

60182

FCR

BOHN

**CLASSIFICATION OF  
OFFENDERS IN AN  
INSTITUTION FOR  
YOUNG ADULTS**

## FCI RESEARCH REPORTS

FCI RESEARCH REPORTS publish papers describing empirical investigations in a variety of disciplines conducted at the Federal Correctional Institution, Tallahassee, Florida. These REPORTS are privately circulated to selected individuals, institutions and libraries. Publication of an investigation in FCI RESEARCH REPORTS does not preclude subsequent submission of the study to a scholarly journal. All statements in FCI RESEARCH REPORTS are the opinion of the investigator(s) and do not represent official opinions, policies or attitudes of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. All rights reserved.

FCI RESEARCH REPORTS are edited by Edwin I. Megargee, Ph.D., Consulting Psychologist and are published at irregular intervals by the Warden's Advisory Committee on Research of the Federal Correctional Institution, Tallahassee, Florida. Members of the Committee include:

D. C. Lundgren, Warden

Henry E. Gilbert, Associate Warden

R. D. Brewer, Associate Warden

Martin J. Bohn, Jr., Ph.D. Chief, Psychology  
Department

Davey L Edwards, Ed. D., Supervisor of Education

Richard L. Smith, Chief Correctional Supervisor

Patrick T. Casey, Case Management Coordinator.

All correspondence regarding FCI RESEARCH REPORTS should be addressed to:

Dr. Edwin I. Megargee  
Psychology Department  
Florida State University  
Tallahassee, Florida 32306

**CLASSIFICATION OF OFFENDERS  
IN AN INSTITUTION FOR YOUNG ADULTS**

MARTIN J. BOHN, JR.  
Federal Correctional Institution  
Tallahassee, Florida

**NCJRS**

**AUG 13 1979**

**ACQUISITIONS**

## Abstract

### *Classification of Offenders in an Institution for Young Adults*

This paper describes the implementation and evaluation of a management classification system which has the advantages of being economical of staff personnel and time, can be computerized, and has categories related to extensive psychological research. Young adult male inmates were classified into three general categories: (1) those most likely to act out aggressively, (2) those likely to be victims, and (3) those in neither of the first two extreme groups. The primary instrument was the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), with groups formed according to profile similarity and studied with an earlier sample at the Federal Correctional Institution, Tallahassee, Florida, (Megargee & Bohn, 1977). Classification was based on MMPI groups, behavior ratings on the Correctional Adjustment Check List (Quay, 1973), and review of records. Inmates were assigned to one of three open dormitories, with the two extreme groups separated from each other. All inmates could later apply for a fourth unit featuring more intensive programs. Results comparing nine months before introduction of the system in May 1977 with nine months afterward showed no differences in the number of men sent to the maximum security section or written reports of institution rule infractions. Serious incidents, however, decreased (315 v. 289) as did assaults (24 v. 13). These and other results suggest that the system has contributed to making the institution safer and facilitated management decisions.

# CLASSIFICATION OF OFFENDERS IN AN INSTITUTION FOR YOUNG ADULTS

MARTIN J. BOHN, JR.

*Federal Correctional Institution*

*Tallahassee, Florida USA*

Accurate classification is essential in the effective treatment and management of individuals committed to criminal justice system institutions. Providing a safe and humane environment to those segregated for punishment will continue to require a judicious use of resources, both material and human. This paper describes the implementation and evaluation of a management classification system in a Federal prison.

## *The Setting*

The Federal Correctional Institution (FCI) at Tallahassee serves the Southeastern region of the United States as far north as North Carolina and as far west as Arkansas and Louisiana, housing men primarily between the ages of 17 and 24. The institution population varies between 550 and 600 men who have been convicted of violating the Federal Statutes. On the average, the men have five prior arrests, were age 17 at the time of their first arrest, have ten years of education, and have estimated intelligence in the average range. The average sentence is between 3 and 5 years, and the average stay is about 20 months. At the time the new Management Classification System was introduced, the racial balance was 54% black and 46% white/other. The most common offenses were those dealing

with the general areas of larceny (26%), robbery (14%), drug violations (11%), forgery (10%), and firearms (9%). Education is the primary program available to the inmates, with programs ranging from basic education through the first two years of college. Vocational training and apprenticeship programs are also available. Group and individual counseling is offered to most residents, and 10-15% of the men are employed in the Federal Prison Industries. In addition to education, virtually all inmates are assigned to a work detail which provides work experience while maintaining the operations of the institution.

## *Institution Background Factors*

Current operations of the institution have been influenced by the architecture and research history of the FCI. Originally designed in the 1930's for nonviolent, obedient inmates (mostly "moonshiners"), the institution was constructed with four open dormitory buildings and no fence. The inmates were typically adults and they were sentenced for short stays. Being somewhat responsible, the inmates carried on the work of the institution with minimal supervision and there was little violence in the backgrounds or institution behavior of these first inmates.

The research history of the FCI was another major institution background factor in this classification project. Only four miles from Florida State University (FSU), the institution staff had the advantages of interaction with behavioral scientists in university departments such as psychology and criminology. An ambitious research project, conducted by psychologists from FSU and supported by the National Institute of Mental Health and the Bureau of Prisons, gathered information on each commitment to the institution between November 1970 and November 1972. These men were followed within the institution until 1974 and through their post-institutional records in 1976 (Megargee et al, 1971, 1972). This project developed baseline data to be used in comparisons in later years and more importantly, the project fostered within the institution a tolerant and relatively informed attitude toward research. This attitude was instrumental in the introduction of the new Classification System within the institution.

### *Institution Changes*

Since its opening, the FCI has undergone several sweeping changes in the nature of its population and its administration. The first clientele was replaced in the mid-1960's by younger, more aggressive, more violent and less responsible inmates who were more often urban black rather than rural white. This new type of inmate required more security, so that fences and gun towers were added to the architecture and the tension level of the institution increased markedly.

A second major institutional change was the transition to functional unit

management that occurred in 1973-74. The institution moved from being a centralized institution to a collection of four or five semi-autonomous units. The new approach was designed to move the program decision-making closer to the men whose lives were being influenced, to bring the inmates and their program staff into closer working relationships, and to improve communication. The functional units also provided the opportunity for programs with varied emphasis to be offered to differing subpopulations of inmates. This move to functional units in 1974 was the last major change before the introduction of the new classification system in 1977.

### *The Initial Population*

In May 1977 the institution was comprised of four relatively comparable units, three of which were general treatment units and the fourth which had a Drug Abuse Program (DAP) unit. Typically, an incoming inmate was assigned to one of the three general units so that each general unit received every third commitment. Men who expressed an interest in treatment for drug related or alcohol problems were transferred after classification to the Drug Abuse Program unit, according to the space available there. Thus, the general units were virtually identical in terms of inmate characteristics such as race, type of sentence, length of sentence, prior record, personality characteristics, intelligence, and education. Offenders with all levels of offense seriousness were found in all dormitories, as were inmates of every custody level and propensity toward violence. The units were similar in program involvement, incidence of violence, and

numbers of men who were discipline problems.

As one aspect of efforts to provide a safer and more humane institution for both inmates and staff, it was decided to separate the more predatory inmates from those who were most likely to be victimized. Correctional supervisors and program staff who were asked to identify those inmates seen as most troublesome for any of the three reasons: 1) their acting out against others, 2) their being acted against, or 3) their involvement in many incidents of one kind or another. Correctional supervisors have the primary duty to see to the orderly running of the institution, and program staff have the primary responsibility of developing, coordinating, and implementing programs. If the troublesome inmates could be somewhat separated from the others, two results could occur: 1) the special needs of the extreme

groups could be met better; and 2) those inmates who did not require special attention, but were hampered by less well-adjusted men, would be able to pursue their programs with less distraction.

### *Informal Pilot Study*

To test staff reaction to such a system, staff were asked to nominate inmates for inclusion in either a group that had a history of acting out or a group seen as being acted against. Of the 563 men in this institution, approximately 40 were nominated for the first group and 30 were nominated for the second by both custodial and program staff. The agreement among staff was taken as indication that the general categories were understandable to the staff and that reliable discriminations could be made.

## **Classification of the Initial Population**

To classify the initial population formally, a system was developed drawing upon the experience of other Federal institutions as well as the unique features of the Tallahassee institution. A number of institutions had achieved success in the classification of inmates based on behavioral ratings; the Federal Correctional Institution at Oxford, Wisconsin, and the U. S. Penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, had both implemented classification systems which were seen to be helpful in management decisions (Smith & Fenton, 1978). At Tallahassee there was a history of psychological research not available to the other institutions, specifically in the study of inmate

characteristics and their relationship to past histories, educational and vocational accomplishments, and criminal records.

### *Components of the Classification System*

For the initial population, decisions were based primarily on the inmates behavior as rated by staff members who knew them and secondarily by their performance on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI). From data on these two aspects of the person, decisions were made as to whether a man belonged to either one of the extreme groups or to the middle group with no marked predilection toward either extreme.

**Table 1**

Scales on the Correctional Adjustment Checklist as  
Indicators of Local Inmate Types

Correctional Adjustment Checklist Scales	Local Types
I Aggressive-Psychopathic	B
II Immature-Dependent	C
III Neurotic-Anxious	C
IV Manipulative	

*Behavioral ratings* were scored using the Correctional Adjustment Checklist that had been developed by Dr. H. C. Quay (1973) under contracts with the Federal Bureau of Prisons. All inmates were rated on this form by members of their program team. Staff members were asked to indicate which statements were descriptive of the man, and from these responses the inmate's scores on the scales were derived. The inmates were known to the team members for as little as one month or as long as 18 months and in some cases longer, so that the staff were able to make informed ratings of the inmates. These ratings of the man's behavior were the primary basis for the initial population classification. The men obtained scores on the four factor-analytically derived scales: I. Aggressive-Psychopathic; II. Immature-Dependent; III. Neurotic-Anxious; and, IV. Manipulative.

Within the institution the men were classified into three categories: 1) the aggressive, acting out, physical extreme (later named Type B for Unit B), 2) the less-aggressive, sometimes passive, intellectual, aesthetic, and immature

group (Type C), or 3) neither extreme (Type D). Men who had elevated scores ( $t \geq 65$ ) on the Correctional Activities Checklist Scale I (Aggressive-Psychopathic) were classified in the first extreme group. Men with elevated scores on Scale II (Immature-Dependent) and/or Scale III (Neurotic-Anxious) were classified into the second extreme group. Men with an elevated score on Scale IV (Manipulative) or no elevated scores were assigned to the third, non-extreme group.

*The MMPI* has a long and well-documented history of use in the area of personality measurement. Originally developed as a measure for psychiatric disturbance, recent evidence indicates that it is useful in the description of strengths and weaknesses in non-psychiatric populations. As a personality measure, it has been the subject of studies in colleges and universities, outpatient clinics, mental institutions, and prisons. Applications of the MMPI to prison work have involved inmate classification, adjustment to prison, and aggressive behavior (Dahlstrom, Welsh, & Dahlstrom, 1975).



The MMPI is a collection of 566 true-false statements which a person endorses as true as applied to him or false as applied to him. Requiring a reading level of approximately sixth grade, it is understandable by the majority of inmates. The responses are scored on three validity scales and 10 standard clinical scales. (In addition, there are upwards of 100 experimental scales.) Scores are based on similarity with a group selected as representative of the man in the street in comparison with specifically diagnosed psychiatric groups. From the scores, inferences can be made about the individual's outlook, mood, interests, thinking patterns, energy level, and sociability. The MMPI has the advantages of a wealth of research and theoretical relevance in the personality area. It is economical of professional staff time, can be machine scored, and provides meaningful scores about the functioning of an individual.

Based on the similarity of the MMPI profiles, a classification system was developed using an earlier population of the institution at Tallahassee. Dr. E. I. Megargee and his associates (1977) at Florida State University developed the system, and with collaboration of Dr. Bohn of the Federal Correctional Institution the characteristics associated with membership of the MMPI types were described (Megargee and Bohn, 1977). The MMPI groupings reflected personal differences in past histories, family backgrounds, educational and vocational accomplishment, and motivation. To avoid the surplus meanings that often accompany the labels given in a classification system, the groups were designated according to the letters

in the alphabet with the phonetic call names: Able, Baker, Charlie, etc.

The MMPI types in the Tallahassee system can be arranged according to their average elevation and therefore their average extent of pathology. Group Item had the lowest average scores and thus was seen as the best adjusted group. The most disturbed group as indicated by their MMPI profiles is How. From the least elevated average profile to the most elevated profile, the MMPI types arrange themselves in this order: 1) Item, 2) Easy, 3) Baker, 4) Able, 5) George, 6) Delta, 7) Jupiter, 8) Foxtrot, 9) Charlie, and 10) How. The first four types (Item, Easy, Baker, Able) are comprised of relatively stable individuals; the last two MMPI types (Charlie, How) are the most disturbed.

#### *Implementing the Classification System*

In order to implement a classification system within the institution, several coordinated steps were required. First, the initial population had to be classified systematically, as described. Secondly, a centralized admission and orientation (A&O) unit for the identification and classification of incoming inmates had to be established. Thirdly, a series of orderly moves would be required to rearrange the existing population into units that reflected the classification. These steps are presented in a logical order and in an abstract situation, one step would be completed before the next would be undertaken. In actuality, the steps were interdependent and efforts were made to begin work on at least the first two issues simultaneously.

*Establishment of centralized admissions program.* After the initial popula-

tion had been classified, the admissions program was set up on one-half dormitory. It was necessary to establish a place for new commitments, to minimize the pressure and influence of the older, more senior inmates who were comfortable within the institution and who had their own motives for orienting the new commitments. In addition to identifying and classifying these new men, the program would provide an opportunity for staff to present a new frame of reference for the incoming residents, a frame of reference which included the expectation of the classification goals and operation. One-half dormitory was essentially cleared of residents, and all new commitments after the starting date in May were assigned to the new admissions unit.

*The Voluntary Program Unit* was established in the other half of the dormitory housing the Admissions and Orientation (A&O) Unit. This Voluntary Program Unit was the successor to the Drug and Alcohol Abuse Program, meeting the legal requirements for a program for offenders with drug convictions but not necessarily limited to those with drug offenses. This unit offered the opportunity to participate in a more intensive series of program activities designed for self-help. The men within this unit were originally those previously selected for the former Drug and Alcohol Abuse Program. As in the past, men in the program would continue to be selected from the other general units. Thus, every individual coming through the new A&O program and being assigned to a general unit would have the chance to be accepted into the Voluntary Program Unit and

to leave the dormitory of his initial assignment.

*A Special Housing Unit* as part of the Voluntary Program Unit was established, providing the opportunity for an even more intensive experience in programming. Housed in another part of the institution, this unit maximized self-regulation and self-discipline. Inmates for this unit were eventually selected from the Voluntary Program Unit where they had all successfully completed the basic activities. The treatment approach for the Voluntary Program Unit was Transactional Analysis, with all men in the Voluntary Program Unit agreeing to complete the basic 17 week course. For those so inclined, the option of attempting to move to the Special Housing Unit was available and was predicated on the basis of advanced participation in more confrontative and personally committing group experience.

*The initial moves.* Once the institution population had been classified, the case loads of the units were altered to reflect the aims of the system in a series of three moves. First, in order to establish the A&O program, selected inmates were removed from that dormitory and moved to one of the three general treatment units. Secondly, case loads in the two dormitories housing the extreme groups were reviewed and men in an inappropriate dormitory were moved. Thirdly, in the general unit designated to house men who were in neither of the extreme groups, men who were rated as belonging to either extreme were considered for movement.

Following the establishment of the A&O program and the Voluntary Pro-

gram Unit, isolating the extreme groups was the next step. At the outset, men from both extremes were living in all the dormitories so that in each dormitory any given case load had examples of the more aggressive inmates mixed with the less aggressive ones. Thus, from the dormitory designated for the aggressive men, all of the less aggressive men had to be moved, and vice versa.

The final wave of moves involved the third general treatment unit and the units housing the two extremes. Men who were rated as suitable for either of the extreme units were considered for movement. Those whose behavior indicated overwhelming tendencies toward either extreme were moved, usually in exchange for a man in an extreme unit who was rated suitable for the third general unit. Moves involving this third dormitory completed the initial moves to the new system.

*Designations: pure and actual.* Because the implementation of the classification was being carried out in an institution with on-going programs involving inmates and staff, it was necessary to keep the disruption to programs and operations to a minimum. For that reason, only those men for whom there were compelling reasons to move (i.e., high ratings or behavioral problems) were actually transferred from one living unit to another. Many inmates whose ratings would have indicated appropriateness for another dormitory were in fact making adequate adjustments where they were. Since only the minimum possible number of men would be moving, a method had to be devised to study all of the classifications independent of the actual moves. Two

designations were noted: the "actual" designations were based on the moves that did occur in the transition from the assignment according to number to the management classification system. "Pure" designations were based on the classification that would have been made using the ratings only, without regard for other institutional considerations.

*Actual designations* began with the movement of some men out of the first dormitory to make room for new Admissions and Orientation Program. Of the men who moved to one of the general units, 15 went to the dormitory for the more aggressive men, 26 to the less aggressive dormitory, and 13 to the third, non-extreme unit. Approximately one week after the moves out of the A&O unit, the necessary moves between the two dormitories designated for the extreme groups were made. Only those men whose behavior rating scores indicated that they were undoubtedly in the wrong living unit were moved. This second wave of moves cleared the two extreme dormitories of men who belonged to the other extreme. In this second series of moves, 16 men went from the aggressive dormitory, to the less aggressive dormitory, while 23 men moved in the opposite direction. In the third and less critical moves from the dormitory designated for neither extreme, 10 men moved to the aggressive dormitory and 2 inmates moved to the less aggressive dormitory. In summary, of the 563 men in the initial population of May 1977, 105 moved from one unit to another. With all of the rating and classification, the vast majority

of men remained in their original dormitory.

*Pure designations* were made on the basis of the behavioral ratings and without consideration of other institution factors. To the extent that these ratings reflect actual behaviors of the inmates, they would provide the basis of an ideal classification based on a person's performance. In the study of relationship between the behavioral ratings and the MMPI types, these pure designations were of the major interest. To be classified in an extreme group, an individual had to have ratings equal to a score of 65 or more in the relevant scales.

The correspondence between the pure and actual designations is shown in Table 2, which presents the numbers of men actually living in each dormitory according to their rated behavior type

after the moves. The majority of men (70%) in the institution were rated as non-extreme inmates (Behavior Rating Type D). This was expected, bearing in mind that the number of troublesome inmates was known to be a small percentage of the total population. The extreme groups (Behavior Rating Types B and C) each accounted for 13% of the population, while 3% of the men showed indications of both Behavior Rating Types B and C.

Within the dormitories, the overwhelming majority of men were living in the unit indicated by their rating type. That is, in Unit D, 93% of the men were Type D. Unit C was divided primarily between behavior Types D (56%) and Type C (36%), while Unit B was divided between Type D (48%) and Type B (45%). In the

**Table 2**  
Distribution of Behavior Rating Types by Actual Unit Assignment

Rating Type	Unit Assignments				Total
	A	B	C	D	
Type D	78	67	93	159	397
of type	20%	17%	23%	40%	70%/total
of unit	89%	48%	56%	93%	
Type C	4	4	60	6	74
of type	5%	5%	81%	8%	13%/total
of unit	4%	3%	36%	4%	
Type B	3	63	4	4	74
of type	4%	85%	5%	5%	13%/total
of unit	3%	45%	2%	2%	
Mixed Type	3	5	8	2	18
of type	17%	28%	44%	11%	3%/total
of unit	3%	4%	5%	1%	
Total	88	139	165	171	563
	16%	25%	29%	30%	100%

first move, Unit A tended to retain inmates rated as Type D, with 89% of the caseload being of that type.

The results of the behavioral ratings of the inmates and the subsequent moves of inmates from one dormitory to another indicate that differential ratings can be obtained on inmates and at least in the short run, the institution population can be managed according to behavior types. From a conceptual perspective, the next question was how these behavioral rating types would correspond with the already determined MMPI types. From a practical perspective, the next question was whether or not such a system could be implemented and used in an ongoing, programmatic fashion.

#### *Behavior Rating Types as Related to MMPI Types*

Although the primary basis for the categorization of the initial population was the behavior ratings, MMPI scores were also available for the majority of the men. To determine the relationship of the inmate types based on behavior ratings to the MMPI types based on profile similarity, these two classifications were compared. The results of the comparisons are presented in Table 3. Of the 563 men in the initial population, MMPI types were available for 429 men. There were 68 inmates for whom the MMPI was not available, and for 66 men the MMPI results were listed as "Unclassified" because the profile simply did not fit any of the existing MMPI types or because the profile was considered to be invalid.

The distribution of men according to MMPI types in this sample was similar to the distribution found in the orig-

inal Tallahassee study based on the admissions to the institution from November 1970 to November 1972. As in that earlier group, the largest group was category Item which was the least disturbed group among the inmates. In this sample, Item accounted for 21% of the men for whom MMPI's were classified. The second largest group in the May 1977 sample was How, the group considered to be the most disturbed. The third largest group, Able, has an average MMPI profile reflecting the high energy level and impulsivity often seen in inmates; other personality difficulties were not indicated by the Able group. Thus, two of the three most populous MMPI types could be considered to be reasonably healthy or non-disturbed groups.

Type D inmates, as determined by the behavior ratings, were those who had either no elevated behavior rating scores greater than 65 or had elevated scores only on Scale IV (Manipulative). These men were believed to have shown no predilection toward acting out aggressively against others or being acted out against by other men. The distribution by MMPI type is shown in Table 3. As would be expected, the MMPI groups of Item and Able were both overrepresented in Type D. The largest single MMPI group in Type D was Item and its percentage in Type D was greater than its percentage within the total institution. The results for Easy and George also showed those groups to be overrepresented in Type D. The MMPI types that were most elevated and indicative of past difficulty, How and Charlie, were underrepresented in Type D, as was Delta. Generally, the men whose behavior ratings suggested lack

**Table 3**  
Distribution of MMPI Types by Behavior Rating Types  
**Behavior Rating Types**

MMPI Type		D	C	B	Mixed	Total
Able	(N)	50	4	5	3	62
	(%)	81%	6%	8%	5%	14%
Baker	(N)	7	1	3	0	11
	(%)	64%	9%	27%	0%	3%
Charlie	(N)	27	10	8	2	47
	(%)	57%	21%	17%	4%	11%
Delta	(N)	19	7	8	3	37
	(%)	51%	19%	22%	8%	9%
Easy	(N)	20	2	1	0	23
	(%)	87%	9%	4%	0%	5%
Foxtrot	(N)	23	3	6	3	35
	(%)	66%	9%	17%	9%	8%
George	(N)	24	4	4	0	32
	(%)	75%	12%	12%	0%	8%
How	(N)	51	17	5	3	76
	(%)	67%	22%	7%	4%	18%
Item	(N)	72	7	12	0	91
	(%)	79%	8%	13%	0%	21%
Jupiter	(N)	10	2	3	0	15
	(%)	67%	13%	20%	0%	4%
Total	(N)	303	57	55	14	429
	(%)	71%	13%	13%	3%	100%

of behavioral difficulty were also those who had the least elevated or disturbed MMPI profiles.

Type C inmates were those who had elevated scores on Scale II (Immature-Dependent) and/or Scale III (Neurotic-Anxious): these men were thought to be

most likely to be acted out against by the men in the aggressive extreme group. MMPI type How was an indication that the men did not belong in Type D, the middle group, and it was clearly overrepresented in Behavior Rating Type C. MMPI type How has the pro-

**Table 4**

Scales on the Checklist for Analysis of Life History  
as Indicators of Local Inmate Types

Life History Scales	Local Types
I Aggressive-Psychopathic	B
II Immature-Dependent	C
III Situational	D

file with the highest amount of overall elevation and is considered to be the most disturbed group. The relatively healthier MMPI types of Item and Able were underrepresented in Behavior Rating Type C.

*Type B* inmates were those who had elevated scores on Scale I (Aggressive-Psychopathic) and not on Scale II (Immature-Dependent). These were the men believed to be the most aggressive and likely to act out against others. MMPI types Charlie, Delta, and Foxtrot were the most overrepresented groups in Type B. MMPI types Easy, Able and How were underrepresented in Behavior Rating Type B.

*Mixed Type* men, rated as extreme in both the aggressive and non-aggressive directions, were those who had elevated scores in Scale I, plus an elevated score on Scale II and/or III. They were a numerically small group (14), so the trends for this group are not considered stable. Mixed Types were overrepresented in both Units B and C after the moves, with the largest number of them being found in Unit C. How and

Charlie are the most extreme MMPI types and so it would be expected that men rated as most extreme would likely be men from these MMPI types. MMPI types Delta and Foxtrot may also be considered disturbed and were overrepresented in the Mixed Type. MMPI types Item, George, and Easy obtain more benign profiles and were underrepresented. For this Mixed Type, being rated as extreme is often corroborated by membership in some of the elevated MMPI Types.

There are definite relationships between the classifications made according to the behavioral ratings done by the staff and the classifications based on the inmate's MMPI scores. The unremarkable group (Type D) shows an overrepresentation of men with the MMPI types of Item, Able, and Easy, and these MMPI types are among the least elevated profile groups. Those thought to be potential victims (Type C) had the highest percentage of MMPI Type How. Those considered likely to act out against others (Type B) had higher proportions of Charlie, Delta, and Foxtrot.

## **Inmate Management Classification as an Ongoing Process**

Classification of the initial FCI population in May 1977 was accomplished through persistent and through effort of institution staff for a short period of intense activity. Once the ratings had been made, scored, and analyzed, that particular project was complete. The institution continued to receive new commitments, and the new system had to be applied to all the incoming residents. In the attempt to apply the same procedures to incoming residents, it soon became apparent that the different kinds of information being requested varied in availability and consistency. The primary elements in the classification system remained the same, that is, Behavioral Ratings and MMPI Types, but the relative emphasis changed as the system was adapted to a program designed to classify men within the first two weeks of their stay in the institution.

### *Basic Elements in the System*

*Behavior Ratings* were obtained from staff members in the Admission and Orientation Program who observed the new commitments during the first two weeks in the institution. The A&O Program was designed to make the new inmates visible to staff, to orient them to the institution and its operation, and to gather basic psychological and educational information. A major difference between the ratings from A&O staff and those ratings used in the classification of initial population was the length of the time staff members were able to observe the men. For the initial population, the majority of inmates were well-known to their program teams who were able to make judgments that would

permit the discrimination among the different types of inmates. Thus, the ratings were extremely useful and were indeed the primary basis of that classification. When staff were asked to make the same kinds of ratings after knowing an inmate only two weeks, however, the ratings were less distinctive. By comparison, in the initial population 29% of the inmates were categorized in the extreme categories. In the six months following the introduction of the Management Classification System, only 10% of the men would have been rated in the extreme category. The assignment figures are shown in Table 5. In the A&O procedures, the ratings obtained could not match the level of those from the initial population classification.

*MMPI scores* were obtained from the inmates in A&O in the same way as they had been collected from the men in the initial population. For the most part, inmates continued to take the MMPI in a group testing situation. For those who could not read, a tape recorded version was available. The distribution of men according to the MMPI type during the first six months is presented in Table 6, and the proportions within the MMPI groups were approximately the same as had been found in the sample from the Tallahassee Research cohort as well as in the initial population of May 1977. Because the ratings became less distinctive while the MMPI type indicators remained at the same level, the MMPI types became more important in the classification of the men.



**Table 5**  
**Behavior Rating Types by Actual Unit Assignments**  
**Unit Assignment**

Rating Type	None	A	B	C	D	Total
Type D	24	15	101	91	107	338
of type	7%	4%	30%	27%	32%	90%
of unit	89%	88%	90%	85%	94%	
Type C	2	2	2	15	4	25
of type	8%	8%	8%	60%	16%	7%
of unit	7%	12%	2%	14%	4%	
Type B	1	0	9	1	2	13
of type	8%	0%	69%	8%	15%	3%
of unit	4%	0%	8%	1%	2%	
Mixed Type	0	0	0	0	1	1
of type	0%	0%	0%	0%	100	0%
of unit	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	
Total	27	17	112	107	114	377
	7%	4%	30%	28%	30%	100%

*Record Review* was added to the classification procedures in the A&O program. For the initial population, this aspect was subsumed in the behavior ratings because the teams by virtue of their knowledge of their caseloads incorporated record information in making the behavior ratings. For the record review the Check List for Analysis of Life History Records developed by Dr. Quay was completed by the case manager designated as the new commitment screener. The three scales on the Checklist are I. Aggressive-Psychopathic, II. Immature-Dependent, and III. Situational. These three scales are similar to the three Behavior Types B, C, and D, so that elevated scores on the scales were taken as indications of membership in one of the three inmate categories.

The Checklist is based on the man's Presentence Investigation (PSI), and this document is not available on all incoming residents. In the first six months of operation, the PSI was available on 39% of the cases. The average scores on the three scales for the first six months were all less than 50. The ratings were used to corroborate or refute the classifications and were found to be helpful in some cases. As with the Behavior Ratings, the scores typically were not elevated enough to be the basis of a classification.

#### *Added information*

Physical size had been taken into account implicitly in the classification of the initial population, with the bigger and stronger inmates tending to be

**Table 6**  
MMPI Types by Actual Unit Assignments  
**Unit Assignment**

MMPI Type		None	A	B	C	D	Total
Able	(N)	0	1	26	6	18	51
	(%)	0%	2%	51%	12%	35%	17%
Baker	(N)	0	0	0	4	1	5
	(%)	0%	0%	0%	80%	20%	2%
Charlie	(N)	0	0	12	4	4	20
	(%)	0%	0%	60%	20%	20%	7%
Delta	(N)	0	1	11	3	8	23
	(%)	0%	4%	48%	13%	35%	8%
Easy	(N)	1	1	3	2	9	16
	(%)	6%	6%	19%	13%	56%	5%
Foxtrot	(N)	1	0	14	1	4	20
	(%)	5%	0%	70%	5%	20%	7%
George	(N)	1	4	3	16	7	31
	(%)	3%	13%	10%	52%	23%	11%
How	(N)	7	6	18	26	7	64
	(%)	11%	9%	28%	41%	11%	22%
Item	(N)	3	2	8	11	32	56
	(%)	5%	4%	14%	20%	57%	19%
Jupiter	(N)	0	0	1	6	1	8
	(%)	0%	0%	13%	75%	13%	3%
Total	(N)	13	15	96	79	91	294
	(%)	4%	5%	33%	27%	31%	100%

categorized for Unit B and less physically developed men tending to be categorized for Unit C. The height and weight information was explicitly added to the A&O information collected on incoming men in September, 1977.

Race was an item of information available on the men coming through the

A&O program. *Estimated intelligence and educational functioning level* were added to the information collected as part of the A&O procedures and made available in the management classification. Age data were also available although the majority of commitments continued to be in the 17-24 age range.

### *Institutional Considerations*

Being a classification system designed to assist in management decisions, it is understandable that institution considerations would have an effect on the decisions made. *Equivalent assignment* was a goal established before the system was made operational; this refers to the numbers of men assigned to each of the three general dormitories. It was stipulated that each unit would receive approximately the same number, so that no one unit would receive more or less than its share of the incoming residents. At the end of the six-month period, the assignments to the units were 112, and 107, and 114 for B, C, and D Units respectively.

*Racial balance* was another institutional consideration which was taken into account in the decisions. Because it is the policy of the Bureau of Prisons not to have segregated units, the racial balance within the units was maintained close to the overall institution level. The initial population was 54% black and 46% white/other. At the end of the first six months in the system, the institution percentages were 57% black and 43% white/other.

### *The Classification Procedure*

The classification decisions were the result of reviewing several factors in each individual case in addition to the institutional considerations already discussed. The information used was examined in the order of significance to the procedures, so that the first data taken into account became the MMPI Type. From this first fact, a man was tentatively categorized as likely to be in one of the extreme minority groups or in the

unremarkable majority. The second factor examined was the information in the Behavioral Ratings and the comments made by the staff in conjunction with the ratings. The ratings tend to be below the cutting points used in the initial population; the added comments sometimes made up for the lack of distinctiveness in the behaviors checked. Information from the ratings was compared with the tentative decisions made from the MMPI Type. The data were seen as confirming or refuting the first tentative classification. Thirdly, the record review scores were studied to determine whether or not the record indicated a definite direction for the man.

As the procedures evolved, before a final decision was reached, the physical size of the man in question was considered. Age, intelligence level, and educational functioning level were noted to see if these factors added anything critical to the understanding of where the man was likely to get along the best within the institution.

### *Classifications of the First Six Months*

Within the first six months of operation, information was collected on 377 men who were committed to FCI. As mentioned, these men were assigned to the three general units almost equally with 112 (30%) going to Unit B, 107 (28%) going to Unit C, 114 (30%) to Unit D, and the remaining 17 (4%) being Study and Observation cases and not assigned to any dormitory.

In terms of the racial balance, the incoming residents included 199 Black (53%) and 177 White/other men (47%). Unit D received slightly more Whites/other than Blacks (52%v.

48%), Unit B received a higher percentage of Blacks (58% v. 42%), while C's assignments were evenly divided (50% v. 50%).

*Classification according to Behavior Rating Types.* On the basis of the ratings alone, 90% or 332 of the first months commitments would have been rated as Type D, the unremarkable majority type inmate. Because of the physical arrangements of the institution, these men obviously could not all be assigned to Unit D, the unit designated for men of this type. The largest single group of this Behavior Rating Type (32%) actually went to Unit D, and the rest were sent to the other two units.

Of the 10% of the incoming residents who would have been categorized as extreme on the basis of Behavior Ratings alone, the vast majority went to the appropriate dormitory. Twenty-five men were rated for Unit C and of these men two went to Unit B, 15 went to Unit C, and four went to Unit D. Similarly, of the 13 men rated Type B inmates, nine went to that unit, one went to Unit C, and the other two were sent to Unit D. The classifications made were generally consistent with the ratings, but the ratings did not provide enough information to be a singular or primary basis of the A&O classifications.

*Classifications according to MMPI Types.* Almost every new commitment completed the MMPI during the first six months of the new classification system. Approximately 80% of these men could be categorized on the basis of their MMPI profiles into one of the 10 MMPI types, with 10% of the men not having usable MMPI scores and 12% of the men being Unclassified because their

profiles either: a) were considered to be of questionable validity, or b) the profile did not resemble any MMPI type closely enough to be placed in one of the MMPI types. The MMPI type was taken as the first indication of a classification direction, and the other data were then reviewed when making the final assignments.

Unit D, as would be expected, received in its assignments the highest percentage of minimally elevated, non-disturbed MMPI types. Specifically, the MMPI types of Item, Able, and Easy were over-represented in the men sent to Unit D directly from A&O. On the other hand, the more elevated and disturbed groups of How, Charlie, and to a lesser extent George were under-represented in the men sent to that Unit. In keeping with one of the aims of the system, Unit D was sent those men who were expected to be able to live without the special attention required by those sent to the units housing the more extreme men, Units B and C.

It cannot be overemphasized that in the Units B and C, the absolute numbers of men who were actually members of the extreme minority groups were exceedingly small. In the nominations made of the initial population, scarcely 10% of the men were identified in a broad categorization of "troublemaker." In the Behavior Ratings during the first six months, again 10% were rated as being such inmates. Of the MMPI types, those categories taken to indicate the likelihood of belonging to either extreme were How, Foxtrot, Charlie, Delta, and perhaps George and Baker. The four most definite categories accounted for 44% of the MMPI classified men. Bear-

ing this fact in mind, the MMPI types assigned to Units B and C will be discussed.

The extreme minority assigned to Unit C were those men who for one reason or another were thought to be less aggressive and acting out toward others. The MMPI types overrepresented in that Unit's assignments were How, George, and Baker. How is the most elevated MMPI group and this group probably included the highest percentage of MMPI's considered to be of questionable validity. More and more men whose profiles resemble this group are being asked to retake the test, with the explanation that their scores raise questions about the way they took the test the first time. MMPI type George is characterized by impulsivity and depression, and MMPI type Baker (a small group) tends to be seen as worrying and neurotic. The MMPI scores of these men suggest the need for supporting and sensitive staff who are not upset in the face of emotion or unusual behavior. The MMPI types underrepresented in the Unit C assignments were largely those that were seen as more appropriate for Unit B or Unit D. That is, MMPI types Foxtrot, Easy, Delta, Able and Item were all underrepresented in Unit C's assignments. Of those groups mentioned, both Item and Able were sent to Unit D in proportions greater than the institution average, and these men were seen as being able to live in the dormitory where most men do not require special attention or equally well in the dormitory with the aggressive extreme, Unit B.

Unit B received a group in which the overrepresented MMPI types were Able,

Foxtrot, Charlie, and Delta. Able types were sent to that Unit because of their presumed survival skills, while the other three MMPI types were sent there on the assumption that they were more likely than most inmates to act out aggressively within the institution. The MMPI types underrepresented in this Unit B assignments were George (already discussed in Unit C), Item and Easy (the healthiest groups, therefore, most suited for Unit D).

#### *Conclusions from the first six months.*

It was possible to apply an adaptation of the classification system used with the initial population. By the end of two weeks within the institution, the majority of men could be assigned to a dormitory in an arrangement designed to maximize their institutional adjustment. In addition to the finding that a classification system could work in a setting such as the FCI, it was evident that some modifications in the data used would be necessary. The Behavior Ratings were not adequate as a primary basis as they had been with the initial population. The MMPI types, while providing a helpful starting point for the classification, required consideration of other information in the making of the final assignments.

In identifying men as likely to belong to one of the extreme groups, some MMPI types in some cases were actually seen in both extremes albeit more in one direction than in the other. It is possible that an investigation of the actual MMPI scores of the men assigned to the extreme groups would reveal meaningful scale score differences, so that the MMPI types could be identified as subgroups such as How<sub>1</sub> and How<sub>2</sub>,

for example. Ten MMPI types should be enough to account for most incoming residents, but it is possible the realignment of some subgroups might provide a more efficient classification.

The classifications made in this program were based on a minimal set of assumptions, dividing residents into potentially three groups: those likely to act out against others, those likely to be acted out against, and the rest belonging to neither group. It was recognized that individuals express an infinite num-

ber of nuances with respect to personality types. In a situation with less limited resources, it might be possible to discern four, five, or six, or more distinct groups of men and to house these men in four, five, or six, or more different types of units. The present classification effort clearly worked within the setting of four open dormitories and the need to classify young adults in a way to minimize the amount of violence and stress in the living arrangements.

### **Evaluation of the Classification System**

In research situations, one ideal is to isolate the effects of an independent variable with measures before and after introduction of the variable. The implementation of the classification system at Tallahassee approximated this situation in that many of the institution variables remained essentially the same before and after the classification system was begun. The institution count remained approximately the same, the target population did not change, programs were not changed significantly, staff size was constant, the administrative organization of the institution was not changed markedly. The single major change was the classification system and the resultant issues that it forced. The institution, of course, continued to make efforts to improve existing services, accountability, sanitation, operation of the maximum security unit, and other aspects of the institution. These efforts were primarily carried out through the refinements of existing procedures rather than sweeping changes in operations.

#### *Management Information System*

As part of the program to evaluate the

classification system and its effects on the institution, a data retrieval system was developed following earlier efforts at the institution to monitor administrative measures of performance. Information on various aspects of institution operations were tabulated and compared with the activities of earlier periods. This reporting system was based on a variety of data collection procedures, gathering information from the functional units and from several centralized offices within the institution. Results were published weekly as the institution "Management Information System." A copy of a weekly report, which summarized the information from the week of March 31, 1978, is shown in Table 7.

The six general categories of information were these:

- I. Caseload
- II. Management Classifications
- III. Releases
- IV. Incident Reports, Assaults
- V. Escapes, Furloughs, Other
- VI. Education Enrollments

Caseload information included tabulations of the men actually living in the

Table 7

Federal Correctional Institution  
Tallahassee, Florida 32304

Date  
March 31, 1978

## WEEKLY REPORT

	A	B	C	D	A/O	Total
Caseload, Total	98	127	138	150	63	576
Count	96	121	132	146	56	551
Cellhouse	2	6	6	4	7	25
Percent Black	51	61	54	57	48	55
Percent White/Other	49	39	46	43	52	45
Management Classifications, Total	0	6	8	11	1	26
Black	0	2	2	6	1	11
White/Other	0	4	6	5	0	15
Releases, Total	1	5	6	3	0	15
Transfers	0	1	4	2	0	7
Releases to Detainer	0	0	0	0	0	0
Releases to EGT/MR	0	0	0	0	0	0
Releases to Parole	0	0	0	0	0	0
Releases to CTC	1	3	2	1	0	7
Other	0	1	0	0	0	1
Percent CTC	100	100	100	100	0	100
Incident Reports	0	2	3	1	0	6
IDC Referrals	0	2	0	0	0	2
Assault Incidents W/O Weapon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assault Incidents With Weapon	0	0	0	0	0	0
Escapes Outside	0	0	0	0	0	0
Escapes Inside	0	0	0	0	0	0
Escape Attempts	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furlough Escapes	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furlough Incidents	0	0	0	0	0	0
Furloughs Overnight	3	0	3	0	0	6
Furloughs One Day	0	0	5	6	0	11
Unit Meetings (Town Hall)	2	2	1	2	0	7
Administrative Remedies Filed	0	0	0	0	1	1
Education Enrollments, Total	64	113	104	100	4	385
Adult Basic Education	7	22	43	22	0	94
GED	11	29	27	27	1	95

Table 7 (Continued)

	A	B	C	D	A/O	Total
College	13	4	1	10	0	28
Vocational Training	29	44	25	31	3	132
Apprenticeship Program	3	1	0	1	0	5
Recreation	1	13	8	9	0	31

A=A/N and E Units

A/O=A/S and Holdovers

unit plus the number of assigned to the cellhouse, the maximum security section of the institution. The dominant racial group was black. In keeping with the policy of not having segregated units, the racial balance was monitored weekly comparing percent black with percent white/other.

*Management Classifications* reflected the assignments made to each unit at the end of each week. Among the general units a balance was established so that the units received comparable numbers of new assignments. The racial composition of the assignments permitted review of the trends of the incoming residents, as well as the results of the assignments to the units.

*Incident Reports and Assaults* provided information about the numbers of written reports of institution rule infractions from each of the units. Not all infractions are serious enough to warrant a written report. Of those incidents written up, less than half are carried beyond the first formal level of institution discipline: the unit team. If the issue cannot be resolved at this level, it is referred to the next level, the Institution Discipline Committee which can make an administrative decision and/or refer

the case for possible criminal prosecution in the Federal Court System. Assaults are typically a minority of the serious infractions, and information whenever weapons were used reflects another aspect of security and control within the institution.

*Escapes, Furloughs, and Other* information was useful in monitoring institution procedures in several areas. Tallahassee was a medium security institution which had, in general, reduced escapes and escape attempts to a minimum. Furloughs and furlough incidents referred to the success of efforts to permit inmates to visit the community for specific purposes and to return to the institution within established time frames. The number of unit meetings indicated the number of town meetings within the unit: these meetings were held to disseminate information to the population and to provide them with an opportunity to raise issues of concern to them. Administrative Remedies represented formal grievance procedures initiated by inmates after failure to resolve problems in an informal manner. The Administrative Remedy was the last step before taking an issue up with the Federal Court System.



*Education Enrollments* were included because the majority of inmates were enrolled in some kind of education program. It was anticipated that a change in general climate of the institution might be reflected in differential participation in programs, with education being one of the main indications of such participation.

#### *Before and After Comparisons*

Because information had been systematically collected before the introduction of the Management Classification System, it was possible to compare institution performance before and after the system was introduced in May 1977. Measures on the Management Information System for the nine months preceding the quarter in which the system was begun (July 1976-March 1977) were compared with nine months afterward (July 1977-March 1978). Results are summarized in the Tables 8-11. The experimental units in this study were B, C, and D because these units remained essentially the same in both

periods, except that their populations were determined by Management Classification decisions. Unit A was divided between the A&O program for new commitments and the Voluntary Programs Unit which selected men from Units B, C, and D. The information for Unit A will be reported as part of institutional results. For statistical tests of differences, the comparisons will be made among Units B, C, and D.

*Average Cell House Count* by unit reflects the number of men sent to detention and is presented in Table 8. It is readily seen that there was no decrease in the numbers of men sent to the maximum security unit. In fact, the overall figure reflects an increase in the totals (37 v. 46). There are some specific explanations for the unit numbers. For example, in Unit C which shows the greatest total increase (9.0 v. 17.3) there was a serious assault involving one victim and multiple assailants in early May. The aggressors were kept in the cell house after the

**Table 8**

Average Cell House Count by Unit Before and After  
Introduction of the Management Classification System

Unit	Before (July 76-Mar 77)				After (July 77-Mar 78)			
	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Average Total	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	Average Total
A&O					5	8	9	7.3
A	19	12	4	11.7	2	3	4	3.0
B	5	11	8	8.0	9	14	10	11.0
C	8	6	13	9.0	19	22	11	17.3
D	6	9	10	8.3	4	11	7	7.3
Total	38	38	35	37.0	39	58	41	41.0

**Table 9**  
Incident Reports by Unit Before and After  
Introduction of the Management Classification System

Unit	Before (July 76-Mar 77)			Total	After (July 77-Mar 78)			Total
	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>		Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>3</sub>	
A&O					7	12	16	35
A	75	36	36	157	12	18	9	39
B	41	44	46	131	87	59	77	223
C	66	54	74	194	95	65	66	226
D	62	59	52	173	51	59	35	145
Total	244	203	208	655	252	213	203	668

case was referred for court consideration and were kept there until a legal resolution was reached. By the time of the last quarter, the Cell House population for that unit had returned to a figure closer to those of the other dormitories. Unit B's Cell House numbers show the anticipated rise in men sent from the living general areas to detention, while Unit D's Cell House count perhaps reflects a modest decrease (8.3 v. 7.3). As stated, there was not an overall decrease in the Cell House count. Instead, there was seen to be something of an increase.

*Incident Reports* or written reports of institution rule infractions are shown in Table 9, and the numbers before and after the Management Classification System show no appreciable change (655 v. 668). There were differences between the units with Unit D showing a modest decrease (173 v. 145) while the units housing the extremes showed an increase in these numbers (B-131 v. 223; C-194 v. 226). At this discipline

level, it was concluded that Management Classification did not make a difference in the overall level of reports. There was, however, a highly significant difference in the distribution of reports in the three experimental dorms, B, C, and D ( $\chi^2 = 20.25$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $p = .001$ ).

*Referrals to the Institution Discipline Committee (IDC)* are made on those Incident Reports that are deemed to be too serious to be handled at the unit team level. At this second formal level, the figures indicate a drop in the number of cases being referred to the IDC (315 v. 289). The numbers of IDC referrals by units does not follow the relatively straightforward numbers of the incident reports. Unit D shows a slight increase (57 v. 69). Unit B, as would be expected, shows a noted increase in IDC referrals (75 v. 120); more than half of the Incident Reports from Unit B were eventually referred to IDC. Unit C, on the other hand, showed a decrease in IDC referrals (95 v. 77) and only

**Table 10**

**Institution Disciplinary Committee Referrals by Units Before and After  
Introduction of the Management Classification System**

Unit	Before (July 76-Mar 77)			Total	After (July 77-Mar 78)			Total
	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>1</sub>		Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>1</sub>	
A&O					1	2	5	8
A	46	28	14	88	3	6	6	15
B	26	24	25	75	45	36	39	120
C	26	29	40	95	39	20	18	77
D	16	27	14	57	30	23	16	69
Total	114	108	93	315	118	87	84	289

one-third of Unit C's Incident Reports were referred to IDC. Among the experimental dorms B, C, and D, there was a statistically significant difference in the distribution of IDC referrals ( $\chi^2 = 10.66$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $p = .005$ ).

*Number of Assaults* in some ways is the most easily understood measure in the evaluation of the Management Classification System. A major impetus for

initiating this program was the level of violence in all of the dormitories, and a primary goal of the system was to make at least some of the institution safer. The results of the assault data are shown in Table 2. Comparing the before and after periods there was a 46% decrease in assaults within the institution (24 v. 13). Within this general decrease in assaults, the patterns for the experi-

**Table 11**

**Total Number of Assaults by Units Before and After  
Introduction of the Management Classification System**

Unit	Before (July 76-Mar-77)			Total	After (July 77-Mar 78)			Total
	Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>1</sub>		Q <sub>2</sub>	Q <sub>1</sub>	Q <sub>1</sub>	
A&O					0	0	0	0
A	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
B	1	2	2	5	5	3	1	9
C	0	4	2	6	2	2	0	4
D	4	3	4	11	0	0	0	0
Total	6	10	8	24	7	5	1	13

mental units show statistically significant differences in distribution ( $\chi^2 = 10.96$ ,  $df = 2$ ,  $p = .001$ ). This decrease is most remarkable for Unit D which had 11 assaults in the Before period and none in the After period. Unit C showed a slight decrease in assaults (6 v. 4), and Unit B showed a definite increase in these figures (5 v. 9). Unit B received the inmates categorized as most likely to act out, and this fact was known to staff and inmates. In the first quarter after the system began, Unit B showed the greatest increase in assaults, fulfilling the prediction of anticipated tension. In subsequent quarters, however, with a continued assignment of aggressive inmates to Unit B, the number of assaults decreased to a level comparable with the rest of the institution. In the last quarter of the period being presented, the only assault within the entire institution was attributable to Unit B.

### *Conclusions and Implications*

*Level of violence decreased.* One of the stated objectives of this program was to make the institution safer for both staff and inmates. It seems evident that the absolute level of violence within the institution was lessened after the introduction of the classification system and assignments to living units. As expressed by one administrator, a serious assault has become a rare event rather than an expected occurrence in the institution.

*Differential reduction in violence.* Although the total institution experienced a decrease in violence, this was not equally true across units. The experimental unit receiving the least troublesome men, Unit D, showed the most

dramatic improvement on this issue, with no assaults after the system was introduced. This record was matched by the Voluntary Programs Unit; however, that unit accepted only those men who had agreed to participate in an intensive program designed for self-help and the unit included a smaller number of men. The personal characteristics of the men assigned to Unit D, the developing positive peer culture which attempted to remove violence as an acceptable problem-solving approach, and the expectation of success within the institution that was promulgated by both staff and inmates all seemed to have positive effects.

Within the unit where the aggressive types were assigned, Unit B, the initial reaction was in the opposite direction. The amount of violence and the number of assaults increased immediately after the classification was introduced, representing a deterioration of unit performance. In spite of the fact that this unit was being sent the men most likely to act out against others, in the last reporting quarter assaults were almost as low in that unit as in the other units.

*Inmate morale.* From inmate report, the classification is well understood by the inmate population. Many of the incoming men can make a reasonable appraisal of their own circumstances and the likelihood that they will be assigned to a particular unit. One quantifiable aspect of inmate morale is the number of Administrative Remedies filed by inmates. These remedies represent the last formal step in the complaint process before a matter is submitted to the U. S. Courts. The number of remedies filed

before and after the classification system began increased slightly (120 v. 143). At face value, this would suggest that there has been no gain in this area. Using national statistics, however, the number of remedies has at least doubled in the typical institution as inmates become more adept at using the process. Maintaining a constant level of remedies in the face of great anticipated increases is taken as a measure of progress and a reflection of improved inmate morale.

*Staff performance and morale.* Effects of the system can be seen in measures other than those focused on inmate performance. Recent evaluations by personnel from outside the institution have commented on the attitude, communication level, and performance of the staff in present arrangements. The functioning of unit management in the institution, long a subject of disagreement and some tension, seems to have been made more understandable and acceptable to evaluators from outside the institution. Unit management audits have reflected this optimistic, forward looking outlook expressed by the performance of the staff. In another area, audits of the custodial staff have reflected their increased capacity to work on issues particularly relevant to their job, within the explicit frame of reference of the more homogeneous groupings.

*Staff utilization.* With the segregation of troublesome inmates from those not likely to be troublesome, it was hoped that institution staff could be utilized more efficiently. This was borne out in the experience of the institution in this study because the remarkable decrease in assaults noted in the non-extreme unit was actually accomplished with a lessened amount of staff coverage. This reduction in need for staff in that unit composed of middle group inmates permitted extra coverage in the other units housing the inmates predicted to need more support and security. These results support the differential use of institution custodial staff in response to differing inmate requirements.

In summary, the classification system has implications for inmate classification, institution management, and resource utilization. The MMPI types as described can provide a strong beginning base for classification, although there is a need for further research and perhaps refinements of some groups. Assignment of men with compatible types to the same living unit can contribute to the improved functioning of an institution and the desired effects of lessened institutional violence. With respect to resource utilization, inmate groups most likely to experience difficulty can receive the increased staff attention that is needed, and thus staff can be assigned more efficiently.

## References

Dahlstrom, W. G., Welsh, G. S., & Dahlstrom, L. E. *An MMPI handbook, Volume II: Research applications*. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1975.

Megargee, E. I. (Ed.) A new classification system for criminal offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 1977, 2, 107-216.

Megargee, E. I., Hokanson, J. E., & Spielberger, C. D. The Behavior Research Program at the Federal Correctional Institution, Tallahassee. I. Goals and initial data collection procedures. *FCI Research Reports*, 1971, 4, 1-48. Federal Correctional Institution, Tallahassee, FL 32304.

Megargee, E. I., McGuire, J. S., Elion, V. H., Steuber, H., Nuehring, R. E., and Gilbert, D. The Behavior Research Program at the Federal Correctional Institution, Tallahassee. II. Later data collection procedures. *FCI Research Reports*, 1972, 3, 1-34. Federal Correctional Institution, Tallahassee, FL 32304.

Megargee, E. I., & Bohn, M. J., Jr. A new classification system for criminal offenders: Empirically determined characteristics of the ten types. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, 1977, 4, 149-210.

Quay, H. C. *The differential behavioral classification of the adult male offender: Interim results and procedures*. Report to Bureau of Prisons, U. S. Department of Justice (J-1C-22-253), 1973.

Smith, W. A., & Fenton, C. E. Unit management in a penitentiary: A practical experience. *Federal Probation*, 1978, 42 (3), 40-46.

### Footnotes

This research was supported by the Office of Research, Bureau of Prisons, and the Federal Correctional Institution, Tallahassee, Florida. The conclusions are not presented as official views and/or policies of the Bureau of Prisons.

The author wishes to thank these colleagues for their careful reading of earlier versions of this paper and their assistance: Suzanne E. Bohn, R. D. Brewer, C. E. Fenton, E. I. Megargee, and W. A. Smith.

Portions of this paper were presented at the annual meetings of the International Differential Treatment Association, Denver, April 1978, and the International Association of Applied Psychology, Munich, July 1978.

## LIST OF PREVIOUS PUBLICATIONS

### FCI Technical and Treatment Notes

#### 1970, Vol. 1

- No. 1 HAVEN, H. The MMPI with Incarcerated Adult and Delinquent Offenders. *Not Available.*
- No. 2 STUMPHAUSER, J. Behavior Modification with Juvenile Delinquents: A Critical Review. *Not Available.*

#### 1971, Vol. 2

- No. 1 LANTZ, H. & INGRAM, G. The Psychopath and His Response to Behavior Modification Techniques. *Not Available.*
- No. 2 MEKETON M. J. Counseling Offenders through the Looking Glass and Other Schemes of Desperation.

#### 1972, Vol. 3

- No. 1 SWARTSFAGER, AMES K. Family Oriented Therapy Groups for Youthful Offenders.
- No. 2 FENLON, SISTER MAUREEN. An Innovative Project for Wives and Families of Prisoners. *Not Available.*
- No. 3 VANDERBECK, DAVID JOHN. An Examination of the Use of Adjective Checklists in Measuring Anger States and Hostile Traits.

#### 1974, Vol. 4

- No. 1 BOHN, JR., MARTIN, J. WAZAK, RICHARD A., & STORY, BILL R. Transition to Functional Units, 1973-1974.

#### 1975, Vol. 5

- No. 1 KLING, J. KENNETH. Current Trends in the Treatment of Incarcerated Alcoholic Offenders.
- No. 2 FOWLER, M. G., MEGARGEE, E. Psychometric Characteristics of Megargee's Work Performance and Interpersonal Adjustment Rating Schedules.

#### 1976, Vol. 6

- No. 1 MEGARGEE, EDWIN I. & DORHOUT, BRENT. Revision and Refinement of an MMPI-Based Typology of Youthful Offenders. *Not Available.*



## FCI Research Reports

### 1969, Vol. 1

- No. 1 SOSA, J. Vascular Effects of Frustration on Passive and Aggressive Members of a Clinical Population. *Not Available*
- No. 2 MEGARGEE, E., PRICE, A. C. FROHWIRTH, R., & LEVINE R. Time Orientation of Youthful Prison Inmates. *Not Available.*
- No. 3 LEVINE, R. The MMPI and Revised Beta as Predictors of Academic and Vocational Success in a Correctional Institution. *Not Available.*
- No. 4 MEGARGEE, E. Conscientious Objector's Scores on the MMPI O-H Scale (Overcontrolled Hostilities). *Not Available*
- No. 5 HAVEN, H. Racial Differences on the MMPI O-H (Overcontrolled Hostilities). *Not Available.*
- No. 6 STUMPHAUZER, J. Increased Delay of Gratification in Young Prison Inmates through Imitation of High-Delay Peer-Models. *Not Available.*
- No. 7 MAUK, W. The Effects of Short-Term Tasks and Financial Incentive on the Educational Achievement of Young Prison Inmates. *Not Available.*

### 1970, Vol. 2

- No. 1 GOLDEN, R. E. Parental Identification of Psychopathic and Sub-cultural Delinquents.
- No. 2 BARTLETT., COOK, P. & PRICE, A. C. The Community Adaptation Schedule: A Validation Study on Federal Prisoners and Vocational Students.
- No. 3 WHITE, W. C., JR. Selective Modeling in Youthful Offenders with High and Low O-H (Overcontrolled Hostility) Personality Types.
- No. 4 WHEELER, C. A., JR. & MEGARGEE, E. Normative Data for 678 Federal Youthful Offenders on 79 MMPI Scales.

### 1971, Vol. 3

- No. 1 MENZIES, E., Preferences in Television Content among Violent Prisoners. *Not Available.*
- No. 2 HANSON, G. Behavior Modification of Appointment Attendance among Youthful Offenders.

### FCI Research Reports (Continued)

- No. 3 WHEELER, C. A. JR. Overcontrolled Hostility and the Perception of Violence.
- No. 4 MEGARGEE, E., HOKANSON, J., & SPIELBERGER, C. The Behavior Research Program at the Federal Correctional Institution, Tallahassee, I: Goals and Initial Data Collection Procedures. *Not Available.*
- No. 5 WHITE, W., MCADOO, W. G., & MEGARGEE, E. I. Personality Factors Associated With Over- and Undercontrolled Offenders.

#### 1972, Vol. 4

- No. 1 O'HAGAN, S. E. J. The Validation of an MMPI Scale of Sociopathy
- No. 2 MEYER, J., JR. & MEGARGEE, E. Development of an MMPI-Based Typology of Youthful Offenders. *Not Available.*
- No. 3 MEGARGEE, E., MCGUIRE, J. S., ELION, V. H., STEUBER, H., NUEHRING, R. E., & GILBERT, D. The Behavior Research Program at the Federal Correctional Institution, Tallahassee. II: Later Data Collection Procedures. *Not Available.*
- No. 4 KLING, J. KENNETH. A Comparison of Learning Performance of Primary and Secondary Psychopaths Under Material and Social Reinforcement Conditions.
- No. 5 MENZIES, ELIZABETH S. The Effects of Repeated Exposure to Televised Violence upon Attitudes towards Violence among Youthful Offenders.
- No. 6 HAVEN, HOWARD JOEL. Descriptive and Developmental Characteristics of Chronically Overcontrolled Hostile Prisoners.

#### 1973, Vol. 5

- No. 1 SPERR, EDWIN V. The Effects of Modeling and Vicarious Reinforcement upon an Impulsive Response Style of Psychopathic and Neurotic Delinquents.
- No. 2 VANDERBECK, DAVID JOHN. A Construct Validity Study of the O-H (Overcontrolled Hostility) Scale of the MMPI, Using a Social Learning Approach to the Catharsis Effect.
- No. 3 MCGUIRE, JUDITH S. Personality Adjustment Associated with Different Levels of Marijuana Use in a Youthful Offender Population.

## FCI Research Reports (Continued)

### 1974, Vol. 6

- No. 1 MEYER, JR., JAMES. Empirical Correlates of Five Meyer-Megargee Types of Youthful Offenders. *Not Available.*
- No. 2 WHEELER, JR., CHARLES A. The Relationship between Psychopathy and the Weak Automatization Cognitive Style.
- No. 3 ELION, VICTOR H. The Validity as a Discriminator of Social Deviance among Black Males.
- No. 4 BROWN, JAMES G. Internal-External Locus of Control and Adjustment in a Correctional Institution.

### 1975, Vol. 7

- No. 1 MEGARGEE, EDWIN I. Behavior Research Program: III. Report of Progress by Megargee Research Group.
- No. 2 STEUBER, HARRY B. The Prediction of Academic Achievement with the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) and California Personality Inventory (CPI) in a Correctional Institution.

### 1976, Vol. 8

- No. 1 BOYD, JEFFREY. Race of Inmate, Race of Officer, and Disciplinary Proceedings at a Federal Correctional Institution.

### 1977, Vol. 9

- No. 1 CADOW, BARBARA. The MMPI and CPI as Measures of a Prison Treatment Program.

### 1979, Vol. 10

- No. 1 BOHN, JR., MARTIN, J. Classification of Offenders in an Institution for Young Adults.

"This publication printed by Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Printing Plant, Federal Correctional Institution, Lompoc, California."

"Training in the Printing Plant at Lompoc includes an apprenticeship program in composition, camera, plate making and offset printing. This program is approved by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training and the Los Angeles, California Area Multi-Trades Joint Apprenticeship Standards."

**END**