of three states. It was not intended to provide a sample of all offenders in any of the states.

APPLICATION AND SITE VISITS

We formally applied for permission to conduct the survey in each of the selected sites[4] and followed up each of the written applications.

[4] To protect against the possibility of disapprovals, we also made initial applications to conduct the survey in the state prisons of Washington and Maryland, and in the Harris County (Houston) jail.
with site visits. The application process included review by several boards for the protection of human subjects. In addition, procedures were developed for protecting the confidentiality of data provided by state and local corrections agencies. The site visits were essential for satisfying locally imposed conditions for conduct of the survey and provided an opportunity to arrange the use of prison or jail facilities that were best for administering the survey. We were also able to explain the sensitivity of the survey and the need for cooperation on the part of institution staff to insure the confidentiality of respondents' answers to the survey.

**SELECTION OF INSTITUTIONS**

The site visits aided our selection of particular institutions. Table 2 indicates the institutions in which we conducted the survey. In every county other than San Diego we conducted the survey in every jail facility used to house inmates. In San Diego County we conducted the survey in the central jail and in two of the county's six jail camps.

The prison institutions in which the survey was conducted did not include all facilities housing inmates from the study counties. Because the Departments of Corrections in each of the three states operate multiple institutions and inmates from a given county could be housed in any one of them, it was not feasible to survey all such prisoners. In selecting institutions within which to conduct the survey, we attempted to approximate a cross section of inmates within each state.

---

[5] As part of the approval process, we were required to obtain agreement of the inmates' council in the San Francisco County jail at San Bruno.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Prisons</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Jail (County)</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>California Correctional Institute, Tehachapi</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deuel Vocational Institute, Tracy</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Quentin State Prison</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Correctional Training Facility, Solidad</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>State Prison of Southern Michigan, Jackson</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan Reformatory, Ionia</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>Genesee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan Training Unit</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>State Prison</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>Wasenah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wynne Unit</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellis Unit</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coffield Unit</td>
<td>275</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferguson Unit</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total, all prisons</td>
<td>1380</td>
<td>Total, all county jails</td>
<td>936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Respondents from Texas jails were not used in the survey analysis. (Inmates in jails in Texas are predominantly offenders sentenced to prison and awaiting transportation or additional court action. The respondents in Texas prisons were sufficiently representative without including any respondents from Texas jails.) Jail respondents in the analysis sample numbered 810; total prison and jail respondents, 2190.
In California we conducted the survey in the same institutions used for the First Inmate Survey,[6] except that the California Institution for Men at Chino was eliminated because we had pretested the new survey instrument there. The four California prisons shown in Table 2 represent a mix of the three security levels within that state. The California Correctional Institute (CCI) at Tehachapi and Deuel Vocational Institute (DVI) at Tracy are used primarily to house younger offenders, CCI the less serious juvenile offenders, and DVI the more serious. We conducted the survey in both the north and the central units of the California Training Facility (CTF) at Soledad, representing medium security facilities. We did not conduct the survey at the south farm at CTF, a low-security unit. San Quentin is one of the two maximum security facilities within the California system.

The three institutions in Michigan again provided a good cross-section of inmates for the entire system. The state prison for Southern Michigan (SPSM) in Jackson houses approximately one-third of the state prisoners in Michigan and is the largest single prison in the country. We conducted the survey within each of the three facilities at SPSM, the north or "Lansing" unit, the central unit, and the south or farm unit. The southern unit was the least secure and housed prison trustees who worked on the prison farm located there. The central unit was the largest of the three and most heavily secured. The north unit is the newest of the three units. The other two institutions in Michigan, the Michigan Training Unit and the Michigan Reformatory, both housed predominantly younger offenders. The Michigan Training Unit, a low

security facility housing inmates in dormitory units rather than in cell blocks, offered a variety of rehabilitation, educational, and industrial programs. The Michigan Reformatory houses more serious youthful offenders and is a high security institution.

All of the four prisons selected for our survey in Texas operated at approximately the same maximum security level. All institutions include extensive farm and agricultural programs as well as educational programs for some inmates. Nevertheless, there are notable differences among inmates housed in the four institutions. Both Ferguson Unit and Coffield Unit house somewhat younger inmates. Ferguson typically houses first-time offenders, whereas Coffield is more likely to house inmates with criminal records. The Coffield Unit was the newest prison operating in Texas at the time of the survey, and prison construction was still being completed at that time. The Ellis Unit is used to house some of the most serious and difficult inmates in the Texas prison system, but it also includes inmates who work in sophisticated work programs provided there (e.g., school bus reconstruction, construction units, dental laboratories). The Wynne Unit houses somewhat older and often infirm inmates, but it also includes inmates working in the institution's data processing industry.
IV. SURVEY FIELD PROCEDURES

The survey was administered to groups of 10 to 30 inmates. Individual sessions were run for some inmates in disciplinary segregation or death row and for some men who had difficulty reading the survey instrument. From one to four sessions were planned each day depending upon the number of inmates to be surveyed and the inmate and institution schedules. Occasionally several sessions were run simultaneously at large institutions. Each session ran from 90 to 120 minutes.

Inmates selected for the survey were notified by mail (see Appendix E) a day or two before the survey. The institutions assigned selected inmates to sessions on the basis of work requirements and housing assignments and then notified inmates of this assignment through ducats (handwritten or typewritten passes issued to inmates) telling them to report to the room in which the survey was conducted at the scheduled time.

Nine temporary Rand employees administered the survey sessions, usually two or three during each session. Administrators were selected for their ability to develop rapport with inmates. They represented several ethnic groups, and all but one had previous experience working with felons in correctional institutions. Seven initial administrators received approximately 20 hours of training on the questionnaire and survey procedures. They also participated in the Chino pretest. Two administrators were hired after field work had begun to replace two initial administrators. These replacements were trained but did not participate in the pretest.
Sessions were conducted in a variety of institutional rooms large enough to hold the groups of surveyed inmates--e.g., classrooms, visiting rooms, dining rooms. As part of the site visits, one of the authors visited each institution to work out room and seating arrangements. During the sessions, correctional staff either remained outside of the room or, if they remained in the room, stayed away from inmates while they were completing the questionnaires.

Typically, inmates arrived for sessions in small groups and would talk with each other or the administrators until the session began. When the session began, one or more administrators passed out the Agreement to Participate Forms (Appendix B) and questionnaire booklets (Appendix C) while another administrator explained the purpose of the survey and the response task.[1] As part of this explanation, the administrator read out loud the Agreement to Participate form. The administrator answered questions about the study and the Agreement to Participate Form (there were usually few questions about the latter), reiterated that inmates would receive $5.00 for participating and that they had the right to leave and not answer the questionnaire. Inmates who chose not to participate were then permitted to leave, and the signed Agreement to Participate Forms were collected.

The administrator then read the instructions and examples on the first page of the questionnaire booklet, requesting the respondents to follow along. After inmates had been working on the survey for several minutes, the administrator would interrupt and explain how to identify

[1] The administrator offered Spanish versions of the questionnaire and Agreement to Participate Form. One Spanish-speaking administrator was present at each session to help explain and answer questions about the survey and questionnaire.
the "street months on the calendar" and complete the calendar (Appendix D).

All administrators in attendance circulated through the room to answer questions and identify inmates who were having difficulty. Often administrators would work with most or all inmates in completing questions about the calendar. Administrators also often explained crime categories in response to inmates' questions. If an inmate was having difficulty reading or answering the questionnaire, an administrator would take the inmate (or inmates) aside and work through the questionnaire in a one to one (or sometimes one to two) interview. Occasionally, inmates who were having difficulty were rescheduled for separate, individual sessions.

Almost all survey sessions went smoothly. Most inmates seemed to regard the questionnaire as a "test," which they tried to answer accurately and seriously. They usually completed the questionnaires quietly by themselves, but sometimes administrators had to ask inmates not to talk to each other about their answers to the questionnaire. A few inmates who objected to particular survey questions refused to complete the survey and left the room. At two California institutions, the Fresno County jail and a wing of Deuel Vocational Institute housing members of the Neustra Familia prison gang, Mexican-American inmates refused to answer the questionnaire, apparently on instructions from inmate leaders. Otherwise, administrators encountered little difficulty, even when administering the survey to high security inmates, including individual inmates in chains on death row and in the highest security segregation in California.
Procedures for men in disciplinary segregation varied. In Texas, the few men in segregation were not allowed to participate. In California, administrators went to the inmate's cell, even for men on death row or in the most highly secure segregated custody. In one Michigan prison, the men in disciplinary segregation were brought to one group session; in the other two prisons, segregated inmates were interviewed individually.

As each inmate finished, he left the survey room. Before leaving, he sealed his questionnaire in an envelope and signed his name to a payment sheet to receive his $5.00 for participating.

IMPLEMENTING FIELD PROCEDURES

The field procedures varied considerably across the surveyed institutions, depending on a number of factors at each institution, such as the types of facilities provided for conducting the group survey sessions, the daily schedule at the institution, the method of scheduling inmates for survey sessions, and unexpected but not atypical conditions at the time the survey was being conducted. Several common problems arose during the course of the survey fieldwork. For future efforts of this type we would have survey administrators arrive a day or two before the scheduled sessions to make themselves known to the prison guard personnel with whom they would be working and to become familiar with the daily routine of the institution. In addition, we would try to be more involved in the scheduling of inmates for the group sessions. We expect, however, that conducting fieldwork in prisons and jails will always be difficult because survey workers can have little control over their environment or their respondents.
ACCESS TO INMATE RESPONDENTS

Although we sent an announcement to sampled inmates informing them of the Rand survey, we were totally dependent on the institution to schedule inmates and tell them where and when they were to attend. The method of doing this varied from posting a list on a bulletin board to handing out individual passes to scheduled inmates. In many cases, the method was less than completely successful. For example, the list was sometimes posted where most men did not see it. In other cases no one came to bring men from their workplace to the facility where the survey was being conducted. In other cases men were not allowed out of their cellblock to attend because of the population count or because a disturbance of some type had occurred in the cellblock. In still other cases we were told that inmates ignored the pass they had received because it told them to go somewhere but did not say why. If told to report to a visiting area, for example (a place where survey sessions often were held), and the inmate knew he was not allowed any more visitors for the month, he simply would not go.

Our sessions sometimes conflicted with regular or special institutional visiting schedules. It was also difficult to conduct sessions near meal times and when men were at work assignments. Evening sessions were often preferable from our standpoint but were difficult for some institutions because of greater nighttime security problems.
V. SAMPLE IMPLEMENTATION

Initially, we wanted to obtain approximately 1000 completed surveys from respondents in each of the three states, divided approximately equally between prison and jail inmates. The sampling universe was identical for both: convicted male offenders who were housed in one of the selected institutions on the date of the survey and whose most recent commitment was from one of the study counties. However, the method used to choose prison inmates to take the survey was not the same as the method used to choose jail inmates. The prison inmates were chosen from lists prepared two or three months in advance, and jail inmates were chosen in the field one or two days before survey administration. There were several reasons for this distinction:

1. Prison inmates serve longer terms than jail inmates, so attrition of prison inmates who complete their terms during a period of three months is small, but it might be over half of the jail inmates.

2. State Departments of Corrections maintain information about the age, race, and other characteristics of prison inmates in computer-readable form. We wanted to use such information for comparing response rates of various subgroups and for devising field procedures that would compensate for differential response rates. In the selected states, no similar information about jail inmates is maintained in computer-readable form, and many jails do not maintain files in any form containing background information about their inmates.

3. For the prisoners, we wanted to establish sampling probabilities that differed according to the duration of their sentences. In Rand's First Inmate Survey, the respondents were (in principle) a random cross section of prisoners in the selected institutions, which led to two problems for the analysts. First, prisoners serving long terms (e.g., murderers) constituted a large fraction of the respondents, but many of them were not criminals of interest to our policy concerns, because they had committed only one serious offense.
Second, mathematical models were needed to weight the survey data so that policy-relevant statistics could be obtained. For the present survey, the weighting was carried out in the process of selecting the prison sample, so we needed information about the survey universe beforehand. In contrast, jail inmates all serve short sentences. We were able to choose an unweighted random sample, because we did not expect an unusually high representation of inmates with long sentences.

The sections that follow provide details of the sample implementation and response rates.

JAIL SAMPLE

In most of our study counties, all jail inmates who met the selection criterion (conviction for a crime other than specified minor offenses) were invited to take the survey. However, in four large county institutions (Detroit House of Corrections, Kent County Jail, San Francisco County Jail, and San Diego County Jail) neither the physical facilities nor the budgetary limitations of the survey team permitted surveying all eligible inmates.

In these four jails, survey administrators visited several days before the scheduled survey date, examined the institution's card file or list of inmates, and wrote the names (and inmate identification numbers) of eligible inmates on a preprinted form prepared at Rand. The preprinted forms had a random digit (between 0 and 9) printed on each line where an inmate's name could be written. After the names were entered on the form, a 40 percent random sample was chosen by selecting all inmates whose digits were 0, 1, 2, or 3.
SAMPLING WEIGHTS FOR PRISONERS

The prisoners chosen to take the survey were collectively intended to represent a random sample of an incoming incarceration cohort from the study counties. An incoming (or admission) cohort can be defined as the collection of individuals who entered prison during a specified period of time, such as calendar year 1977, or January and February of 1978. Such an incoming cohort is interesting because its subgroups' crime commission rates are directly relevant to sentencing policies—i.e., can judges identify highly active criminals, what proportion of inmates sentenced to prison and jail are highly active?[1] The crime commission rates of a random sample of inmates in prison are not immediately relevant to sentencing policies, and their importance for such policies is difficult to interpret. Because we attempted to serve a number of different research objectives, we did not actually choose a random sample of an incoming cohort. Different objectives argued for sampling inmates both at the beginning and at the end of their current sentences:

1. To allow for the possibility of follow-up studies of released inmates within a few years after the survey, it was preferable to select inmates who were nearing the end of their period of incarceration than those near the beginning.

2. Although a "release cohort" (individuals who will be released from prison during a specified period) would have been nearly as satisfactory as an incoming cohort for purposes of policy

[1] See the reports of findings from either the First Inmate Survey (Peterson and Braiker, 1981) or the Second Inmate Survey (Greenwood, 1982; Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982) for examples of such interpretations.
analysis, it was not as satisfactory for purposes of survey administration. In some instances it would have been difficult to know exactly when an inmate will be released, so a release cohort could not be clearly defined in advance.

3. Moreover, members of a release cohort had been in prison for at least a year, and perhaps much more, so they had poorer recollection of their time spent on the street before incarceration than did newcomers. Their memories might also have been influenced by socialization of the prison experience. If they were finishing long sentences, inmates about to be released also would have been exposed to conditions in the outside world (e.g., availability of various types of drugs) that are somewhat out of date.

4. For purposes of collecting official record data about inmates, a release cohort was not desirable because the completeness of statewide rap sheets has improved in recent years. The official records of incoming inmates were compiled recently, but the records of inmates about to be released were compiled some years in the past.

5. Although it was not difficult to choose a small sample of prisons that house a cross-section of inmates, it would have been more difficult to choose prisons that contain a cross-section of recently incarcerated inmates. In some states, for example Michigan, the inmates moved from one prison to another according to the length of time they had been imprisoned.

6. This survey also served as a data source for a study of the prison experiences of inmates (Petersilia and Honig, 1980).
For the purposes of that study, an incoming cohort was unacceptable as a sampling universe, because the members of an incoming cohort would not have experienced any treatment programs during their current term. Moreover, a temporal cross-section was somewhat preferable to a release cohort, because the inmates could provide contemporaneous information about currently available institutional programs for inmates with a minimal memory lapse.

Because of these conflicting objectives, the prison sample actually chosen consisted of inmates at all temporal stages of their prison terms, but sampling weights were chosen in such a way that the relative representation of inmates of various types was similar to the composition of either an incoming cohort or a release cohort. The primary distinction between an incoming (or release) cohort and the collection of people who are in prison at any given time is that inmates serving long terms have higher representation in the in-prison group. The sampling weights were chosen to correct for this overrepresentation. To be more precise, the weights were established as follows: A data tape was obtained from each of the state corrections agencies listing the prison inmates on the date the tape was prepared, and each inmate was given a sampling weight proportional to the inverse of the length of his prison term.

To see why this sampling method converts the group of prisoners into a simulated incoming (or release) cohort, consider the following simple model. Suppose that prison terms can have durations $T_1, T_2, T_3, \ldots, T_K$, and that the proportion of incoming prisoners who have prison terms of length $T_k$ is $p_k$. Suppose further that the system is in steady
state, so that the number of inmates who enter is constant from year to
year, and the proportion \( p_k \) having prison term \( T_k \) is also constant from
year to year. Then, under these assumptions, a release cohort will have
exactly the same composition as an incoming cohort (because in steady
state the flow in is balanced by the flow out)—the proportion of the
release cohort that served a term of length \( T_k \) is also \( p_k \). But the
fraction of people in prison who have sentence length \( T_k \) is \( p_k T_k / \sum_i p_i T_i \),
which is proportional to the sentence length \( T_k \). (See, for example,
Peterson and Braiker, 1981, p. 234; or see any description of time-
biased sampling.) Hence, by establishing a sampling weight proportional
to \( 1/T_k \) for people in prison who are serving terms of length \( T_k \), the
relative proportions are converted back to those that are appropriate to
an incoming cohort.

Several obstacles prevent a precise application of this model to
data from actual prison systems. First, the length of term to be served
by an inmate is not always known exactly, or even to a close
approximation. Second, the steady-state assumptions of the model are
not correct for applications to real prison systems. For example, the
number of persons who have been sentenced to prison for robbery has
gradually increased from year to year in most states, and the length of
typical prison terms for robbery may have varied from year to year
because of changes in legislation or the practices of parole boards or
sentencing courts. As a consequence, release cohorts from prison
systems may not be precisely representative of incoming cohorts (see
Peterson and Braiker, 1981, pp. 245-252, for an example from
California), and the factor \( 1/T_k \) may not exactly relate the proportion
of people in prison with term \( T_k \) on a given date to the proportion of
people who entered prison with term of length \( T_k \) in the same year.
Despite these (and possibly other) limitations of the weighting scheme as described, it successfully approximated an incoming cohort--i.e., the sample we obtained by applying the weights appeared much more representative of an incoming cohort than of an in-prison group. Tables 3, 4, and 5 compare four characteristics of the survey sample we obtained by using weighted random sampling[2] with the same four characteristics of an incoming cohort. For example, Table 3 shows that approximately 11 percent of the prison inmates from the study counties in Texas, but only 6 percent of an entering cohort from early 1978, were convicted of homicide. The original sample, chosen for the survey by applying sampling weights inversely proportional to the prisoner's term of sentence, also included 6 percent convicted of homicide. Similarly, inmates convicted of robbery constitute 28 percent of the prison population but only 17 percent of an incoming cohort (nearly equal to the 18 percent in the chosen sample).

For every characteristic, the percentages for the Texas chosen sample are closer to those for the incoming cohort than to those for the in-prison population, and the same is generally, but not invariably, true for Michigan (Table 4). The performance of the weighting scheme was substantially less satisfactory for the California prisoners (Table 5), primarily because the California Department of Corrections was unable to provide us with data concerning the length of term for individual prisoners.[3] We were therefore forced to estimate each California prisoner's term according to his most serious conviction

[2] Each inmate was given a sampling weight proportional to the inverse of his expected total sentence length. The resulting "chosen" sample, shown in the tables, has not been adjusted for nonrespondents.

[3] At the time we chose the sample, California had recently converted from an indeterminate to a determinate sentencing law. The process of establishing determinate sentences for prisoners whose incarceration predated the new law had only begun.
Table 3

COMPARISON OF CHOSEN SAMPLE WITH INMATES IN PRISON AND INCOMING COHORT

(Texas prisoners from the study counties)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Original Chosen Sample</th>
<th>Incoming Cohort&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>In Prison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31+</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White Hispanic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other white</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior prison terms</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or more</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction offense</td>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kidnap</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Items may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

<sup>a</sup>An incoming cohort was defined as follows: prisoners present on October 31, 1978, who entered prison from March 1978 through August 1978.

<sup>b</sup>Most serious conviction offense, ranked in the order shown.
Table 4
COMPARISON OF CHOSEN SAMPLE WITH INMATES IN PRISON AND INCOMING COHORT

(Michigan prisoners from the study counties)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Original Chosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 23</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31+</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other white</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior prison terms</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or more</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction offense&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kidnap</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary/theft</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forgery/fraud</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Items may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

<sup>a</sup>An incoming cohort was defined as follows: prisoners present on June 30 1978, who entered prison from October 1977 through March 1978.

<sup>b</sup>Most serious conviction offense, ranked in the order shown.
Table 5

COMPARISON OF CHOSEN SAMPLE WITH INMATES
IN PRISON AND INCOMING COHORT

(California prisoners from the study counties)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Chosen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Cohort&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31+</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White Hispanic</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other white</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior prison terms</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or more</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction offense</td>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary/Theft</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forgery/Fraud</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Items may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

<sup>a</sup> An incoming cohort was defined as follows: prisoners present on September 30 1978, who entered prison from January through June 1978.

<sup>b</sup> Most serious conviction offense, ranked in the order shown.
crime (using the average length of time served for that crime). Obviously, such a rough approximation did not capture the characteristics of offenders and offenses that cause some sentences to be longer than others. By contrast, the data provided by the Departments of Correction in Michigan and Texas indicated fairly accurately the expected date on which each prisoner would be released, allowing us to calculate a sampling weight specific to each prisoner.

**SAMPLING ATTRITION[4]**

Because several months necessarily intervened between the time when the state Department of Corrections prepared the data that we used to select our sample and our administration of the survey, we expected that some of the prisoners we selected for our sample would no longer be available when the survey was administered. Some would have been released from imprisonment, others would have transferred from the institutions selected for the survey to some other institution or facility (e.g., medical center).

We use the term "sample attrition" to refer to the various processes by which prisoners selected to be members would become unavailable for survey administration. To the extent that attrition is random (e.g., a regular rotation of prisoners among geographical locations, or absences for annual physical checkups), we could simply correct for attrition by choosing a larger sample than would otherwise appear to be necessary. However, completely random attrition could not

---

[4] Analysis of sample attrition and response rates (the remainder of this section) was carried out jointly with Marcia Chaiken. The authors gratefully acknowledge her help.
reasonably be anticipated. Release from imprisonment is obviously more likely for prisoners serving short terms than for those serving long terms, and transfers of inmates among institutions could have been (as far as we know) very selective, introducing biases into the sample.

Fortunately, our procedures for telling prison administrators which inmates were in our sample provided us with advance indications of the extent and nature of sample attrition. In California and Texas, we concluded that attrition would probably not introduce any important biases, and our expectations were subsequently confirmed. For these two states, Tables 6 and 7 compare selected characteristics of the originally chosen sample with the sample that was available after attrition (the scheduled sample). Table 6 shows that the attrition rate was 18 percent in Texas, and it introduced no noticeable (or statistically significant) biases in the variables displayed.[5] Similarly, Table 7 indicates that the attrition rate in California was 21 percent, and no significant attrition biases were apparent in the variables displayed.[6]

[5] Table 6 shows the entire Texas sample. Similar comparisons for each institution separately showed the following significant biases, which were no longer significant when included in the total sample. In the Coffield Unit, blacks were overrepresented in the scheduled sample, whites underrepresented. In the Wynne Unit, those convicted of rape, robbery, and drug crimes were overrepresented, those convicted for homicide, theft, auto theft, and "other" offenses were underrepresented; 24- to 30-year olds were overrepresented, the other two age categories underrepresented.

[6] Table 7 shows the entire California sample. Similar comparisons for each institution separately showed the following significant biases that were no longer significant when included in the total sample. In San Quentin, those with less serious conviction crimes (forgery, fraud) were underrepresented in the scheduled sample. In Deuel Vocational Institute (DVI), whites were overrepresented in the scheduled sample; in CCI, blacks were overrepresented. In the North subunit of the CTF, those without records were overrepresented in the scheduled sample.
Table 6

COMPARISON OF THE ORIGINAL PRIMARY SAMPLE
WITH THE SCHEDULED PRIMARY SAMPLE

(Texas prisoners)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Original (N = 895)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 23</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31+</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White Hispanic</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other white</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior prison terms</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or more</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction offense(^a)</td>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kidnap</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Coffield</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wynne</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Most serious conviction offense, ranked in the order shown.
Table 7  
COMPARISON OF THE ORIGINAL PRIMARY SAMPLE WITH THE SCHEDULED PRIMARY SAMPLE  

(California prisoners)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Original (N = 787)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31+</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White Hispanic</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other white</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior prison terms</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or more</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction offense$^a$</td>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary/theft</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forgercy/fraud</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution$^b$</td>
<td>San Quentin</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deuel</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTF-North</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTF-Central</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Most serious conviction offense, ranked in the order shown.  

$^b$CTF = California Training Facility, Tehachapi; CCI = California Correctional Institute.
By contrast, our site visit to Michigan indicated that many inmates were being transferred in and out of the study institutions and that transfer rates differed substantially among institutions. Because the characteristics of the inmates varied among the institutions, we took corrective action to assure that the characteristics of the scheduled sample would approximately match those of the originally chosen sample.

Table 8 shows the data on which we based the corrections. Originally, we chose a weighted sample consisting of 785 inmates who had been present in the study institutions on June 30, 1978. When the prison administrators checked their rosters around September 18, 1978, they found that about half of the inmates were available in the Michigan Training Unit and about three-quarters in the other two study institutions. Our analysis showed that in regard to the characteristics

Table 8

INTERIM TRANSFER RATES OBSERVED FOR MICHIGAN PRISONERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Original Number 6/30/78</th>
<th>Still There on 9/18</th>
<th>There on 9/18 (incl. transfers in)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent of Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionia</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSM</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>76.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTU</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: See Table 2 for full names of institutions.
we examined, the transfers appeared to be random within institution.

From the figures in Table 8 we estimated a weekly loss rate and "transfer-in" rate for each institution and extrapolated it to the dates the survey would be administered (October 9 to 17). The extrapolations implied we should select an additional 23 inmates from the Ionia Unit (16 percent of the number originally chosen), 135 from the State Prison of Southern Michigan (25 percent), and 76 from the Michigan Training Unit (76 percent). These added inmates were chosen according to the weighted sampling scheme previously described, stratified by institution.

To the extent that we could evaluate it, this method of compensating the sample attrition was successful. The characteristics of the scheduled sample, especially the relative numbers in each of the three study institutions, were not significantly different from those of the original sample (see Table 9);[7] the ultimate attrition rate--adjusted for transfers-in--was 22 percent in Ionia, 31 percent in the State Prison of Southern Michigan, and 49 percent in the Michigan Training Unit.

Because the sampling design was successful in matching the scheduled sample with the original sample in terms of the age, race, conviction offense, previous prison terms, and current prison, in the remainder of this Note we will relate response rates to the scheduled sample.

[7] Table 9 shows the entire Michigan sample. Similar comparisons for each institution separately showed the following significant biases that were no longer significant when included in the total sample. In the State Prison of Southern Michigan, burglars and thieves were underrepresented among those scheduled. In the Michigan Training Unit, young inmates were underrepresented.
Table 9

COMPARISON OF THE ORIGINAL PRIMARY SAMPLE WITH THE SCHEDULED FINAL PRIMARY SAMPLE

(Michigan prisoners)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Original (N = 785)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 23</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31+</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other white</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior prison terms</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or more</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction offense(^b)</td>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary/theft</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forgerfy/fraud</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State Prison, So. Mich.</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan Training Unit</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)The scheduled sample is not a subset of the original sample.

\(^b\)Most serious conviction offense, ranked in the order shown.
REPLACEMENT SAMPLE

We believed it was not ethically proper for us to use standard survey techniques, such as follow-up, to convince non-respondents to become respondents. The survey population was institutionalized and potentially faced various intangible risks from responding to our questionnaire. However, we did want to compensate for major nonresponse biases without the necessity of applying weights to respondents' data during analysis.

The following method was adopted to correct for nonresponse bias during field administration of the survey. For each prisoner who was selected as a member of the original sample, we also chose another prisoner as his potential replacement, to be called if the first prisoner did not respond. The potential replacement prisoner shared age, race, previous prison term, and most serious current conviction crime (categorized as shown in the preceding tables)[8]. Replacements were selected before the survey field work, at the time of our original sample selection.

If the prisoner in the original sample fell into one of the following categories, the prisoner identified as his potential replacement was called to take the survey:

[8] For purposes of choosing potential replacement prisoners, age was not categorized as shown in Tables 3-5 (namely, 18-23, 24-30, 31 and higher). Instead, age was categorized specifically for each state so as to divide the prison population from the study counties equally into three groups. In cases where a prisoner in the sample could not be paired with any prisoner (other than those originally selected to be in the sample) having the same four characteristics, we chose a potential replacement prisoner who was the same on three characteristics and close on the fourth. In a small number of cases, we were unable to choose a potential replacement prisoner for prisoners in the sample.
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- No-show. The prisoner was scheduled for a survey session but did not appear to take the survey.

- Refusal. The prisoner showed up at his scheduled survey session, but after reading (or listening to) the informed consent information, or examining the survey booklet, he refused to participate.

- Breakoff. The prisoner began filling out the survey booklet but decided not to continue.

The replacement sessions were scheduled five to nine days after the original survey sessions.

For the following categories of nonrespondents, no replacement prisoner was called.

- Not scheduled. The prisoner was no longer present in the institution and could not be called to take the survey. (Compensation for these attrition losses was handled by oversampling, as described in the previous section.)

- Requested a later session. Some prisoners were unable to attend their scheduled survey session, and they requested a later session. If they failed to attend the later session, it was too late to replace them.

- Requested individual administration. Survey administrators assisted prisoners who had difficulty completing the questionnaire on their own (reading problems, visual or perceptual problems, special conditions of confinement, physical handicaps). In a few cases, limitations in the amount
of time allocated to survey administrators for this purpose prevented individual administration to all prisoners who requested it. The ones who requested but were unable to obtain individual administration were not replaced.

The process of selecting replacements reduced apparent response biases in California and Michigan. In Texas, the response rate was high and no biases other than differences in response rates among institutions were apparent, so we did not have to use replacement respondents.

RESPONSE RATES, BIASES, AND CORRECTIONS FOR BIASES

The response rates for the jail inmates are shown in Table 10. They fall in the range 50 to 75 percent in California, and 64 to 94 percent in Michigan. In California, most of the nonresponse was caused by inmates not appearing at their scheduled survey sessions. On the average, 93.5 percent of California jail inmates who showed up at their sessions completed the survey. By contrast, in Michigan the bulk of nonresponse among jail inmates was caused by inmates leaving the session after they arrived. On average, 83 percent of Michigan jail inmates who showed up completed the survey. Because no information was available for collection about the characteristics of nonrespondent jail inmates, we do not know the nature or extent of response biases that may exist in our jail inmate sample.

The response rates for prisoners who were originally scheduled to take the survey are shown in Table 11. (This table does not include replacement respondents, and consequently the figures differ from those in Table 2.) The response rates for prisoners in California and Michigan averaged 49 percent, somewhat lower than for their jail counterparts;
Table 10
RESPONSE RATES FOR JAIL INMATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number Called</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>75.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Joaquin</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit (Wayne)</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>64.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genesee</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingham</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washtenah</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Respondents are inmates who completed usable survey instruments.

rates varied quite substantially among institutions. The response rates for Texas prisoners averaged 82 percent.

Nearly all (97 percent) of scheduled Texas prisoners attended their survey sessions, so the bulk of nonresponse in Texas was among prisoners who refused to complete the survey. In Michigan and California prisons, the bulk of nonresponse was among scheduled prisoners who did not appear at their survey sessions. Approximately 73 percent on average showed up in both states. Between 55 and 90 percent of Michigan and California prisoners who attended their survey sessions completed a usable survey.
Table 11
RESPONSE RATES FOR PRISONERS BY INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduled in Primary</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTF-Central</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTF-North</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DVI</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Quentin</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ionia</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPSM</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTU</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>731</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coffield</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wynne</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aSee Table 2 for full names of institutions.

bA respondent is a prisoner who completed a usable survey instrument. Replacement respondents are not included in this table.

The rate varying among institutions and averaging about 67 percent in both states. The institutions that had the lowest percentages of prisoners showing up at their scheduled sessions had the highest percentage remaining at their sessions to complete the survey.
RESPONSE BIASES

Most of the biases can be traced to the differences in response rates among institutions. We compare two methods for reducing the biases: (1) including the replacement respondents, and (2) weighting the sample of respondents according to their institutions. In California and Michigan, inclusion of replacement respondents was preferable; in Texas, weighting by institution was preferable.

Before discussing the biases in detail, we briefly explain why the inmates who had special forms of survey administration were included in the survey sample.

Special Survey Administration

Two forms of special survey administration were carried out: individual and small group administration.[9] These were provided to inmates who could not be mixed with other inmates for security reasons or who had reading problems or physical handicaps. Their inclusion in the survey analysis was not taken lightly, because prisoners whose circumstances of survey administration differed from others could be expected to evidence different response patterns. Before deciding to use the responses of prisoners who received special administration, we determined that their inclusion was desirable by virtue of their overall contribution to bias reduction.

[9] In "individual" or "one-on-one" administrations, a survey administrator read the prisoner the questions aloud, and he responded verbally or in writing. In "small group" administration, the only people present during survey administration were the survey administrator and from one to five respondents, who filled out the questionnaire normally.
Table 12 shows how we carried out the comparison of bias with and without inclusion of respondents who had special administration. For each of the four prisoner characteristics previously displayed, we

Table 12
COMPARISON OF BIAS BETWEEN NONRESPONDENTS AND RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment of Respondents with Special Administration</th>
<th>Descriptor Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included as respondents</td>
<td>11.5$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated as nonrespondents</td>
<td>16.3$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of inclusion of special administration respondents on bias</td>
<td>Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included as respondents</td>
<td>55.7$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated as nonrespondents</td>
<td>63.2$^a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of inclusion of special administration respondents on bias</td>
<td>Better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included as respondents</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated as nonrespondents</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of inclusion of special administration respondents on bias</td>
<td>Worse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$Significant at .01 level.

$^b$Significant at .05 level.
compared respondents with nonrespondents under two different assumptions: (1) where respondents who had special administration are considered to be nonrespondents and (2) where the respondents with special administration are included with other respondents. The value of the $x^2$ statistic in cross-tabulations of categorized descriptor variables are shown in the table. Smaller values of the $x^2$ statistic mean that there is less difference between respondents and nonrespondents, a desirable situation.

The inclusion of respondents with special administration reduced known biases in Texas and Michigan and had little effect in California.[10] Therefore, we included those respondents in our subsequent analyses.

**Effects of Institutional Response Rates**

Even after inclusion of the respondents with special administration, some of the biases shown in Table 12 are statistically significant. We have observed (Table 11) that response rates differ among institutions, so the observed biases may be unrelated to characteristics of individual prisoners in the sample but may be related only to the institution in which they were housed. If true, the implication is that response biases were caused by local prison administrative practices: timing of survey sessions, timing and method of informing inmates of their survey sessions, and physical facilities made available for survey sessions.

[10] The reading levels of respondents and nonrespondents were also compared. Data concerning reading levels for Texas inmates were not available for these comparisons, so reading levels have not been displayed in the tables. The analysis showed that inmates with low reading levels were significantly less likely than others to take the survey. The inclusion of prisoners with special administration did not help alleviate this bias.
To examine this possibility, we compared respondents with nonrespondents by cross-tabulation of the four categorized descriptive characteristics (age, race, number of previous prison terms, and conviction offense) separately for each institution in each state (Table 13). In Texas and Michigan, no statistically significant response biases related to these four characteristics were found in any of the

Table 13

VARIATION OF RESPONSE RATE ACCORDING TO PRISONER CHARACTERISTICS

(Significance of $X^2$ in a tabulation of respondents vs. nonrespondents)$^a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Prior Prison</th>
<th>Conviction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffield</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellis</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynne</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All four together</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionia</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPSM</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTU</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All three together</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTF-Central</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTF-North</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deuel</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Quentin</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All five together</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$A lower value of the significance of $X^2$ indicates a stronger difference between respondents and nonrespondents.

$^b$See Table 2 for full names of institutions.
institutions. Tables 14 and 15 confirm this observation by showing that a sample weighted according to each institution's response rate has the same characteristics as the scheduled primary sample in Texas and is an improvement in regard to age and prior prison biases in Michigan. In California, significant racial differences between respondents and nonrespondents were found in three institutions; conviction crime differences were also found in one of these (Table 13). The nature of the racial response bias in California is that Chicanos had significantly lower response rates than other racial groups (see Table 18 below).

Inclusion of Replacement Respondents

In Texas, the original response rate was sufficiently high that the resulting sample size (601) met our original expectations without the replacement respondents in the analysis. Moreover, the procedure we used for correcting sampling biases in Texas--weighting by institution--yielded satisfactory results. For Michigan and California, we used our replacement respondents after evaluating their contribution to reduction of sample bias.

As might be expected, response rates for potential replacement prisoners were lower than for the prisoners called earlier (because they "represent" nonrespondents). In Michigan, 248 potential replacements were called to take the survey, and 87 (or 35 percent) responded. In California, 147 were called and 50 (or 34 percent) responded.[11]

The results of the analysis of replacement respondents in Michigan are shown in Tables 16 and 17. The characteristics of these replacement

[11] These figures slightly understate the response rate for potential replacements. Some prisoners happened to be erroneously called to replace prisoners who were actually respondents. They are counted as "called," but their survey instrument is not counted as "usable."
Table 14
RESPONSE BIASES ATTRIBUTED TO INSTITUTIONS

(Texas prisoners)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduled (N = 731)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 23</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31+</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior prison terms</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or more</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction offense&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kidnap</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>The characteristics shown in the last two columns are those of the unweighted and weighted final analysis samples, respectively.

<sup>b</sup>In the last column, each respondent was weighted by the inverse of his institution's average response rate.

<sup>c</sup>Most serious conviction offense, ranked in the order shown.
Table 15
RESPONSE BIASES ATTRIBUTED TO INSTITUTIONS

(Michigan prisoners)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Original Scheduled Sample (N = 683)</th>
<th>Original Respondents (N = 335)</th>
<th>Respondents Weighted by Institution (N = 683)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31+</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior prison terms</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or more</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction offense</td>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary/theft</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forgery/fraud</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading level</td>
<td>Below 8th grade</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th grade +</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aIn the last column, each respondent was weighted by the inverse of his institution's average response rate.

bMost serious conviction offense, ranked in the order shown.
Table 16
COMPARISON OF NONRESPONDENTS AND REPLACEMENT RESPONDENTS

(Michigan prisoners)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of Group in Category</th>
<th>Nonrespondents&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Replacement&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>( \chi^2 ) Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31+</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior prison terms</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or more</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction offense&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary/theft</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forgery/fraud</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading level</td>
<td>Below 8th grade</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th grade +</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Nonrespondents are prisoners who were originally scheduled to take the survey and did not complete usable survey instruments. (Prisoners who were called as potential replacements and failed to respond are irrelevant and are not shown in the table.)

<sup>b</sup>Replacements are prisoners who were called as potential replacements and responded, completing usable survey instruments.

<sup>c</sup>Most serious conviction offense, ranked in the order shown.
respondents were found not to be significantly different from those of prisoners who originally failed to respond, except for reading level (Table 16). By including the replacement respondents, biases of the original respondent group were unchanged (Table 17), and the reading level bias was not exacerbated as with institutional weighting, our alternative means for attempting to reduce response biases. We consequently included the replacement respondents in the sample, obtaining a final analysis sample whose characteristics are in the last column of Table 17.

In California, the inclusion of replacement respondents was even more desirable: The group of original respondents was biased compared with the scheduled sample, and the replacement respondents alleviated the biases. The analysis sample that resulted from including replacement respondents is shown in Table 18.

**COMPOSITION OF THE FINAL STUDY GROUP**

The final study group for Texas consists of the original respondents, including those who had special survey administration, weighted according to the inverse of the response rate for their institution (Table 14); it does not include replacement respondents. The final study groups for Michigan and California consist of primary and replacement respondents, including those with special administration (last columns of Tables 17 and 18).

For most of the characteristics examined, the final study group is quite similar to the scheduled sample. The only exceptions are reading level and race. In the two states where reading level could be examined (Michigan and California), poor readers are underrepresented. In
### Table 17
CHARACTERISTICS OF FINAL STUDY SAMPLE—INCLUDING REPLACEMENTS

(Michigan prisoners)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Original Scheduled Sample (N = 683)</th>
<th>Original Respondents (N = 335)</th>
<th>Original + Replacement Respondents (N = 422)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31+</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior prison terms</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or more</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction offense a</td>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary/theft</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forgery/fraud</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading level</td>
<td>Below 8th grade</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8th grade +</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions b</td>
<td>Ionia</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPSM</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTU</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*Most serious conviction offense, ranked in the order shown.

*b*See Table 2 for full names of institutions.
Table 18
CHARACTERISTICS OF ORIGINAL AND FINAL RESPONDENT SAMPLE
(California prisoners)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent of Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scheduled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sample (N = 621)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Under 23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31+</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior prison terms</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One or more</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conviction offense&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drugs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burglary/theft</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Forgery/fraud</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading level</td>
<td>Below 7.5 grade</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 grade +</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutions&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>CCI</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTF-Central</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CTF-North</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DVI</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Quentin</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Most serious conviction offense, ranked in the order shown.

<sup>b</sup>See Table 2 for full names of institutions.
California, Hispanics had a substantially lower response rate than other racial groups and are underrepresented in the final study group.

Several types of inmates are present in prison populations but are missing from our sample because they are infrequent in an incoming cohort. Even if all potential respondents in these categories had been called to take the survey and had responded at the usual rate, their sizes would not have been sufficiently large enough to study. Inmates committed for kidnap are not present in the California sample and are omitted in the Michigan and Texas samples. The California and Michigan samples also do not include inmates convicted of auto theft; those convicted of forgery or fraud are omitted in Michigan as are those convicted of rape in California.
VI. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY DESIGN

QUESTIONNAIRE RETEST

To permit subsequent analyses of reliability of survey responses, a small subsample of the original sample of prisoners was prechosen to be asked to fill out the questionnaire a second time if they responded in the first instance. The retest candidates were selected randomly, except that we did not field retest sessions in every prison institution that we visited regularly. Replacement respondents were not retested.

In general, response rates for the retest were substantially higher than the original response rates (because those called to fill out questionnaires a second time were already respondents). In California, 66 prisoners responded out of 84 called for retests (79 percent); in Michigan, 45 out of 70 (64 percent); in Texas, 141 out of 151 (93 percent). Thus, 252 retests were available for analysis.

OFFICIAL RECORD DATA

In addition to the completed surveys, we obtained selected official record data that applied to the prison respondents. This information was obtained from hard copy records ("inmate folders") maintained by the various departments of corrections. Three Rand employees coded this information immediately after the completion of field administration of the survey in each state.

We obtained information for over 100 variables per case, supplementing the survey data in several areas and providing data on official records that was needed to evaluate the quality of inmates' survey responses.[1] The general categories of information coded included sociodemographic data, rap sheet arrest and conviction history,

current conviction offense(s), other adult and juvenile criminal
information, and miscellaneous administrative information.

Codesheet Construction

Because of variations in the type and amount of information
available across states, we created three separate codesheets, one for
California, one for Michigan, and one for Texas. Each state's codesheet
was designed to capture all pertinent data available and to follow the
sequence of forms and records typically found in an inmate folder.

For Michigan inmates only, the first part of the codesheet
consisted of data that had already been obtained from the tape sent to
us by the various departments of corrections for purposes of sample
selection. We checked items on this preprinted section that were also
in the inmate's folder (e.g., race and birthdate), filling in missing
data and correcting discrepancies.

Data Collection

The signed payment sheets (listing those prison inmates who
completed the survey) provided the link between the two data collection
operations. The survey administrators passed a copy of each payment
sheet to the official record coders, who collected data immediately
following the completion of the inmate survey fieldwork in each state.
Data collection took place where the most complete inmate folder data
was located—i.e., in the central records offices in Michigan and Texas,
and in each prison surveyed in California.

The inmate names on each state's complete set of payment sheets
were checked against a complete list of sampled inmates.
Because of the time and expense involved in coding the inmate folder data, we only coded this information for prisoners who responded to the survey. Inmate names and prison numbers were transferred to the codesheet cover pages, which contained a unique codeform number for that inmate. (The same codeform number appeared on all other pages of the codesheet as well.) After coding the inmate folders, we detached the cover sheets from the forms and stored them separately. At that point the completed codesheets no longer contained any personal identifiers. Later, the cover sheets were used to create a link file permitting access of all three data sets for each inmate.

Within each state, inmate records are maintained in a certain order, and we tailored the sequence of our codesheets to access inmate folders efficiently. Accessing records in Michigan was quite slow; the folders were physically retrieved by the coders themselves. Moreover, some Michigan inmates had two or more folders (for example, if they were returned to prison on a new conviction while still on parole for a previous conviction). In California and Texas, lists of inmate numbers were presented to the Corrections Department record-keeping personnel, and they retrieved the folders for us. Because of the time involved in coding so many inmate folders in each state, we randomized the order in which folders were chosen for coding to avoid any selection bias reflected in each department's numerical sequencing—e.g., perhaps inmates incarcerated longer had lower numbers. This procedure provided for coder experience or fatigue to be randomly distributed among inmates and also allowed us to terminate the coding process at any point because of time considerations.
Most of the uncoded folders were being used by the department for administrative reasons—e.g., parole or transfer considerations—and were unavailable for coding.

The entire data collection operation started in Michigan in October 1978 and ended in Texas in February 1979. The number of inmates on whom we collected information appears in Table 19 below.

Data Available

Because each state's codesheet was tailored to fit the data available, the format and content differ greatly across states. Therefore, for reasons of brevity and clarity, the following discussion will proceed with a general description of the types of official record data coded. This general description centers on the following categories of data: rap sheet arrests and conviction history, current offense(s), other adult criminality, juvenile criminality, and other administrative data.[2] Within each category we describe the data

Table 19
INMATES SURVEYED AND OFFICIAL RECORDS CODED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inmates with</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Texas</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completed surveys</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>1503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official records coded</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>1341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired survey/official record</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures include survey booklets later found to be invalid or unusable.
available in each state, the source of the data, and any coding
comments that may shed light on the data.

Data Quality of Rap Sheets

We used rap sheets—chronological lists of arrests, court actions,
entry or exits from prison, jail, probation, or parole—to collect
conviction history and arrest information for specific sets of offense
types. The comprehensiveness and clarity of rap sheets varied within
and across states. Although inmate folders almost always contained at
least one rap sheet, in many cases they contained several versions.
Where multiple rap sheets existed, we used all available data to code
the most complete record of criminal activity. Arrest and conviction
charges on some rap sheets were spelled out, but other times penal codes
were used. Further, the listing of multiple charges or counts was made
more explicit on some versions than others.

The ease with which we coded rap sheets differed across the states.
Inmate folders in Michigan, on the average, were the most difficult to
code. Here, multiple rap sheets were more common, producing difficulty
in obtaining a complete picture. A handful of Michigan inmate folders
had no rap sheet; a 'yes/no' variable, Rap Availability, identified
those inmates.

Coding of California rap sheets was plagued by the inconsistent use
of penal codes and named arrest charges, and by differences between old
and new versions of the state's rap sheets. Texas rap sheets were the
easiest to code. Almost all of the inmate folders contained just one

[2] In addition, various sociodemographic data were collected in
each state.
rap sheet (state), which provided the most standard version of an inmate's official criminal record.

**Measures**

Both the conviction and arrest data were coded two ways: tallies and incidents. The former sums all the relevant offense counts recorded when an arrest or conviction occurs; the latter represents the number of arrest or conviction events for which a crime is listed.

For any single event, the rap sheet may show several counts of a crime, several different crimes, or just one count of one crime. Regardless of the event complexity, each was counted as one single incident. But where an event includes charges of multiple crimes, each of these charges was tallied. As a result, the sum of tallies across each of the coded offense types for any inmate may be greater than the number of incidents.

**Offense Types**

Table 20 displays, for each state, the statute numbers for the offenses coded from rap sheets and which offenses were included in the conviction and arrest measures. The states do not have the same universe of conviction offenses, and only California and Texas have matching sets for arrest offenses. These slight variations hamper cross-state comparisons of conviction and arrest incidents; tallies for specific offenses are unaffected by this variation.

**Conviction History**

We obtained conviction tallies for a specific subset of serious crime types across an inmate's entire criminal record. Our coding of such information was neither time-specific nor age-specific--i.e., we
Table 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Michigan</th>
<th>Texas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>447a-456, 548</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>28.01 et seq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>203-204, 216-222, 240-246, 273a, 4500-4501.5</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>22.00 et seq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto theft</td>
<td>487, 489, 499b, 499d, 10851(V/C)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>31.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>459-464</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>30.01-30.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug possession</td>
<td>(865) 11350, 11357, 11358, 11377</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug sales</td>
<td>11351-11354, 11359, 11361, 11363, 11378-11380, 11382-11383</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>4.04-4.05, 4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(CS) 4476-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>4530-4535, 4550</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgery</td>
<td>470-483, 484d-1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>32.21-32.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>72, 424, 425 (IC 556 et seq.)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>32.01-32.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitual offender</td>
<td>32047.5, 3048.5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>187-190, 192-193</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>19.01 et seq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnap</td>
<td>207-210</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>20.01 et seq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession/rec'v</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>261, 264, 264.1</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>21.07, 21.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>264.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.05, 21.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>211-214</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>29.01 et seq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Offense</td>
<td>261.5, 266, 266a-1, 267, 273a, 281, 285, 288, 288.1, 288.5, 314, 647a</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft</td>
<td>484, 484b-c, 485, 487, 487a-g, 488-490, 498-499a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>31.01-31.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons</td>
<td>4502, 4574, 12020-12034</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>46.01 et seq</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* (A) - coded for window arrest history.
(C) - coded for conviction history.
started with the first entry. However, the agencies responsible for transmitting and collecting these data may have changed their policies over time or may have unique policies regarding the recording of such data for offenders below a certain age. Either one of these issues would introduce an unknown degree of temporal and jurisdictional bias within and across states.

Of the offenses coded for convictions, those for escape and habitual offender convictions are probably the two with the greatest degree of jurisdictional variation; one state may vigorously prosecute offenders on these charges, but another may be content with having the offender back in prison.

Reference Period Arrests

We coded arrest tallies and incidents for a specific set of offense types, but only for the measurement period for each inmate—the period ending with the month of the arrest for which the inmate is now serving time, and beginning with January of the preceding year. The inmate identified this period while completing his questionnaire, and survey administrators transferred the self-reported measurement period to the payment sheets next to the inmate's name and prison number. The official record coders then transferred the dates to the code sheets used to record official record data. The rap sheets were coded for arrests falling only within this reference period.

In a small percentage of cases in each state there was a large discrepancy (greater than three months) between the inmate's self-reported measurement period and the period as deduced from the rap sheet itself. We included a variable "Revised Window Period" (both
month and year) on the code sheet for these cases and proceeded to code arrest data within this updated timespan.

Of the arrest crime types coded in all three states, recording arrests for drug sales was most problematic. Many drug arrests were not clearly differentiated; distinctions between arrests for drug sales versus drug possession could not always be made. Therefore, tallies were recorded for all drug arrests, except minor charges such as possession of small amount of marijuana. (Similarly, the inmate survey excludes this minor offense.)

Arrests for attempted crimes were coded as tallies within their crime types except for attempted murder, which logically fits into the assault category according to the structure of the questions in the survey booklet. Kidnap tallies include those for the lesser crime of illegal imprisonment, whereas rape tallies do not include lesser crimes.

Coding the number of arrest incidents differed across the three states because the set of arrest categories on which it is based varied. Several more trivial arrest categories were included in the coding of Michigan arrests.

Current Offense

An inmate's current offense refers to the conviction offense or offenses for which the inmate is serving prison time at the time of the survey. The California data appeared in written form and by statute number on the "Cumulative Case Summary" sheet in the inmate's folder. The Michigan data were culled from the "Basic Information" section of the "Transcase," a summary sheet similar to California's "Cumulative Case Summary" sheet, and from the front of each inmate folder. Some inmates with multiple sentences had multiple folders. The Texas data
were taken directly from the Department of Corrections tape provided to us for purposes of sample selection.

We coded current offense data only for a specified list of offense types. The following 16 offenses were coded for California and Michigan and were available on the Texas Department of Corrections tape; assault, auto theft, burglary, drugs, escape, forgery, fraud, habitual offender, homicide, kidnap, receiving/possession of stolen goods, rape, robbery, sex offense other than rape, theft, and weapons.

The list of current offense categories in California most closely approximated the list on the survey questionnaire, whereas a few additional categories were coded in Michigan and many additional categories were present in the Texas data. We have data for arson in Michigan and Texas; it was not coded for California inmates. For both California and Michigan inmates we were able to distinguish between drug sales and drug possession current offenses; the Texas data did not make this distinction.

Other Adult Criminality

For all three states, if a probation or parole revocation was cited in the inmate folder we coded a variable, revoke, "1" = yes; the absence of such a notation does not mean the inmate was never revoked, only that the corrections department knew of no such revocation or had not recorded its occurrence. Most typically, the information was contained in the rap sheet. This does not distinguish between adult and juvenile revocations, nor does its corresponding survey variable (Part A, question 19).

Both Michigan (Department of Corrections tape) and Texas (folder) have variables on adult probation terms: for Michigan the number of
adult misdemeanor and felony probations and for Texas the number of
adult federal and state probation terms. California has no
corresponding variable. All three states have Department of Corrections
data on the number of prior prison terms. Michigan and Texas have
inmate folder data, California has Department of Corrections tape data.
We have jail data (number of terms) for Texas inmates only. And, as
part of a separate coding procedure (to accommodate the coding needs of
another project)[3] we have for California only: date of first adult
arrest, arrest type, whether or not convicted, the disposition if
convicted, date of first arrest for which the offender was convicted,
arrest type, and the disposition. This information was obtained from
the rap sheets and probation reports contained in the inmate folder.

Juvenile Criminality

California and Michigan routinely maintain information on age at
first arrest in the inmate folder. In Texas, we were able to
approximate this by coding the year of first arrest on the inmate's rap
sheets. However, this date may be influenced by the source of the
information. In Michigan, for example, this information may be
determined by interview (at intake) or by presentence investigation
report, institutional records, or community records (of which the rap
sheet is but one type); in California similar records are used to
provide this information as well.

The remaining data available on juvenile criminality are less
uniform across the three states. Texas has the least amount of
information. From the inmate folder we coded the number of juvenile
probation terms, parole violations, detention home referrals, and

reformatory commitments. For Michigan we have age at first attention of authorities, the type of juvenile record (probation or commitment) prior to age 15; and whether the inmate ever had a juvenile incarceration or probation sentence. For California we have age at first commitment and whether the inmate ever had a juvenile commitment.

As part of a separate coding procedure, we have additional data for California inmates only. Based on presentence investigation reports and other supporting documents, we coded up to ten juvenile arrest transactions. Each transaction included: the arrest date; arrest charge; whether convicted; and the disposition if convicted.

Administrative Data

Aside from inmate criminality we coded information by date received by the Department of Corrections and expected release date, length of prison sentence, any record of escapes, current prison disciplinary reports, treatment needs assessments, and treatment program recommendations.
VII. CONCLUSION

Rand's Second Inmate Survey produced a complex data base designed to serve multiple research objectives: examining the recent criminal activity for a large number of known offenders, exploring how this criminal activity was associated with characteristics of those offenders, studying how alternative sentencing and other criminal justice policies might affect criminal activity, and evaluating the reliability and validity of offenders' self-reports of crime.

These data were obtained primarily from a self-administered written questionnaire completed by 2316 inmates who were in prisons and jails in California, Michigan, and Texas in 1978.[1] The questionnaire data for 1214 prison inmates was supplemented with data coded from rap sheets and other official records. The questionnaires were confidential, but they were not anonymous. As a result, the questionnaire and official data can be linked and further data could be collected to examine recidivism among these 2316 offenders.

The study was successful in obtaining self-reports of crime from a large number of inmates incarcerated in prisons and jails, although many inmates who were selected for the study either failed to appear for the scheduled survey sessions or chose not to participate. To some degree we were able to compensate for the 30 to 50 percent nonparticipation rate by (1) surveying "replacement" inmates who were matched to nonparticipating inmates on four critical characteristics and (2) by

[1] However, data for inmates in Texas jails were not used in the survey analysis (Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982; Greenwood, 1982), yielding a sample size of 2190 inmates.
weighting respondents' answers to lessen differences among different institutions in their ability to get inmates to scheduled sessions. These adjustments eliminated most sampling biases that we could measure. Even though most measurable biases were eliminated, nonparticipating inmates might nevertheless differ from respondents in unknown ways. The adjustments did not remove one bias: The sample of California inmates underrepresented Hispanics, primarily because of refusals by Hispanic inmates in two institutions.

Another sampling bias is probably inevitable for a written, self-administered questionnaire: Our sample included but underrepresented inmates with poor reading skills. We attempted to compensate for this problem by reading questionnaires to inmates who were having difficulty and by offering a Spanish language version of the questionnaire. Both of these procedures undoubtedly helped some in reducing sampling biases, but neither was totally effective. Illiterate or poorly literate inmates probably avoided the survey sessions, so we never had an opportunity to offer assistance with the survey. Others who attended sessions might have refused to participate because they were uncomfortable in asking for help. We also discovered that the Spanish language version was not a full solution for Hispanic inmates, because many who spoke Spanish could read neither English nor Spanish.

The survey questionnaires dealt primarily with the criminal activities of inmates during the two years before their arrest for their present conviction offense. Although the questionnaire was fairly challenging for this population--it was 62 pages long, took on average about one hour to complete, and involved complicated procedures for identifying the measurement period in which we were interested and for
describing the extent of criminal activities--administration of the questionnaires went smoothly. Our extensive pretesting resulted in question formats that could be followed by inmates with help from survey administrators and that obtained desired information. Most inmates did need some help, particularly in calculating the measurement period, so the questionnaire could not have been administered effectively if a sufficient number of skilled administrators had not been present at each session.

Inmates seemed highly motivated to complete the questionnaire with apparent accuracy. Again, the skill of our administrators contributed to this motivation. But we have found in our repeated surveys and interviews that most inmates become deeply involved in talking about their past: Some express the hope that others might benefit from learning of their experiences, others seem grateful that someone is interested in them, some want the money ($5.00) that we paid respondents, others seem to see the survey as momentary relief from the boredom of incarceration. So long as researchers are not threatening or judgmental and questions avoid out-of-bounds topics (e.g., violence within institutions, "snitching" on others), the self-report method seems a promising means of gathering information about crime.

Analysts must, of course, be conservative in interpreting information provided by this and similar surveys. Few respondents could precisely remember the number and circumstances of their crimes, the exact number and details of past arrests, and so forth. Our questions were not designed to provide precise data about these matters. In analyzing our data, analysts must appreciate that the information is useful only at a somewhat general level. Precise calculations of crime
rates, incapacitation effects, and so on cannot be justified. Similarly, the official record information has no greater claim for precision--those records are subject to their own sources of error.

Nonetheless, the questionnaire and official record information obtained in this study provides vast information about criminals and the crimes that they commit. Despite limitations in designing and executing our sampling plan, we can think of no other method that can provide as much information about the individual criminal activities of large numbers of persons who have been actively engaged in crime. And, because all respondents have been convicted of crimes, they represent the population that must be studied to better understand and plan criminal justice policies directed at convicted offenders.

The data have been analyzed at The Rand Corporation in a series of studies examining criminal careers and the extent and types of criminal activities (Chaiken and Chaiken, 1982), the effectiveness of criminal sentencing policies that attempt to achieve the selective incapacitation of particularly dangerous criminals (Greenwood, 1982), the behavior and treatment of career criminals during imprisonment (Petersilia and Honig, 1980), and the quality of offenders' self-reports of arrests and convictions (Marquis, 1981). We expect that the data will continue to be useful for further analyses by researchers at Rand and at other institutions.
Appendix A

FIELD TEST OF THREE QUESTIONNAIRE FORMATS USING POLICE OFFICER RESPONDENTS
INTRODUCTION

When we were designing the questionnaire for Rand's Second Inmate Survey, we wanted to choose formats and wording of questions about crimes the offender had committed that would encourage and facilitate accurate responses. Survey questions about crimes committed by offenders should permit obtaining accurate estimates of two different statistics for each respondent:

- His rate of committing the crime when he is doing it, and
- The total number of crimes he committed during any specified period of time (e.g., one year), taking into account that he may not commit crimes at some times during the period.

To test how well various questionnaire formats encourage accurate responses, one would like to know the "true" values of these statistics for some sample of offenders; but except in trivial cases (e.g., the one-time murderer), the true values are nearly impossible to determine.

We could possibly have tested various questionnaire formats by asking offenders about their arrest rates in these formats, which we could then have compared with official records of arrest. However, the relevance of such a test is doubtful, because the typical offender's arrest rate (several per year) can be two orders of magnitude smaller than the crime commission rates of high-rate offenders (hundreds or thousands per year).
We concluded, then, that a validity test of questionnaire formats for crime commissions is not feasible with offender respondents. Instead, we developed a plan for testing various ways of wording recall questions using police officers as respondents. With the cooperation of the Santa Monica Police Department, we asked uniformed field patrol officers to fill out questionnaires concerning the numbers of arrests and traffic citations they had made during a three-year period. The correct answers to these questions were readily available to us, because the police department had been tabulating them on a monthly basis.

Although there are many obvious differences between offenders providing self-reports about crimes and police officers providing self-reports about arrests and traffic citations, the analogies are quite striking, as shown in Table A.1. Nearly all officers who had a uniformed field duty assignment in 1975, 1976, or 1977 completed a questionnaire (the response rate was 90 percent), and many of them had not been continuously on field duty for that entire time. The pretest was carried out in May 1978.

Table A.1
ANALOGIES BETWEEN VARIABLES MEASURED FOR OFFENDERS AND VARIABLES MEASURED FOR POLICE OFFICERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offenders</th>
<th>Police Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crimes committed</td>
<td>Arrests and citations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street time</td>
<td>Field duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in jail or prison</td>
<td>Time on nonpatrol assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time in hospital</td>
<td>Time on injury/sick leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started time recently</td>
<td>Joined force recently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not on street recently</td>
<td>Not on field duty recently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moved</td>
<td>Change in watch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This Appendix describes the research questions that motivated the questionnaire pretest, the format and content of the questionnaires used, the methods of analysis, and the conclusions of the study.

**MOTIVATION FOR THE PRETEST**

In Rand's First Offender Survey (Peterson and Braiker, 1981), respondents were asked to "think about the 3 years before you started serving your current term." Questions about crimes committed during the three-year period were posed in two different ways, which are illustrated by these questions about burglary:

- In a **typical** month, how many burglaries did you do?
- During those three years before you started your present term, **all together** how many times did you do . . . burglary?

  0 [ ] 1-2 [ ] 3-5 [ ] 6-10 [ ] More than 10, how many?  

Analysis of the data (Peterson and Braiker, 1981, p. 26) showed that respondents who reported committing burglaries had a median of four burglaries in a typical month. However, when the number of reported burglaries "all together" was divided by the total number of months the respondent had been on the street, the median burglary rate was 0.24 per month. This disparity, a factor of 16, led us to speculate on several possible explanations:

1. When thinking about a **typical** month, the respondents might have had in mind a typical month when they were in fact committing burglaries. They would not have adjusted their response to account for months when they were inactive. This problem is
particularly pertinent if the offenders' patterns of behavior changed substantially over their three-year period.

2. Since respondents are unlikely to give fractional responses, the "typical month" question effectively excludes rates lower than one per month.

3. Respondents may not have had the mathematical facility to figure out how many months they had spent on the street during a three-year period and then to count the corresponding number of crimes.

4. In the "all together" question, some respondents may have given counts of burglaries per month, rather than the expected counts of burglaries in three years.

5. The reported number of burglaries "all together" may have been influenced by the response choices, which possibly suggested that sensible answers were between 1 and 10.

Quite apart from any possible explanation of the observed disparity, we were of course interested in knowing which of the estimates ("typical month" or "all together") was closer to the truth, and whether any alternative wording would produce more accurate responses. We also hypothesized that use of a calendar printed on a card or in the survey booklet would help the respondent count the number of street months correctly, and we wanted to test this idea.

PRETEST DESIGN AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

In our survey of police officers, we used three different survey
instruments, which are summarized in Fig. A.1. The first instrument, called "No-Cal," was very short (2½ pages) and did not provide any calendar to assist the respondent in estimating the number of months he had been on field duty during 1975, 1976, and 1977. One page of questions asked for "typical month" counts of two types of arrests the respondent had made and three types of citations he had written during those three years. Another page asked for 3-year total counts of arrests and citations (see Fig. A.2). The format of this instrument was very similar to that of Rand's First Offender Survey.

The second instrument, called "Cal-1," provided a card on which a three-year calendar was printed. The years were labeled 1975, 1976, and 1977, and each of the thirty-six months was represented by a box labeled January, February, ..., December. Instructions in the survey booklet told the respondent officer to mark an X through any months when he or she was not assigned to uniformed patrol or was away from field duty (sick, injured, in training, on special assignment, etc.). A series of questions asked the officer to think about various job-related and personal events in his or her life during the three-year period. In the Cal-1 instrument, each of the five types of arrests/citations was covered on its own page. (See Fig. A.3 for an example of one page.) The questions asked about each arrest/citation included:

- How many months (during the three years) this activity was done.
- The **highest** number of arrests/citations in one month.
- The **average** number in all other months (excluding zero).
- The "all-together" three-year total number.

*Complete copies of all three pretest instruments are available from Jan Chaiken at The Rand Corporation.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counts Provided</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No-Cal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years together</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One for each year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months did; highest and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average monthly count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altogether</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years' total</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One for each year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. A.1—Formats of pretest questionnaires
6. **MONTHS ON FIELD DUTY**

7. While you were assigned to uniformed patrol, were there any periods when you spent some time, but less than half time, on field duty? For example, you might have worked half a day on field duty and half a day on something else, or a few days on field duty followed by several days on a desk assignment. (Please check one box.)

   - [ ] 2 NO — Go on to the next question.
   - [ ] 1 YES — 7a. How many months were you on field duty less than half time?

NOW, PLEASE THINK ABOUT THE MONTHS DURING THOSE THREE YEARS WHEN YOU WERE ACTUALLY ON FIELD DUTY. KEEP IN MIND THE NUMBER OF MONTHS YOU WROTE IN THE BOX.

8. In a **typical month** about how many felony arrests did you make?

   **Number of Felony Arrests**

9. In a **typical month** about how many misdemeanor arrests did you make? Do not include Q citations.

   **Number of Misdemeanor Arrests**

10. In a **typical month** about how many parking citations did you write?

    **Number of Parking Citations**

11. In a **typical month** about how many non-hazardous traffic citations did you write?

    **Number of Non-hazardous Traffic Citations**

12. In a **typical month** about how many hazardous traffic citations did you write?

    **Number of Hazardous Traffic Citations**
13. During the 3 year period when you were actually on field duty altogether about how many:

   a. felony arrests did you make
      _____________________________
      50

   b. misdemeanor arrests did you make
      (do not include 0 citations)
      _____________________________
      54

   c. parking citations did you write
      _____________________________
      58

   d. non-hazardous traffic citations did you write
      _____________________________
      62

   e. hazardous traffic citations did you write
      _____________________________
      66

That is the end of the survey. Thank you very much for participating.

Fig. A.2 (second of two pages)
SECTION B

THIS SECTION CONTAINS QUESTIONS ABOUT ARRESTS YOU MADE AND CITATIONS YOU WROTE DURING THE MONTHS WHEN YOU WERE ON FIELD DUTY. THESE ARE THE MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR THAT DO NOT HAVE Xs. YOU WROTE THE TOTAL NUMBER OF MONTHS ON FIELD DUTY IN THE BOX ON THE CALENDAR.

1. During this period, while you were on field duty, were there any months when you did not make any felony arrests?

   □ YES  □ NO

2. How many months were there when you made one or more felony arrests?

   Number of Months

3. Think about the month when you made the most felony arrests. How many felony arrests did you make that month?

   Number of Felony Arrests

4. Not counting your biggest month, which you just mentioned, or months when you did not make any, about how many felony arrests did you make in an average month?

   Number of Felony Arrests

5. Altogether, how many felony arrests would you say you made during the three year period shown on the calendar?

   Number of Felony Arrests
The last instrument, called Cal-3, was the most complicated of the three and required nearly 40 minutes to complete. It included a calendar, identical to the one in instrument Cal-1, and differed from Cal-1 by requesting three separate responses to each question: one answer for 1975, one for 1976, and one for 1977. We were unable to produce a workable format that asked for months, highest month count, and average month count for each of three years, so the wording in Cal-3 followed that of No-Cal: "typical" month and "all-together." Figure A.4 shows the format used for the example of felony arrests.

The police officers who had served on field patrol in 1975, 1976, or 1977 were divided in advance into three groups, one group for each survey instrument. The groups were designed to be fairly well balanced on the following characteristics:

- Average rate of making arrests and writing citations.
- Degree of fluctuation in arrest or citation rate between high months and low months.
- Some officers in each group did and some did not have months in which they made no arrests or no citations.
- Some officers in each group did and some did not have gaps (six months or more in a row) in field duty.

The numbers of respondents were 19 for No-Cal (86 percent response rate), 19 for Cal-1 (83 percent), and 23 for Cal-3 (100 percent).

By comparing the accuracy of responses, we were able to address the following questions:

- Whether use of the calendar improves the accuracy of estimates of the number of months on field duty.
1. During a typical month in each year about how many felony arrests did you make?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1977</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] NO FIELD DUTY</td>
<td>[ ] NO FIELD DUTY</td>
<td>[ ] NO FIELD DUTY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Altogether, how many felony arrests would you say you made while on field duty each year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1977</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1975</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] NO FIELD DUTY</td>
<td>[ ] NO FIELD DUTY</td>
<td>[ ] NO FIELD DUTY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. A.4—Format for Questionnaire Cal-3
Whether use of the calendar improves the accuracy of estimates of the rates of making arrests and writing citations.

Whether providing separate estimates for each of three years improves the estimate of the total count or the overall rate.

Whether "typical" month represents a full-time month or an average month.

Whether taking "high" month into account improves the estimated rate for an "average" month.

METHODS OF ANALYSIS

Two different methods were used to examine the errors made in estimating counts and rates of arrests/citations. In one, the mean and standard deviation of the survey responses for all officers who completed a given instrument were compared with the true mean for these officers. This gives a measure of the extent to which an instrument tends to yield overestimates or underestimates. Each mean rate is a weighted average, where the weight for an officer is his number of months of field duty. The officer can err in estimating both his or her number of months of field duty and the rate; the variance we used takes both of these errors into account.

In the second method, a logarithmic error function was calculated for each response and averaged over officers. This gives a measure of the extent to which the answers on an instrument tend to be high when the true answer is high and low when the true answer is low. (It is possible that the mean of survey responses is close to the true mean, but the response for each individual is not close to his true value.)
The error function for total counts over a three-year period is:

\[
\log \left( \frac{\text{true} + 4}{\text{response} + 4} \right).
\]

The error function for counts per month is:

\[
\log \left( \frac{\text{true} + 0.15}{\text{response} + 0.15} \right).
\]

(These are roughly equivalent. They are equal if the officer's field time was 27 months.) For assistance in interpretation, Table A.2 relates percentage errors to the error function we used.

Table A.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Error Function</th>
<th>Percent Error (if high)</th>
<th>Percent Error (if low)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.05</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.15</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.20</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.25</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.30</td>
<td>99.5</td>
<td>49.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.35</td>
<td>123.9</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.40</td>
<td>151.2</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The five types of arrests/citations differ substantially in their qualitative characteristics. Felony arrests occur infrequently (around 2 to 5 per month) and do not vary widely from month to month. Moreover, police officers would tend to consider their felony arrest rate as an important indicator of performance. Parking citations and misdemeanor arrests, by contrast, can be very few or very many (over 100) in a month,
depending on the officer's assignment. Presumably these are not as memorable as felony arrests and are not considered important indicators of performance. The number of hazardous and nonhazardous traffic citations appears to depend on the officer's predilection.

RESULTS OF ANALYSIS

Estimation of Months of Field Duty

The No-Cal instrument was much worse than the other two instruments for estimating the number of field months. The other two instruments are equally accurate. Table A.3 shows that typical errors were nearly twice as high when the calendar was not used. This is an example where the average of the responses for the No-Cal instrument was quite accurate although individual errors were fairly large.

Table A.3

ESTIMATE OF MONTHS OF FIELD DUTY IN THREE YEARS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Logarithmic Error Function</th>
<th>Average Months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Standard Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-Cal</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal-1</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cal-3</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We conclude that the calendar is a definite aid in estimating the number of field months. However, as we discuss below, getting the number of months of field duty right was not necessarily helpful in getting the rate of arrests or citations right. If an individual overestimated his number of months of field duty, he tended also to overestimate his counts of arrests or citations, and vice versa.
Estimation of Arrest Rates and Citation Rates

Most estimates were fairly accurate. The main sources of error arose from gross mistakes, such as confusing "all together" with "typical month," or confusing "number of months" with "counts in a typical month," or multiplying incorrectly. With the correct answers in hand it is possible to see which answer is a gross mistake, but we did not correct any answers unless the mistake was obvious from the survey instrument. Hence the main differences in accuracy among the three instruments arise from a small number of respondents who gave answers with large errors.

Estimates of the number of parking tickets behaved differently from estimates in the four other categories. For the others, using the method of the error function, we obtained the following general patterns:

- The "typical month" estimate is better than $N/T = (\text{estimate of total})/(\text{estimate of field months})$.
- The "typical month" estimate is closer to the true rate per full-time equivalent (FTE) month than to the true rate per real month.

The exceptions to these patterns are shown by "greater than" signs ($>$) in Table A.4. One officer who used the No-Cal instrument made a very large error in his estimate of the number of nonhazardous traffic citations in a typical month. For parking tickets the reverse pattern holds:

- The estimate $N/T$ is better than "typical month."
- The estimate $N/T$ is closer to the true rate per real month than to the true rate per FTE month.
However, all these comparisons for parking tickets are not statistically significant.

**Table A.4**

**ERRORS IN ESTIMATING ARREST AND CITATION RATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No-Cal</th>
<th>Cal-1</th>
<th>Cal-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typical Month</td>
<td>Average Month</td>
<td>Typical Month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hazardous traffic tickets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per FTE month</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per real month</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonhazardous traffic tickets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per FTE month</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per real month</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking tickets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per FTE month</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per real month</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Felony arrests</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per FTE month</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per real month</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Misdemeanor arrests</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per FTE month</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per real month</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For responses on the Cal-1 instrument, we were able to calculate the estimated average per month by taking into account "zero months" and "count for the high month." As shown in Table A.5, this calculated rate was found to be not necessarily a better estimate of the true rate than the reported count for the "average month" (which supposedly excluded the high month and zero months).
Table A.5
EFFECT ON ERROR OF TAKING "HIGH" MONTH AND "ZERO MONTHS" INTO ACCOUNT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Calculated Rate</th>
<th>Average Month</th>
<th>N/T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous traffic tickets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per FTE month</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per real month</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonhazardous traffic tickets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per FTE month</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per real month</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking tickets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per FTE month</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per real month</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony arrests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per FTE month</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per real month</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor arrests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per FTE month</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per real month</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table A.6, there is no persistent pattern favoring one instrument over another for estimating the three-year total number of citations or arrests. However, with the exception of parking tickets, the estimates of three-year totals are less accurate than the estimates of monthly rates.

Table A.6
ERRORS IN ESTIMATING THREE-YEAR TOTALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Average Logarithmic Error Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO=Cal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous traffic tickets</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonhazardous traffic tickets</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking tickets</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony arrests</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor arrests</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, Table A.7 shows the accuracy of the three survey questionnaire formats for estimating the average arrest rates and citation rates across officers. The Cal-3 instrument yielded large systematic errors and was clearly inferior to the other two instruments. The Cal-3 format tended to yield overestimates of small monthly rates and underestimates of high rates. The Cal-1 format is preferable for low rates and the No-Cal format for high rates.

CONCLUSIONS FROM THE ANALYSIS

The data revealed that the presumed benefit of a calendar in estimating the number of months on field duty (vs. off field duty) is real. Other presumed benefits of the calendar (e.g., sparking recollection of events and activities) were not verified by the pretest.

Most of the error between true and self-reported figures arose from isolated misunderstandings, mistakes, and miscalculations. Hence we concluded we ought to ask a single direct question as close as possible to the desired statistic, rather than ask the respondent to answer several questions from which the analyst can calculate the desired statistic. The large error rates for self-reports from the Cal-3 instrument support this conclusion, since this instrument asked for three or six numbers in order to estimate a single average arrest rate or citation rate.

The results for formats No-Cal and Cal-1 suggested that the best questionnaire format for estimating rates of events that occur frequently and nearly every month might be different from the best format for estimating less frequent events. For example, the rate of felony arrests was estimated more accurately by the Cal-1 instrument, which asked for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>No-Cal</th>
<th>Cal-1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Cal-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>True Value</td>
<td>Percent Error in</td>
<td>True Value</td>
<td>Percent Error in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typical Month</td>
<td>N/T</td>
<td>Average Month</td>
<td>N/T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous traffic tickets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per FTE month</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>+ 5.7</td>
<td>-15.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per real month</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>+37.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+ 9.5</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonhazardous traffic tickets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per FTE month</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>+66.3&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>- 3.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per real month</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>+116.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+25.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking tickets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per FTE month</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>-10.6</td>
<td>-22.5&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per real month</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>+16.5</td>
<td>+ 0.9</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felony arrests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per FTE month</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>+ 8.2</td>
<td>+ 4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per real month</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>+41.0&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+35.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misdemeanor arrests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per FTE month</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>-14.7&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-20.6&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per real month</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>+11.1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>+ 3.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> More than three standard deviations away from the true answer.
the number of months in which no arrests were made, than by the No-Cal instrument. An officer frequently makes no felony arrests during a month, but such a "zero month" would be quite unusual for the other four types of arrests and citations. The No-Cal instrument yielded slightly better results for these four types of arrests and citations, which typically occur every month.

This pretest could not shed any light on the appropriate format for asking about very infrequent occurrences (e.g., fewer than 10 per year), because the average rates for all the events studied here exceeded three per month.
Appendix B

INFORMED CONSENT FORM FOR
SECOND INMATE SURVEY

This form describes the Rand Jail/Prison Survey. It is also the form which you
use to indicate that you agree to take the survey. If you agree to participate in
the survey, print your name in the space on this form.

I agree to participate in a survey being conducted by The Rand Corporation. I
understand that The Rand Corporation is a private, nonprofit corporation that does
research on public policy issues. I understand further that the purpose of the survey
is to collect information from men who are serving time in prisons and jails to find
out our opinions and experiences with the criminal justice system, how we are treated
when we are in jail or prison, and what are our opinions, past activities, and ex-
periences in doing crime.

I understand that I will be given a booklet of questions to answer. The booklet
has a number on it but I do not need to print my name on this booklet. I agree to
print my name in the space provided on this form which has the same number as the
booklet. My name may be retained for followup research but my name will be kept in a
separate place from my answers.

I understand that The Rand Corporation will use the numbered sheet to combine
my answers with information about my arrests, classification, and treatment by the
criminal justice system. Researchers will collect this information from records
kept by criminal justice agencies—such as police, courts, jails, and prisons.

I understand that Rand will use my answers to questions in the survey booklet
and the information they collect from criminal justice agencies only for the pur-
oposes of research. Federal law requires that my answers and all of the other infor-
manation collected by the researchers be kept strictly confidential. The law provides
that copies of my answers are immune from legal process and cannot be admitted as
evidence in any judicial or administrative proceeding without my written consent.
This means that unless I agree, no court, police department, jail or prison can get
copies of my answers from the researchers. However, I understand that the law makes
no mention of legislative proceedings and may not protect this information from a
legislative subpoena.

I understand that my participation is completely voluntary. I do not have to
participate in the survey and I do not have to give permission to The Rand Corporation
to obtain information about my arrests, classification, and treatment by criminal
justice agencies. By answering the questions in the survey I am agreeing to parti-
cipate and to permit The Rand Corporation to obtain such information from criminal
justice agencies. I can refuse to answer the questions either now or after I have
seen the survey booklet. The only benefits to me from answering all the questions
are that I will receive a payment of $5.00 and that I may later be asked to volunteer
to participate in another survey, for which I will also be paid.

PLEASE PRINT YOUR NAME HERE

                      FIRST       LAST
                      -       -

11557

Prison/Jail Number

*42 U.S. Code 3771(a) says:
"No officer or employee of the Federal Government, nor any recipient of
assistance under the provisions of this chapter shall use or reveal any research
or statistical information furnished under this chapter by any person and identi-
fiable to any specific private person for any purpose other than the purpose for
which it was obtained in accordance with this chapter. Copies of such information
shall be immune from legal process, and shall not, without the consent of the person
furnishing such information, be admitted as evidence or used for any purpose in any
action, suit, or other judicial or administrative proceedings."

1 Reproduction is reduced 23 percent.
Appendix C

SURVEY INSTRUMENT
INSTRUCTIONS

THERE ARE DIFFERENT TYPES OF QUESTIONS IN THE SURVEY.

TYPE 1 FOLLOW ANY INSTRUCTIONS OR ARROWS NEXT TO THE ANSWER YOU CHOSE, WHICH TELL YOU TO GO TO ANOTHER QUESTION, OR ANOTHER PAGE.

1. Have you watched a baseball game on T.V. in the last year?
   YES [X] NO [ ] go on to next page

2. In all, how many baseball games did you watch?
   [ ] 1 or more [X] 1 to 10 How many?
   [ ] 8
   go on to next page

3. During how many months last year did you watch one or more baseball games on T.V.?
   [ ] Months

4. In the months when you watched baseball games on T.V. how often did you usually watch them?

TYPE 2 CIRCLE ONE ANSWER NEXT TO EACH ITEM LISTED.

Before you were 18, how often did you play the following sports?
(Circle one number next to each sport.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Just Once or Twice</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TYPE 3 FOR MOST QUESTIONS CHOOSE ONE ANSWER FROM THE CHOICES LISTED AND CHECK THE BOX NEXT TO IT. SOME QUESTIONS HAVE INSTRUCTIONS THAT SAY "Check all that apply". FOR THESE CHECK THE BOXES NEXT TO ALL THE ANSWERS THAT APPLY TO YOU.

What sports have you ever watched on T.V.? (Check all that apply.)

[X] Football
[X] Soccer
[X] Stock car racing
[X] Baseball
[X] Basketball
[X] Tennis
[X] Other, what? horse racing
PART A

The first questions are about your background. Some of the questions ask you to think back about your life and to remember things that happened. Please really think about the questions and give the most accurate answers you can.

1. How old were you when you were first arrested—that is, officially charged by the police (an adult or juvenile arrest, other than a traffic violation)?
   
   _______ Years Old
   25

2. How old were you when you were first convicted of a criminal offense (an adult or juvenile conviction, other than a traffic violation)?

   _______ Years Old
   27

3. What were the main reasons that you first got involved in crime? (Check all that apply)

   [ ] For excitement
   29/

   [ ] Friends got me into it
   30/

   [ ] To get money for high living—nice clothes, car, etc.
   31/

   [ ] Lost my temper
   32/

   [ ] To get money for drugs—had a habit
   33/

   [ ] To get money for day to day living—self or family support
   34/

   [ ] For the reputation
   35/

   [ ] Everyone I knew was doing crimes—just a normal way of life
   36/

   [ ] Other, what? ________________________________
   37/

4. How old were you at that time?

   _______ Years Old
   38
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5. Were you ever sent to a local or county juvenile facility such as a county youth camp, a home, or a juvenile hall?

   NO □    YES □ ➔ How many times? _____ Times

6. Were you ever sent to a statewide or federal juvenile institution?

   NO □    YES □ ➔ How many times? _____ Times

7. Before you were 18, did you ever do anything on this list?

   Broke into someplace
   Stole a car
   Stole something worth more than about $100
   Used a stolen credit card
   Forged something

   YES □    NO □ ➔ Go on to next page

8. How old were you when you first did any of these things?

   _____ Years Old

9. Before you were 18, how often did you do any of these things?

   □ 1 Once or twice
   □ 2 A few times
   □ 3 Sometimes
   □ 4 Often
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10. **Before you were 18, did you ever do anything on this list?**

- Robbed someone
- Threatened someone with a gun or knife or other weapon
- Hurt someone with a gun or knife or other weapon
- Beat someone badly
- Raped someone

**YES □₁**

**NO □₂**

50/

11. How old were you when you first did any of these things?

______ Years old

51

12. **Before you were 18, how often did you do any of these things?**

□₁ Once or twice
□₂ A few times
□₃ Sometimes
□₄ Often

53/

13. **Before you were 18, how often did you use each of the things on the list below? (Circle one number on each line.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Just Once or Twice</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana ......</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSD/Psychedelics/Cocaine ..</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uppers/Downers .......</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin .........</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54/

55/

56/

57/
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The next questions are about your whole life, both as an adult and as a juvenile.

14. Altogether in your life, how many times have you been arrested?  
(Don't count traffic violations.)

☐ Once  
☐ 2-3 times  
☐ 4-6 times  
☐ 7-10 times  
☐ 11-15 times  
☐ 16-25 times  
☐ More than 25 times

15. How many different terms have you served in a local or county jail?  
(If you are now in jail, include this term in your total count.)

☐ None  
☐ 1-2 terms  
☐ 3-5 terms  
☐ 6-10 terms  
☐ 11-15 terms  
☐ 16-25 terms  
☐ More than 25 terms

16. How many times have you been on probation?

☐ Times ☐ OR ☐ Never

17. How many different terms have you served in an adult prison?  (If you are now in prison, include this term in your total count. Don't count parole revocations as a different term.)

☐ None  
☐ 1 term  
☐ 2 terms  
☐ 3 terms  
☐ 4 terms  
☐ 5 terms  
☐ 6 or more terms
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18. How many times have you been on parole (count each time you were released on parole)?

______ Times  OR  [ ] Never

19. How many times have you had probation or parole revoked?

______ Times  OR  [ ] Never

20. Have you ever been committed to a drug treatment program?

[ ] 1 YES  [ ] 2 NO

21. Altogether in your life, how many times have you been convicted of a felony?

[ ] Never
[ ] Once
[ ] 2-3 times
[ ] 4-6 times
[ ] 7-10 times
[ ] 11-15 times
[ ] 16 or more times
PART B

1. Here is a set of statements about the law, prisons, police and men who get involved in crime. Read each statement carefully. Think about your own experience and people you know. Then decide how much you AGREE or DISAGREE with each statement. (Circle one number next to each statement.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Whenever someone gets cut or shot there is usually a good reason...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men with a record get a bad deal in court</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is possible to get so good at crime that you'll never get caught.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One good thing about crime is the fun of beating the system.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a man only does one or two crimes a year, chances are good he'll never get caught</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You don't learn anything in jail or prison that helps you make it going straight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No matter how careful you are, you won't always get away with crime...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot of men would stay out of crime if sentences were longer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually someone who gets cut or shot deserves it</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committing crime is pretty much a permanent way of life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you keep doing crime, you know you will go to prison sometime....</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In court, no one really looks out for the defendant's rights...</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men who are really good at crime never seriously think about going straight</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of insurance, no one is really hurt by property crimes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you've figured it out, doing prison time is not too hard.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime is the easiest way to get what you want.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Here is a list of things that can happen in a person's life. What are the chances each of these things would happen to you from doing crimes? (Circle one number next to each thing listed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>No Chance</th>
<th>Low Chance</th>
<th>Even Chance</th>
<th>High Chance</th>
<th>Certain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being bored</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having money for necessities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting arrested</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High living</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having worries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owning expensive things</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having hassles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being my own man</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having people look down on me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a lot of money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to prison for years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting injured or killed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being happy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. In the past, how many of the good things in the above list happened to you from doing crime?

- [ ] All of them
- [ ] Most of them
- [ ] Some of them
- [ ] A few of them
- [ ] None

4. In the past, how many of the bad things in the above list happened to you from doing crime?

- [ ] All of them
- [ ] Most of them
- [ ] Some of them
- [ ] A few of them
- [ ] None
5. Here is the same list of things that can happen in a person's life. What are the chances each of these would happen to you if you did not do crimes? (Circle one number next to each thing listed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Chance</th>
<th>Low Chance</th>
<th>Even Chance</th>
<th>High Chance</th>
<th>Certain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having friends</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being bored</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having money for</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>necessities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting arrested</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High living</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having worries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owning expensive things</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having hassles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being my own man</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having people look down</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a lot of money</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to prison for</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting injured or</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>killed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being happy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. In the past, how many of the good things in the above list happened to you when you were not doing crime.

- [ ] All of them
- [ ] Most of them
- [ ] Some of them
- [ ] A few of them
- [ ] None

7. In the past, how many of the bad things in the above list happened to you when you were not doing crime?

- [ ] All of them
- [ ] Most of them
- [ ] Some of them
- [ ] A few of them
- [ ] None
8. Overall, in the past, how successful do you think you were in doing crime?

- Very Successful
- Somewhat Successful
- Somewhat Unsuccessful
- Very Unsuccessful

9. What do you think the chances are that you will try to make it going straight when you get out? (Circle the number that is your answer.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>Certain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. What do you think the chances are that you will actually make it going straight on the outside? (Circle the number that is your answer.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>Certain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. What do you think the chances are that you will end up back in prison or jail after you get out? (Circle the number that is your answer.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Completely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>Chance</td>
<td>Certain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The next section will be about the time before you were arrested for your present term. There is a blue card with a calendar on it. The instructions on this page tell you how to fill it out. Raise your hand if you have any trouble filling it out.

2. For the sentence you are now serving, in what year were you arrested? (If you were arrested several times for this sentence, use the earliest arrest.)

   Year Arrested: __________

   Write that year where it says "Year Arrested" on the calendar.

3. In what month of that year was that arrest?

   Month Arrested: __________

   Write "arrested" on the calendar in that month (for the "Year Arrested" line).

4. Now, draw a line through all the months after that month (to the end of the year).

5. You will not be asked about anything that happened in the months you drew the line through.

6. What was the year before you were arrested?

   Year Before Arrested: __________

   Write that year on the calendar where it says "Year Before Arrested".

7. During all the months on the calendar before you were arrested (including both years) were you ever locked up for a month or more?

   NO □ _  YES □ _
   Put X's in all the months when you were locked up. (If you can't remember exactly, think about the time of year it was and put X's in the number of months you were locked up around that time of year.)
8. Now look at the calendar. All the blank boxes (without X's or lines) are months when you were on the street before you were arrested.

9. Count all the blank boxes. How many months was that? ———— Months

10. You will be asked about these months and also about the month you marked "Arrested". To get the total of these months, add one month and write the total here. ———— Total Street Months

11. Write this total number in the box on the calendar where it says "STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR". You will need this number in answering the next questions.

12. Underneath the month marked "Arrested," write "Include this month."

This will remind you to include this month in your answers.
The next questions are about the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR (including the month you were arrested). These are the months on the calendar that do not have X's or lines in them.

13. Were you in the military service at all during this time?
   NO □ □  YES □ □  Write "service" on the calendar months when you were in the service.

14. Were you in the hospital for a month or more?
   NO □ □  YES □ □  How many months was that?
   _______ Months
   Write "hospital" on the calendar months when you were in the hospital.

15. Were you going to school regularly during this time?
   NO □ □  YES □ □  Write "school" on the calendar months when you were going to school.

16. Think about all the different places you lived during the street months on the calendar. Did you move from one city or town to another?
   NO □ □  YES □ □  How many different cities or towns did you live in?
   _______ cities/towns

17. During the street months on the calendar did you have any jobs? (Include work release jobs.)
   YES □ □  NO □ □  go on to next page

18. During how many of these months did you work?
   _______ Months

19. During these months, how many different jobs did you have?
   _______ Jobs

20. About how much did you make per month from these jobs?
   $ _______ Per month
Look at the calendar. Remember to answer only for your "street months on the calendar".

21. During how many of the street months on the calendar were you married or living with a girlfriend?

______ Months

22. During these months, did you drink heavily, get drunk often, or have a drinking problem?

☐ 1 YES  ☐ 2 NO

23. Did you use drugs at all during the months on the street? (Don't count prescribed drugs or marijuana.)

☐ 1 YES  ☐ 2 NO → go on to next page

24. During how many of these months did you use drugs other than marijuana?

☐ Every month

☐ Most months

☐ About half the months

☐ Sometimes, but less than half the months

☐ Hardly ever

25. During the months when you were using drugs, how often would you say you usually used each of the drugs listed below? (Circle one number for each drug.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Did not use at all</th>
<th>A few times a month</th>
<th>A few times a week</th>
<th>Everyday or almost everyday</th>
<th>More than once a day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heroin/Methadone.............</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbiturates/downers/ &quot;reds&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphetamines/uppers/ &quot;whites&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. If you used heroin, about how much money did you spend on it in a typical day when you used it? (If you did not use heroin at all, write 0.)

$______ Per day

27. If you used pills, (uppers or downers) about how many did you take in a typical day when you used them? (If you didn't use pills at all, write 0.)

______ Pills
28. During the street months on the calendar, which of the following best describe the way you thought of yourself? (Check all that apply)

- Car thief
- Booster
- Thief
- Working man
- Misfit
- Burglar
- Fighter/street fighter
- Conman
- Gang member
- Fence
- Problem drinker
- Family man
- Drug dealer
- Drug user/addict
- Alcoholic/drunk
- Forger/check passer
- Non criminal/straight
- Violent person
- Robber
- Bad tempered
- Player
- Other, what? ____________________
The next questions are also only about the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR. Look at the calendar to help you remember what you were doing during these months. These are months that do not have X's or lines in them.

I. 1. During the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR did you do any burglaries? (Count any time that you broke into a house or a car or a business in order to take something.)

YES □₁  NO □₂ → go on to page 18

2. In all, how many burglaries did you do?

☐ 11 OR MORE

3. Look at the total street months on the calendar. During how many of those months did you do one or more burglaries?

☐ 1 TO 10

How many?

Burglaries

go on to next page

☐ 11 OR MORE

Months

4. In the months when you did burglaries, how often did you usually do them?

(CHECK ONE BOX)

EVERYDAY OR ALMOST EVERYDAY ☐ How many per day?

How many days a week usually? ☐

SEVERAL TIMES A WEEK ☐ How many per week?

EVERY WEEK OR ALMOST EVERY WEEK ☐ How many per month?

LESS THAN EVERY WEEK ☐ How many per month?
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5. How many of these burglaries were you arrested for? (Include all of the times you were arrested for doing a burglary even if you were charged with something else.)

______ Arrests for burglaries

6. How many burglaries were stores or other businesses?

☐ None
☐ A few
☐ Most
☐ All

7. When you entered or broke into places to do a burglary, how often did you carry a gun (real or fake) or knife or other weapon?

☐ 1. All the time
☐ 2. Most of the time
☐ 3. About half the time
☐ 4. Some of the time
☐ 5. Once
☐ 6. Never

8. What kind of weapon did you usually carry? (Check all that apply)

☐ 1. Never carried weapon
☐ Hand gun
☐ Knife
☐ Rifle/Shotgun
☐ Other, what kind?

9. While you were doing a burglary, did you ever run into someone—that is, did you ever find someone inside a place or have someone find you?

NO ☐ 1       YES ☐ 2  How many times?______
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II. 1. During the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR did you rob any businesses? That is did you hold up a store, gas station, bank, taxi or other business?

   YES □₁                      NO □₂ → go on to page 20

2. In all, how many businesses did you rob?

   □ 11 OR MORE

3. Look at the total street months on the calendar. During how many of those months did you rob one or more businesses?

   ________ Months

4. In the months when you did business robberies, how often did you usually do them?

   (CHECK ONE BOX)

   EVERYDAY OR ALMOST EVERYDAY □ → How many per day? □ → How many days a week usually? □

   SEVERAL TIMES A WEEK □ → How many per week? □

   EVERY WEEK OR ALMOST EVERY WEEK □ → How many per month? □

   LESS THAN EVERY WEEK □ → How many per month? □
5. How many of these robberies were you arrested for? (Include all of the times you were arrested for robbing a business even if you were charged with something else.)

_________ Arrests for business robberies

6. When you robbed a business, how often did you carry or use a weapon to threaten or injure someone?

☐ 1 All the time
☐ 2 Most of the time
☐ 3 About half the time
☐ 4 Some of the time
☐ 5 Once
☐ 6 Never

7. What kind of weapon did you usually carry or use? (Check all that apply)

☐ 1 Never used weapon
☐ 2 Hand gun
☐ 3 Knife
☐ 4 Rifle/Shotgun
☐ 5 Other, what kind?_________________________
III. 1. During the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR did you rob any persons, do any muggings, street robberies, purse snatches, or hold-ups in someone's house or car? (Do not include any business robberies or hold-ups during a burglary that you already mentioned.)

YES □  

NO □  ➔ go on to page 22

2. In all, how many robberies did you do?

□ 11 OR MORE

□ 1 TO 10 

How many?

3. Look at the total street months on the calendar. During how many of those months did you rob someone?

□ Months

go on to next page

4. In the months when you robbed someone, how often did you do it (don't include robbing businesses)?

(CHECK ONE BOX)

EVERYDAY OR ALMOST EVERYDAY  □ — per day?

How many

How many days a week usually?

SEVERAL TIMES A WEEK  □ — per week?

How many

EVERY WEEK OR ALMOST EVERY WEEK  □ — per month?

How many

LESS THAN EVERY WEEK  □ — per month?
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5. How many of these robberies were you arrested for? (Include all of the times you were arrested for robbing a person even if you were charged with something else.)

__________ Arrests for robbing people  

6. When you robbed someone, how often did you carry a weapon or use a weapon to threaten or injure someone?

☐ 1 All the time
☐ 2 Most of the time
☐ 3 About half the time
☐ 4 Some of the time
☐ 5 Once
☐ 6 Never

7. What kind of weapon did you usually carry or use? (Check all that apply)

☐ 1 Never used a weapon
☐ 2 Hand gun
☐ 3 Knife
☐ 4 Rifle/Shotgun
☐ 5 Other, what kind? ____________________________
IV. 1. During the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR, did you ever hurt or kill someone during a burglary (break-in) or a robbery?

   YES □ 1       NO □ 2 ▶ go on to page 24

2. Altogether during these months, how many people did you hurt or kill during a burglary or robbery?

   □ □ People

3. What kind of weapon did you use to hurt or kill these people? (check all that apply)

   □ No weapon/Bare hands
   □ Hand gun
   □ Knife
   □ Rifle/Shotgun
   □ Other, what kind? □ □

4. Do you think that any of the people you injured might have died? If so, how many?

   YES □ 1 ▶ How many? □ □ People

   NO □ 2
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This page blank;
go on to next page
V. The questions on this page DO NOT include things that happened during a robbery or burglary. Look at the calendar. Remember to answer for the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR.

1. Even if no one was hurt, during the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR did you assault someone, threaten someone with a weapon, shoot at someone, try to cut someone, or beat or strangle someone?

   YES ☐

   NO ☐  go on to page 26

2. Altogether, during those months how many times did you do these things? (Not during a burglary or robbery)

   _________ Times

3. How many people did you injure or kill? (Not during a burglary or robbery)

   _________ People
4. How many times were you arrested when you assaulted, threatened, shot at, tried to cut, or beat or strangled someone?
   ____ Arrests

5. When you did any of these things, how often did you use a weapon?
   □ All the time
   □ Most of the time
   □ About half the time
   □ Some of the time
   □ Once
   □ Never

6. What kind of weapon did you use? (Check all that apply)
   □ No weapon/Bare hands
   □ Hand gun
   □ Knife
   □ Rifle/Shotgun
   □ Other, what kind? ________________

7. Do you think that any person you hurt might have died? If so, how many persons?
   YES □ 1 ▶ How many? _____ People
   NO □ 2
VI. 1. During the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR did you do any theft or boosting? That is, did you steal from a till or cash register, shop lift, or pick pockets, or take something from someone without their knowledge? (Do not include car theft.)

YES □ 1 □ 2 go on to page 28

2. In all, how many thefts did you do?

□ □ 11 OR MORE

□ □ 1 TO 10 How many?

□ □ Thefts

How many?

go on to next page

□ □ Months

3. Look at the total street months on the calendar. During how many of those months did you do one or more thefts?

□ □ 11 OR MORE

□ □ 1 TO 10 How many?

□ □ Thefts

How many?

go on to next page

□ □ Months

4. In the months when you did thefts, how often did you usually do them?

(CHECK ONE BOX)

EVERYDAY OR ALMOST EVERYDAY □ — How many per day? □ — How many days a week usually? □

□ □ 1 TO 10 How many per week?

□ □ SEVERAL TIMES A WEEK

□ □ 1 TO 10 How many per week?

□ □ EVERY WEEK OR ALMOST EVERY WEEK □ — How many per month?

□ □ 1 TO 10 How many per month?

□ □ LESS THAN EVERY WEEK
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5. How many of these thefts were you arrested for? (Include all of the times you were arrested for doing a theft even if you were charged with something else.)

______ Arrests for Thefts
VII. 1. During the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR did you steal any cars, trucks or motorcycles?

   YES □ 1
   NO □ 2  go on to page 30

2. In all, how many times did you steal a vehicle (a car, truck or motorcycle)?

   □ 1 TO 10
   □ 11 OR MORE

3. Look at the total street months on the calendar. During how many of those months did you steal one or more vehicles?

   _______ Months

   Vehicle Thefts

   go on to next page

4. In the months when you stole a vehicle, how often did you usually steal one?

   (CHECK ONE BOX)

   EVERYDAY OR ALMOST EVERYDAY □  How many per day? □  How many days a week usually? □

   SEVERAL TIMES A WEEK □  How many per week? □

   EVERY WEEK OR ALMOST EVERY WEEK □  How many per month? □

   LESS THAN EVERY WEEK □  How many per month? □
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5. How many of these vehicle thefts were you arrested for? (Include all of the times you were arrested for stealing a vehicle, even if you were charged with something else.)

   _____ Arrests for vehicle thefts 48

6. When you stole vehicles did you ___ usually sell the vehicle or its parts?

   YES □ 1      NO □ 2
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VIII. 1. During the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR did you ever forge something, use a stolen or bad credit card, or pass a bad check?

YES □ 1

NO □ 2 go on to page 32

2. In all, how many times did you forge something, use a bad credit card, or pass a bad check?

□ 11 OR MORE

3. Look at the total street months on the calendar. During how many of those months did you forge something, use a bad credit card, or pass a bad check?

□ 1 to 10

How many?

Forgeries/Cards/Checks

□ 11 OR MORE

How many?

go on to next page

4. In the months when you did forgeries, used bad cards or passed bad checks, how often did you usually do these things?

(CHECK ONE BOX)

EVERYDAY OR ALMOST EVERYDAY □ How many per day? □ How many days a week usually?

SEVERAL TIMES A WEEK □ How many per week?

EVERY WEEK OR ALMOST EVERY WEEK □ How many per month?

LESS THAN EVERY WEEK □ How many per month?
5. How many of these forgeries, bad checks or credit cards were you arrested for? (Include all of the times you were arrested for doing one of these things even if you were charged with something else.)

______ Arrests
IX. 1. During the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR did you do any frauds or swindles (illegal cons) of a person, business, or the government?

   YES □
   NO □ \( \Rightarrow \) go on to page 34

2. In all, how many frauds or swindles did you do?

   \( \Rightarrow \) 11 OR MORE

3. Look at the total street months on the calendar. During how many of those months did you do one or more frauds or swindles?

   \( \Rightarrow \) Frauds or Swindles
   \( \Rightarrow \) go on to next page

4. In the months when you did a fraud or swindle, how often did you usually do them?

   \( \Rightarrow \) (CHECK ONE BOX)

   EVERYDAY OR ALMOST EVERYDAY \( \Rightarrow \) How many per day? \( \Rightarrow \) How many days a week usually?

   SEVERAL TIMES A WEEK \( \Rightarrow \) How many per week?

   EVERY WEEK OR ALMOST EVERY WEEK \( \Rightarrow \) How many per month?

   LESS THAN EVERY WEEK \( \Rightarrow \) How many per month?
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5. How many of these frauds or swindles were you arrested for? (Include all of the times you were arrested for doing a fraud or swindle even if you were charged with something else.)

27 Arrests for frauds or swindles
X. 1. During the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR did you ever deal in drugs? That is, did you make, sell, smuggle or move drugs?

   YES □1  NO □2 ➔ go on to page 25

2. In all, how many drug deals did you do?

   □ 11 OR MORE

3. Look at the total street months on the calendar. During how many of those months did you do one or more drug deals?

   _______ Months

4. In the months when you did drug deals how often did you usually do them?

   (CHECK ONE BOX)

   EVERYDAY OR ALMOST EVERYDAY □ ➔ How many per day? How many days a week usually? □

   SEVERAL TIMES A WEEK □ ➔ How many per week?

   EVERY WEEK OR ALMOST EVERY WEEK □ ➔ How many per month?

   LESS THAN EVERY WEEK □ ➔ How many per month?
5. How many of these drug deals were you arrested for?

_____ Arrests for drugs 48

6. What kind of drugs did you deal? (Check all that apply.)

☐ Heroin 50/
☐ Methadone 51/
☐ Uppers 52/
☐ Downers 53/
☐ Cocaine 54/
☐ Marijuana 55/
☐ PCP/Angel Dust 56/
☐ Other, what? 57/
XI. 1. This is a list of reasons men have given for doing crimes. Go through the whole list and show how important each reason was for the crimes you did during the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR. (Circle a number for each reason.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Did Not Happen/Does Not Apply</th>
<th>Not Important At All</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Losing your job.....</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy debts.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good opportunity...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn’t get a job...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge or anger...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excitement and kicks.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get money for good times and high living.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends’ ideas...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get money for drugs...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get money for rent, food, self support.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just felt nervous and tense.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blew up—lost your cool.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because you had taken drugs.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because you had been drinking.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Again look at the calendar. During the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR how much of your total income came for crime?

- 0%  
- Less than 10%  
- 10% to 25%  
- 25% to 50%  
- More than half
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3. In a typical month during the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR, about how much money did you make from all your crimes?

   $________ per month

4. Look at the calendar. During the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR, how many times were you arrested for each of the following crimes? Count an arrest even if you did not actually do the crime you were arrested for. (Check NONE if not arrested for that crime.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime</th>
<th>Arrests</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>NONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBBERY OR ARMED ROBBERY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSAULT, AGRAVATED ASSAULT OR ASSAULT WITH A DEADLY WEAPON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MURDER OR MANSLAUGHTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUTO THEFT, MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEFT, GRAND THEFT, LARCENY OR GRAND LARCENY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORGERY, USE OF A STOLEN OR BAD CREDIT CARD OR BAD CHECK PASSING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELLING DRUGS, POSSESSING DRUGS FOR SALE, OR TRANSPORTING DRUGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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5. The questions on this page are only for men who did a burglary (break-in), robbery, theft, car theft, forgery, fraud or swindle during the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR. Did you do any of these crimes during these months?

YES □ □ □ □ □ □ NO □ □ □ □ □ □ go on to next page

When you did these crimes, how often did you do each of the following things? (Circle one number next to each line listed.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worked out a plan for the crime before you went out to do it...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found places or persons with a lot of money.......................</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learned about alarms, hours, or money transfers...................</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decided to do the crime on the spot..................................</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked out an escape plan before doing the crime..................</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got special equipment such as burglary tools......................</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with partners..................................................</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lined up a fence or buyer before the crime.........................</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used tips to line places up..........................................</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only cased a place or person just before the crime...............</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stole a car or got a gun that could not be traced..................</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Followed a person to a safe place to do the crime...............</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARD 08
6. These questions are only about the crime(s) for which you are now serving a sentence. What charge(s) were you convicted of that you are serving time for now? (Check all that apply.)

☐ Assault/ADW
☐ Auto Theft/Vehicle Theft
☐ Burglary
☐ Drug Possession
☐ Drug sales
☐ Forgery/Bad check/Bad credit card
☐ Fraud or Swindle
☐ Kidnapping
☐ Murder/Manslaughter
☐ Possession or receiving stolen property
☐ Rape
☐ Robbery
☐ Sex offense (other than rape)
☐ Theft/Grand theft/Larceny
☐ Weapons charge
☐ Other, what? ____________________________

7. For these convictions, what crimes, if any, do you think you really did? (Check all that apply.)

☐ Assault/ADW
☐ Auto Theft/Vehicle Theft
☐ Burglary
☐ Drug Possession
☐ Drug sales
☐ Forgery/Bad check/Bad credit card
☐ Fraud or Swindle
☐ Kidnapping
☐ Murder/Manslaughter
☐ Possession or receiving stolen property
☐ Rape
☐ Robbery
☐ Sex offense (other than rape)
☐ Theft/Grand theft/Larceny
☐ Weapons charge
☐ Other, what? ____________________________
☐ Did no crime
8. Do you think you could do the same crime(s) again without getting caught?
   NO □ 1  YES □ 2  How many times?
     _____ times

9. Did you have a weapon during the crime(s)?
   NO □ 1  YES □ 2  What weapon?
       (Check all that apply)
   □ 1 Hand gun
   □ 1 Knife
   □ 1 Rifle/shotgun
   □ 1 Other, what? _____

10. Did you hurt or kill anyone during the crime(s)?
    NO □ 1  YES □ 2  How many? _____ Persons

11. When you described your crimes during the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR,
    did you include any of the crimes you are now doing time on?
    □ 1 Yes
    □ 2 No
    □ 3 Some but not all

12. How long have you served on your present sentence?
    _____ Years and/or _____ Months

13. How long do you think you have left to serve on your present sentence?
    _____ Years and/or _____ Months
14. Again look at the calendar. During the STREET MONTHS ON THE CALENDAR, altogether how many times did you do each of the following:

a. Beat or physically hurt someone badly.
   0 □ 1-2 □ 3-5 □ 6-10 □ More than 10 □ 31/

b. Hustled or conned someone.
   0 □ 1-2 □ 3-5 □ 6-10 □ More than 10 □ 32/

c. Cut someone with a knife or shot someone with a gun.
   0 □ 1-2 □ 3-5 □ 6-10 □ More than 10 □ 33/

d. Burglary—broke into a home or business in order to take something.
   0 □ 1-2 □ 3-5 □ 6-10 □ More than 10 □ 34/

e. Threatened to hurt someone with a gun, knife or other weapon.
   0 □ 1-2 □ 3-5 □ 6-10 □ More than 10 □ 35/

f. Tried to kill someone.
   0 □ 1-2 □ 3-5 □ 6-10 □ More than 10 □ 36/

g. Forged a check or other paper.
   0 □ 1-2 □ 3-5 □ 6-10 □ More than 10 □ 37/

h. Stole a car.
   0 □ 1-2 □ 3-5 □ 6-10 □ More than 10 □ 38/

i. Sold hard drugs.
   0 □ Less than □ Less than □ Less than □ More than 100 □ 39/
     10 50 100
The questions on this page are about a different time period, the two years just before the calendar.

1. Look at the calendar again. What was the earliest year you wrote on the calendar (the year before you were arrested)?

   19___

2. In the box on this page write the two years just before that year: From 19___ to 19___

3. The next questions are about the two years you just wrote in the box. Think about what you were doing during those two years as you answer the next questions.

4. How old were you at the beginning of these two years?

   _______ Years Old

5. Did you do any time in a prison, jail or juvenile institution during these years?

   □ 0 Did no time  □ OR □ 1-6 months
   □ 7-12 months  □ 13-18 months  □ 19-23 months  □ all 24 months

6. At any time during these years were you married or living with a girlfriend for more than a month?

   □ 1 YES  □ 2 NO

7. During these years did you have a job for more than a month?

   □ 1 YES  □ 2 NO

8. Did you use drugs (other than marijuana)?

   □ 1 YES  □ 2 NO

9. During these years did you do any of the following crimes? (Check all that apply)

   □ 1 Burglary  □ 1 Theft
   □ Robbery of businesses  □ Car theft
   □ Robbery of persons  □ Forgery (Credit Cards/Checks)
   □ Assault during a robbery or burglary  □ Fraud or Swindle
   □ Assault/ADW  □ Drug deals
   □ Did none of these crimes

CARD 09
The questions on this page are about an even earlier time period, the two years before those you described on the last page.

10. Look at the BOX you filled in on the page just before this. What is the earliest year in that box?

19

11. In the box on this page write the two years just before that year: From 19____ to 19____

12. Now think about what you were doing during these two years as you answer the next questions.

13. How old were you at the beginning of these two years?

_______ Years Old

14. Did you do any time in a prison, jail, or juvenile institution during these years?

☐ Did no time  OR  ☐ 1-6 months
☐ 7-12 months
☐ 13-18 months
☐ 19-23 months
☐ all 24 months

15. At any time during these years were you married or living with a girlfriend for more than a month?

☐ 1 YES  ☐ 2 NO

16. During these years did you have a job for more than a month?

☐ 1 YES  ☐ 2 NO

17. Did you use drugs (other than marijuana)?

☐ 1 YES  ☐ 2 NO

18. During these years did you do any of the following crimes? (Check all that apply.)

☐ Burglary  ☐ Theft
☐ Robbery of businesses  ☐ Car theft
☐ Robbery of persons  ☐ Forgery (Credit Cards/Checks)
☐ Assault during a robbery or burglary  ☐ Fraud or Swindle
☐ Assault/ADW  ☐ Drug deals
☐ Did none of these crimes

CARD 10
1. How old were you on your last birthday?

_______ Years old

2. What is your race?

☐ 1 Asian
☐ 2 Black
☐ 3 Chicano/Latino
☐ 4 Indian/Native American
☐ 5 White
☐ 6 Other

3. What is the highest grade you finished in school?

☐ 0 No schooling
☐ 1 6th grade or less
☐ 2 7th - 9th grade
☐ 3 10th - 11th grade
☐ 4 High school graduate
☐ 5 Some college
☐ 6 College graduate
☐ 7 Post graduate study

4. At the present time, are you: (Check one)

☐ 1 Married
☐ 2 Widowed
☐ 3 Divorced
☐ 4 Separated
☐ 5 Never married

5. How many times have you been married?

☐ 00 Never ☐ OR ☐ _______ Times

6. Are you serving a jail term or a prison term at this time?

Jail ☐ 1 ☐ Prison ☐ 2 \( \rightarrow \) go on to page 45

That is the end of the survey. Thank you for participating. Please put the survey in the envelope and seal it.
This page blank;
go on to next page
The next questions are about the kinds of prison programs you might have been in during your current prison term (at any prison, but only for this term).

1. **During this term, have you ever been in an adult basic education program (classes up to the 9th grade level)?**

   YES □ 1

   a. Counting this month, how many months altogether have you taken adult basic education classes?

      ____ Months

      □ OR

      □ Less than 1 month

   b. How many hours a week did you spend in the classes?

      ____ Hours a week

      □ OR

      □ Less than every week

   c. Here is a list of reasons why some men take adult basic education programs. How important was each of these reasons to you? *(Circle one number next to each reason.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Unimportant</th>
<th>Not Important At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Break up boredom, see what it was like.....</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be with friends or make friends............</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help make parole.........................</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help myself; learn or work toward a diploma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   **CARD 11**
d. How much did staff influence your decision to take this adult basic education program? (Check only one box.)

☐ 1 Staff made me take it
☐ 2 Staff suggested it
☐ 3 Neither; staff had no effect

e. How much do you think this adult basic education program will help you? (Circle one number for each.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A Lot of Help</th>
<th>Some Help</th>
<th>A Little Help</th>
<th>No Help At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjust to prison life.....</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get a better education...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get and keep a job........</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay out of crime..........</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. Are you still in the adult basic education program?

NO ☐ 1 Why not?
(Check the main reason below)

☐ 1 Finished the program
☐ 2 Teacher was no good
☐ 3 Had hassles with other men in the program
☐ 4 It was a waste of time
☐ 5 Something better came along
☐ 6 Transferred to another prison
☐ 7 Other, what? ____________

YES ☐ 2 go on to next page
2. During this term, have you ever been in a high school education program to get your G.E.D. or diploma?

YES □ 1

a. Counting this month, how many months altogether have you taken high school education classes?

□ Months

OR

□ Less than 1 month

b. How many hours a week did you spend in the classes?

□ Hours a week

OR

□ Less than every week

NO □ 2 ▶ Why not?

(Check the main reason below)

□ 1 Finished high school
□ 2 Not given at this prison
□ 3 Heard bad things about it
□ 4 Staff didn’t want me to
□ 5 Too busy to take it
□ 6 Not qualified to take it
□ 7 Other, what? ____________

go on to page 50

---

c. Here is a list of reasons why some men take high school education programs. How important was each of these reasons to you? (Circle one number next to each reason.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Unimportant</th>
<th>Not Important At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Break up boredom; see what it was like</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be with friends or make friends</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help make parole</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help myself; learn or work toward a diploma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CARD II
d. How much did staff influence your decision to take this high school education program? (Check only one box.)

☐ 1 Staff made me take it
☐ 2 Staff suggested it
☐ 3 Neither; staff had no effect

35/

e. How much do you think this high school education program will help you? (Circle one number for each.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A Lot of Help</th>
<th>Some Help</th>
<th>A Little Help</th>
<th>No Help At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjust to prison life</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get a better education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get and keep a job</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay out of crime</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36/

37/

38/

39/

f. Are you still in the high school education program?

NO ☐ 1 Why not?

(Check the main reason below)

☐ 1 Finished the program
☐ 2 Teacher was no good
☐ 3 Had hassles with other men in the program
☐ 4 It was a waste of time
☐ 5 Something better came along
☐ 6 Transferred to another prison
☐ 7 Other, what?

YES ☐ 2 go on to next page

40/

41/

CARD 11
3. During this term, have you ever been in a vocational training program (skill or trade training, but not a prison work assignment)?

YES □ 1

a. Counting this month, how many months altogether have you been in a vocational training program?

□ Months

□ OR

□ Less than 1 month

NO □ 2 Why not?

(Check the main reason below)

□ 1 Already have a trade or license

□ 2 Not given at this prison

□ 3 Heard bad things about it

□ 4 Staff didn’t want me to

□ 5 Too busy to take it

□ 6 Not qualified to take it

□ 7 Other, what?

□ OR

□ Less than every week

go on to page 52

42/ 43/ 44/ 45/ 46/ 47/ 48/ 49/ 50/ 51/
d. How much did staff influence your decision to take this vocational training program? (Check only one box.)

- □ 1 Staff made me take it
- □ 2 Staff suggested it
- □ 3 Neither; staff had no effect

52/

e. How much do you think this vocational training program will help you? (Circle one number for each.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A Lot of Help</th>
<th>Some Help</th>
<th>A Little Help</th>
<th>No Help At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjust to prison life</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn a trade/Get a license...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get and keep a job</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay out of crime</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53/

54/

55/

56/

f. Are you still in the vocational training program?

NO □ 1 Why not?

(Check the main reason below)

- □ 1 Finished the program
- □ 2 Instructor was no good
- □ 3 Had hassles with other men in the program
- □ 4 It was a waste of time
- □ 5 Something better came along
- □ 6 Transferred to another prison
- □ 7 Other, what? ____________

YES □ 2 Go on to next page

57/

58/

CARD 11
4. During this term, have you ever been in an alcohol program (for example, A.A.)?

YES □ 1

a. Counting this month, how many months altogether have you gone to alcohol program sessions?

   ____ Months
   OR

□ Less than 1 month

b. How many hours a week did you spend in the alcohol program?

   ____ Hours a week
   OR

□ Less than every week

NO □ 2 Why not?

(Check the main reason below)

□ 1 Don't need this program
□ 2 Not given at this prison
□ 3 Heard bad things about it
□ 4 Staff didn't want me to
□ 5 Too busy to take it
□ 6 Not qualified to take it
□ 7 Other, what? __________

---

59/
60/
61
62
63
64
65/
66/
67/
68/

---

CARD II
d. How much did staff influence your decision to take this alcohol program?  
(Check only one box.)

□ 1 Staff made me take it  
□ 2 Staff suggested it  
□ 3 Neither; staff had no effect

69/

e. How much do you think this alcohol program will help you?  (Circle one number for each.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Lot of Help</th>
<th>Some Help</th>
<th>A Little Help</th>
<th>No Help At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjust to prison life...........</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control a drinking problem....</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get and keep a job............</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay out of crime..............</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70/

71/

72/

73/

f. Are you still in the alcohol program?

NO □ 1 Why not?  
(Check the main reason below)

□ 1 Finished the program  
□ 2 Counselor was no good  
□ 3 Had hassles with other men in the program  
□ 4 It was a waste of time  
□ 5 Something better came along  
□ 6 Transferred to another prison  
□ 7 Other, what? ____________

YES □ 2 go on to next page

74/

75/

CARD 11
5. During this term, have you ever been in a drug program (for example, N.A.)?

YES □ 1

a. Counting this month, how many months altogether have you gone to drug program sessions?

□ Months

OR

□ Less than 1 month

b. How many hours a week did you spend in the drug program?

□ Hours a week

OR

□ Less than every week

c. Here is a list of reasons why some men join drug programs. How important was each of these reasons to you? (Circle one number next to each reason.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Unimportant</th>
<th>Not Important At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Break up boredom; see what it was like...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be with friends or make friends......</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help make parole....</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about or deal with problems.....</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

go on to page 56
d. How much did staff influence your decision to take this drug program?  
(Check only one box.)

☐ 1 Staff made me take it  
☐ 2 Staff suggested it  
☐ 3 Neither; staff had no effect

18/

e. How much do you think this drug program will help you:  (Circle one number for each.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A Lot of Help</th>
<th>Some Help</th>
<th>A Little Help</th>
<th>No Help At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjust to prison life..............</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control a drug problem.............</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get and keep a job.................</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay out of crime..................</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18/  20/  21/  22/

f. Are you still in the drug program?

NO ☐ 1  Why not?  
(Check the main reason below)

☐ 1 Finished the program  
☐ 2 Counselor was no good  
☐ 3 Had hassles with other men in the program  
☐ 4 It was a waste of time  
☐ 5 Something better came along  
☐ 6 Transferred to another prison  
☐ 7 Other, what?  

YES ☐ 2  go on to next page

23/  24/
6. During this term, have you ever been in individual counseling with a correctional counselor, psychologist or psychiatrist?

Yes [ ] 1

NO [ ] 2 Why not?

(Check the main reason below)

[ ] 1 Don’t need this program
[ ] 2 Not given at this prison
[ ] 3 Heard bad things about it
[ ] 4 Staff didn’t want me to
[ ] 5 Too busy to take it
[ ] 6 Not qualified to take it
[ ] 7 Other, what? __________

[ ] 20

---

a. Counting this month, how many months altogether have you gone to individual counseling sessions?

______ Months

[ ] OR

[ ] Less than 1 month

b. How many hours a week did you spend in individual counseling?

______ Hours a week

[ ] OR

[ ] Less than every week

[ ] 28

---

c. Here is a list of reasons why some men take individual counseling. How important was each of these reasons to you? (Circle one number next to each reason.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Unimportant</th>
<th>Not Important At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Break up boredom; see what it was like....</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help make parole....</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about or deal with problems.........</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[ ] 30

---

[ ] 31

[ ] 32

[ ] 33
d. How much did staff influence your decision to take individual counseling?  
(Check only one box.)

☐ 1 Staff made me take it  
☐ 2 Staff suggested it  
☐ 3 Neither; staff had no effect

---

34/

35/

36/

37/

38/

---

e. How much do you think this individual counseling will help you:  
(Circle one number for each.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A Lot of Help</th>
<th>Some Help</th>
<th>A Little Help</th>
<th>No Help At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjust to prison life...............</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about/deal with problems.....</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get and keep a job..................</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay out of crime...................</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

f. Are you still in individual counseling?

NO ☐ 1 Why not?  
(Check the main reason below)

☐ 1 Finished the program  
☐ 2 Counselor was no good  
☐ 3 Had hassles with other men in the program  
☐ 4 It was a waste of time  
☐ 5 Something better came along  
☐ 6 Transferred to another prison  
☐ 7 Other, what? _____________

YES ☐ Go on to next page  

40/
7. During this term, have you ever been in group counseling (with a correctional counselor, psychologist or psychiatrist)?

YES □ 1

NO □ 2  Why not?

(Check the main reason below)

□ Don't need this program
□ Not given at this prison
□ Heard bad things about it
□ Staff didn't want me to
□ Too busy to take it
□ Not qualified to take it
□ Other, what? ______________

go on to page 60

---

c. Here is a list of reasons why some men take group counseling. How important was each of these reasons to you? (Circle one number next to each reason.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Unimportant</th>
<th>Not Important At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Break up boredom; see what it was like...</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be with friends or make friends.......</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help make parole.......</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about or deal with problems......</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. How much did staff influence your decision to take group counseling? (Check only one box.)

☐ 1 Staff made me take it
☐ 2 Staff suggested it
☐ 3 Neither; staff had no effect

51/

e. How much do you think this group counseling will help you? (Circle one number for each.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Lot of Help</th>
<th>Some Help</th>
<th>A Little Help</th>
<th>No Help At All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjust to prison life.......</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learn about/deal with problems.................</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get and keep a job............</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay out of crime.............</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52/

f. Are you still in group counseling?

NO ☐ 1 Why not?
(Check the main reason below)

☐ 1 Finished the program
☐ 2 Counselor was no good
☐ 3 Had hassles with other men in the program
☐ 4 It was a waste of time
☐ 5 Something better came along
☐ 6 Transferred to another prison
☐ 7 Other, what? __________________________

YES ☐ 2 go on to next page

56/

57/
8. What other programs have you been in during your current term? (Check all that apply.)

☐ No other programs
☐ College education program
☐ Outside community activities
☐ Religious activities
☐ Inmate self-help group(s), clubs or activities
☐ Pre-release program
☐ Work furlough
☐ Other, what?

9. Do you currently have a prison job? (Do not include vocational training program activities.)

YES ☐ 1

a. Altogether, how many hours a week do you work?

☐ 1 Hour a week
☐ 2 Hours a week

b. How much help do you think your prison job will be for getting a job when you get out?

☐ 1 A lot of help
☐ 2 Some help
☐ 3 A little help
☐ 4 No help

NO ☐ 2 Why not?

(Check the main reason below)

☐ 1 No jobs available
☐ 2 Do not want one
☐ 3 Too busy
☐ 4 Lost job as punishment
☐ 5 Sick or disabled
☐ 6 Custody/security reasons
☐ 7 Other, what?

10. Since you began this term, have you gotten any disciplinary reports (write-ups)?

YES ☐ 1 How many? Reports

About how many of these reports were for serious charges (for example, fighting)?

☐ 0 None ☐ OR Reports for serious charges

NO ☐ 2 Go on to next page
11. Since you began this term, how much time have you spent in the "hole" or in segregation as a result of disciplinary actions (not for protective custody)?

- None
- Less than 1 month
- 1 to 3 months
- 4 to 6 months
- 7 to 12 months
- More than 12 months

12. Since you began this term, how many times have you tried to escape?

- Never
- Once
- 2 to 3 times
- More than 3 times

13. Here is a list of reasons why some men get into trouble in prison. Since you began this term, how often did these reasons lead to trouble for you, whether or not you got a write-up? (Circle one number next to each reason below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid debts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just horsing around</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial problems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal problems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with staff</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Is this your first prison term?

YES □

NO □ go on to next page

If yes, this is the end of your survey. Thank you for participating. Please put the calendar and the survey in the envelope and seal it.
15. **During your past prison terms, did you take any of the following programs for at least a month? Do not include the time you were in programs during your current term. (Check all that apply.)**

- [ ] Adult Basic Education
- [ ] High School Education
- [ ] College Education
- [ ] Vocational Training
- [ ] Alcohol Programs
- [ ] Drug Programs
- [ ] Individual Counseling
- [ ] Group Counseling

---

This is the end of the survey. Thank you for participating. Please put the calendar and the survey in the envelope and seal it.
INSTRUCTIONS FOR USING THIS CALENDAR ARE INCLUDED IN THE SURVEY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Winter</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Summer</th>
<th>Fall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>February</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Before Arrested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Arrested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Include this month:
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Appendix E

NOTICE MAILED TO SAMPLED INMATES

The Rand Corporation, a research company, will be doing a survey of men in this facility. This is part of a nationwide survey of men in prisons and jails. Your name has been randomly selected for the survey. You will be scheduled for a meeting where the researchers will explain the survey. You may then choose whether or not to take the survey. If you choose to take the survey, it will be given at that meeting. The survey will take about one hour and you will receive $5.00 to your account.
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