PRISON VICTIMIZATION: HIGH-RISK CHARACTERISTICS AND PREVENTION

A thesis submitted
to Kent State University in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree of Master of Arts

by

Leslie A. Swales

August, 2008

Thesis written by
Leslie A. Swales
B.A., Kent State University, 2006
M.A., Kent State University, 2008

Approved by

Shelley Listwan, Ph.D.	, Advisor
Marc Colvin, Ph.D.	, Chair, Department of Justice Studies
John Stalvey, Ph.D.	, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Shelley Listwan for her support, guidance, and patience as well as for the opportunity of working beside her and gaining invaluable knowledge and experience. I would also like to thank the Department of Justice Studies for providing me with a wonderful education. I would like to thank my friends for their positivity and encouragement which helped me through this process. Last but not least, I would like to thank my parents for their continuous support and encouragement who without this would not be possible, I love you.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The Bureau of Justice Statistics (2005b) defines victimization as a crime as it affects one individual person or household. In the United States, victimization is a common occurrence. In 2006, the BJS reported over five million crimes of violence against the population of those aged 12 and older (Catalano, 2006). Attempted or threatened violence occurred in over 3.5 million victimizations while completed acts of violence occurred in 1.6 million victimizations. These violent crimes included completed violence, attempted violence, and threatened violence; which further included rape, sexual assault, aggravated assault, and simple assault. According to the BJS (2005a), the most common form of victimization is assault (includes both aggravated and simple). Aggravated assault is an attack that results in serious injury and includes the use of a weapon while simple assault may or may not result in injury but does not involve a weapon (Catalano, 2006). Over 4.4 million assaults involved individuals aged 12 and older. Rape and sexual assault occurred in 69,370 and 61,530 victimizations, respectively. While attention and research often focuses on victimization that occurs in the community, there has been minimal research conducted on victimization that occurs within the prison environment. In prisons, the rate of victimization is difficult to

ascertain. Moreover, inmates are often overlooked because of their status in society. To many, inmates are criminals who have willfully violated the law, therefore they get what they deserve. Inmates are not offered the same protection or sympathy as law-abiding citizens. DeRosia (1998) discusses "principle of least eligibility", which states that inmates are the least eligible for social benefits because of their criminal behavior.

There are different types of victimization that occur in prison including psychological, physical and sexual forms of violence. Recently, sexual victimization in prison has received considerable attention. The recent interest stems partly from the recognition that being sexually victimized while incarcerated may lead to mental health complications such as Rape Trauma Syndrome (RTS) and Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) (Fagan, Wennerstrom, & Miller, 1996). Moreover, human rights organizations have been very vocal in arguing that inmates should be provided with a safe and humane environment (Fagan et al., 1996). The Eighth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution prohibits the use of cruel and unusual punishment and requires places of confinement such as prisons to maintain humane conditions (Human Rights Watch, 2006). In addition, the Eighth Amendment requires prison administration to take reasonable measures in order to guarantee the safety of the inmates (Human Rights Watch, 2006). Not only does the Eighth Amendment protect inmates from correctional officers but from other inmates as well. In the case of *Farmer v Brennan, 1994*, The Supreme Court ruled that inmates have a right to be free from sexual assault and that such assault is constitutionally unacceptable because it is not part of the penalty for which an inmate pays for their offense (Human Rights Watch, 2006).

In addition, there are legal ramifications for those staff members who do not report an assault they may have witnessed. Deliberate indifference is a legal standard for the Eighth Amendment which holds a prison administrator or staff member liable if he or she knowingly disregards an excessive risk to inmate health or safety (Man & Cronan, 2001). The Supreme Court decided that an inmate must only show that the prison official "acted or failed to act despite his knowledge of a substantial risk of serious harm" (Man & Cronan, 2001, p. 135). Therefore, if an inmate notifies prison staff that he is at risk of harm but the staff fails to protect the inmate, the staff can be held liable. However, staff cannot be held liable though if they lack knowledge of the risk of harm to an inmate, even if it is obvious to others (Human Rights Watch, 2006).

Finally, sexual assaults may lead to more violent inmate-on-inmate incidents (Fagan et al., 1996) compromising safety within the prison. In 1979, at the U.S. Penitentiary at Lewisburg, Pennsylvania, 25 percent of inmate assaults and five of the eight murders that took place were associated with sexual motivations such as pressure for sex, unrequited love and jealousy (Fagan et al., 1996). Similar statistics were reported for California's correctional system in which 25 percent of the violent incidents between inmates were related to sexual behavior (Fagan et al., 1996).

Over the past 36 years, there has been a rise in the awareness of prison rape. In order to help prevent rape from occurring in prison, many organizations have been formed to address the issue of sexual victimization in prisons. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) created the National Prison Project (NPP) in 1972 (Melby, 2006). The purpose of the NPP is to fight unconstitutional conditions that may occur

while incarcerated. This is a litigation program used on behalf of prisoners. Since its creation, it has helped more than 100,000 individuals.

Stop Prisoner Rape (SPR), a non-profit organization based in Los Angeles, California was created in 1980 by Russell Dan Smith and other former male inmates who had fallen victim to sexual violence during their incarceration. Originally named People Organized to Stop the Rape of Imprisoned Persons, the group aimed to deal with the issues of rape, sexual assault, non-consensual sexual slavery, and forced prostitution in prison. In 1994, SPR was run by Stephen Donaldson who, as an inmate, was gang-raped 60 times over a period of two days (Donaldson, 1993). "SPR remains the only organization in the U.S. dedicated exclusively to the elimination of sexual violence in detention" (Stop Prisoner Rape, 2008). Over the past 20 years it has operated with the help from volunteers. SPR seeks to end the crime of rape in prisons for not just men but for females and juveniles as well.

Also in 1994, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that being violently assaulted is not part of an offender's penalty. *Farmer v. Brennan, 1994*, concluded that such treatment constitutes "cruel and unusual punishment" which violates the Eighth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. In 2001, Human Rights Watch issued a report condemning the abuse in American prisons. The report helped SPR pressure Congress to alter reporting and enforcement of sexual victimization prevention (Melby, 2006).

The purpose of this paper is to explore the factors associated with prison victimization. Specifically, the goal is to identify the characteristics of inmates who report victimization while incarcerated. The present research explores whether those inmates who are at the

highest risk possess certain characteristics that make them vulnerable and susceptible to victimization. These characteristics may be ones that an inmate is unable to change or hide from others such as age, race, and stature (e.g., height and weight).

CHAPTER 2

Prison Environment

Importation vs. Deportation

Popular culture depicts prisons as violent institutions where there is constant strife between inmates and staff. While caricatures of prison life are often exaggerated, the basic themes bear some semblance to prison society. An individual prison may house up to 2,000 men at a time, many with violent backgrounds. As of 2004, U.S. prisons housed over 630,000 inmates who were serving time for a violent offense (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2007). Placing these men together in close quarters may lead to feelings of hostility, anger, and inevitably violence.

The literature exploring the prison environment has focused on two interconnected areas; importation and deprivation. The importation model focuses on preprison factors in relation to prison adjustment and argues that inmates possess their own distinctive traits and that their behavior is influenced by these traits (Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002). The traits then influence their response to the prison environment and their antisocial behavior that develops in the community (DeLisi, Berg, & Hochstetler, 2004). Traits most commonly associated with this model are the "inability to cope under conditions of adversity, depression and confusion, anger, antisocial personality style, and impulsivity, and low self-control" (Hochstetler & DeLisi, 2005, p. 258.). Jiang and

Fisher-Giorlando (2002) examined disciplinary reports from 431 male inmates in an attempt to explain inmate-on-inmate incidents. Those chosen were charged and found guilty of their most current offense that occurred while in prison. Jiang and Fisher-Giorlando (2002) found that the importation model explained violent incidents, specifically incidents against other inmates. Kellar and Wang (2005) argue that the importation model may explain what leads inmates to resort to violence as a means of coping in a hostile prison environment. This violence is also found outside of prison and therefore the inmate may import their pre-existing violent behavior while serving their period of incarceration.

The deprivation model hypothesizes that prison conditions such as security-level, crowding, and management style and competency can influence inmate behavior (Hochstetler & DeLisi, 2005). It also emphasizes how deprivation of liberty, goods and services, heterosexual relationships, autonomy, and security affect prison adjustment (Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002). These deprivations are referred to as the "pains of imprisonment." These pains can create a subculture that is resistant to authority and may lead to inmate-on-inmate violence (Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002).

The inmate culture by which inmates are influenced is derived from the values and norms the inmates share. The inmate culture is one that is tough and abrasive and in many prisons, the culture demands that inmates not act weak or vulnerable. This culture can be explained by the deprivation and importation models in regards to the occurrence of inmate-on-inmate violence. The criminal background is one of the classic features of the prison culture because it is brought in with the inmates (Camp & Gaes, 2005).

Another feature of the inmate culture is the brutalization that occurs between inmates (Camp & Gaes, 2005). The inmate culture however can be influenced by administrators during classification. Camp and Gaes (2005) explain that placing inmates with others who have similar criminal backgrounds allows for different levels of prison culture. For example, a security level in which high-risk inmates are placed is more likely to have a higher criminogenic culture. These classification processes that occur in prison may lead some inmates to feel more deprived than their counterparts who are classified at a lower security level (Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002).

Violence and disorder in prisons is reflective of the inmates' behavior. One way in which inmate behavior can be explained is the inmates' criminal propensity or their inclination to commit crime (Camp & Gaes, 2005). Inmates may commit crime inside prison against anyone they see as a suitable target. "Criminal propensity is a latent factor that cannot be directly measured; however, criminal propensity ends to manifest itself in the behaviors of individuals" (Camp & Gaes, 2005, p. 428). For example, those who have a higher criminal propensity are assumed to have more infractions during their incarceration. Identifying this behavior may be helpful to prison staff during classification. Misclassification may intensify the already existent deprivation of prison by restraining an inmate to an area which may not be necessary.

Unlike those who live in free society, risk-takers in prison are less likely to be victimized as they are seen as less vulnerable. These risk-takers are the inmates who are more likely to engage in confrontations with others and violate prison rules. These qualities allow risk-takers to take advantage of more vulnerable inmates by using

intimidation and coercion. While both inmates may be suffering from deprivation, the stronger inmate is able to act out against other inmates (McCorkle, 1993). In prison, an inmate's vulnerability is based on status. Those who are higher on the social ladder are viewed as less vulnerable whereas those who are lower are prone to victimization. In order to reach a higher status, inmates must be willing to use violence (McCorkle, 1993)

Edgar (2008) explains that the prison environment has four characteristics that make prisons prone to violence. The first characteristic is deprivation. It allows for competition among inmates because the things people take for granted such as communication with family and access to food, showers or recreation have a hefty price. Inmates have different access to items of value based on the means available. Because some inmates may be able to obtain more goods than others, competition may occur among those who may or may not be able to obtain these goods. The second characteristic is the high risk of victimization which may cause inmates to be defensive and willing to use physical force. Inmates often feel that they have to be on guard at all times (Edgar, 2008). The loss of personal autonomy is the third characteristic. This creates an imbalance of power between inmates due to constant scrutiny and judgment. The final characteristic is the lack of nonviolent routes for resolving conflict. These four characteristics, in addition to the overcrowding of thousands of inmates in one facility, provoke violence and victimization.

Byrne and Hummer (2008a) contend that prison overcrowding fuels violence. Prison overcrowding is also related to the deprivation model in that inmates are deprived from privacy as well as personal space. Specifically, "crowding severely limits or

eliminates the ability of prisoners to be productive, which can leave them feeling hopeless…and then there is simply the excessive noise, heat, and tension. This is fertile ground for violence" (Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prisons, 2006, p. 23). Prison overcrowding has negative effects on an inmate's behavior. Overcrowding may have adverse effects on inmates because there are heightened levels of idleness and fear as well as an inability to maintain ones' identity (Prison Overcrowding, 1996). Barrett (2005) explains that overcrowding can lead to restlessness and frustration which may then lead to violence. Overcrowding also increases the amount of time inmates have to interact with one another. Unwanted interaction can lead to frustration, which can then lead to increased aggression.

Violence is also related to staffing levels, staff characteristics, and staff quality. If inmate-staff ratios are high, staff may be forced to implement more punitive sanctions which can create a formalized environment, in turn preventing relationships to build between staff and inmates (Byrne & Hummer, 2008a). "In U.S. prisons today, staffing ratios of 100 (inmates) to 1 (line officer) are not unusual" (Byrne & Hummer, 2008a, p. 47). The characteristics of prison staff include age, gender and diversity while quality of staff encompasses education, experience, training and competence. Byrne and Hummer (2008a) emphasize that along with a lower inmate-staff ratio, a more culturally diverse and higher quality staff should be directly related to lower levels of prison violence and disorder.

Inmates may also use violence as a response to fear. Inmates are deprived of the safety they may have felt outside of prison. The deprivation model suggests that the

stress and oppression found in prison may cause aggressive behavior. Caucasian inmates are particularly vulnerable to this type of victimization. Those inmates who may be subjected to this violence more often than others are Caucasian inmates. Caucasian inmates are often viewed as weak because some are unwilling to use violence. Caucasian inmates may also be victimized due to racial antagonisms such as African-Americans getting back at their Caucasian oppressors (McCorkle, 1993). Others who are seen as vulnerable are those who are from rural areas where they are not familiar with the urban culture and those who lack allies and are social isolates (McCorkle, 1993).

A deeper understanding of aggression and violence in prison can be found with general strain theory (GST). With this theory, "a range of strains or stressors increase the likelihood of crime and these strains may involve the inability to achieve positively-valued goals (e.g., money, status, autonomy), the loss of positively-valued stimuli (e.g., loss of romantic partners, property), and the presentation of negatively-valued stimuli (e.g., verbal and physical abuse)" (Agnew, 2006; p.11). These strains may cause individuals to commit crime when their level of stress is high causing them to feel badly (Agnew, 1992). Agnew's theory can also explain the violence which is imported by inmates in that it is a coping mechanism for those who cannot escape strain. Prison itself can be considered an objective and subjective strain (Agnew, 2006). Objective strains are events or conditions disliked by most individuals while subjective strains are events or conditions disliked by the individual experiencing them. The loss of positively- valued strains and the presentation of negatively-valued strains may lead to violence in prison. These strains are created by coercion.

Related, inmate aggression can be a result of stressful conditions within prison. These stressful and oppressive conditions may create higher levels of anxiety and fear among inmates (Unnever, Colvin & Cullen, 2004, p. 244). Colvin's (2000) differential coercion theory suggests that crime involving an offender and a victim have an alienated bond in which one person is stronger than the other. Coercion occurs because the victim begins to act a certain way through force or intimidation by the offender. Colvin (2000) explains that coercion can motivate an individual to behave a certain way because it is physically and emotionally painful. Furthermore, because coercion can explain crime in general, it can also be used to explain the deprivation model in regards to inmate-on-inmate violence.

Prison violence is a product of what Colvin (2000) describes as dimensions of control. The first type of control seen in the prison environment is consistent coercion. Consistent coercion occurs when the offender and victim have an ongoing, highly punitive relationship. Individuals under this type of control experience high level of self-directed anger and weak social bonds (Colvin, 2000). Inmates then have a decrease in pro-social behavior and a high probability of mental health problems. Also, inmates under this control may behave in such a way that increases the potential for assault or murder (Colvin, 2000).

The second type of control that is evident in prisons is erratic coercion. This type of control is one in which individuals experience low self-control, low self-efficacy, and weak, negative alienated social bonds (Colvin, 2000). The erratic coercion causes inmates to behave in such a way that they act defiant and hostile toward prison staff, and

they coerce and intimidate other inmates. Colvin (2000) explains that this type of control has a strong relation to Agnew's (1992) strain theory.

Because disputes in prison are routine and violence is rampant, research is often conducted to examine the effects violence has on inmates. McCorkle (1993) conducted a study of 300 Tennessee inmates to assess their level of fear of victimization. The findings showed that the inmates had a higher level of fear in prison than they would if in the community. A majority of the inmates (55.4%) had been seriously threatened during their incarceration. Forty-five percent of the sample generally felt unsafe and over one-third of the sample had been hit with a fist. Approximately 45 percent of the inmates explained that they we were fearful of being attacked and over half of the sample felt that their chances of attack were fairly high (McCorkle, 1993). Younger inmates expressed greater fear as well as those who had experienced prison aggression prior to the study (McCorkle, 1993). Chubaty (2002) conducted a study of 91 inmates from two Canadian prisons. One-third of the sample had been threatened in the past year with assault while one-fifth had been physically victimized. Due to the fear of victimization, many of the inmates reported carrying a weapon, being the aggressor, or joining a gang in order to protect themselves from assault (Chubaty, 2002). The next section will discuss the types of victimization in more detail.

Prison Inmate-On-Inmate Victimization

Victimization in prison can take many forms: physical/assaultive, psychological, and sexual. Each of these types will be discussed in detail. Byrne and Hummer (2008b)

state that while assault does occur in prison, the extent and severity is unknown. This may be due to the differences in definitions of assault among correctional departments. For example, some departments may or may not include verbal threats or attempted assault when reporting levels of assault in their prisons (Byrne & Hummer, 2008b). Physical assault is the most common form of victimization in prison and is reported at a higher rate than both psychological and sexual victimizations. The following sections will describe the three types of victimization as well as the rates at which they have occurred.

Physical Victimization

The most common form of victimization in prisons is physical abuse. "The Correctional Service of Canada defines an assault as a 'deliberate attack on an inmate or inmates" (Cooley, 1993, p. 489). Byrne and Hummer (2008b) found that in 2000 there were 34,355 inmate-on-inmate assaults in federal, state and private prisons in the U.S. Moreover, the rate of assaults appears to have increased over time. According to Stephan and Karberg (2003), between 1995 and 2000 the number of assaults increased 32 percent in all types of correctional facilities. To evaluate the rate at which physical victimization occurs in prison versus the general community, Wolff, Blitz, Shi, Siegel and Bachman (2007) administered surveys to 7,221 male and 564 female inmates from 14 prisons. Wolff, et al. (2007) argued that their study confirmed the violent prison stereotype and found that the rates of physical victimization were more than 18 times higher than the rates for males and 27 times higher than the rates for females outside of prison.

Moreover, 20 percent of inmates from the 14 prisons reported experiencing some form of physical violence (Wolff, et al., 2007). Consistent findings were reported in Cooley's (1993) study of 117 inmates who were incarcerated in five Canadian federal prisons. Fifty-five (47%) of the 117 inmates interviewed reported 107 different incidents of victimization with 82 percent of the personal victimizations classified as assaults or threats of assaults (Cooley, 1993).

The specific causes for the high rate of physical assaults in prison remain unclear (Carriere, 1980). Physical violence may be used for a variety of reasons including a means to settle altercations, instill fear, obtain something that is wanted, or protect oneself. Violence in prison is likely due to both importation and deprivation. The prison environment is filled with extortion, homosexual relations, debts, stealing, and routine disputes. Violence may occur, or be more likely to occur, as a result of these factors (Wright, 1991). Wright (1991) adds that the prison environment is similar to that of an urban slum in which the population consists of lower-class individuals who are hostile to others of different ethnicities. These individuals "lack commitment to public morality which promotes a safe and violent-free setting" (Wright, 1991, p. 5). The different ethnic groups then form coalitions in order to protect themselves as well as to demonstrate their strength. In prisons, this can translate into aggression toward other inmates or groups of inmates (Wright, 1991).

Another influence on inmate violence is the formal organization of the prison which may include security, programs, rehabilitation, staff characteristics, and prison strain (Camp & Gaes, 2005). The formal organization of the prison may also be referred

to as the prison regime. The dominant feature of the regime is prison security. If this is too rigid, the organization may cause inmates to lash out (Byrne & Hummer, 2008b). The formal organization of the prison or the prison regime encourages prisonization which allows for the adaptation of the "pains of imprisonment" (Jiang, Fisher-Giorlando, 2002). Prisonization refers to taking on the customs and general culture of the prison (Clemmer, 1940). Once again, the deprivation model accounts for these inmate behaviors (Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002).

Victimization in prison may be avoided by changing daily activities. Inmates who are at high-risk for victimization are those who spend less time in structured activities (Wooldredge, 1998). Structured activities have heightened supervision which reduces the risk for victimization. Those who are involved in classes are less likely to associate with inmates who victimize and therefore, reduce their chances of victimization. However, while reducing the risk of personal victimization, inmates increase the risk of falling victim to a thief because their property is not being supervised.

Psychological Victimization

The least discussed type of victimization is psychological victimization. Psychological victimization is the use of a threat, action or coercive tactic that includes one or more of the following: humiliating the victim; controlling what the victim can and cannot do; taking advantage of the victim; disclosing information that would tarnish the victim's reputation; and deliberately doing something to make the victim feel diminished such as making them feel less attractive or less intelligent (Centers for Disease Control

and Prevention, 2007). Psychological victimization may include bullying which includes ridiculing, ostracizing, and rumor spreading (South & Wood, 2006). Bullying requires an imbalance of power and must be unprovoked, repeated, and intended to cause fear or harm (Edgar, 2005; South & Wood, 2006). Finally, exclusion is another form of psychological victimization in which the targeted inmate is threatened and sometimes physical victimized in order to keep the inmate away (O'Donnell & Edgar, 1998). Exclusion may also be no more than avoidance of the hated inmate (O'Donnell & Edgar, 1998). O'Donnell and Edgar (1998) suggest that exclusion can be as harmful to an inmate as verbal abuse because it may lower an inmate's self-esteem. Victims of exclusion are often left feeling inferior and powerless.

Edgar (2005) explains that power disparity is essential for psychological victimization. Based on a study conducted in four institutions with over 1,000 adult and juvenile offenders, O'Donnell and Edgar (1999) conclude that psychological victimization occurs at high levels in prisons. The survey measured how often inmates were victimized as well as their victimization of others. Verbal abuse was measured by asking each inmate about their experiences of having been "called hurtful names or having had insulting remarks made about their family or girlfriend" (O'Donnell & Edgar, 1999, p. 92). Verbal abuse was found to be more frequent in juvenile institutions; however, psychological victimization was present among all age groups. Kerbs and Jolley (2007) found that 85 percent of their sample of older inmates had experienced line cutting by younger inmates. Older inmates also experienced insults (40%), threats that

include fake punches (25%), being called a snitch (19%), and being verbally threatened (17%).

Emotional victimization may occur for a variety of reasons. Threats may be used to force a person to do something against their will (O'Donnell & Edgar, 1998). Threats may be used to coerce an inmate into giving up some type of good or service, to provoke a fight, or to put an end to ongoing insults. Victimized inmates may have little or no social status and are therefore prime targets for those who wish to gain social status. Victimization may take place because the inmate has not integrated into a social system such as a gang which would protect inmates from bullying. Psychological victimization may also occur when inmates exhibit higher levels of maladjustment to prison life. Inmates who are powerless and feel inferior may experience this type of victimization if unable or unwilling to conform to prison life.

Sexual Victimization

In jails and prisons across the United States, the act of and extent to which sexual assault occurs among inmates has recently gained heightened attention. The definitions of sexual victimization vary and can cause problems for identifying the acts of sexual aggression, sexual assault and rape. Rape is defined as forced vaginal, oral or anal penetration by a body part or a foreign object (Rape, Abuse and Incest National Network, 2008). RAINN (2008) defines sexual assault as any unwanted sexual contact in which rape or attempted rape does not occur. However, some state laws, like those in the State

of Ohio, use rape and sexual assault interchangeably. Sexual assault as defined by the State of Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction is:

> Any contact between the sex organ of one person and the sex organ, mouth or anus of another person, or any intrusion of any part of the body of one person, or of any object into the sex organ, mouth or anus of another person, by the use of force or threat of force (p. 1).

According to Knowles (1999), rape occurs when sexual intercourse with at least one other person is obtained through physical force, threats or intimidation. Not only is the physical act of sexual assault a problem, but all the factors that surround it are problematic as well. People's perceptions of inmate-on-inmate sexual assault often make it difficult to come to an effective solution to protect vulnerable inmates. The perceptions of the prison wardens, correctional officers, and other inmates, often clash and inevitably prevent appropriate protection for those inmates who are at high risk of being sexually victimized.

Clashing perceptions on this issue have resulted in a wide range of prevalence figures. For example, research has shown rates of rape as low as 1 percent of the prison population to as high as 41 percent (Saum, Surratt & Inciardi, 1995). This is partly due to different definitions of sexual victimization and methodologies. Because definitions of different types of sexual victimization vary between states it is possible for rape and sexual assault to be used interchangeably in one state and be defined separately in another. One study of 300 Tennessee inmates found that one-quarter had been approached for sexual favors (McCorkle, 1993). In another study, Saum, et al. (1995)

found that of 101 male inmates only 3 percent has seen one rape and 1 percent had seen two rapes. These inmates were also asked to rate the frequency of rape. Over 29 percent of the inmates believed that rape occurred once a month, 38 percent thought it occurred once a week or more, and 16 percent believed that rape occurred daily (Saum, et al., 1995). Saum et al. (1995) report that the inmates contradicted themselves and that these varying statistics demonstrate that sexual victimization is a problem, however, the extent of the problem remains unclear. What are more apparent are the characteristics of the victims and the possible reasons for this behavior.

Cooley (1993) suggests that because inmates are not perceived as victims, the research is often neglected therefore prevalence may remain low despite the amount of sexual victimization that occurs. To many, inmates are not seen as a vulnerable target of victimization (Cooley 1993). However, Cooley (1993) administered a criminal victimization survey to 177 prisoners and found that sexual assault occurred in only six reported incidents of victimizations. Saum, et al. (1995), reported that 60 percent of inmates never heard of rape occurring in the previous year of their incarceration. Those who had heard of incidences of rape claim that rumors are widespread. Although the rate of confirmed rapes is small, the fear and the threat of rape are widespread.

In addition to prison administrators, wardens do not believe that rape occurs at a high rate among the prison population (Hensley & Tewksbury, 2005b). Hensley et al. (2003a, 2003b) conducted a study on wardens from prisons across the U.S. and found that of the 441 surveyed, 72 percent indicated that there had not been reports of rapes in the last year. Of those who had official reports of rape, 11 percent reported only one

incident and 17 percent stated they had received two to 17 reported rapes (Hensley et al., 2003b). Davis (1968) interviewed 3,304 inmates in order to find the extent to which sexual victimization occurs. In order to prevent misrepresentation, assaults were only included if they were corroborated by another party, such as through institution records or polygraph results from witnesses. Interviews of 156 inmates reported incidences of sexual assault. Davis (1968) found that 5 percent of his sample had been sexually assaulted. Moss, Hosford, and Anderson (1979) explain that rape incidents may vary from one and a half to 3 percent of the prison population. However, it has been reported that over half of the states fail to collect rape information in prisons, which also skews the percentage of rapes (Report, 2001; Robertson, 2003).

Robertson (2003) explains several reasons as to why there are disparities in data collection including most samples in research are unrepresentative; a vast portion of the inmates surveyed are illiterate; underreporting of rapes during personal interviews; and dissimilar management practices. The last reason for disparity is that some prisons may tolerate or simply ignore rape in the prison. While some studies report low levels of sexual victimization, others indicate the problem is more pervasive. An article from Contemporary Sexuality (Report: Male rape victims, 2001) surveyed inmates, correctional officers, and prison administration about the perceptions of the prevalence of sexual victimization. Inmates believed that one-third of their fellow inmates are forced into sex. Correctional officers and prison administrators estimate that inmates are forced into sex less frequently (25% and 12.5% respectively).

The reasons for sexual victimization in prison vary. In prison there is an informal classification system among inmates. This classification system uses vocabulary, or argot, to identify inmates including those who have been victimized. Hensley, Wright, Tewksbury and Castle (2003c) claim that prison argot can influence the treatment which an inmate will receive from fellow inmates and staff members. These labels are "central elements in the structuring of social interactions" (Hensley et al., 2003c, p. 291). These terms stigmatize inmates and are often impossible to remove. Many of the terms inmates use to identify inmates are derogatory and can actually lead to victimization. This labeling by other inmates may also be considered a form of abuse.

Being "turned out" is a term used to describe the act of forcing the victim of sexual victimization to assume a female role (O'Donnell, 2004). The actual labels by which an inmate is identified may be "punk," "kid," or "fag" (Dumond, 1992; Hensley et al, 2003c). "Punk" or "kid" is used to describe an inmate who engaged in sexual activities because of coercion or rape. Punks or kids are thought of as cowards who are weak and unable to defend themselves and are perceived as sexual slaves who fit the common characteristics of the first-time offending, middle class, Caucasian, and male. These inmates may accept a passive role in order to gain protection or material rewards.

"Fags" fulfill the stereotypical homosexual role (Hensley et al., 2003c). Fags are effeminate and often wear makeup and dress in women's clothing and may be passive as well but provoke sexual tension. Although these inmates may be more willing to take on the role of a female and be more inclined to engage in sexual activities, they too can be victims of sexual assault. Additional items that have been used to identify inmates

targeted as victims or prey include “sissy”, “grumpy”, “fresh meat”, “boy”, “gay boy”, “young thing”, “mines” and “mule” (Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, n.d.).

Risk Factors and Characteristics

Characteristics that make a person susceptible to victimization in the outside world also apply to the prison environment. Victimization in society may be caused by certain personal risk factors. Arnold, Keane and Baron (2005) explain that risk is the probability of an undesirable outcome. For example, the age and gender of an individual may be a risk factor for some sort of assault. While females are at higher risk than males, the age range at highest risk for both genders is 15 to 24 years (Arnold, Keane & Baron, 2005). An individual may place themselves at risk by the location in which they live. For example, those who reside in an urban area have a 10 percent greater risk than those who reside in rural areas (Arnold et. al, 2005). Another type of risk is engaging in activities in the evening or at night (Arnold et. al, 2005).

Those who are at high-risk of victimization may be the one to precipitate the event. Victim precipitation is the idea that the victim plays a role in the crime committed against them through their poor judgment, excessive risk-taking, or self-destructive life-style (Timmer & Norman, 1984). Timmer and Norman (1984) explain that “crime can be understood as the product of individual character traits and motives and thus may be controlled or prevented by influencing the behavior of individuals” (p. 63). It has been suggested that individuals should take steps to prevent victimization by dressing less

seductively, leaving lights on, not letting newspapers pile up, locking or barring windows, engraving valuables, installing alarm systems, or joining the neighborhood watch (Timmer & Norman, 1984).

In the prison environment, an inmate may be able to avoid victimization by steering clear of areas that may be prone to such incidents. For example, avoiding unpopulated or unmonitored areas may reduce the risk of victimization in prison. Inmates should also never accept anything from other inmates. Often times accepting gifts from another inmate results in the expectation of something in return, often sexual activity. Refusing to pay a perceived debt to an inmate may then result in physical victimization. However, these choices are not always easy for the inmates to make.

The moment an inmate enters prison he may already be a target for sexual assault (Human Rights Watch, 2006). However, the characteristics that make the inmate a high-risk target for sexual victimization are often out of the inmates' control. The most vulnerable inmate is described as a Caucasian, middle-class male with a slight build who possesses a youthful and attractive demeanor and is most likely a first-time, non-violent offender (Dumond, 2000; Greene, 1984). Those who are also prime targets are effeminate gays, male-to-female transsexuals and those who are unassertive, passive, shy and intellectual (Greene, 1984). The more high-risk characteristics an inmate possesses the more likely they are to be targeted. Inmates younger in age or who appear to be youthful are at high risk as well with most victimized inmates falling between the ages of 18 and 30 (Fagan, Wennerstrom, & Miller, 1996). Being physically or mentally weak may also make an inmate vulnerable. Strength alone may not prevent an assault from

occurring however, inmates must often act aggressively to protect themselves (Human Rights Watch, 2006).

Man and Cronan (2001) explain that "many physical characteristics are indicators of sexual abuse that can be assessed immediately. An inmate's physical characteristics allow a potential rapist to assess the likelihood that an attempted rape will be successful" (p. 157). These characteristics include race, age, physical build, mental capacity and prior prison experience. Race, as noted by Man and Cronan (2001), "is highly polarizing" and each inmate must find others of the same race for protection (p. 158). Inmates do not respect other races and within the prison walls, the Caucasian men are the minority while the African-Americans and Hispanics are the majority (Man & Cronan, 2001).

Man and Cronan (2001) suggest that racial groups traditionally labeled as minorities may seek retribution on their perceived "majority" oppressors. Rape then, is "a mechanism by which African-American inmates can obtain retribution and assert their dominance over Caucasians" (Man & Cronan, 2001, p. 160). Since Caucasian inmates are the minority, it is less likely that an African-American or Hispanic inmate will be "turned out" or become a "punk". Caucasian inmates are also less likely to back each other up due to their minority status. This results in Caucasian inmates being preyed on by all races, including other Caucasians.

Hensley, Koscheski, and Tewksbury (2005a) surveyed 800 inmates from a maximum-security correctional facility. Analyses of the 46-item questionnaire showed that 73 percent of sexual assault targets were Caucasian, while African-Americans

comprised only 23 percent of the targets (Hensley, et al., 2005a). In another study, Hensley, Tewksbury, and Castle (2003b) interviewed 174 inmates about consensual and coercive sexual activity. Results showed that 58 percent of the targets were Caucasian and 29 percent were African-American. Although the percentages vary, they show that the majority of sexual assault targets are Caucasian. Davis (1968) examined 129 assault cases in prison and found no cases with a white aggressor and a black victim. In contrast, 56 percent of the cases reported a black aggressor assaulting a white victim.

Knowles (1999) noted that African-Americans and Hispanics rarely sexually assault someone of their own race. Moss, Hosford, and Anderson (1979) found in their study that all of the perpetrators of inmate-on-inmate victimization were from minority groups while all of the victims were Caucasian. As others have suggested, sexual assault may be the "American ethnic power struggle taken to the personalized level" (Moss, et al., 1979, p. 826).

Age is another factor that can influence the risk for sexual assault. The average age of rape victims is 21 to 23. Prisons with younger inmates have higher occurrences of rape than those who house older inmates. Younger inmates are more likely to be sexually assaulted for several reasons. Younger inmates have a tendency to have more feminine features and are unaware of the informal rules of prison life (Man & Cronan, 2001). Additionally, older inmates target younger inmates in order to establish a claim to them before another inmate has time to do so (Man & Cronan, 2001). These young inmates are also targeted because they are less likely to be attracted to other inmates and many prove to be more loyal to their partner (Man & Cronan, 2001).

The feminine features associated with some younger males are an attraction to others. Those who are younger and have a smaller stature are seen as more feminine, therefore placing them at higher risk of prison rape. Homosexual inmates who possess the stereotypical feminine characteristics are at an especially high risk (Man & Cronan, 2001). The features that attract offenders are high pitched voices, certain hairstyles, gestures, and the way in which some inmates wear their clothing. Man and Cronan (2001) explain that masculinity is a necessity in prison and those who fail to act masculine are more vulnerable. "For example, inmates who look scared, shy, or nervous face immediate danger because they exude signs of weaknesses" (Man & Cronan, 2001, p. 166).

Offenders often use physical force to overpower their target, so those who are smaller in stature face a likelihood of being victimized. The inmates who possess a smaller physical build are easily dominated and less able to defend themselves (Man & Cronan, 2001, p. 167). In addition, offenders are better able to justify, at least to themselves, the rape of a smaller effeminate inmate because the offender can assert dominance without feeling the stigma of homosexuality (Man & Cronan, 2001). The average weight of a sexual assault victim in prison is 141 pounds. This is lighter than the average offender. The offender also stands one inch taller than his target (Man & Cronan, 2001).

Offenders may also use intimidation tactics in order to get their victim to perform certain sexual acts. The victim on the other hand tends to prefer isolation and is "weak, passive, and easily intimidated" (Fagan et al., 1996, p. 55). Victims of prison rape may

also be mentally ill, mentally retarded, and/or elderly. Fagan et al. (1996) explains that those who survive rape in prison are more likely to become rapists or to commit other violent crimes later in their lives. Another target of sexual victimization is an inmate who is mentally challenged or elderly. These inmates "may not possess the cognitive ability, self-assertiveness, or physical strength necessary to recognize and cope with sexual aggressors" (Fagan et al., 1996, p. 56). In recent years, there has been an increase in the number of victimizations of mentally challenged or elderly inmates (Human Rights Watch, 2006). Other inmates who are at risk for sexual victimization are those who self-identify as homosexual. It is beneficial for these inmates to hide their sexual orientation in order to reduce their risk of victimization.

The criminal history of the victim is another factor that may lead to victimization. Those who are at a particularly high risk of sexual assault are those who are incarcerated for sex crimes (Human Rights Watch, 2006). In most cases though, the victim has a less severe crime than his offender. In some instances, their crime may have been the cause of their victimization as this type of crime is grounds for punishment by other inmates (Fagan et al., 1996).

Another reason for sexual victimization is to express ones power and control over another inmate, also referred to as the process of seduction. New inmates may be offered protection, gifts, or commissary and are subsequently approached by an inmate seeking some kind of sexual activity (Eigenberg, 2000). If an inmate refuses to engage in sexual activity, he must give back the gifts or commissary and give up the protection. However, many offending inmates may resort to aggression and force in order to gain participation

in sexual activities. Furthermore, Knowles (1999) argues that sexual victimization as an expression of power results in the ultimate humiliation by causing a man to assume the role of a female. In prison, inmates lose respect for those in the female role because a "real man" would not allow himself to be forced into something he did not want to do (Knowles, 1999). By assuming this role, he also becomes the property of the rapist and becomes a sex slave (Knowles, 1999).

Impact of Victimization

Psychological Consequences

Inmates who are victims of another inmate's aggression and violence are often placed under immense psychological stress. Victimized inmates often experience clinical features similar to Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), a mental disorder that is caused by a(n) extreme traumatic event(s) that involved physical harm or the threat of physical harm (National Institute of Mental Health, 2008). PTSD is diagnosed in approximately 5-6 percent of the male population. Symptoms of PTSD include recurrent flashbacks (images, thoughts, or perceptions), recurrent nightmares, feelings that the event is recurring, feelings of distress when exposed to cues that resemble the event, and physiological reactivity to such cues. Other symptoms may be classified as avoidance and numbing symptoms such as an effort to avoid thoughts, feelings, activities, or places and feelings of detachment. Symptoms of increased arousal may also occur including difficulty falling or staying asleep, irritability, and difficulty concentrating. According to

the National Institute of Mental Health (2008) as many as 7.7 million individuals living in the U.S. have PTSD.

Gibson, Holt, Fondacaro, Tang, Powell, and Turbitt (1999) examined traumatic events leading to PTSD among male inmates and what psychiatric disorders are comorbid with PTSD in this sample. The most common comorbid disorders cooccurring with PTSD were substance abuse, other anxiety disorders, major depression, and antisocial personality disorder. The authors interviewed 213 randomly selected male inmates who reported experiencing a traumatic event such as witnessing someone being hurt or killed. Of the 213 inmates who reported a traumatic event, 69 (33%) met DSM-III-R criteria for lifetime PTSD (symptoms at any point during their life) and 45 (21%) met criteria for current PTSD (symptoms occurring during the past six months). Of those who met criteria for lifetime PTSD, the self-reported worst event was witnessing someone being hurt or killed followed by being raped and being physically assaulted. Seventy-five (35%) inmates who reported a traumatic event did not meet DSM-III-R criteria for PTSD. These inmates most likely reported that they did not experience symptoms in which DSM-III-R criteria for PTSD is required. Hochstetler, Murphy and Simmons (2004) state that previous trauma predicts distress and that "prison victimization is a significant predictor of depressive and posttraumatic stress" (p. 448). The symptoms of PTSD become more severe when the inmate is physically injured or fears for his own life.

To reduce the risk of prison sexual victimization prison administrators need to focus on those inmates who are at high risk. All too often risk factors are ignored and can lead to victimization that could have been prevented. Attitudes such as this have

paved the way for inmate protection through the legal standards of deliberate indifference. It is an inmate's right to be free from harm, even if they themselves have committed crimes. Victimization by other inmates may occur due to importation and deprivation which further highlights the need for prison administration to provide an outlet for inmates who experience these feelings. Ignoring these elements of the prison subculture may lead to victimization which in turn may cause PTSD. Furthermore, it is important to protect inmates because all too often they are thought of as predators and not as victims. Inmates are the "antithesis of the 'ideal victim" (Cooley, 1993, p. 480).

Sexual victimization of an inmate can be debilitating and overwhelming and the effects may be worsened due to the confinement setting (Corlew, 2006). This may cause an inmate to blame himself for being sexually victimized. This self-blame can lead to psychological distress. Many emotions are likely to flow through the victim such as feelings of low self-worth, a sense of stigma, shame and embarrassment, nightmares, and flashbacks. In addition, victimized inmates may experience physical responses such as skeletal muscular tension and pain, gastrointestinal irritability, genitourinary disturbances, impotence and extreme emotional expressions (Tewksbury, 2007). These symptoms originate from the two phases of Rape Trauma Syndrome (RTS), a form of PTSD. The first phase is the acute phase and includes the physical symptoms while the second, long-term phase includes the emotional symptoms. These two phases are part of what Fagan, Wennerstrom, and Miller (1996) call Stage One of RTS. The second stage, reorganization, deals with the emotional aftermath of the incident (Fagan et al., 1996).

The third stage is the resolution stage. This stage occurs when the victim is able to sort through the conflicting and suppressed emotions (Fagan et al., 1996).

Inmates who experience PTSD or RTS as a result of prison victimization must be given adequate attention and given the opportunity to seek the help they may need following the incident. Because some inmates have the possibility of experiencing victimization and the effects of it, prison staff needs to be ready to help the victim through the emotions that may follow. An inmate should receive the help needed to reach the third stage of RTS.

This study will examine the three types of victimization and the relationships they have with characteristics and factors that may increase an inmate's risk for victimization. This study will use four hypotheses which aim to confirm the risk factor and characteristic literature: 1) Younger inmates are more likely to be victimized in prison than older inmates, 2) Inmates smaller in stature (i.e. height and weight) are more likely to be victimized in prison, 3) Caucasian inmates are more likely to be victimized in prison than other races, 4) First-time inmates are more likely to be victimized than those who have been previously incarcerated and, 5) Inmates who participate in activities such at treatment are less likely to be victimized.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Sample

The current sample utilizes data collected as part of a NIJ-funded grant entitled *Prison Experiences and Re-Entry: The Impact of Victimization on Coming Home.* The sample was collected over the course of approximately one year from August 2006 through August 2007. The purpose of the study was to determine whether prison victimization has an impact on inmates as they return to the community. The population under study was formerly incarcerated in Ohio's prison system. Interviews were conducted in halfway houses from across the state. Ohio has more than 30 halfway houses that serve approximately 8,500 males and females. Halfway houses were representative of Ohio's institutions at all five security levels. Females, parole violators, and offenders on probation were excluded from this study.

The target population included males currently serving time in halfway houses. These clients were classified as either transitional control (TC) or post- release control (PRC). Transitional control is used for clients who are made eligible by the Ohio Parole Board. These clients are transferred to a halfway house to complete up to 180 days of the remainder of their sentence. If these TC clients do well in their transition, they may be given electronic monitoring. The emphasis of TC is employment, education, vocational

training and treatment. A major goal of TC is to make an inmate's transition into the community more successful. Post-release control clients are under the Adult Parole Authority supervision following their release from prison. Only offenders sentenced to prison on or after July 1, 1996 are classified as PRC.

There were several advantages of conducting the study in halfway houses. The first advantage was that the subjects were in the community which makes them accessible to the research team. Ohio's halfway houses must keep new clients on the premises for seven days for their orientation to the facility. The second advantage was that the clients were recently released from prison. Clients who have been victimized are less likely to be detected by staff and other inmates should they discuss their victimization. The researchers hypothesized that the added comfort level in a halfway house may increase the rate of disclosure. The third advantage of conducting this study in halfway houses was that it allowed for face-to-face interviews. This method of interviewing increases disclosure and allows interviewers to probe for incident details.

The male clients included in this study had been recently released from prison within the past six months and were currently serving the remainder of their sentence in one of the 24 surveyed halfway houses. Over 2,200 clients were eligible for this study. Of those eligible, 1,616 completed the interviews, 93 refused to participate, 31 clients were unavailable for interviews and 463 clients were terminated prior to being asked to participate.

Data Collection

The study from which the current subsample was taken included three data collection periods. During the first period, the research team administered standardized assessments that included victimization history, reentry expectations, social support, PTSD cognitions, psychological indicators (using the Trauma Symptom Checklist), and coping with stressful situations. Clients were also asked questions regarding types of victimization, specifically, whether they had witnessed or directly experienced victimization. If a victimization question was answered affirmatively, the interviewer would begin asking questions that would capture the details of the victimization. Victimization data was collected only if the client had experienced an incident within the past twelve months.

During the second period of data collection, clients were surveyed six months after their release from the halfway house. The surveys focused on obstacles they may have faced during their reentry into the community. The third step of data collection was the collection of official data on each of the clients. This includes prison data, halfway house data and community adjustments (technical violations and recidivism). The current study focused on the first data collection point to explore characteristics of those who reported victimization compared to those who did not report victimization.

The research team that conducted the interviews for the present study consisted of Master's and doctoral level students from universities across Ohio. Students were recruited through fliers distributed by their department's graduate director. Universities included the University of Cincinnati, Bowling Green State University, Wright State University, University of Toledo, The Ohio State University, Case Western University,

Kent State University, University of Akron and Cleveland State University. Over 50 interviewers were selected. All of the interviewers were trained on the study protocol, how to interview the clients and how to distribute the incentives.

In order to eliminate favoring and the self-selection of clients, interviewers obtained a list of all eligible halfway house clients. Eligible inmates were approached individually to ensure confidentiality. Every inmate was given a consent form that explained the purpose of the study and its risks. Participation in the study was completely voluntary. Whether or not a client decided to participate, he was asked to sign and date the consent form stating whether or not the research team was permitted to use his information for the study. Subjects were also notified that there would be no consequences for choosing not to participate. Each participant was given an incentive in the form of a $15 Wal-Mart gift card. The interview did not need to be completed for the incentive to be given.

Variables

The data set used for this study included 1116 interviews. The independent variables analyzed were age, race, height, weight, stature, prior prison experience, education level, length of prison sentence, prison employment, treatment participation and religious involvement. While race was used as an independent variable, only those who self-reported as Caucasian or African-American were included in the analyses. Race was coded with 0 for African-American and 1 for Caucasian. The majority (36%) of the sample was between the ages of 19 and 29 years. Age was a continuous variable that was

collapsed into 10-year intervals in order to duplicate the Center for Disease Control and Prevention's comparison of age with the mean height and weight for adult males. This allowed for the direct comparison of inmate height and weight with the CDC data on the height and weight of the U.S. population. However, for purpose of analysis, age remained a continuous variable.

Height and weight were measured based on the mean for males in the U.S. Between 1999 and 2000, the average height of males was approximately 5 feet, 9 inches while the average weight ranged between 172 pounds and 196 pounds, depending on the age of the male. The average height and weight for our sample was 5 feet, 10 inches and 184 pounds, respectively. Height and weight were continuous variables that were recoded to indicate the average height and weight of the sample. Each variable was coded as 1 for those who were below average and 0 for those who were above average. Because literature has shown that those with smaller statures are at a higher risk for victimization, a new variable, small stature, was created using the height and weight variables. If a client reported that they were below average in both categories, they were considered to have a small stature. This variable was coded with 0 for those who did not have a small stature and with a 1 for those who reported they did. Prior prison experience was coded with 0 for prior experience and 1 for no prior experience. Prison employment, treatment participation and religious involvement were coded 0 for none and 1 for yes. Education was coded 0 for at least a high school education and 1 for less than a high school education.

The dependent variables included the types of victimization discussed throughout this paper (psychological, physical and sexual). Victimization for the purpose of this study was measured by asking subjects several questions for each type of victimization. The first type, physical victimization, was measured by asking whether the client had been involved in specific altercations. First, clients were asked if they had witnessed someone being hurt by another inmate, if another inmate had attempted to hurt them, or if another inmate had actually hurt them. If the client responded yes to any of these questions, they were then asked from a list of items what had happened. Responses for these questions included a fist fight, use of a weapon, objects thrown, unwanted sexual contact, harmful things said and all of the above. Second, clients were asked if they had witnessed a fight or been involved in a fight. Available responses for these questions were two individuals fist fighting, two individuals fighting with weapons, gang fighting, more than two people fist fighting, more than two people fighting with weapons, and a fight where someone needed medical attention. If a client stated that he had seen or been involved in a fight with more than two people, he was asked about how many people were involved.

Psychological victimization was measured by asking whether the client had witnessed or directly experienced emotional abuse. Responses for these two questions included being made fun of, name calling, being disrespected, threats made by another inmate, and whether the subject was afraid of being hurt.

In order to measure sexual victimization, clients were asked whether they had witnessed sexual coercion or whether a client attempted to coerce or successfully coerced

them into sexual activity. Clients who answered "yes" to these questions were then given the specific list of activities which included unwanted kissing, being coerced into touching the privates or butt of the inmate with or without clothes on, being coerced into placing their mouth on the inmates' privates or allowing the other inmate to place their mouth on the client's privates, being coerced into putting their mouth on the other inmate's butt, being coerced into anal sex, and being coerced into letting an inmate stick a foreign object into their rectum such as a pool stick or shank. Clients were then asked if they had witnessed rape, had someone attempt to rape them or if someone had successfully raped them. The list of sexual activities for these questions was identical for all sexual victimization responses.

Analysis

This study examined the relationship between physical, psychological and sexual victimization, and the characteristics that the literature has deemed as high-risk. A chi-square test was conducted to examine the relationship between the types of victimization and the independent variables, and a binary logistic regression was used to demonstrate the relationship of the types of victimization and the independent variables.

CHAPTER 4

Results

Demographic Information

Demographic data including age, race, education level, stature, sexual preference and prison employment were collected. The majority of the sample was between the ages of 19 and 29 years. The results indicated that a slight majority of the sample was African-American (53.4%). While 70 percent of the sample had at least a high school diploma, 27.6 percent had less than a high school education and less than 2 percent had graduated from college. The average height and weight of the sample was approximately 5 feet 10 inches and 184 pounds. Those who weighed less than 184 pounds and were shorter than 5 feet 10 inches were considered to have a small stature as they would be smaller than the average adult male. The stature variable shows that the majority of the sample did not have a small stature.

Table 1. Frequencies of Demographics

	N	%
Age Range		
Aged 19-29	427	38.4
Aged 30-39	319	28.7
Aged 40-49	257	23.1
Aged 50-59	95	8.5
Aged 60 and older	15	1.3
Mean	34.97	
Race		
Caucasian	489	46.6
African-American	560	53.4
Education		
Less than high school	307	27.6
High school	287	25.8
GED	256	23.0
Some college	244	21.9
Bachelors	16	1.4
Graduate degree	4	0.4
Height in inches		
Mean	70.23	
Weight in pounds		
Mean	183.82	
Small Stature		
Yes	299	27.4
No	791	72.6
Sexual Preference		
Heterosexual	1090	98.4
Homosexual	5	0.5
Bisexual	13	1.2
Prison Employment		
Yes	997	89.5
No	117	10.5

While those at higher risk for victimization were those who identify themselves at homosexual or bisexual, the majority of the sample (98.4%) identified themselves as heterosexual. Only 11 percent of the sample reported that they were not employed during their incarceration.

Prior Record

In order to establish a clients experience with prison, each client's prison record was collected. Those who had less experience with prison and the law in general were at higher risk for victimization.

Table 2. Frequency of Prior Record

	N	%
Prior Prison Experience		
Yes	712	64.4
No	394	35.6
Past Drug Use		
Yes	1029	92.4
No	85	7.6
Current Drug Use		
Yes	47	4.5
No	995	95.5
Street Gang		
Yes	148	13.3
No	961	86.7
Prison Gang		
Yes	64	5.8
No	1045	94.2

A majority of the sample has had prior prison experience (64.4%). While the majority of the clients reported a drug history (92.4%) only 4.5 percent reported current drug use. Only 13.3 percent of the sample reported being in a street gang and 5.8 percent reported being in a prison gang.

Prison Influences

Table 3 shows the frequencies of the factors that influence prison behavior. Participation in treatment may have an influence on an inmate's behavior by occupying their time with pro-social activities. Slightly more subjects reported that they were

Table 3. Frequencies of Prison Influences

	N	%
Treatment Participation		
Yes	536	50.1
No	533	49.9
Prison Length in Months		
Mean	27.13	
Fought with a CO		
Yes	65	5.9
No	1045	94.1
Solitary Confinement		
Yes	469	42.1
No	644	57.9
Protective Custody		
Yes	22	2.0
No	1089	98.0
Are inmates told how To report rape?		
Yes	811	77.2
No	239	22.8
Do COs help inmates Who have been raped?		
Yes	302	50.8
No	293	49.2

involved in treatment than those who reported that they were not (50.1% and 49.9% respectively). While a display of aggression and strength lowers the risk of victimization, a majority of inmates reported that they were not involved in an altercation with a correctional officer (94.1%). However, violating rules and policy of an institution may result in time spent in solitary confinement. This violation may be seen as aggression which lessens the risk for victimization. The majority of subjects reported they did not

spend time in solitary confinement (57.9%). Protective custody on the other hand would be used for those were at risk for some type of victimization. Ninety-eight percent of the sample reported that they had not been in protective custody while in prison. PREA and the Eighth Amendment require new inmates to be notified of the risk of victimization, specifically how to report prison rape. A majority (77.2%) reported that they were notified how to report rape at the beginning of their incarceration. Inmates who have directly experienced sexual victimization are entitled to medical as well as psychological assistance. Sexually victimized inmates are also able to press charges and seek protection. Fifty-one percent of the subjects indicated that correctional officers had helped victims of rape

Victimization

Data related to physical victimization are found in Table 4. Subjects reported that they had witnessed physical victimization more often than experiencing it themselves.

Table 4. Frequencies of Physical Victimization

	N	%
Attempted Physical Victimization		
Yes	211	19.4
No	878	80.6
Witnessed Physical Victimization		
Yes	995	91.1
No	97	8.9
Completed Physical Victimization		
Yes	350	32.1
No	742	67.9
Physical Victimization*		
Yes	231	21.2
No	860	78.8

*This variable used for bivariate and multivariate analyses includes both attempted and completed victimization

Similar findings are shown in Table 5. A majority of the sample reported witnessing psychological victimization than being the victim of it.

Table 5. Frequencies of Psychological Victimization

	N	%
Witnessed Emotional Victimization		
Yes	1036	95.0
No	55	5.0
Completed Emotional Victimization*		
Yes	426	39.3
No	659	60.7

*This variable used for bivariate and multivariate analyses includes both attempted and completed victimization

Table 6 shows that a majority of the sample reported that they had little or no experience with sexual victimization in prison. Only seven clients reported they had been a victim of sexual coercion or attempted rape while only three reported they were raped.

Table 6. Frequencies of Sexual Victimization

	N	%
Witnessed Sexual Coercion		
Yes	192	18.1
No	866	81.9
Attempted Sexual Coercion		
Yes	53	4.9
No	1029	95.1
Completed Sexual Coercion		
Yes	7	0.6
No	1078	99.4
Witnessed Rape		
Yes	108	10.2
No	956	89.8
Attempted Rape		
Yes	7	0.7
No	953	99.3
Completed Rape		
Yes	3	0.3
No	961	99.7
Sexual Victimization*		
Yes	59	5.3
No	1057	94.7

*This variable used for bivariate and multivariate analyses includes both attempted and completed victimization

Because meaningful analyses could not be conducted due to the low rate of responses for each type of victimization, results were placed into three variables based on their victimization type. Each of the variables included attempted, coerced and forced or direct victimization. However, because the present study focuses on victimization by attempt, coercion and force, the variables pertaining to the witnessing of a specific incident were excluded.

Bivariate Analyses

Chi-square analyses were conducted using cross tabulations in order to determine whether a relationship existed between each type of victimization and the selected independent variables. Table 7 shows physical victimization paired with the variables race, prior prison experience, prison employment, treatment participation, religious involvement, small stature and education level. Only race was found to be significant predictors of physical victimization.

Table 7. Chi-square showing the relationship between physical victimization and characteristics

	Physical Victimization	
	Yes	No
Race		
Caucasian	55.0	44.7
African-American	45.0	55.3
x^2 (1, n=1026) = 7.161, p = .007		
Prior Prison Experience		
Yes	66.8	63.7
No	33.2	36.3
Prison Employment		
Yes	90.0	89.2
No	10.0	10.8
Treatment Participation		
Yes	55.3	49.3
No	44.7	50.7
Religious Involvement		
Yes	53.5	54.2
No	46.5	45.8
Small Stature		
Yes	23.1	29.0
No	76.9	71.0
Education Level		
Less than HS	25.5	27.9
HS or above	74.5	72.1

As seen in Table 8, race, treatment participation and education level were significant predictors of psychological victimization.

Table 8. Chi-square showing the relationship between psychological victimization and characteristics

	Psychological Victimization	
	Yes	No
Race		
Caucasian	54.8	41.7
African-American	45.2	58.3
x^2 (1, n=1020) = 16.779, p = .000		
Prior Prison Experience		
Yes	65.4	63.0
No	34.6	37.0
Prison Employment		
Yes	89.9	88.9
No	10.1	11.1
Treatment Participation		
Yes	57.7	46.0
No	42.3	54.0
x^2 (1, n=1042) = 13.643, p = .000		
Religious Involvement		
Yes	56.4	51.8
No	43.6	48.2
Small Stature		
Yes	25.7	29.3
No	74.3	70.7
Education Level		
Less than HS	21.1	31.6
HS or better	78.9	68.4
x^2 (1, n=1084) = 14.259, p = .000		

Table 9 shows that the only significant relationship was between treatment participation and sexual victimization.

Table 9. Chi-square showing the relationship between sexual victimization and characteristics

	Sexual Victimization	
	Yes	No
Race		
Caucasian	57.7	46.0
African-American	42.3	54.0
Prior Prison Experience		
Yes	55.9	64.9
No	44.1	35.1
Prison Employment		
Yes	94.9	89.2
No	5.1	10.8
Treatment Participation		
Yes	68.6	49.2
No	31.4	50.8
x^2 (1, n=1069) = 7.322, p = .007		
Religious Involvement		
Yes	49.2	54.2
No	50.8	45.8
Small Stature		
Yes	29.8	27.3
No	70.2	72.7
Education Level		
Less than HS	22.0	27.9
HS or better	78.0	72.1

Multivariate Analyses

Binary logistic regression analyses were conducted in order to identify which characteristics and factors influenced the chance at which an inmate would be victimized.

Each analysis included race, age, prior prison experience, education level, length of prison sentence, prison employment, treatment participation, religious involvement, and stature.

Table 10 shows that the race and age of the inmate predict physical victimization. Specifically, those who identified themselves as Caucasian were more likely to report incidents of physical victimization as well as those who are younger in age. Stature, treatment participation and prior prison experience were not significant predictors of physical victimization.

Table 10. Logistical Regression Predicting Physical Victimization

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Significance
Race	.440	.163	7.248	1	.007*
Age	-.024	.010	6.158	1	.013*
Prior Prison Experience	.159	.170	.870	1	.351
Education Level	-.172	.185	.872	1	.351
Length of Prison Sentence	-.001	.002	.181	1	.671
Prison Employment	.121	.286	.178	1	.673
Treatment Participation	.312	.163	3.650	1	.056
Religious Involvement	-.003	.163	.000	1	.985
Small Stature	-.133	.213	3.89	1	.533

*$p < .05$

As shown in Table 11, race, length of prison sentence, education level and treatment participation are predictors of psychological victimization. Those who identified as Caucasian were more likely to experience psychological victimization. Inmates who had served longer sentences were also more likely to report psychological victimization which is evident by the positive coefficient. Similarly, the results indicated

that those with an education level of at least a high school diploma were more likely to experience psychological victimization. Treatment participation also was a significant predictor of psychological victimization however; those who participated in treatment were more likely to report psychological victimization. Again, age, prior prison experience and small stature were not significant predictors for psychological victimization.

Table 11. Logistical Regression Predicting Psychological Victimization

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Significance
Race	.502	.139	13.008	1	.000*
Age	.002	.014	.021	1	.885
Prior Prison Experience	.191	.239	.636	1	.425
Education Level	-.572	.161	12.575	1	.000*
Length of Prison Sentence	.012	.003	12.707	1	.000*
Prison Employment	.169	.242	.490	1	.484
Treatment Participation	.605	.140	18.640	1	.000*
Religious Involvement	.140	.138	1.027	1	.311
Small Stature	-.169	.175	.934	1	.334

*$p < .05$

Table 12 shows that only treatment participation is a significant predictor of sexual victimization while the age, prior prison experience, small stature and race were not. Those who participate in treatment are more likely to report sexual victimization.

Table 12. Logistical Regression Predicting Sexual Victimization

Variable	B	S.E.	Wald	df	Significance
Race	.435	.321	1.838	1	.175
Age	.012	.029	.156	1	.692
Prior Prison Experience	.386	.533	.524	1	.469
Education Level	-.493	.405	1.483	1	.223
Length of Prison Sentence	.004	.007	.330	1	.565
Prison Employment	.265	.619	.183	1	.669
Treatment Participation	.683	.336	4.127	1	.042*
Religious Involvement	-.100	.316	.100	1	.752
Small Stature	-.253	.385	.433	1	.511

*$p < .05$

CHAPTER 5

Conclusion

The current research examines the predictors of victimization among formerly incarcerated inmates. While some of the variables proved to be important risk factors, other hypothesized risk factors did not. The study builds upon the existing research by adding to the limited research on victimization, specifically sexual victimization in prison. Moreover, previous studies have failed to explore whether stature, not just separate measures of height and weight were related to victimization. Finally, the study adds to the limited research that identifies specific factors that increase the likelihood of its occurrence.

Physical victimization was the most commonly reported type of victimization. The bivariate analysis indicated that only race was a significant predictor of this type of victimization. As shown in Table 7, Caucasians were more likely to report physical victimization. Bivariate analysis also indicated that there was not a significant relationship between those with small stature and physical victimization. The results of the multivariate analyses did not show a relationship between physical victimization and prior prison experience. Also, the multivariate analysis model predicting physical victimization also indicated that race and age were significant predictors. Age

was represented with a negative coefficient which means that younger inmates were more likely to report victimization.

When examining the characteristics predicting psychological victimization, three variables were significant. Specifically, race, treatment participation and education level predicted this type of victimization. As with physical victimization, bivariate analysis showed that there was a significant relationship between Caucasians and those who self-reported the incident of psychological victimization. The analysis also showed that treatment participation was significantly related to psychological victimization. There was also a significant relationship between those who reported to have at least a high school education and psychological victimization. Those who did not graduate from high school were not likely to report psychological victimization. Multivariate analysis also showed that race, treatment participation, a longer sentence length and education level were significant predictors of psychological victimization. Caucasians, those with longer prison sentences and those who possess at least a high school education are more likely to report victimization. Those who participated in treatment however were more likely to report victimization which is contradictory to the literature suggesting that those in treatment are more occupied therefore less likely to report victimization.

There are several suggestions that might help explain the relationship between treatment and victimization. The first suggestion is that those who participate in treatment may be perceived as more vulnerable and are therefore targets of victimization. Second, the treatment sessions may help inmates be more open about their feelings in turn allowing them to be more vocal about victimizations. This does not necessarily

mean there is an increase in victimization incidences but that there may be just an increase in reporting it. Third, inmates often share sensitive information about themselves in treatment groups and although this information should be kept within the group, it is possible that other inmates use this information against them at a later time. Lastly, inmates may feel that by participating in treatment, they are escaping possible victimization because they may perceive treatment as a safe place. This may be a preventative measure or they may have joined treatment to avoid further victimization.

The least common reported type of victimization was sexual. Bivariate analysis showed that there was a significant relationship between treatment participation and sexual victimization. Multivariate analysis also showed that treatment participation was a significant predictor of sexual victimization. Those who are involved in treatment participation are more likely to be sexually victimized.

In summary, the first hypothesis stated that younger inmates are more likely to be victimized. Age was found to be a significant predictor of only physical victimization. Because the multivariate analysis reported the significance with a negative coefficient, younger inmates were more likely to report this type of victimization. The second hypothesis which predicted that those with smaller statures would be more likely to be victimized was rejected. Small stature was not a significant predictor nor did it have a relationship with any of the victimization types. The third hypothesis stating that Caucasians are at higher risk of victimization was supported for only physical and psychological victimization. According to the analyses, race was a significant predictor of these two types of victimization Race was not found to be a significant predictor in

either analysis of sexual victimization. A bivariate analysis of the fourth hypothesis stating that those without prior prison experience are likely to face victimization did not indicate a significant relationship between prior prison experience and physical victimization but not with psychological or sexual victimization. Similarly, the multivariate analysis showed that prior prison experience was not a predictor of the three types of victimization. The fifth hypothesis states that inmates who participate in treatment are less likely to report victimization. A bivariate analysis showed that there was a significant relationship between treatment participation and psychological victimization as well as sexual victimization. Multivariate analysis showed that treatment participation was a significant predictor of both psychological and sexual victimization however, those who participate in treatment were more likely to report victimization. Therefore, the fifth hypothesis was also rejected.

Limitations

Other limitations for this study include sampling issues, validity and institution comparability. First, sampling issues are a limitation because there is the possibility of response bias and selection bias. Response bias occurs when the individual being interviewed answers the way in which they feel the interviewer wants them to answer rather than answer with their own responses. Selection bias occurs when there is a distortion in the way the data are collected possibly causing the data to be manipulated. In terms of response bias, the survey inquires about sensitive information, specifically information pertaining to sexual victimization, which may cause response rates to be

lower than expected. In an effort to reduce this issue, all available eligible subjects were asked to participate. As mentioned previously, eligibility was based on their classification as a transitional control (TC) or post-release control (PRC) client. Furthermore, subjects were informed that they would receive a $15 incentive for participating. Each interviewer was given a roster including the eligible subjects from each halfway house and was instructed to choose them for an interview based on their intake date thereby reducing selection bias. Another sampling issue that is of concern is the fact that eligible inmates were those who were TC or PRC. This may be viewed as a selection bias because clients who were not under supervision following prison were excluded as were those who came from federal institutions and parole violators. However, the sample of halfway house clients used for this study was a comparable to inmates currently in an Ohio institution.

Second, validity is of concern because the present study did not use techniques to validate reports of victimization. While prior studies have used polygraph tests to verify incidents the present study did not. However, the study implemented several data collection periods in order to validate allegations.

Lastly, institution comparability is a limitation in that different prisons have different security levels which may increase or decrease the risk of victimization due to inmate contact. Subjects chosen for the study come from all of Ohio's prisons which range from minimum security to super-max excluding facilities that house females and juveniles.

CHAPTER 6

Discussion/Policy Implications

Because only two of the five hypotheses were supported in the present study there is a need for further research on the implementation of policies in order to protect these individuals. As mentioned earlier, victimization may cause trauma in the victim leading to PTSD. Not only does sexual victimization have tremendous implications for the victim but for their family as well. Although they may be perceived as less serious, physical and psychological victimization may leave an impact on the victim. Victims may endure injuries as well as psychiatric trauma due to another individual's abuse. Because the consequences of victimization may be extreme, it is important to prevent the incident from ever occurring. There are ways in which an inmate may prevent victimization from happening to them. McCorkle (1992) found that 77.7 percent of the sample of inmates felt they could reduce the risk of victimization by keeping to themselves. These inmates follow the inmate code that states you do your own time. More than 40 percent of the sample stated that they avoided certain areas of the prison and 70 percent stated that they had sought out other inmates for protection. More than a quarter of the inmates reported carrying a weapon in the event they were attacked. Because inmates may take it upon themselves to reduce their risk of victimization by resorting to finding protection, levels of violence may increase as a means of self-

protection. Prisons should increase their level of safety by installing more security cameras as well as making sure employees are more visible to inmates. Visibility of correctional officers as well as cameras may reduce the incidences of victimization.

In addition to the above examples, inmates are advised to avoid isolated areas such as stairways and unoccupied restrooms. To avoid sexual assault, an inmate should stay within the eyesight of correctional staff. Inmates should also be aware of their body language. For example, inmates should never walk with their head down and eyes lowered. Inmates should never accept food, cigarettes or other items from other inmates. Acceptance of these items will cause the inmate to be in debt which they may be expected to repay with sex. Similarly, inmates must be aware of other inmates who offer their protection, since this protection may have an associated "cost". Inmates should avoid revealing personal information to other inmates. Finally, inmates are told to not purchase large amounts of commissary as this will give the impression that they have money available to them (Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, 2007).

Also, it has been suggested that programs focusing on individual change must be implemented. Individual change can be achieved through education, vocational training, and treatment for mental health and drug or alcohol addiction as well as life course decisions and physical health problems (Byrne & Hummer, 2008a). Also, in order to avoid over-classifying of inmates, classification methods must be altered. Proper classification would allow for placement into institutions that have available programs that enable change therefore reducing the rate of victimization of others. (Byrne & Hummer, 2008a). Without proper programs or treatment, inmates who victimize in prison

may continue this pattern in the community (Byrne & Hummer, 2008b). Therefore, it is important to prevent or eliminate this behavior while inmates are still serving their sentences.

Not only should an inmate attempt to prevent victimization but prison staff and prison administration should as well. Prevention can be achieved through training, understanding of their liability, and gaining skill in the ability to be able to tell the difference between consensual and coerced sexual activity (Fagan et al., 1996). Prison staff should also eliminate blind spots in facilities where these incidents may occur. It should be noted that to ensure that appropriate steps are taken in order to reduce and eliminate victimization, specifically sexual victimization, law-makers have taken the initiative to make inmates aware of their right to protection in U.S. institutions.

The Prison Rape Elimination Act

On July 21, 2003, Senate Bill 1435, known as the Prison Rape Elimination Act was introduced. In less than a week, the bill had passed both the Senate and the House. On September 2, 2003, the Bill was presented to President Bush. He signed it two days later on September 4, 2003. PREA was set forth to "provide for the analysis of the incidence and effects of prison rape" in U.S. institutions as well as to provide "information, resources, recommendations, and funding to protect individuals from prison rape. (Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003, 108th Cong., 2003, p. 1). The purpose of PREA was to establish a zero-tolerance policy for the incidence of prison rape; to make prevention a top priority in prisons nationwide; and to develop and

implement standards for detection, prevention, reduction and punishment (Beck, 2004). PREA guidelines urged prison administration to increase data and information on the incidence of rape in hopes to improve management and administration of institutions. It also enforced the use of standardize definitions used for data collection, increased the accountability of prison officials, protected inmates' Eighth Amendment rights, increased the effectiveness and efficiency of Federal grant programs used for health care, mental health care, and disease prevention; and to reduced the costs that prison rape imposes on interstate commerce (Mair, Frattaroli, & Teret, 2003).

There are five main components of PREA (Mair, Frattaroli and Teret, 2003). First the BJS is required to conduct a yearly comprehensive statistical review and analysis of the incidence and impact of prison rape. Second, a review panel on prison rape must be established within the Department of Justice (DOJ). Third, the Attorney General must provide funding to states for training, technical assistance, data collection, and equipment to prevent and prosecute those inmates accused of prison rape (Mair et al., 2003). Fourth, the act requires the establishment of a National Prison Rape Reduction Commission which consists of nine members who have expertise in the area of prison rape. Finally, the Attorney General is required to publish a final rule within one year of the Commission's report of the national standards for detecting, prevention, reducing, and punishing prison rape.

Prevention in the State of Ohio

The State of Ohio has implemented efforts in addition to PREA to protect individuals in prisons. In 2004, the Director of the Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (DRC) created the "Ohio Correctional Institution Sexual Assault Abatement Ten Point Plan" (DRC, 2004). The plan indentifies the mechanisms through which sexual assault in prison can be prevented. The first point describes the necessary training for prison staff. It is vital that staff is taught how to properly prevent, detect and respond to sexual assault. Also, inappropriate relationships between staff and inmates are forbidden.

The second point is inmate education. Similar to the education given to staff, inmates should be educated on sexual assault among inmates. This includes self-protection, how to report, and treatment if sexual assault occurs. Inmates must also learn about inappropriate relationships with prison staff. In 2004, all Ohio institutions received posters and pamphlets designed to create awareness among inmates of sexual assault and to encourage reporting. At inmate orientation, an educational video is shown to make inmates aware of their new surroundings and the risk of sexual assault.

The third point on the Sexual Assault Abatement plan is the implementation of sanctions. These include sanctions for inmates and staff should they sexually assault an inmate. Also, there is the implementation of criminal sanctions. A process improvement team must evaluate whether criminal prosecution should be pursued against staff or an inmate accused of sexual assault. This team will also assist local prosecutors with the prosecution of these individuals.

Fourth, a victim support specialist must be made available to inmates to assist with emotional support. These individuals provide mental health treatment during the investigation phase. Training for this position was made available to any staff member who was interested. The fifth point is training in investigation procedures. Training is provided for all institutional investigators on techniques related to inmate-on-inmate sexual assault.

The sixth point is to identify and monitor known inmate aggressors or manipulators. All inmates found convicted through an inmate disciplinary hearing are maintained in the Departmental Offender Tracking System (DOTS). The seventh point is to ensure that all assaults are tracked through DOTS which will be more readily available to research staff and other staff members who need this information.

The eighth point on the plan is to audit an institution's compliance with departmental policies related to sexual assault. The standards by which an institution must follow are in accordance with the American Correctional Association's Commission on Accreditation for Corrections.

The ninth point is the process improvement team's recognition of an inmate's fear to report sexual assault. Victims are often unwilling to report or discuss a sexual victimization. The team developed ways to address inmates concerns about fear of reprisal, stigmatization, and embarrassment. These techniques encourage reporting without placing the victimized inmate in further danger. The final point is the continuation of institutional compliance with PREA. The Inmate Sexual Abuse

Oversight Committee monitors the developments of PREA and directs further action as necessary.

In summary, the State of Ohio Department of Rehabilitation has taken steps to implement strategies aimed at protecting inmates from sexual victimization. Together with PREA, Ohio aims to continue its implementation of preventative techniques as well as to provide every inmate with information and assistance when needed. Future research should examine the impact of these policies on rates of victimization.

Additional Implications

While PREA and Ohio's ten-point plan aim to prevent the occurrence of sexual victimization, there is a need for the prevention of all types of victimization. First, prison staff needs to circulate more often throughout common areas in addition to cell blocks or dorms. Staff circulation increases the visibility of authority figures which in turn may decrease the incidence of victimization. Second, more security cameras and the use of mirrors in areas with low-visibility would be beneficial as it is these areas that victimization occurs. The separation of aggressors from the general population may also prevent victimization as well as the separation of those who are believed to be targets of victimization. Separating these individuals from each other and the general population may decrease victimization as they are no longer able to communicate or live in the same cells or dorms.

Fourth, staff training should include that victimization can cause trauma. Also, staff needs to be more aware of why prevention is important as well as the necessity to

help inmates who have been victimized. Should victimization occur, prison staff should be ready to handle the situation. Inmates need to feel comfortable when disclosing information about such incidents. Staff should also be involved by thinking of new ways to prevent victimization. Involvement may make staff take victimization more seriously. Not only should staff receive such training but inmates should as well. While new inmates are made aware of the possibilities of victimization and are given examples of ways that increase their risk, accepting gifts for example, it should be stressed that staff is there to help and that by reporting incidents they are helping reduce victimization. This will only be effective though if accused attackers are separated from the victim as well as staff being more visible. Lastly, it may be beneficial for inmates to attend brief lectures on the severity of victimization. These lectures should not occur just for new inmates but throughout their sentence.

References

Agnew, R. (1992). Foundation for a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. *Criminology* 30, 47-87

Agnew, R. (2006). General strain theory: current status and directions for further research. In F. T. Cullen, J. P. Wright, K. P. Blevins (Eds.). *Taking stock: The status of criminological theory* (pp. 101-123). New Brunswick, NJ: Transactions Publishers.

Arnold, R., Keane, C., & Baron, S. (2005). Assessing risk of victimization through epidemiological concepts: An alternative analytic strategy applied to routine activities theory. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology, 42*, 345-364.

Barrett, C. I. (2005). Does the Prison Rape Elimination Act adequately address the problems posed by prison overcrowding? If not, what will? *New England Law Review, 391*, 1-32.

Beck, A. J. (2004). *Implementation of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003*. 2004 National Conference – Justice Research and Statistics Association. Seattle, WA. Retrieved June 15, 2008 from www.jrsa.org/events/conference/presentations-04/Allen-Beck.html

Byrne, J. M., & Hummer, D. (2008a). Examining the impact of institutional culture on prison violence and disorder: An evidence-based review. In J. M. Byrne, D. Hummer & F.S. Taxman (Eds.) *The culture of prison violence* (pp. 40-90). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Byrne, J. M., & Hummer, D. (2008b). The nature and extent of prison violence. In J. M. Byrne, D. Hummer, & F.S. Taxman (Eds.). *The culture of prison violence* (pp. 12-26). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Camp, S. D., & Gaes, G. G. (2005). Criminogenic effects of the prison environment on inmate behavior: some experimental evidence. *Crime and Delinquency, 51*, 425-442. .

Carriere, C. C. (1980). The dilemma of individual violence in prisons. *New England Journal on Prison Law, 6*, 195-230.

Catalano, S. M. (2006). *Criminal victimization, 2005*. U.S. Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Washington, DC: NCJ214644.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2007). *Intimate partner violence surveillance*. Retrieved March 6, 2008, from http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/ipv_surveillance/11_Section34.htm.

Chubaty, D. E. (2002). Victimization, fear, and coping in prison. *Forum on Corrections Research, 14*, 13-15.

Clemmer, D. (1940). *The prison community*. Boston, MA: Christopher Publishing.

Colvin, M. (2000). *Crime and coercion: An integrated theory of chronic criminality*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prisons (2006). *Confronting Confinement*. Washington D. C.: Vera Institute of Justice.

Cooley, D. (1993). Criminal victimization in male federal prisons. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 34*, 479-495.

Corlew, K. R. (2006). Congress attempts to shine a light on a dark problem: An in-depth look at the prison rape elimination act of 2003. *American Journal of Criminal Law, 33*, 157-190.

Davis, A. J. (1968). Sexual assaults in the Philadelphia prison system and sheriff's vans. *Trans-action, 6*, 8-16.

DeLisi, M., Berg, M. T., & Hochstetler, A. (2004). Gang members, career criminals and prison violence: Further specification of the importation model of inmate behavior. *Criminal Justice Studies, 17*, 369-383.

DeRosia, V. R. (1998). *Living inside prison walls: Adjustment behavior*. Westport, Ct.: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.

Donaldson, S. (1993, December 29). The rape crisis behind bars. *The New York Times*, A11.

Dumond, R. W. (1992). The sexual assault of male inmates in incarcerated settings. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law, 20*, 135-158.

Dumond, R. W. (2000). Inmate sexual assault: The plague that persists. *The Prison Journal, 80*, 407-414.

Edgar, K. (2005). Bullying, victimization and safer prisons. *Probation Journal, 52*, 390-400.

Edgar, K. (2008). Cultural roots of violence in England's prisons: an exploration of inter-prisoner conflict. In J. M. Byrne, D. Hummer & F.S. Taxman (Eds.). *The culture of prison violence* (pp. 180-201). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Eigenberg, H. M. (2000). Correctional officers' definitions of rape in male prisons. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 28*, 435-449.

Fagan, T. J., Wennerstrom, D., & Miller, J. (1996). Sexual assault of male inmates: prevention, identification, and intervention. *Journal of Correctional Health Care, 3*, 49-65.

Gibson, L. E., Holt, J. C., Fondacaro, K. M., Tang, T. S., Powell, T. A., & Turbitt, E. L. (1999). An examination of antecedent traumas and psychiatric comorbidity among male inmates with PTSD. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 12*, 473-484.

Greene, C. A. (1984). Rape: The unstated sentence. *Pacific Law Journal, 15*, 899-923.

Hensley, C., Koscheski, M., & Tewksbury, R. (2003a). The impact of institutional factors on officially reported sexual assaults in prisons. *Sexuality and Culture, 7*, 16-26.

Hensley, C., Koscheski, M., & Tewksbury, R. (2005a). Examining the characteristics of male sexual assault targets in a southern maximum-security prison. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*, 667-679.

Hensley, C., & Tewksbury, R. (2005b). Wardens' perceptions of prison sex. *The Prison Journal, 85*, 186-197.

Hensley, C., Tewksbury, R. & Castle, T. (2003b). Characteristics of prison sexual assault targets in male Oklahoma correctional facilities. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*, 595-606.

Hensley, C., Wright, J., Tewksbury, R., & Castle, T. (2003c). The evolving nature of prison argot and sexual hierarchies. *The Prison Journal, 83*, 289-300.

Hochstetler, A. & DeLisi, M. (2005). Importation, deprivation, and varieties of serving time: An integrated-lifestyle-exposure model of prison offending. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 33*, 257-266.

Hochstetler, A., Murphy, D. S., & Simmons, R. L. (2004). Damaged goods: Exploring predictors of distress in prison inmates. *Crime and Delinquency, 50*, 436-457.

Human Rights Watch. (2006). *No escape: Male rape in U.S. prisons.* Retrieved November 7, 2007, from http://www.hrw.org/reports/2001/prisons.

Jiang, S., & Fischer-Giorlando, M. (2002). Inmate misconduct: A test of the deprivation, importation, and situational. *The Prison Journal, 82*, 335-358.

Kellar, M., & Wang, H. M. (2005). Inmate assaults in Texas county jails. *The Prison Journal, 85*, 515-534.

Kerbs, J. J., & Jolley, J. M. (2007). Inmate-on-inmate victimization among older male prisoners. *Crime and Delinquency, 53*, 187-218.

Knowles, G. J. (1999). Male prison rape: A search for causation and prevention. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice, 38*, 267-282.

Mair, J. S., Frattaroli, S., & Teret, S. P. (2003). New hope for victims of prison sexual assault. *Journal of Medicine & Ethics, 31*, 602- 606.

Man, C. D., & Cronan, J. P. (2002). Forecasting sexual abuse in prison: The prison subculture of masculinity as a backdrop for "deliberate indifference." *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, 92*, 127-186.

McCorkle, R. C. (1992). Personal precautions to violence in prison. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 19*, 160-173.

McCorkle, R. C. (1993). Living on the edge: Fear in a maximum-security prison. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 20*(1/2), 73-91.

Melby, T. (2006). Convicted once, punished twice. *Contemporary Sexuality, 40*, 1-6.

Moss, C. S., Hosford, R. E. & Anderson, W. (1979). Sexual assault in a prison. *Psychological Reports Missoula Mont*, 44, 823-828.

Nacci, P. L. (1978). Sexual assault in prisons. *American Journal of Correction, 40*, 30-31.

National Institute of Mental Health. (2007). *Anxiety disorders.* Retrieved on June 23, 2008, from http://www.nimh.nih.gov/health/publications/anxiety-disorders/nimhanxiety.pdf

O'Donnell, I. (2004). Prison rape in context. *British Journal of Criminology, 44*, 241-255).

O'Donnell, I., & Edgar, K. (1998). Routine victimisation in prisons. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice, 37*, 266-279.

O'Donnell, I., & Edgar, K. (1999). Fear in prison. *The Prison Journal, 79*, 90-99.

Ogden, C. L., Fryar, C. D., Carroll, M. D., & Flegal, K. M. (2004). *Mean body weight, height, and body mass index, United States 1960-2002.* U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Hyattsville, Md. (No. 347).

Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. (2004). *Ohio correctional institution sexual assault abatement: A ten point plan.* Retrieved June 15, 2008, from http://www.drc.state.oh.us/web/prea.htm

Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction. (n.d). *Male inmate on inmate sexual assault orientation.* Retrieved June 15, 2008, from http://www.drc.state.oh.us/web/PREA/SexAssaultMale.pdf

Prison overcrowding. (1996). *John Howard Society of Alberta*. Retrieved July 8, 2008, from http://www.johnhoward.ab.ca/PUB/C42.htm

Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003, 15601U.S.C. (2003).

Rape, Abuse & Incest National Network. (n.d.). Retrieved July 8, 2008, from http://www.rainn.org/get-information/types-of-sexual-assault

Report: Male rape victims in prison get little empathy. (2001). *Contemporary Sexuality, 35*, 8.

Robertson, J. E. (2003). Rape among incarcerated men: Sex, coercion and STDs. *Aids, Patient Care and STDs, 17*, 423-430.

Saum, C. A., Surratt, H. L., & Inciardi, J. A. (1995). Sex in prison: Exploring the myths and realities. *The Prison Journal, 75*, 413-430.

South, C. R., & Wood, J. (2006). Bullying in prisons: The importance of perceived social status, prisonization, and moral disengagement. *Aggressive Behavior, 32,* 490-501.

Stephan, J., & Karberg, J. (2003). *The census of state and federal correctional facilities*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Stop Prisoner Rape (2008). Stop Prisoner Rape: A Brief History. Retrieved July 8, 2008, from http://www.spr.org/en/spr_history.asp

Tewksbury, R. (2007). Effects of sexual assaults on men**:** Physical, mental and sexual consequences. *Mental and Sexual Consequences, 6,* 22-35.

Timmer, D. A., & Norman, W. H. (1984). The ideology of victim precipitation. *Criminal Justice Review, 9,* 63-68.

Unnever, J. D., Colvin, M., & Cullen, F. T. (2004). Crime and coercion: A test of core theoretical propositions. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 41,* 244-268.

U.S. Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2004). *Data collections for the prison rape elimination act of 2003.* Washington, DC: NCJ 206109.

U.S. Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics (2005a). *Criminal victimization in the United States, 2005 statistical tables.* Washington, DC: NCJ 215244.

U.S. Department of Justice. Bureau of Justice Statistics (2005b). *Criminal victimization in the United States, statistical tables index.* Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Justice. Federal Bureau of Prisons. (2005). *Sexually abusive behavior prevention and intervention program.* Washington, DC: P5324.06.

Wolff, N., Blitz, C. L., Shi, J., Bachman, R., & Siegel, J. A. (2006). Sexual violence inside prisons: rates of victimization. *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, 83*, 835-848.

Wolff, N., Blitz, C. L., Shi, J., Siegel, J. A., &. Bachman, R. (2007). Physical violence inside prisons: Rates of victimization. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 34*, 588-599.

Wooldredge, J. D. (1998). Inmate lifestyles and opportunities for victimization. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 34*, 480-502.

Wright, K. N. (1991). The violent and victimized in the male prison. *Journal Offender of Rehabilitation, 16*(3/4), 1-25.