

CORRECTIONAL SERVICE CANADA

CHANGING LIVES. PROTECTING CANADIANS.



RESEARCH REPORT

Risk Factors Related to the Initial Security Classification of Women Offenders: A Literature Review

2018 N^o R-418

Ce rapport est également disponible en français. Pour en obtenir un exemplaire, veuillez vous adresser à la Direction de la recherche, Service correctionnel du Canada, 340, avenue Laurier Ouest, Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0P9.

This report is also available in French. Should additional copies be required, they can be obtained from the Research Branch, Correctional Service of Canada, 340 Laurier Ave. West, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0P9.

**Risk Factors Related to the Initial Security Classification of Women Offenders: A
Literature Review**

Kayla A. Wanamaker

Correctional Service of Canada

November 2018

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Sebastian Baglolle for his assistance with the literature search. We would also like to thank Jennie Thompson and staff at the Women Offender Sector for their feedback and review of the methodology and search terms. Thank you to Theresia Bedard for her support on identifying and locating relevant research for inclusion in the review. Finally, a big thank you to Lynn Stewart and Kaitlyn Wardrop for reviewing drafts and providing valuable feedback.

Executive Summary

Key words: *Initial security classification, women offenders, institutional adjustment, Indigenous*

The security classification of offenders is a critical component of effective management within correctional institutions. Offenders' security level designates their living conditions, including the type of accommodation and movement allowed within the institution, as well as the programming available to them. Given the role of classification in the safety and security of institutions, it is important that offenders be classified using valid tools.

To facilitate initial security classification, the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) currently uses the Custody Rating Scale (CRS) which consists of two independently scored subscales; the Institutional Adjustment (IA) subscale that assesses risks associated with institutional misconducts, and the Security Risk (SR) subscale that measures the amount of danger the offender would pose to the public in the event of escape. Concerns have been raised that gender-neutral assessment tools (i.e., measures applied to men and women), such as the CRS, may not consider all the relevant factors for women and could result in their being incorrectly classified.

The current report reviewed the literature to identify relevant factors that could inform the initial security classification of women offenders. Evidence for potential risk factors that could be relevant across three outcomes (institutional adjustment, escape risk, and risk to the public in the event of an escape) was examined, as well as potential social history factors that could be relevant for Indigenous women offenders.

Overall, results suggested that several gender-neutral risk factors (i.e., age, criminal history, sentence length, gang membership, IQ, substance misuse, and education/employment) and factors commonly considered gender-responsive (i.e., history of trauma/abuse, mental health issues, relationship dysfunction, and parenting responsibilities) were related to institutional adjustment and/or escapes for women offenders. More research is needed to determine whether gender-responsive risk factors incrementally predict institutional outcomes over and above the contribution by gender-neutral risk factors alone.

The literature indicated that Indigenous women offenders typically had poorer institutional adjustment than non-Indigenous women and were more likely to be classified in a higher level of security. Indigenous women offenders more frequently had substance use issues, had been removed from their home at a young age, and had a history of trauma or abuse than non-Indigenous women. Research is necessary to determine if these factors should be incorporated into the classification process, given ethical concerns related to classifying woman as higher-risk because of disadvantages they experienced.

Several recommendations are suggested for consideration to reduce the likelihood of over-classification among women offenders entering institutions. These include altering the weighting of items that may be less or more relevant for prediction, incorporating additional response options in items (to capture the unique experiences of women), and conducting further validation studies of both initial security and reclassification tools.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	ii
Executive Summary	iii
List of Tables	vii
List of Appendices	vii
Introduction.....	1
Correctional Service of Canada’s Initial Security Classification of Women	2
Custody Rating Scale (CRS)	2
Additional Risk Factors Relevant for Women.....	5
Current Study.....	6
Method	7
Findings.....	8
Risk Factors Associated with the Initial Security Classification of Women.....	8
Escape Risk.....	8
Risk to the Public in the Event of an Escape	9
Institutional Adjustment	10
Factors Associated with the Initial Security Classification of Indigenous Women	20
Issues Encountered when Classifying Women for Security Purposes	21
Summary	23
References.....	25

List of Tables

Table 1. <i>Factors related to initial security classification for women (operational suggestions and implications for research)</i>	18
--	----

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Custody Rating Scale	34
Appendix B: Supplementary Tables	37

Introduction

The security classification of offenders is a critical component of effective management within correctional institutions (Blanchette, 2002). Offenders' security classification level designates their living conditions, including the type of accommodation and movement allowed within the institution, as well as the programming available to them (Blanchette, 2002; Blanchette & Motiuk, 2004; Rubinfeld, 2014). Given the role of classification in the safety and security of institutions, it is important to ensure that offenders are classified at the appropriate security level, using valid assessment tools.

Women make up a small proportion of the total federally incarcerated offender population in Canada, although the number of women offenders under federal jurisdiction has increased by 38 percent over the last 10 years (Office of the Auditor General [OAG], 2017). In a recent report, the Auditor General criticized the Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) for not implementing an initial security classification process specifically designed for women offenders (OAG, 2017). Concerns have been raised that 'gender-neutral' assessments, that is, tools that are applied to both men and women may not consider all the relevant factors identifying the risks and needs of women offenders, or could result in over (or under) classification (Brennan, 2007). Many correctional agencies use classification systems that classify women offenders using the same procedures as men and focus on behavioural and risk factors that have been associated with outcomes predominately for men (Brennan & Austin, 1997). This often results in the use of overrides to make the final security classification for women. Hannah-Moffat (1999) suggests that overrides are used with women "...to compensate for the perceived deficiencies of many traditional methods of classification." Additionally, when staff use these tools and override the recommendation of the security classification tool it can result in a larger proportion of women offenders in higher levels of security than is recommended by the tool (OAG, 2017).

The literature focusing on security classification of women offenders is sparse, with the majority of the empirical research focusing solely on men or failing to disaggregate women from men in the analyses. Specifically, classification and risk assessment tools have been primarily created for, and validated on, men offender samples, and then later applied to women offenders (Blanchette & Taylor, 2007). Recently, however, some correctional agencies have started to move toward developing and implementing tools designed specifically for women offenders. For

instance, CSC has implemented a women-specific reclassification scale, the Security Reclassification Scale for Women (SRSW; see Blanchette, 2005 and Thompson & Wardrop, 2018 for more details). Currently, CSC utilizes similar initial security classification processes for men and women offenders entering federal institutions.

Correctional Service of Canada's Initial Security Classification of Women

On reception to federal custody, a comprehensive Offender Intake Assessment (OIA; Motiuk, 1997) is completed. This process, first implemented in 1994, assesses offenders' risks and needs, program eligibility, and identifies initial security classification level. Initial security classification is conducted using the Custody Rating Scale (CRS; CSC, 2018). According to the *Corrections and Conditional Release Act (CCRA)*, the classification designation is determined based on three considerations: institutional adjustment, escape risk, and risk to the public in the event of an escape. Women are classified as either minimum, medium, or maximum security level; CSC currently has five multi-level security women's institutions housing women classified as minimum, medium or maximum security (CSC, 2013; 2017). Additionally, CSC operates a Healing Lodge for Indigenous women classified as either medium or minimum security. An offender's classification is reviewed at least once every two years (as designated by the CCRA) and can result in reclassification into a lower security level aiding in the reintegration into the community (Gobeil, 2008). The reclassification process is conducted utilizing a different set of classification tools than in the initial security classification. The Security Reclassification Scale (SRS; Luciani, Taylor, & Motiuk, 1998) is used solely for men offenders, and the Security Reclassification Scale for Women (SRSW; Blanchette, 2005) is used solely for women offenders. In contrast, the CRS used for the initial classification, does not have a separate version for women, although previous research has indicated that it predicts institutional outcomes for both men and women, albeit the effects are typically small (Barnum & Gobeil, 2012; Blanchette, Vebrugge, & Wichmann, 2002; Gobeil, 2011).

Custody Rating Scale (CRS)

The Custody Rating Scale (CRS) is an actuarial¹ initial security classification tool

¹ Actuarial measures require the use of formal, objective procedures to weight and combine factors in a way to create a total score that informs a specific recommendation (such as classifying an offender as minimum, medium, or maximum security; Blanchette & Taylor, 2007). Research suggests that actuarial methods perform better than clinical prediction (e.g., Swets, Dawes, & Monahan, 2000).

developed in 1988 to provide a standardized, objective approach to the initial security placement of federal offenders (Blanchette et al., 2002). CSC implemented the CRS nationally in 1991. The CRS consists of two independently scored subscales; the Institutional Adjustment (IA) subscale that is comprised of five items aimed at assessing risks associated with institutional misconducts, and the Security Risk (SR) subscale that is comprised of seven items measuring the amount of danger the offender would pose to the public upon escape (see Appendix A). The IA subscale consists of questions related to *history of institutional incidents, escape history, street stability, alcohol/drug use, and the offender's age at the time of the sentencing*. The SR subscale assesses the *offender's number of prior convictions, the most serious outstanding charge, the severity of the current offence, the sentence length, street stability, prior parole releases, and the offender's age at the time of admission*. Initial security classification is based on the CRS result, any available psychological reports, and a caseworker's clinical judgement (Rubenfeld, 2014). As such, a caseworker can recommend a security designation that is different than that suggested by the CRS. Higher scores on the CRS indicate a higher security level designation suggestion. Notably, other jurisdictions use classification tools that assess similar factors including the Ontario Ministry of Community Safety and Correctional Services (Level of Service Inventory-Ontario Revision [LSI-OR]; Andrews, Bonta, & Wormith, 1995) and the Hawaii Department of Public Safety (see Bench, 1996)

The CRS was originally developed on a sample of federally incarcerated men (Porporino, Luciani, Motiuk, Johnston, & Mainwaring, 1989) and has predominately been validated on samples of men offenders (Rubenfeld, 2014). Men who were designated to a higher security level were found to have engaged in more major and minor institutional incidents and had more serious institutional charges (Grant & Luciani, 1998; Luciani, Motiuk, & Nafekh, 1996).

Other research conducted by CSC has found mixed results in terms of the predictive validity of the CRS for women offenders. One study conducted by Blanchette et al. (2002) on a sample of 334 federally sentenced women offenders found that the IA subscale demonstrated significant correlations with both violent and general institutional misconducts for both Indigenous (.39 and .47, respectively) and non-Indigenous women (.12 and .21, respectively). The SR subscale, however, only demonstrated significant correlations with violent and general institutional misconducts for non-Indigenous women (.18 and .19, respectively). In addition,

several items from the two scales were not found to be related to institutional misconducts. For non-Indigenous women, *street stability* from the IA subscale was not related to violent and general misconducts, whereas *alcohol and drug use* was not related to violent or general misconducts for Indigenous women (see Table B1 in Appendix B). On the SR subscale, only the *street stability* item was related to misconducts for Indigenous women, whereas only *prior convictions* were related to misconducts for non-Indigenous women (although age was also related to general misconducts among non-Indigenous women; see Table B2 in Appendix B). The authors indicated, however, that statistical power was restricted by the size of the Indigenous offender group, and, as such, it would be premature to conclude that certain variables on the CRS were not predictive of institutional misconduct for Indigenous women.

A further validation study conducted by Barnum and Gobeil (2012) on a sample of 628 federally sentenced women offenders found that, overall, the CRS was predictive of major institutional incidents for Indigenous women (Area Under the Curve [AUC] = .71),² but not for non-Indigenous women (AUC = .54). However, the CRS was not predictive of minor institutional incidents for Indigenous women (AUC = .51) but was predictive of minor institutional incidents for non-Indigenous women (AUC = .58), although the effect was small.

The most recent validation study was conducted by Rubinfeld (2014), who examined the effect of reweighting the CRS specifically for women. The CRS was reweighted using the Burgess method (Nuffield, 1982) where a weight was provided to individual response options based on the extent to which the item was associated with the outcome of interest. In this case, because escapes are such an infrequent event and risk to the public in the event of an escape cannot be measured (Blanchette, 2004), the reweighting was based solely on institutional adjustment variables. Using a development sample of 541 federally sentenced women offenders (143 Indigenous and 398 non-Indigenous), the researcher found a slight increase in predictive accuracy using the reweighted CRS, with an AUC value of .67 (in comparison to .59 for the original CRS). The predictive accuracy of the reweighted CRS for Indigenous women was slightly lower than the original CRS (.61 versus .63), while the predictive accuracy of the reweighted CRS was higher than the original CRS for the non-Indigenous women (.68 versus

² Area Under the Curve (AUC) statistic is a common metric when reporting Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves. Values of .56, .64, and .71 represent small, moderate, and large effect sizes, respectively (Rice & Harris, 2005).

.61).

The reweighted CRS was then tested on a validation sample to confirm the results on the developmental sample. On the validation sample of 542 federally sentenced women offenders (143 Indigenous and 399 non-Indigenous), there was an increase in predictive accuracy using the reweighted CRS with an AUC value of .66 (in comparison to .60 for the original CRS). For the Indigenous women, the predictive accuracy of the reweighted CRS was higher than the original CRS (.59 versus .53), however the effect was still small. For the non-Indigenous women, the predictive accuracy of the reweighted CRS was also higher than the original CRS (.67 versus .61). Taken together, these results are similar to those of Blanchette et al. (2002) and Barnum and Gobeil (2012) which found that, overall, items on the CRS were weakly associated with institutional adjustment outcomes for women and weighting the items based on their association with relevant outcomes marginally improved the predictive accuracy of the tool.

In a study looking at the predictive accuracy of the CRS for men offenders, results suggested that the tool predicted minor institutional misconducts for both Indigenous men (AUC = .61) and non-Indigenous men (AUC = .62; Gobeil, 2011). The CRS was slightly better at predicting major institutional misconducts for both Indigenous men (AUC = .62) and non-Indigenous men (AUC = .64). Overall the results of these studies indicate that the CRS predicts institutional misconducts equally well for Indigenous and non-Indigenous men and women, albeit the effect sizes are typically small (with AUCs under .64).

Additional Risk Factors Relevant for Women

While much of the correctional research indicates that the factors predictive of institutional adjustment for men are also predictive for women (e.g., Blanchette, Verbrugge, & Wichmann, 2002; Camp, Gaes, Langan, & Saylor, 2003; Harer & Langan, 2001; Luciani et al., 1996; Motiuk, 1997), some research suggests that there are additional risk factors important for women that should be considered in the initial classification process (e.g., Davidson, Sorensen, & Reidy, 2016; Farr, 2000; Gover, Perez, & Jennings, 2008). These factors include mental health issues (Blackburn & Trulson, 2010; Davidson et al., 2016; Houser, Belenko, & Brennan, 2012; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2009; Van Voorhis, Wright, Salisbury, & Bauman, 2010; Wright, Dehart, Koons-Witt, & Crittenden, 2012; Wright, Salisbury, & Van Voorhis, 2007), family relationships and contact with children (Drury & DeLisi, 2010; Wright et al., 2007), and history of childhood victimization (Steiner & Wooldredge, 2009; Van Voorhis et al., 2010; Wright et al.,

2007).

Overall, there has been a limited amount of research focusing on the risk classification process in general, and even less research focusing on women offenders and the risk factors most relevant to initial security classification (Reidy, Cihan, & Sorensen, 2017). A literature review looking at studies published between 1980 and 2013 that investigated the causes and correlates of offenders' institutional misconduct found that only 20 of the 98 studies included women offenders (see Steiner, Butler, & Ellison, 2013). Furthermore, considering that 36% of women offenders under federal custody are Indigenous (OAG, 2017), more research is needed to identify the potential relevant risk factors and social history factors that should be considered in the initial security classification of Indigenous women.

Current Study

The current review examined the literature to determine which factors are relevant to the determination of the initial security classification of women offenders based on empirical evidence of their relationship to the following outcomes: institutional adjustment, escape risk, and risk to the public in the event of an escape. Finally, social history factors that could be relevant for initial security classification of Indigenous women offenders were explored.

Method

The literature was searched related to: 1) the institutional adjustment of women offenders, 2) the escape risk of women offenders, and 3) risk to the public in the event of an escape. A comprehensive search of several databases including PSYCinfo, Criminal Justice Abstracts, Sociological abstracts, NCJRS, Government correctional agencies, Dissertations and Theses, and Google Scholar was conducted. The search terms included various combinations of the population of interest (i.e., offender*, women, female*, Indigenous*, Aboriginal*, criminal*, inmate*) as well as terms related to the outcome of interest (i.e., initial security*, classification*, institutional outcome*, custody rating scale*, adjustment*, risk factor*, escape risk*, risk to public*, intake assessment*, gender-informed*, gender-responsive*, gender-specific*, gender-salient*).³

Studies were included in the review if they focused exclusively on women offenders and risk factors related to the initial security classification process and/or gender differences and initial security classification. Studies were excluded if they focused only on risk factors related to community outcomes, such as recidivism and community adjustment. Thematic review of the research was conducted to examine the emerging trends within the literature. The search was completed on July 6, 2018.

³ Gender-responsive approach refers to the literature focusing on women (i.e., factors and experiences that are more predictive for women than for men), where as gender-informed refers to an approach whereby research includes both gender-responsive risk factors, in combination with gender-neutral risk factors.

Findings

The next section discusses the findings from the literature review under three main sections. First, risk factors unique to women that have been identified in the literature as important for initial security classification are reviewed. Next, issues encountered when classifying women offenders are discussed, and, finally, relevant factors that could be associated with the initial security classification of Indigenous women are discussed.

Risk Factors Associated with the Initial Security Classification of Women

As previously noted, designating women into appropriate security classification is a key management tool designed to reduce institutional misconducts and violence, minimize the potential for escapes, and assist with the allocation of resources (Blanchette & Taylor, 2007). The assigned security classification that a woman receives informs the level of supervision and the types of programs and services that will be offered while in custody (i.e., the amount of security and control that is required for appropriate offender management within the institution; Blanchette & Taylor, 2007). Factors related to each of these outcomes will be described below, with specific focus on factors related to institutional adjustment. Findings are summarized in Table 1, at the end of the section on institutional adjustment.

Escape risk

Research on predicting risk of escape from correctional institutions is limited, especially with respect to women offenders. The few studies that have focused on women's escapes from custody have generally found that fewer women than men escape from secure custody (Van Voorhis & Presser, 2001). Furthermore, because escape from an institution is rare, researchers have argued that the usefulness of using prediction instruments is limited as false-positive⁴ rates will be inflated (Bench & Allen, 2003; Harer & Langan, 2001; Van Voorhis & Presser, 2001). One of the earliest studies looking at women escapees was conducted by Holt (1974). This study compared the characteristics of women who escaped ($n = 81$) from the California Department of Corrections to the remaining institutional population. He concluded that, similarly to men, women who escaped had more extensive criminal history backgrounds, more parole violations

⁴ A false-positive rate occurs when something is said to have happened when really it has not (in error). In this case, because the rate of escapes is low, using prediction tools can result in the over-estimation of escape risk among offenders.

and more terms of imprisonment. Similarly, a study conducted by Scott, Mount-Michael, and Duffy (1977) compared a sample of women who had escaped ($n = 71$) from an Iowa women's institution to a random sample of women who had not escaped ($n = 97$) and found that those who escaped were significantly younger, had greater histories of psychiatric problems, more juvenile imprisonments, and longer sentence lengths. A Canadian study (Scott, 2012) found that women who were involved in gangs had higher rates of escape attempts than non-gang members (although this difference was not statistically significant due to the small sample size of women in the study and the low base rates of escapes).⁵ Finally, a study comparing women offenders who engaged in self-harm ($n = 78$) to those who did not ($n = 77$) found that women who engaged in self-harm had significantly more prior escape-related behaviours than those women who did not engage in self-harm (Wichmann, Serin, & Abracen, 2002). Importantly, research in this area has predominately focused on the correlates and characteristics of offenders who have escaped, as opposed to factors that are predictive of escapes. Several key correlates emerged, including criminal history, sentence length, psychiatric and mental health concerns, age, and gang-involvement.

Few studies have examined risk factors predicting escapes from custody among women offenders. Escapes are very rare making research challenging. Nevertheless, as noted by Blanchette and Taylor (2007), CSC is legislatively obligated to consider escape risk as part of the security classification process. Taken together, the studies summarized above suggest two things: 1) escapes from correctional custody are less frequent for women than for men, and 2) less emphasis should be placed on the risk for escapes for women offenders in determining security classification for women.

Risk to the public in the event of an escape

Given that escapes are rare, recidivism is often used as a proxy for assessing an offender's risk to public safety and security in the event of an escape (Blanchette, 2002). Women are less likely to escape from prison than men and they are also less likely to reoffend upon release, committing fewer general or violent reoffences than men (Berg & DeLisi, 2006; Celinska & Sung, 2014; Davidson et al., 2016; Farr, 2000; Harer & Langan, 2001; Reidy, Sorensen, & Cunningham, 2012). Recently, correctional scholars have begun to focus on risk

⁵ Scott (2012) used a sample of 337 federally sentenced gang-involved women offenders and 337 federally sentenced women offenders in Canada who were not involved in a gang.

factors for recidivism that may be more relevant to women than for men (Belknap, 2015; Brown, 2017). A recent literature review (see Brown, 2017), identified key factors predicting criminal recidivism among women offenders. Overall, Brown found that, similar to men, criminal history, criminal peers, criminal attitudes, employment, marital/family issues, and community functioning predict recidivism for women. Substance misuse and personal/emotional issues were found to be more predictive of recidivism for women than for men (i.e., gender-salient for women). Unfortunately, very few studies have examined other potential risk factors, such as history of abuse, trauma, anxiety/depression, relationship dysfunction, criminal intimate partners, parental stress, and unsafe housing.

Institutional adjustment

Strategies enhance institutional adjustment include a number of different considerations, such as how to best manage an offender, how well the offender will adjust to being in custody, and whether the offender is involved in any institutional misconducts. The majority of the research on institutional adjustment tends to focus on misconducts. This literature indicates that the types of disciplinary infractions committed by women tend to be less serious than those committed by men (Berg & DeLisi, 2006; Celinska & Sung, 2014; Davidson et al., 2016; Harer & Langan, 2001; Sorensen & Davis, 2011). Research examining the predictive factors of general and violent misconduct among women offenders, however, is limited (Reidy et al., 2017) and mainly focuses on gender-neutral risk factors, rather than attempting to identify potential women-specific risk factors (i.e., gender-responsive or gender-salient), such as a history of abuse or mental health issues (Hardyman & Van Voorhis, 2004).

Methodological considerations. Within the literature on risk factors associated with institutional misconducts, the majority of research has focused exclusively on reporting factors that are prevalent among women who have engaged in misconducts (that is, the research has reported on the profile of women who commit misconducts). While it is important to examine the characteristics of these women, more rigorous analyses are required to determine which factors are *predictive*, as opposed to correlates of misconducts. To date, very few studies have examined the predictive accuracy of gender-responsive factors. In addition, research examining the incremental predictive validity of these gender-responsive factors is required to assess whether these factors increase the predictability of institutional misconducts over and above the gender-neutral factors currently in use. As such, while the literature often refers to these gender-

responsive factors as *predictive*, the evidence to support this claim is not conclusive.

As previously mentioned, when predicting risk for involvement in institutional misconduct, CSC assesses five areas: history of institutional incidents, escape history, street stability (which is broken into employment/education, marital/family adjustment, interpersonal relationships, and living arrangements), alcohol/drug use, and the offender's age at the time of the sentencing.

Escape history. Research has found that history of escapes or being unlawfully at large (UAL) were not predictive of institutional misconducts for women offenders (e.g., Blanchette & Taylor, 2007; Harer & Langan, 2001). Using a large sample of men ($n = 177,767$) and women ($n = 24,765$) offenders, Harer and Langan (2001) found that history of escapes were significantly predictive of violence-related misconduct for men but not for women. Further, a study looking at 580 federally sentenced women offenders in Canada found that being unlawfully at large (ever) was not predictive of any form of misconduct for women offenders (Blanchette & Taylor, 2007). These findings may be due to the low base-rates of escapes (i.e., insufficient statistical power to examine the predictive ability of escapes).

Age. The literature has consistently found that age is significantly related to institutional misconduct for both men and women (e.g., Brennan & Austin, 1997; Degiorgio, 2015; Drury & DeLisi, 2010; Greiner & Allenby, 2010; Hardyman, 2001; Harer & Langan, 2001; Houser & Welsh, 2014; Jiang & Winfree, 2006; Mays & Winfree, 2002; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2014); however, there are some gender differences associated with this relationship. Specifically, while there is a negative relationship between age and institutional misconduct for both men and women, the rate of involvement in institutional infractions decreases at an earlier age for men than for women (Hardyman & Van Voorhis, 2004), although the precise age for this change varies depending on the study. One of the earliest studies to examine gender differences in predictors of institutional misconduct was conducted by Craddock (1996). Results indicated that age (i.e., women who were younger) and sentence length (i.e., longer sentence length) were the most influential variables predicting institutional misconduct. While results indicated that men violated rules sooner than women, the overall patterns were similar for both genders in that both men and women violated rules more at younger ages and less at older ages. Likewise, a study involving 951 women in federal custody in Canada found that for every one-year increase in age, the risk for committing a violation decreased by 2% to 11% (Harris, Blanchette, & Brown,

2014). The research in general demonstrates that age is an important predictor of institutional misconduct for both genders (Hardyman & Van Voorhis, 2004), however, different age cut off values may need to be considered for men and women and may be specific to the profile of the population.

Criminal history. The evidence for the relationship between criminal history and involvement in institutional misconducts has been mixed. Specifically, Hardyman and Van Voorhis (2004) argue that, although there are some exceptions, criminal history factors have been poor predictors of institutional misconducts for women (e.g., Lahm, 2016; McCorkle, 1995). In contrast, other research has indicated that both prior institutional misconduct and criminal history factors are related to institutional misconducts for women (e.g., Drury & DeLisi, 2010; Gobeil, Blanchette, & Barrett, 2009; Gover et al., 2008). One study conducted by Gover and colleagues (2008) with a sample of 247 offenders (190 men, 57 women) examined factors that had a significant impact on institutional behaviour for men and women. Overall, results indicated that age, minority status, length of sentence, and education were strong predictors of rule violations for women. Interestingly, however, those with prior incarcerations demonstrated a 51% decrease in mean number of institutional infractions. That is, women who had prior incarcerations were less likely to violate rules—perhaps because women who experienced prior incarceration were better able to adjust to institutional life (Gover et al., 2008), or possibly because women serving longer sentences were older. Because of these mixed results and because few women tend to receive high scores on criminal history items on classification scales, some researchers have suggested that classification systems should reduce the weights of scores focusing on women’s criminal history (Hardyman & Van Voorhis, 2004).

Sentence length. Generally, as sentence length increases, women tend to face more adjustment problems, safety concerns, and higher rates of infractions (Acevedo & Bakken, 2003; Celinska & Sung, 2014; MacKenzie, Robinson, & Campbell, 1989; Lahm, 2016; McClellan, 1994; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2009). This is not surprising, given that time at risk will increase as sentence length increases, and those with longer sentences are typically assessed as higher risk. Interestingly, however, research assessing the predictive value of sentence length has found mixed results. For instance, one recent study conducted by Reidy and colleagues (2017) on a sample of 439 women offenders from Arizona who had committed at least one serious rule violation during a 3-year follow-up period, found that sentence length and serious infractions

were not related. Thompson and Loper (2005) also found no relationship between sentence length and violent misconduct or emotional adjustment while controlling for length of time served; however, long-term women offenders in their sample had more non-violent misconducts and fewer serious violations of institutional rules. Overall, researchers have suggested that the effects of sentence length for women offenders are mixed (e.g., Lahm, 2016), with the majority of studies failing to control for sentence length in predictive models.

Behaviour, personality, and mental health. There is evidence that affective, interpersonal, and behavioural features associated with psychopathy and antisocial personality are predictive of institutional misconducts among women offenders. Two studies (e.g., Davidson et al., 2016; Skopp, Edens, & Ruiz, 2007) found that these features were predictors of general and aggressive misconduct while incarcerated (AUCs of .62 to .71). Skopp and colleagues (2007) found that antisocial personality traits added incrementally to the prediction of both general (Wald = 6.02, $p < .05$) and aggressive misconducts (Wald = 7.18, $p < .01$) over and above criminal history alone. The study by Davidson and colleagues (2016) also found that several factors demonstrated low to moderate predictive ability for general disciplinary infractions with AUCs ranging from .56 to .60 for traumatic stress, depression, mania, paranoia, schizophrenia, and aggression. With respect to aggressive disciplinary infractions, factors such as traumatic stress, depression, mania, paranoia, schizophrenia, aggression, and stress demonstrated low to moderate predictive ability with AUC values ranging from .57 to .67. These factors, however, did not incrementally predict general or aggressive infractions over and above criminal history.

Additional gender-neutral risk factors. There are several other factors related to institutional misconduct that have been discussed in the literature, albeit to a lesser extent. These factors include education/employment, gang involvement, and IQ (specifically, lower IQ); however, research on these factors among women offender samples is quite limited. In terms of employment, one study looking at women offenders from Florida found that ‘work competency’ and ‘outside work assignments’ were positively related to institutional adjustment at initial assessment (Hardyman, 2001). In terms of the impact of education, research findings are mixed. Some studies suggest no relationship to violations (e.g., Celinska & Sung, 2014) whereas other research suggests that the extent of education is significantly negatively related to institutional misconducts for women (e.g., Gover et al., 2008; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2014; Van Voorhis et

al., 2010). That is, less education (e.g., less than a high school diploma or GED, in most cases) was related to more institutional misconducts. Notably, however, Hardyman and Van Voorhis (2004) reported that in some instances higher education was related to more misconducts among women.

In contrast, research focusing on gang membership has consistently found that gang involvement was highly prevalent among women who engaged in misconduct in comparison to those who did not (Blackburn & Trulson, 2010; Drury & DeLisi, 2010; Scott, 2012). Finally, IQ has also been associated with institutional adjustment with findings suggesting that women with lower IQs have higher rates of institutional charges and security violations than women with higher IQs (Stewart, Wilton, Kelly, Nolan, & Talisman, 2016).⁶

Summarizing research on gender-specific risk factors for women offenders. Research suggests that men and women offenders differ in terms of the types of institutional misconducts they commit (whereby women engage in less serious, more non-violent misconduct in comparison to men; Harris, 2013; Sorensen & Cunningham, 2010; Sorensen, Cunningham, Vigen, & Woods, 2011) and that men and women differ in terms of some of the predictors associated with institutional misconduct (e.g., Gover et al., 2008; Hardyman & Van Voorhis, 2004). Recently, there has been an increased interest in correlates of misconduct that could be more common to women offenders (Houser & Welsh, 2014) and that should be examined for the purpose of initial security classification (Hardyman & Van Voorhis, 2004). Several studies have found that women offenders who are involved in institutional misconducts tend to have histories of childhood sexual and physical abuse/trauma (Davidson et al., 2016; Forcier, 1995; Skopp et al., 2007; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2009; Van Voorhis et al., 2010; Wulf-Ludden, 2016), mental health issues (Blackburn & Trulson, 2010; Davidson et al., 2016; Derkzen, Booth, Taylor, & McConnell, 2013; Houser et al., 2012; Lahm, 2016; McCorkle, 1995; Steiner & Wooldredge, 2009), dysfunctional relationships/absent relationships (Van Voorhis et al., 2010; Wright et al., 2007), and substance misuse problems (Davidson et al., 2016; MacDonald, Gobeil, Biro, Ritchie, & Curno, 2015; Salisbury, Van Voorhis, & Spiropoulos, 2009).⁷ Furthermore, research also suggests that motherhood is important to women's self-concept and, therefore, issues related to

⁶ Stewart and colleagues (2016) looked at a sample of 4,396 men and 292 women offenders between November 2012 and March 2014 who were federally incarcerated in Canada.

⁷ Importantly, substance use and mental health are not inherently gender-responsive factors and are also considered important by gender-neutral researchers.

care for children while incarcerated may affect adjustment to incarceration (Berry & Eigenberg, 2003; Collica, 2010; Collie & Polaschek, 2003; Ferraro & Moe, 2003; Houck & Loper, 2002). Although this research claims that gender-responsive variables are important to consider for initial security classification, the research has predominately reported the prevalence rates of these factors among women who violate institutional rules without examining the predictive ability of these factors directly. Only a handful of studies have looked at the predictive validity of these commonly considered gender-responsive risk factors in predicting institutional adjustment (e.g., Van Voorhis et al., 2010; Wright et al., 2007). Studies that have examined this have generally concluded that gender-responsive risk factors are indeed predictive of institutional misconducts.

A study conducted by Wright and colleagues (2007) looked at how well gender-neutral and gender-responsive needs predicted prison misconduct in a sample of 272 incarcerated women in Missouri. The researchers examined the bivariate correlations between a variety of gender-responsive factors and number of misconducts over a 6-month and a 12-month period. Overall, they found that the correlations between gender-neutral needs and misconducts ranged from .09 to .20, whereas the correlations between gender-responsive needs and institutional misconducts ranged from .09 to .31. They found that the strongest correlations were between misconducts and factors such as: mental health issues, including current psychosis ($r = .16$ to $.31$) and current anxiety/depression ($r = .13$ to $.23$), childhood abuse ($r = .20$ to $.25$), low relationship support ($r = .10$ to $.16$), low family support ($r = .12$ to $.20$), and antisocial attitudes ($r = .14$ to $.18$). In addition, the authors found that including gender-responsive needs increased the predictive ability over and above gender-neutral factors alone.

A study looking at gender-neutral and gender-responsive risk factors in relation to serious prison misconducts found similar results (Salisbury et al., 2009). The study on a sample of 156 women offenders, found that education/employment ($r = .13$), alcohol and drugs ($r = .12$ to $.15$), companions ($r = .13$ to $.14$), self-efficacy ($r = .14$ to $.15$), relationships ($r = -.15$ to $-.18$), and histories of adult emotional abuse ($r = .14$), and child physical abuse ($r = .19$), were all significantly related to serious prison misconducts.

Van Voorhis and colleagues (2010) confirmed these results in a study that included women from three prisons: Colorado ($n = 156$), Minnesota ($n = 198$), and Missouri ($n = 272$).⁸

⁸ Notably, the Colorado and Missouri samples appear to be the same samples used in the previous two studies (i.e.,

They examined serious institutional misconducts committed 6- or 12-months post intake in relation to a combination of gender-neutral and gender-responsive needs. Overall, results indicated that gender responsive items, mental health issues, substance abuse, relationship dysfunction, and childhood trauma were all related to women's institutional adjustment; however, only childhood abuse and relationship dysfunction were significant across all three samples. Once the gender-responsive variables were added to the to gender-neutral needs model, the predictive accuracy increased (AUC values increased from .68 to .70 for the Minnesota sample and from .64 to .66 for the Missouri sample).⁹ This study, in conjunction with the research of Wright and colleagues (2007) and Salisbury and colleagues (2009), suggests that gender-responsive needs are important to consider for initial security classification purposes—although this research was conducted on relatively small American samples.

A more recent study looked at nationally representative survey data from a large sample of 14,297 men and 3,888 women offenders in custody across the US (Celinska & Sung, 2014). Using logistic regression to assess the predictive ability of various gender neutral and gender-responsive factors (for men and women separately), results found that substance misuse, lack of social support, and participation in mental health treatment predicted rule breaking behaviour for women offenders, whereas history of victimization (physical and sexual abuse) and major psychiatric disorders did not significantly predict rule breaking behaviour for women. Similarly, a Canadian study using a sample of 962 federally incarcerated women between February 2010 and February 2014, found that as substance use severity increased, so did the number of disciplinary charges and placements in segregation (MacDonald et al., 2015). Specifically, drug users were 3.8 times more likely than non- or low frequency drug users to be convicted of disciplinary charges and alcohol and drug users were 4.3 times more likely than non- and low frequency drug users to be placed in segregation. These results suggest that substance misuse may be a key factor in predicting institutional adjustment for women.

Taken together, the literature on institutional misconducts suggests that examining factors considered both gender-neutral and gender-specific provided the most comprehensive understanding of incarceration adjustment for women (Harris et al., 2014). Findings on specific

Salisbury et al., 2009 and Wright et al., 2007).

⁹ Analyses could not be assessed among the Colorado sample as only the childhood abuse and relationship dysfunction variables were found to be significant.

factors, however, were mixed and the majority of studies focused on the prevalence or profiles of women who have committed misconduct in the institution, with few studies focussing on the actual utility of risk factors in the prediction of misconducts. Further, there were many inconsistencies in the literature, possibly related to the differing operational definitions of institutional adjustment, and the various operational definitions of gender-responsive risk factors (e.g., trauma), or because studies used different samples of women offenders from varying security levels (Harris et al., 2014).

Table 1

Factors in the literature related to initial security classification for women

Variable	Source of evidence and outcome	Issues and concerns	Suggested solution
Age of offender	Predictive of misconduct and escapes	No specific age cut-offs (ranges across studies)	Different age cut-offs for men and women depend on the population
Criminal history	Predictive of misconduct and escapes	Lower frequency event for women and generally less severe. No specific cut-offs provided	Factor could be weighted and cut-off established
Sentence length	Predictive of misconduct especially escapes	Findings are mixed; Studies have failed to control for sentence length	Should be controlled for in analyses
Antisocial personality and behavioural issues	Predictive of misconduct	Privacy concerns if using diagnoses; Does not predict incrementally over and above criminal history	Use proxies of these problems such as impulsivity and criminal history
IQ	Low IQ is correlated with misconducts	Privacy concerns; Ethical concerns ¹	Use responsivity flag related to cognitive impairment and impulsivity indicator as proxies
Gang membership	Prevalent among those who commit violations and escape	Limited research focusing on the predictive ability of gang membership	Further research is required
Education / Employment	Low education more prevalent among those who commit violations	Limited and mixed research findings	Operational definition of employment should include childcare and homemaker roles. Impact of employment status while incarcerated should be studied

Variable	Source of evidence and outcome	Issues and concerns	Suggested solution
Substance misuse	Consistently predictive of misconduct	May be a catalyst or a coping method for other problems for women	Understand the function of the substance use (i.e., coping strategy versus impulsivity or antisocial behaviour)
Abuse/trauma history	Predictive of misconduct	Privacy concerns; Ethical concerns (confounding need with risk)	Self regulation problems used as a proxy
Parental responsibilities and parental stress	More prevalent among women involved in misconducts	Some evidence that children can be protective. May require different understanding of roles and responsibilities	Parenting and marital factors should be considered separately for women than men and weighted based on tress of association.
Relationship Dysfunction	Predictive of misconduct	Clear definition required	Parenting and marital factors should be considered separately for women.

Note. Additional research is required focusing on the predictive and incremental predictive ability of gender-responsive risk factors among women offenders. Further research is needed looking at the gender differences for gender-neutral risk factors as well. ¹Ethical concerns = classifying offenders as higher risk based on factors that are beyond their control (such as childhood experiences they have faced).

Factors Associated with the Initial Security Classification of Indigenous Women

There has been little research focusing on the evidence base for tools or predictors specifically related to the initial security classification of Indigenous women. Although research conducted on the reclassification of women using the SRSW has indicated that comparable proportions of Indigenous and non-Indigenous women offenders were being classified as minimum, medium, and maximum security (Gobeil, 2008; Thompson, McConnell, & Paquin-Marseille, 2013; Thompson & Wardrop, 2018), research focusing on initial security classification has reported different findings. Specifically, Canadian research has indicated that Indigenous women were more likely to be rated as higher risk than their non-Indigenous counterparts (e.g., approximately 20% more non-Indigenous than Indigenous women were classified as minimum security upon admission; Beaudette, Cheverie, & Gobeil, 2014). In CSC, the CRS was found to be less predictive of misconducts for Indigenous women in comparison to non-Indigenous women (Barnum & Gobeil, 2012; Blanchette et al., 2002). Limited research has assessed the risk factors most predictive of institutional adjustment among Indigenous women.

One area that requires further attention is the impact of Indigenous social history factors (i.e., sometimes referred to as Gladue factors) on security classification. Social history factors are often defined as individual, family, or community experiences and intergenerational effects of experiences among Indigenous offenders (Bombay, Matheson, & Anisman, 2009) and include, but are not limited to, abuse/trauma, residential school experience, substance abuse, and spiritual/cultural connection. These factors are required to be considered when making judicial correctional decisions (Keown, Gobeil, Biro, & Ritchie, 2015) at all stages of the Canadian justice system.

A study conducted by Thompson and Gobeil (2015) profiled 626 women admitted to CSC between April 1, 2008 and March 31, 2010, of whom 174 were Indigenous. In comparison to non-Indigenous women, Indigenous women were found to have poorer institutional adjustment, were more likely to be classified at a higher level of security, and were less likely to receive visits from their families. Upon examining the social histories of these Indigenous women, it was found that over half reported having attended, or having had a family member attend, a residential school, and half reported having lived on a reserve or having been removed from their family home (e.g., foster care or adoption). Almost all the Indigenous women had experienced some form of trauma and had substance misuse issues.

The high prevalence of these social history factors among Indigenous women offenders points to the need for more research focusing on how these factors may relate to institutional outcomes. There may be unique predictors of institutional misconduct for Indigenous women that require different weighting in the classification tools or require the classification tools to adopt additional items that reflect the unique experiences for this group. Furthermore, it is possible that additional items should be included when classifying Indigenous offenders; specifically, those that may act as protective factors for Indigenous offenders (i.e., connection to spirituality or cultural identity). Of concern is a possibility that greater attention to Indigenous social history factors may lead to the factors being perceived as risk factors (e.g., residential school experience, foster care involvement) and thus resulting in more negative decisions and recommendations (e.g., Warner, 2011). The initial security classification process should account for Indigenous peoples' disadvantages (*R. v. Gladue*) and, as such, further research is warranted with respect to *how* these factors should be incorporated into the classification process.

Issues Encountered When Classifying Women for Security Purposes

There are several issues to consider when classifying women offenders for security purposes. One area of concern is the over-classification of women offenders (Farr, 2000; Van Voorhis et al., 2001). This occurs when classification systems assign women to unwarranted higher security levels. This can happen for several reasons including: tools capturing different behaviours for men and women, policies assuming high risk men and women demonstrate the same behaviours, and false-positive decisions (i.e., decisions that determine offenders will pose a risk when they do not) primarily due to low base rates of outcome variables; Hardyman & Van Voorhis, 2004). One way that over-classification based on tools has been addressed is through the use of overrides. As Farr (2000) reports, “studies have uncovered override rates of 40 percent to 50 percent in the classification of women [Austin, Chan, & Elms, 1993; Buchanan, Whitlow, & Austin, 1986], far above the generally accepted 20 percent upper limit [Brennan & Austin, 1997]”. A recent study found that among ten states in the US, override rates ranged from 18 to 70 percent of cases, suggesting that these classification systems for women do not work the way they should (Van Voorhis et al., 2001).

Researchers have proposed several possible solutions to improve the accuracy of security classification of women offenders (Brennan, 2007; Farr, 2000; Hannah-Moffat, 1999; Hardyman & Van Voorhis, 2004; Van Voorhis, Peiler, Presser, Spiropoulis, & Sutherland,

2001). One solution is to utilize different cut off scores for men and women that take into account gender differences on individual items (Harer & Langan, 2001). Further, tools can be improved by expanding upon items to include more relevant options for women—including more response options and weighting certain items as more relevant for women than for men (Van Voorhis et al., 2001). For instance, Hardyman and Van Voorhis (2004) suggest that items focusing on employment should include *homemaker* or *stay at home mom* as potential response options. Finally, assigning different item weights to men and women depending on item relevance can also prevent the over-classification of women offenders. For example, possibly parenting responsibilities and dysfunctional relationships should receive more weight for women than items focusing on past escapes or violent criminal history.

Another consideration is the addition of gender-responsive risk and need items into current gender-neutral classification tools. One major concern related to including these items, similar to concerns around incorporating Indigenous social history factors, is that women may then be penalized for their negative life experiences (e.g., trauma and abuse) or mental health needs, factors beyond their control. As such, gender-responsive factors may be better incorporated into an understanding of the context for involvement in criminality or substance misuse and informing the program and treatment needs of women rather than being used as factors predictive of risk for institutional misconduct.

Additionally, it is important to acknowledge that initial security classification is quite limited to the information that is available to CSC at offender intake. Specifically, upon their arrival, there is very little information known about the offender and their behaviour. This makes it difficult to assess an offender's initial security classification level in comparison to reclassification where there has been more of an opportunity to observe the offender and gather information.

Overall, more research is required to: 1) determine if the inclusion of gender-responsive factors and Indigenous social history factors increases the ability to predict misconducts and by extension, appropriate security placement, among women offenders, and 2) determine how these factors should be incorporated into classification tools, given concerns that women could be further penalized for factors associated with their histories of trauma and mental health problems.

Summary

The CRS has been validated on samples of both men and women offenders (e.g., Barnum & Gobeil, 2012); however, concerns have been raised that this tool does not perform optimally with Indigenous women offenders and that the tool fails to consider gender-informed variables.

The current review of the literature on risk factors associated with the initial security classification process for women found limited research. While many studies examined the characteristics of women offenders who engage in institutional misconducts or focused on the correlates of institutional violations, very few examined the predictive ability of these risk factors. There is some empirical evidence to suggest that certain gender-informed factors may be useful in explaining institutional behaviours in women offenders, although further research is required to assess whether these gender-informed factors provide incremental predictive validity over and above gender-neutral factors alone.

Key risk factors emerged in the literature (albeit with mixed evidence), some are generally considered gender-neutral and others are typically considered more relevant to women offenders. These key risk factors include:

- Criminal history
- Sentence length
- Age of offender
- IQ (lower cognitive function)
- Gang membership
- Substance use
- Education/employment
- Mental health issues (especially those associated with externalizing behaviours)
- Abuse/trauma history
- Relationship dysfunction
- Parenting responsibilities and parental stress

All of these factors may be important for both men and women; further research is required to determine how they relate to institutional misconduct for both genders. For instance, research focusing on mental health issues suggests that mental health problems may increase women's vulnerability to environmental stressors in the institutional environment, such as being

separated from children (Belknap, 1996; Covington, 2003), and can affect involvement in treatment programs (Blitz, Wolff, Pan, & Pogorzelski, 2005). Additionally, exposure to traumatic childhood experiences may affect women differently from men. Research has found that women exposed to abuse tend to engage in more internalizing coping techniques that can lead to increased substance use or mental health issues (e.g., Belknap, 2015). Some researchers recommend that tools will require different cut offs and categories for men and women in order to reflect the gender differences in the impact of factors associated with institutional misconduct (e.g., Hardyman & Van Voorhis, 2004).

Another important consideration is that some of the gender-responsive risk factors pertain to problems women have either experienced (e.g., abuse) or are facing (e.g., anxiety or depression). Classifying a woman as higher-risk because she is coping with these disadvantages raises ethical concerns and requires careful consideration (Van Voorhis et al., 2001). This may be particularly true for Indigenous women offenders who have higher rates of aversive experiences than non-Indigenous women.

A final consideration is the extent to which risk factors are predictive of institutional adjustment and escapes for Indigenous women. Studies in this area have typically used small samples of Indigenous women, reducing the statistical power and limiting the utility and accuracy of the statistical analyses and findings. Research is also needed to examine how social history factors might affect the classification process for Indigenous offenders. Some cultural specific factors in the initial classification process may act as protective factors (e.g., involvement in cultural practices and traditional healing) and might mitigate the relative overrepresentation of Indigenous women offenders at higher security.

Overall, this review of the literature has highlighted a number of suggestions that could be considered in the development of tools designed to assess the appropriate initial security classification of women offenders. Among these suggestions are: altering the weighting of items based on their strength of prediction for women relative to men, and incorporating additional response options in items to capture the unique experiences of women offenders.

References

- Acevedo, K. C., & Bakken, T. (2003). Women adjusting to prison: Disciplinary behavior and the characteristics of adjustment. *Journal of Health and Social Policy, 17*(4), 37-60.
- Auditor General of Canada. (2017). *Preparing women offenders for release – Correctional service of Canada*. Retrieved from http://www.oag-bvg.gc.ca/internet/English/parl_oag_201711_05_e_42670.html
- Austin, J., Chan, L., & Elms, W. (1993). *Women Classification Study - Indiana Department of Corrections*. San Francisco, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Barnum, G. & Gobeil, R. (2012). *Revalidation of the custody rating scale for Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal women offenders* (Research Report R-273). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Beaudette, J., Cheverie, M., & Gobeil, R. (2014). *Aboriginal women: Profile and changing population* (Research Report R-341). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Belknap, J. (1996). *The invisible woman: Gender, crime and justice*. Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.
- Belknap, J. (2015). *The invisible woman: Gender, crime and justice* (4th ed.). Stamford, CT: Cengage Learning.
- Bench, L. L., & Allen, T. D. (2003). Investigating the stigma of prison classification: An experimental design. *The Prison Journal, 83*, 367-382. doi: 10.1177/0032885503260143
- Berg, M. T., & DeLisi, M. (2006). The correctional melting pot: Race, ethnicity, citizenship, and prison violence. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 34*, 631-642.
- Berry, P. E., & Eigenberg, H. M. (2003). Role strain and incarcerated mothers: Understanding the process of mothering. *Women & Criminal Justice, 15*(1), 101-119.
- Blackburn, A. G., & Trulson, C. R. (2010). Sugar and spice and everything nice? exploring institutional misconduct among serious and violent female delinquents. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 38*(6), 1132-1140. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.09.001
- Blanchette, K. (2002). Classifying female offenders for effective intervention: application of the case-based principles of risk and need. *Forum on Correctional Research, 14*, 31-5.

- Blanchette, K. (2005). *Field-test of a gender-informed security re-classification scale for female offenders*. Unpublished dissertation: Carleton University.
- Blanchette, K. (2004). Revisiting effective classification strategies for women offenders in Canada. *Feminism & Psychology, 14*(2), 231-236. doi: 10.1177/0959353504042176
- Blanchette, K., & Brown, S.L. (2006). *The assessment and treatment of women offenders: An integrative perspective*. Hoboken, NJ: J. Wiley & Sons.
- Blanchette, K., & Motiuk, L. L. (2004). Taking down the straw man: A reply to Webster and Doob. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, 46*, 621-630.
- Blanchette, K., & Taylor, K. N. (2007). Development and field test of a gender-informed security reclassification scale for female offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 34*(3), 362-379. doi:10.1177/0093854806290162
- Blanchette, K., Verbrugge, P., & Wichmann, C. (2002). *The custody rating scale, initial security placement, and women offenders*. Research Report R-127. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Blitz, C. L., Wolff, N., Pan, K.-Y., & Pogorzelski, W. (2005). Gender-specific behavioral health and community release patterns among New Jersey prison inmates: Implications for treatment and community reentry. *American Journal of Public Health, 95*, 1741–1746.
- Bombay, A., Matheson, K., & Anisman, H. (2009). Intergenerational trauma: Convergence of multiple processes among First Nations peoples in Canada. *International Journal of Indigenous Health, 5*(3), 6-47.
- Brennan, T. (2007). Institutional assessment and classification of women offenders: From robust beauty to person-centered assessment. In R. Zaplin (Ed.). *Female Offenders: Critical Perspectives and Effective Interventions* (2nd ed.). Jones and Bartlett: Massachusetts, US.
- Brennan, T., & Austin, J. (1997). *Women in jail: Classification issues*. National Institute of Corrections: Washington, D.C.
- Brown, S. (2017). *A review of the women offender risk/need research: In search of gender-neutral, women-salient and women-specific risk factors* (Research Report R-386). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Buchanan, R. A., Whitlow, K. L., & Austin, J. (1986). National evaluation of objective prison

- classification systems: The current state of the art. *Crime and Delinquency*, 32, 272-290.
- Camp, S. D., Gaes, G. G., Langan, N. P., & Saylor, W. G. (2003). The influence of prisons on inmate misconduct: A multilevel investigation. *Justice Quarterly*, 20, 501-533. doi: 10.1080/07418820300095601
- Celinska, K., & Sung, H. (2014). Gender differences in the determinants of prison rule violations. *The Prison Journal*, 94(2), 220-241. doi: 10.1177/0032885514524882
- Collica, K. (2010). Surviving incarceration: Two prison-based peer programs build communities of support for female offenders. *Deviant Behavior*, 31(4), 314-347. doi: 10.1080/01639620903004812
- Collie, R., & Polaschek, D. (2003). Sorting women's risk: New Zealand women prisoners' misconducts and internal security risk. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 32, 101-109.
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2018). *Security classification and penitentiary placement*. Retrieved from: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/acts-and-regulations/705-7-cd-eng.shtml#s8>
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2017). *Women offenders*. Retrieved from: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/publications/092/005007-3012-eng.pdf>
- Correctional Service of Canada. (2013). *Women's facilities*. Retrieved from <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/women/002002-0002-eng.shtml>
- Covington, S. (2003). *Beyond trauma: A healing journey for women*. Center City, MN: Hazelden.
- Craddock, A. (1996). A comparative study of male and female prison misconduct careers. *The Prison Journal*, 76(1), 60-80.
- Davidson, M., Sorensen, J., & Reidy, T. (2016). Gender-responsiveness in corrections: Estimating female inmate misconduct risk using the Personality Assessment Inventory (PAI). *Law and Human Behavior*, 40(1), 72-81. doi: 10.1037/lhb0000157
- Degiorgio, L. (2015). Establishing construct and predictive validity of the Prison Inmate Inventory for use with female inmates. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 59, 196-210. do 10.1177/0306624X13506393
- Derkzen, D., Booth, L., Taylor, K., & McConnell, A. (2013). Mental health needs of federal female offenders. *Psychological Services*, 10(1), 24-36. doi:10.1037/a0029653

- Drury, A. J., & Delisi, M. (2010). Past is the prologue: Prior adjustment to prison and institutional misconduct. *The Prison Journal*, 90, 331-352. doi: 10.1177/0032885510375676
- Farr, K. A. (2000). Classification for female inmates: Moving forward. *Crime & Delinquency*, 46(1), 3-17. doi: 10.1177/0011128700046001001
- Farrell MacDonald, S., Gobeil, R., Biro, S. M., Ritchie, M. B., & Curno, J. (2015). *Women offenders, substance use, and behaviour* (Research Report R-358). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Ferraro, K. J., & Moe, A. M. (2003). Mothering, crime, and incarceration. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 32(1), 9-40. doi:10.1177/0891241602238937
- Forcier, M. (1995). *Massachusetts Department of Corrections Female Offender Objective Classification Technical Assistance Project*. Sponsored by National Institute of Corrections.
- Gobeil, R. (2008). *Assessing security reclassification with male aboriginal and non-aboriginal offenders* (Research Report R- 203). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Gobeil, R. (2011). *The Custody Rating Scale as applied to male offenders* (Research Report R-257). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Gobeil, R., Blanchette, K., & Barrett, M. R. (2009). The impact of security placement on female offenders' institutional behavior. *Crime & Delinquency*, 59, 1211-1233. doi: 10.1177/0011128708330102
- Gover, A. R., Pérez, D. M., & Jennings, W. G. (2008). Gender differences in factors contributing to institutional misconduct. *The Prison Journal*, 88(3), 378-403. doi: 10.1177/0032885508322453
- Grant, B., & Luciani, F. (1998). *Security classification using the custody rating scale*. Research Report R-67. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Greiner, L., & Allenby, K. (2010). *A descriptive profile of older women offenders* (Research Report R-229). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Hannah-Moffat, K. (1999). Moral agent of actuarial subject: Risk and Canadian women's

- imprisonment. *Theoretical Criminology*, 3, 71-94. doi: 10.1177/2F1362480699003001004
- Hardyman, P. L. (2001). *Validation and refinement of objective prison classification systems for women: The experience of four states and common themes*. Washington, DC: The Institute on Crime, Justice and Corrections, National Institute of Corrections.
- Hardyman, P.L., & Van Voorhis, P. V. (2004). *Developing Gender-Specific Classification Systems for Women Offenders*. National Institute of Corrections (NIC Accession Number 018931).
- Harer, M. D. & Langan, N. P. (2001). Gender differences in predictors of prison violence: Assessing the predictive validity of a risk classification system. *Crime and Delinquency*, 47, 513-536. doi: 10.1177/0011128701047004002
- Harris, A. (2013). *Examining gender differences in institutional misconduct within the Canadian federal offender population*. Unpublished Masters thesis: Carleton University.
- Harris, A., Blanchette, K., & Brown, S. L. (2014). *Examining gender differences in institutional outcomes* (Research Report R-312). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Services of Canada.
- Holt, N. (1974). *Escape from custody* (Research Report No. 52). California Department of Corrections.
- Houck, K. D. F., & Loper, A. B. (2002). The relationship of parenting stress to adjustment among mothers in prison. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 72, 548-558. doi: 10.1037/0002-9432.72.4.548
- Houser, K. A., Belenko, S., & Brennan, P. K. (2012). The effects of mental health and substance abuse disorders on institutional misconduct among female inmates. *Justice Quarterly*, 29(6), 799-828. doi: 10.1080/07418825.2011.641026
- Houser, K. A., & Welsh, W. (2014). Examining the association between co-occurring disorders and seriousness of misconduct by female prison inmates. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41, 650-666. doi: 10.1177/0093854814521195
- Jiang, S., & Winfree, T. (2006). Social support, gender, and inmate adjustment to prison life: Insights from a national sample. *The Prison Journal*, 86, 32-55.
- Keown, L. A., Gobeil, R., Biro, S. M., & Ritchie, M. B. (2015). *Ethnocultural offenders: An initial investigation of social history variables at intake* (Research Report R-362).

Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Lahm, K. F. (2016). Official incidents of inmate-on-inmate misconduct at a women's prison: Using importation and deprivation theories to compare perpetrators to victims. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 29(3), 214-231. doi: 10.1080/1478601X.2016.1154263

Luciani, F. P., Motiuk, L. L., & Nafekh, M. (1996). *An operational review of the Custody Rating Scale: Reliability, validity, and practical utility* (Research Report R-47). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Services of Canada.

Luciani, F., Taylor, G., & Motiuk, L. (1998). *National field test results of the security reclassification protocol: Final report*. Unpublished Manuscript. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

MacDonald, S. F., Gobeil, R., Biro, S. M., Ritchie, M. B., & Curno, J. (2015). *Women offenders, substance use, and behaviour* (Research Report R-358). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

MacKenzie, D. L., Robinson, J. W., & Campbell, C. S. (1989). Long-term incarceration of female offenders: Prison adjustment and coping. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 16, 223-238. doi: 10.1177/0093854889016002007

Mays, G. L., & Winfree, L. T. (2002). *Contemporary corrections*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

McClellan, D. S. (1994). Disparity in the discipline of male and female inmates in Texas prisons. *Women and Criminal Justice*, 5, 71-97.

McCorkle, R. C. (1995). Gender, psychopathology, and institutional behavior: A comparison of male and female mentally ill prison inmates. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 23, 53-61.

Motiuk, L. (1997). Classification for correctional programming: The offender intake assessment (OIA) process. *Forum on Corrections Research*, 9, 18-22.

Nuffield, J. (1982). *Parole Decision-making in Canada: Research Toward Decision Guidelines*. Ottawa, ON: Communications Division.

Porporino, F., Luciani, F., Motiuk, L., Johnston, M., & Mainwaring, B. (1989). *Pilot implementation of a Custody Rating Scale: Interim report* (Research Report R-02). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Services of Canada.

- Reidy, T., Cihan, A., & Sorensen, J. (2017). Women in prison: Investigating trajectories of institutional female misconduct. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *52*, 49-56. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2017.07.013
- Reidy, T. J., Sorensen, J. R., & Cunningham, M. D. (2012). Community violence to prison assault: A test of the behavioral continuity hypothesis. *Law and Human Behavior*, *36*(4), 356-363. doi: 10.1037/h0093934
- Rice, M. E., & Harris, G. T. (2005). Comparing effect sizes in follow-up studies: ROC area, Cohen's d, and r. *Law and Human Behavior*, *29*, 615-620. doi: 10.1007/s10979-005-6832-7
- Rubinfeld, S. (2014). *An Examination of a Reweighted Custody Rating Scale for Women* (Research Report R-289). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Salisbury, E. J., Van Voorhis, P., & Spiropoulos, G. V. (2009). The predictive validity of a gender-responsive needs assessment: An exploratory study. *Crime & Delinquency*, *55*(4), 550-585. doi:10.1177/0011128707308102
- Scott, N. A., Mount-Michael, K., & Duffy, R. (1977). MMPI and demographic correlates and predictors of female prison escape. *Criminal Justice & Behavior*, *4*(3), 285–300.
- Scott, T.-L. (2012). *Women Gang Inmates: A Profile* (Research Report, R-272). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Skopp, N., Edens, J. F., & Ruiz, M. A. (2007). Risk factors for institutional misconduct among incarcerated women: An examination of the criterion-related validity of the Personality Assessment Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *88*(1), 106-117. doi: 10.1080/00223890709336841
- Solicitor General of Canada (1987). *Development of a security classification model for Canadian federal offenders*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Sorensen, J. R., & Cunningham, M. D. (2010). Conviction offense and prison violence: A comparative study of murderers and other offenders. *Crime & Delinquency*, *56*, 103-125. doi: 10.1177/0011128707307175
- Sorensen, J. R., Cunningham, M. D., Vigen, M. P., & Woods, S. O. (2011). Serious assaults on prison staff: A descriptive analysis. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *39*, 143-150.
- Sorensen, J. R., & Davis, J. (2011). Violent criminals locked up: Examining the effect of

- incarceration on behavioral continuity. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39, 151–158.
- Steiner, B., Butler, H., & Ellison, J. (2014). Causes and correlates of prison inmate misconduct: A systematic review of the evidence. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 42(6), 462-470. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2014.08.001
- Steiner, B., & Wooldredge, J. (2009). Individual and environmental effects on assaults and nonviolent rule breaking by women in prison. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 46(4), 437-467. doi:10.1177/0022427809341936
- Steiner, B., & Wooldredge, J. (2014). Sex differences in the predictors of prisoner misconduct. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41(4), 433-452. doi: 10.1177/0093854813504404
- Stewart, L. A., Wilton, G., Kelly, Nolan, A., & Talisman, E. (2016). Intellectual deficits among incoming federally sentenced men and women offenders: Prevalence, profiles, outcomes. (Research Report R-367). Ottawa, Ontario: Correctional Service of Canada
- Swets, J. A., Dawes, R. M., & Monahan, J. (2000). Better decisions through science. *Scientific American*, 283(4), 82-87.
- Thompson, C., & Loper, A. B. (2005). Adjustment patterns in incarcerated women: An analysis of differences based on sentence length. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 32, 714-732.
- Thompson, J. & Gobeil, R. (2015). *Aboriginal women: An overview of the correctional process from admission to warrant expiry* (Research Report R-342). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Thompson, J., McConnell, A., & Paquin-Marseille, L. (2013). *The Security Reclassification Scale (SRSW) for shorter review periods among federal women offenders*. Research Report R286. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Thompson, J., & Wardrop, K. (2018). *An assessment of the reliability and validity of the Security Reclassification Scale for Women* (Research Report R-412). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.
- Trulson, C., DeLisi, M., & Marquart, J. (2011). Institutional misconduct, delinquent background, and rearrest frequency among serious and violent delinquent offenders. *Crime & Delinquency*, 57, 709–731.
- Van Voorhis, P., Peiler, J., Presser, L., Spiropoulis, G., & Sutherland, J. (2001). *Classification*

of women offenders: A national assessment of current practices and the experiences of three states. Cincinnati, OH: The Center for Criminal Justice Research.

Van Voorhis, P., & Presser, L. (2001). *Classification of Women Offenders: A National Assessment of Current Practices.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Corrections.

Van Voorhis, P., Wright, E., Salisbury, E., & Bauman, A. (2010). Women's risk factors and their contributions to existing risk/needs assessment: The current status of a gender-responsive supplement. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 37(3), 261-288. doi: 10.1177/0093854809357442

Warner, K. (2011). Equality before the law: Racial and social background factors as sources of mitigation at sentencing. In J.V. Roberts (Ed.), *Mitigation and aggravation at sentencing* (pp. 124-145). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wichmann, C., Serin, R., & Abracen, J. (2002). *Women offenders who engage in self-harm: A comparative investigation* (Research Report R-123). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

Wright, E. M., DeHart, D. D., Koons-Witt, B. A., & Crittenden, C. A. (2013). 'Buffers' against crime? exploring the roles and limitations of positive relationships among women in prison. *Punishment & Society*, 15(1), 71-95. doi:10.1177/1462474512466199

Wright, E. M., Salisbury, E. J., & Van Voorhis, P. (2007). Predicting the prison misconducts of women offenders: The importance of gender-responsive needs. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 23(4), 310-340. doi: 10.1177/1043986207309595

Wulf-Ludden, T. (2016). Pseudofamilies, misconduct, and the utility of general strain theory in a women's prison. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 26(4), 233-259. doi: 10.1080/08974454.2015.1113154

Appendix A: Custody Rating Scale

FPS: COMPLETED:	NAME:	DATE	
INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT SCORE			TOTAL SCORE
1. History of Involvement in Institutional Incidents	a.	no prior involvement	0
	b.	any prior involvement	2
	c.	prior involvement in one or more incidents in "greatest" or "high" severity categories	2
	d.	prior involvement during last five years of incarceration;	
		- In an assault (no weapon or serious injury)	1
		- In a riot or major disturbance	2
	e.	Involvement in one or more serious incidents prior to sentencing and/or pending placement for current commitment	5
8 X TOTAL of a. to e.			
1. Escape History	a.	no escape or attempts	0
	b.	an escape or attempt from minimum or community custody with no actual or threatened violence:	
		- over two years ago	4
	- in last two years	12	
	c.	an escape or attempt from medium or maximum custody or an escape from minimum or community custody with actual or threatened violence:	
		- over two years ago	20
- in the last two years	28		
		two or more escapes from any level within the last five years.	28
1. Street Stability	a.	above average	0
	b.	average	16
	c.	below average	32
2. Alcohol/Drug Use	a.	no identifiable problems	0
	b.	abuse affecting one or more life areas	3
	c.	serious abuse affecting several life areas	6

FPS: COMPLETED:	NAME:	DATE	
INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT SCORE			TOTAL SCORE
1. Age (At any time of sentencing)	a.	18 years or less	24
	b.	19 years	32
	c.	20 years	30
	d.	21 years	18
	e.	22 years	16
	f.	23 years	14
	g.	24 years	12
	h.	25 years	10
	i.	26 years	08
	j.	27 years	06
	k.	28 years	04
	l.	29 years	02
	m.	30 years or more	00
TOTAL INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT SCORE			

SECURITY RISK SCORE			TOTAL SCORE
1. Number of prior convictions	a. b. c. d. e. f.	none one 2 to 4 5 to 9 10 to 14 over 15	0 3 6 9 12 15
2. Most serious outstanding charge	a. b. c. d. e.	no outstanding charges minor moderate serious major	0 2 5 5 35
3. Severity of current offence	a. b.	minor or moderate serious or major	12 36
4. Sentence Length	a. b. c. d.	1 day to 4 years 5 to 9 years 10 to 24 years over 24 years	5 20 45 65
5. Street Stability	a. b. c.	above average average below average	0 5 10
6. Prior Parole and/or statutory release	a. b. c.	None 1 point for each prior parole release 2 points for each prior statutory release	0
7. Age (at time of admissions)	a. b. c. d. e. f. g. h. i. j. k.	25 years or less 26 years 27 years 28 years 29 years 30 years 31 years 32 years 33 years 34 years 35 years or more	30 27 24 21 18 15 12 09 06 03 00
TOTAL SECURITY RISK SCORE			

Appendix B: Supplementary Tables

Table B1

Institutional Adjustment (IA) item and subscale correlations with institutional misconducts

IA Subscale		Incident Type	
		Violent	General
History of Institutional Incidents	Indigenous	.24*	.37**
	Non-Indigenous	.20**	.22**
Escape History	Indigenous	--	--
	Non-Indigenous	.18**	.12**
Street Stability	Indigenous	.22*	.29*
	Non-Indigenous	.09	.09
Alcohol and Drug Use	Indigenous	-.18	.03
	Non-Indigenous	.04	.16**
Age	Indigenous	.00	.16
	Non-Indigenous	.14*	.08
IA SUBSCALE TOTAL SCORE	Indigenous	.39**	.47**
	Non-Indigenous	.19**	.21**

Note. Table recreated from the Blanchette et al. (2002) report examining the validity of the Custody Rating Scale with women offenders. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table B2

Security Risk (SR) item and subscale correlations with institutional misconducts

SR Subscale		Incident Type	
		Violent	General
Prior Convictions	Indigenous	.09	.06
	Non-Indigenous	.14*	.19**
Most Serious Outstanding Charge	Indigenous	-.09	.12
	Non-Indigenous	.00	.07
Severity of Current Offense	Indigenous	-.21	-.38
	Non-Indigenous	.04	.06
Sentence Length	Indigenous	.23	.12
	Non-Indigenous	.07	.06
Street Stability	Indigenous	.25*	.33**
	Non-Indigenous	.06	.08
Prior Parole/ Statutory Release	Indigenous	.11	.21
	Non-Indigenous	.06	.08
Age	Indigenous	-.11	.15
	Non-Indigenous	.09	.18**
SR SUBSCALE TOTAL SCORE	Indigenous	.01	.05
	Non-Indigenous	.18**	.19**

Note. Table recreated from the Blanchette et al. (2002) report examining the validity of the Custody Rating Scale with women offenders. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$