A Profile of Inmates Admitted to the Special Handling Unit in the Correctional Service of
Canada

by

Sarah M. McQuaid

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

in

Psychology

Carleton University
Ottawa, ON

© September, 2015
Sarah M. McQuaid

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Abstract

The Special Handling Unit (SHU) is a prison facility that provides increased supervision and restrictions for inmates who cannot be appropriately managed at a maximum-security institution. SHU confinement differs from other types of segregation (e.g., administrative) in criteria for admission and severity of restrictions. The first purpose of this study was to identify the typical distinguishing characteristics of SHU inmates in comparison to administrative segregation inmates from a large sample of Canadian federal inmates ($N = 3666$). The second purpose was to identify common problems experienced by SHU inmates ($N = 32$), and determine the presence of subtypes of inmates for whom unique programming may be warranted. Results indicated violent behaviours, among other characteristics, to be particularly relevant for SHU inmates. However, distinct SHU subtypes were not identified. The author concluded that differential programming may not be necessary, and expressed the need for prospective research regarding the efficacy of the SHU.

Key words: segregation, inmates, prison, maximum-security

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Ralph Serin, for his guidance and encouragement throughout the research process. I would also like to thank Dr. Shelley Brown and Dr. Maaïke Helmus for sharing their extensive knowledge, perspectives, and insights to help strengthen this thesis. My sincere thanks also goes to Correctional Services Canada for their continuous support and access to important resources.

This thesis would not have been possible without the patience, love, and support I received from my parents, favourite sister, and wonderful fiancé. Last but not the least, I would like to thank the Pizza Party for being my biggest source of inspiration, encouragement, and distraction.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
List of Tables.....	vi
List of Appendices.....	vii
Glossary of Acronyms.....	viii
Introduction.....	1
Legislative context.....	3
What is segregation?.....	3
United States equivalent.....	5
Concerns about balance.....	6
Admission.....	8
The numbers.....	9
Violent offenders.....	10
Deprivation model.....	11
Importation model.....	11
Other models.....	12
Dealing with prison violence.....	13
Mental health concerns.....	15
Madrid v. Gomez.....	16
Colorado.....	16

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Self-injurious behaviour.....	18
Contingency management.....	19
Current Study.....	20
Research questions.....	21
Method.....	21
Study One: SHU Profile.....	21
Purpose.....	21
Sample.....	22
Measures/predictor variables.....	23
Analyses.....	24
Results.....	26
RAST.....	26
Additional variables.....	28
Offense history.....	28
Current offense.....	28
Prison adjustment.....	32
Criminogenic needs.....	32
Employment.....	32
Personal/emotional.....	32
Marital/family.....	32
Associates.....	36
Community function.....	36
Attitudes.....	36

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Summary of risk and need measures.....	36
Criminal history.....	38
Study Two: SHU Problems Survey.....	38
Purpose.....	38
Sample.....	39
Measure.....	39
Analyses.....	40
Inter-rater reliability.....	40
Results.....	40
Community problems.....	41
Institution Problems.....	41
Discussion.....	42
Study One: SHU Profile.....	42
Study Two: SHU Problems Survey.....	45
Overall Study.....	47
Limitations.....	48
Future directions.....	49
References.....	50
Appendices.....	60

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

List of Tables

Table 1. <i>Time Variables for SHU Inmates (days)</i>	23
Table 2. <i>Effect Sizes for RAST Variables</i>	27
Table 3. <i>Effect Sizes for Five Additional Variables</i>	29
Table 4. <i>Effect Sizes of Inmate Current Offenses</i>	30
Table 5. <i>Effect Sizes for DFIA Personal/Emotional Domain</i>	34
Table 6. <i>Effect Sizes for Overall Scores, Reintegration Potential, and Motivation</i>	37
Table 7. <i>SHU Inmate Reasons for Transfer</i>	39

List of Appendices

Appendix A. Complete List of Variables.....	60
Appendix B. Inmate Problems Survey.....	70
Appendix C. Effect Sizes for All Variables.....	74
Appendix D. Results Table for Study Two.....	94
Appendix E. Results Table for Subgroups in Study Two.....	98

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Glossary of Acronyms

ACLU: American Civil Liberties Union

ACR: Adult Court Record

ADX: Administrative Maximum Facility

AUC: Area Under the Curve

BOP: Bureau of Prisons

CCRA: Corrections and Conditional Release Act

CM: Contingency Management

CRS: Custody Rating Scale

CSC: Correctional Services of Canada

DFIA: Dynamic Factors Intake Assessment

GAO: Government Accountability Office

OCI: Office of the Correctional Investigator

OMS: Offender Management System

OSR: Offense Severity Record

PRISM: Promoting Risk Intervention by Situational Management

RAST: Risk of Administrative Segregation Tool

RDC: Regional Deputy Commissioner

RPC: Regional Psychiatric Centre

SDC: Senior Deputy Commissioner

SFA: Static Factors Assessment

SHU: Special Handling Unit

SOH: Sex Offense History

YCR: Youth Court Record

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

A Profile of Inmates Admitted to the Special Handling Unit in the Correctional Service of Canada

An integral step in the criminal justice process is the classification of inmates to the appropriate level of security. Classification is typically based on a series of factors thought to be predictive of the inmate's risk of engaging in behaviours that threaten the security of the institution and the safety of the public. In the Correctional Services of Canada (CSC), classification is based on several factors, especially the offender's criminal history, escape record, and offence severity record (Brown & Motiuk, 2005). An offender's initial security classification is determined by the Custody Rating Scale (CRS; Solicitor General Canada, 1987). This actuarial tool contains 12 scored items that address the offender's institutional adjustment and security risk, and recommends placement in minimum, medium, or maximum security based on total scores. Assigned security levels influence the decisions made about an offender's placement and correctional treatment plan, including programming. Thus, assigning inmates to the appropriate security level is important to the prison system's goal of managing risk. Those offenders assessed as greater risk to the safety of the institution and the public therefore warrant increased custody requirements. As well, correct intervention is particularly important for those inmates who are placed at the highest level of risk. Interestingly, some researchers suggest the possibility that assigning risk levels may cause a self-fulfilling prophecy effect whereby the inmate's classification *influences* his or her behaviour rather than *reflects* it (Bench & Allen, 2003; Gadon, Jonstone, & Cooke, 2006).

Offender risk and needs in regards to treatment are assessed at intake into the prison system (Brown & Motiuk, 2005). The offender's case management team assigns the offender a rating of risk and need ranging from low-low to high-high based on information gathered from

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

various sources including victims reports, offender self-reports, psychological assessments, and court, police, and probation files, through face-to-face interviews and file reviews. The risk assessment is based on the offender's Criminal History Record, Offense Severity Record, and Sex Offense History Checklist, as measured by the Static Factors Assessment (SFA). Offender needs are identified by the Dynamic Factors Intake Assessment (DFIA) and are based on seven domains: employment, marital/family, associates/social interaction, substance use, community functioning, personal/emotional orientation, and attitude. A meta-analytic review of the DFIA determined good content validity and moderate to strong predictive validity for men, women, and Aboriginals (Brown & Motiuk, 2005). This assessment process culminates in an overall summary of the offender's behaviours, program recommendations, and target interventions. It assists the offender's case management team to better match the offender with the appropriate interventions, programming, and level of monitoring and safety. The ultimate purpose of this process is for CSC to protect the public by appropriately managing offenders (Brown & Motiuk, 2005).

According to CSC, approximately 15% of incarcerated federal offenders are classified as high-risk, and approximately 78% are classified as medium-risk or higher (Public Safety Canada, 2013). Sometimes, however, a correctional system must have resources or facilities in place for cases where its risk assessment procedure fails to account for the true severity of the inmate's behaviours. For example, in cases where inmates can no longer be safely managed within a maximum-security institution, the inmate may be confined to a special facility with more severe restrictions and supervision. Such confinement is often referred to as 'segregation'.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Legislative Context

What is segregation? Segregation is an inmate control technique used by correctional authorities to protect others within the prison from particularly dangerous or threatening inmates. It generally involves the confinement of an individual to his or her cell for upwards of 22 hours per day, and often also involves other limitations on interactions with others and access to amenities and services (US Department of Justice, 2013). Segregation may be used punitively as a disciplinary action after an in-prison offense, or as administrative segregation to proactively prevent safety threats. Segregation of this type may be involuntary when a placement is made without the inmate's request or consent. Alternatively, it may be voluntary when an inmate requests placement in segregation (e.g., for protection from other offenders due to the notoriety of their crimes) and the Institutional Head deems it the only reasonable option available (Section 31(3) of the CCRA, 1992). Segregation can be beneficial for inmates, who may be removed from stressors or threats within the general population, as well as for staff who are then better able to provide supervision and interventions for increased safety. Under special circumstances, an inmate who poses serious threat to the institution may be referred to the Special Handling Unit (SHU; Amellal, 2012).

The focus of the current study is on the SHU. It is a "last resort" type facility located at the Regional Reception Centre in Ste-Anne-des-Plaines, Quebec that provides increased supervision and restrictions for inmates who are unable to be appropriately managed at a maximum-security institution. In other words, it is a "max within a max" and is the only of its type in Canada (Amellal, 2012). The SHU can accommodate approximately 90 inmates who will stay for an average of one year (Amellal, 2012; CSC, 2014).

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

While SHU confinement is a type of segregation, it differs from administrative segregation. The criteria for entry into the SHU involve the nature and gravity of the incident, specifics of the case, risk, and viable management strategies. An illustrative example for admission to administrative segregation is if an offender is at risk of interfering with an ongoing investigation – this offender may be kept in administrative segregation for a short period of time to avoid interference with the case. Alternatively, a particularly dangerous offender who poses a demonstrable serious threat to the safety of the institution could be sent to the SHU. Inmates in the SHU are subject to more severe restrictions on movement and contact with others than inmates in administrative segregation. Thus, concerns expressed about the conditions and effects of segregation generally may apply to both administrative segregation and the SHU, while the SHU may have additional concerns due to its more restrictive environment and the characteristics of the inmates. The availability of information regarding discernable and specific differences between the SHU, administrative segregation, and regular maximum-security confinement is severely limited, specifically regarding information on day-to-day activities, staff to inmate ratios, and service delivery methods.

One of the main goals of the SHU is to improve inmates' behaviours to a point where they can be safely returned to a maximum-security institution. To reach this goal, each inmate is provided a correctional plan that typically includes programs to target violent behaviour and to increase motivation to change (Amellal, 2012). Every four months the inmate's progress is assessed by a national committee composed of all the wardens from maximum-security federal institutions and chaired by the Senior Deputy Commissioner (SDC; Amellal, 2012). This committee makes all final decisions. A day in the life of a SHU inmate might include staying in their unit or having meetings with different staff members such as their Parole Officer or a

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

mental health professional; others participate in correctional programs or attend school. Showers occur at six in the evening. They may also have a period of activity during the evening in either the common room area or outside, however the inmates from the same unit have to agree on where they want to have their activity period and there is a maximum of only nine inmates together at one time. The information available about daily life and available programming in the SHU is limited. It remains unclear the format in which services are provided, staff to inmate ratios, what kinds of control techniques are used, and what SHU inmate interactions look like. Additionally, there is a paucity of research reports available about the SHU specifically.

United States equivalent. Similar facilities exist within the US called Supermaximum or “Supermax” prisons. They developed in the US due to a dramatic increase in incarceration rates from the 1970s to the 1990s and thus an increase in overcrowding, prison violence, and misconducts (Kupers et al., 2009; Pizarro & Stenius, 2004). The Administrative Maximum Facility (ADX) is the only Supermaximum federal prison facility in the US, however as of 2004 there were 44 states with Supermaximum facilities (Mears, 2006). In these institutions, inmates are often kept in solitary confinement for 22-23 hours per day with little to no access to programming (Mears, 2006; Pizarro & Stenius, 2004). The Government Accountability Office (GAO) of the United States reported that approximately 7% of US inmates are kept in some kind of segregation, and this population is increasing significantly faster than the general prison population (GAO, 2013). According to the Bureau of Prisons (BOP), Supermax prisons were built for the “containment of extremely dangerous, violent, or escape prone inmates” (BOP, n.d.), however, their uses and effectiveness have been broadly speculated upon.

Specific guidelines pertaining to the purpose and usage of these institutions appear to be somewhat underdeveloped. Entry and exit criteria are not fully defined and vary from state to

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

state; for example, some inmates may go directly from Supermax confinement to the community upon release while others must go through a step-down process (Pizarro & Narag, 2008). Further, criteria for release are often not published or revealed to inmates (Pizarro & Stenius, 2004).

Kupers and colleagues (2009) described the timeline of Supermax prisons in Mississippi, addressing the issue that shortly after their development the system was taken to court due to the abysmal conditions experienced by the inmates. This spearheaded an entire reconstruction of some of the systems already in place, and ultimately a successful step-down unit was developed in Mississippi for inmates with serious mental illness (Kupers et al., 2009). Mears (2008) conducted a review of Supermax prisons and found that they constitute a considerable investment of scarce resources – they are typically two to three times more expensive to build and operate than other prisons due to their need for sophisticated technologies, single occupancy cells, and higher staffing requirements. He also found that the original purpose for developing Supermax prisons, along with their guidelines for use, were never concretely laid out; thus, it is difficult to discern precisely what problems they were designed to alleviate and whether or not they are doing so appropriately and effectively (Mears, 2008). There also appears to be a paucity of rigorous research identifying whether or not these prisons actually achieve their intended goals. An additional concern is whether they do so in a cost efficient manner. That being said, Mears and Castro (2006) reported that Supermax prison wardens believed these institutions successfully incapacitate dangerous inmates and improve prison safety overall, although confirming evidence is unavailable.

Concerns about balance. Debates about the merits of segregation in a prison setting concern the importance, and difficulty, of maintaining the proper balance between the institution's safety and using least restrictive measures, which require that inmates are

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

appropriately treated. While some researchers propose that the use of segregation is beneficial for the safety of the institution (Mears, 2006) and inmates (Power & Brown, 2010), the challenge is ensuring that the benefits outweigh the costs. Various prison stakeholders and researchers alike have expressed some rather serious concerns about the uses of SHU-like facilities, and have made recommendations for limitations on their use. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU, 2014) has purported that the use of solitary confinement is detrimental to inmates and provides no real benefit to the institution; they recommended putting an end to, or at least seriously limiting the use of these techniques for mentally ill inmates in particular. Much earlier, Arbour (1996) recommended limiting the use of administrative segregation to no more than 60 non-consecutive days per year at the Kingston Prison for Women. Additionally, the Office of the Correctional Investigator (OCI) at CSC has expressed numerous concerns and recommendations regarding the use of segregation. In a number of annual reports, the OCI has reported that institutional violence has increased along with the number of segregation placements. The report contended that the increasing use of segregation is a sign of “deteriorating conditions inside federal institutions” (OCI, 2013, p. 23). The OCI further identified particular issues with the fact that the mentally ill and visible minorities are more likely to be over-represented in segregation (OCI, 2013, pp. 7, 15). Along with reviewing the conditions of these segregation facilities, as a result of the expressed concerns, the OCI recommended closer scrutiny of the use of segregation, especially with mentally ill inmates, including adherence to policy and prohibiting long-term segregation for mentally ill inmates (OCI, 2010; OCI, 2012). Given these concerns about balance, it is necessary to have a comprehensive understanding of the use of segregation – not only to know who is being sent into segregation and why, but also to evaluate areas where segregation may be over or under utilized.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Admission

The three criteria for being involuntarily admitted to the SHU are as follows. The inmate:

1. Causes or commits, or there is reason to believe he has committed an act of violence, makes serious threats, or otherwise shows an ongoing propensity for serious violence such that a transfer to the SHU is the only reasonable alternative;
2. Causes or commits an act resulting in serious bodily injury or death; or
3. Is convicted of any terrorism offence where the Custody Rating Scale is maximum and the Regional Deputy Commissioner (RDC) determines that he meets the criteria for a placement to the SHU for assessment purposes. As applicable, an inmate may be directly placed from provincial custody to the SHU (Commissioner's Directive, 2004).

To be admitted to the SHU, an inmate must meet one of the three criteria listed above and will receive approval for transfer by the Regional Deputy Commissioner. The inmate will also undergo a mental health assessment to ensure that he is capable of being transferred to the SHU. Thus, arguably any inmate with existing mental health issues will be screened out at this point and considered for transfer to a Regional Psychiatric Centre (RPC) for appropriate treatment. Within four months of the transfer to the SHU, a comprehensive evaluation will be conducted that includes a psychiatric assessment, a rationale for the placement, and a plan to address the behaviours that were the cause of the referral. A Parole Officer will review the inmate's mental health assessment and involvement in correctional programs and interventions directed at modifying attitudes and stabilizing behaviour. The Parole Officer will then make recommendations to the National Advisory Committee regarding the transfer. The inmate will also provide an interview and/or a written submission to the National Advisory Committee who will review the transfer and make a recommendation to the Senior Deputy Commissioner (SDC).

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

The SDC will then make the final decision whether the inmate will be kept in the SHU. Within five days of the final decision, the inmate will be provided instruction as to the procedures for filing a grievance against the decision. The Institutional Head has the responsibility of reviewing grievances from offenders in segregation, including the SHU, daily (CSC, 2014). Maintenance assessment will occur every four months and involves the SDC's decision whether to maintain or transfer the inmate to a maximum-security institution. Once an offender is admitted to the SHU there is no required minimum or maximum length of stay, however the re-assessment of placement occurs only every four months. The offender will be kept in the SHU as long as the risk he represents cannot be managed at a regular maximum-security institution. Additionally, offenders who are within six-months of their statutory release date or warrant expiry date will only be considered for SHU transfer under particularly exceptional circumstances (Commissioner's Directive, 2004).

The numbers. The most recent Annual Report on the SHU (CSC, 2014) reported a current average of 73 SHU inmates. Thirty-eight percent of the inmates were transferred to the SHU for seriously assaulting another inmate, 19% for assaulting staff, and 12% for displaying ongoing threatening, violent, or sexual behaviour; the remaining inmates were transferred for various reasons including taking staff hostage, murdering an inmate, attempting escape, or being a National Security Case. Thirty-six percent of the SHU inmates were 29 years of age or younger, 30% were between 30 and 39, 19% were between 40 and 49, and 15% were 50 years of age or older. Twenty-three percent of SHU inmates were Aboriginal, and the majority of the remaining 76% were White. Just over half (55%) of the total SHU inmates had been placed there for less than two years, 26% had been there between two and five years, and 19% had been there for more than five years (CSC, 2014).

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Relatedly¹, from 2008 to 2013 total administrative segregation admissions ranged from 7,508 to 8,323. Approximately 95% of these admissions were male inmates and approximately 29.2% were Aboriginal. In April of 2013, approximately 98% of the 797 administrative segregation inmates were males, and almost 32% were Aboriginal inmates. Approximately 41% of administrative segregation inmates were there for 30 or fewer days, 22.7% for 30-60 days, and 16.7% over 120 days (Public Safety Canada, 2013).

Violent offenders. The SHU houses inmates with a variety of offences and reasons for transfer. Some of these reasons include, but are not limited to, displaying violent behaviours, being a high profile case, or being charged with a terrorism offence. A violent inmate may be placed in the SHU based on only one very serious or a series of in-prison offenses. While the SHU houses more than just violent inmates, it is arguably the violent inmates that cause the most trouble for the institutions from which they are sent. Prison violence and misconducts have both overt and covert consequences including: physical and psychological injury for staff and inmates; destroyed property; disruption of order; undermining of public confidence; and increased costs associated with housing the violent inmates in more restrictive facilities (Cooke, 1996, p. 65; Goetting & Howsen, 1986; Porporino, 1986). However, while the costs of prison violence and serious misconducts are high, the base rates are quite low, resulting in a disproportionate amount of resources being allocated to a serious but somewhat rare problem. Researchers and institutions define prison violence in different ways, but most include the following factors: actual, attempted, or threatened bodily harm; physical or sexual assaults; fighting; rioting or inciting a riot; hostage taking; murder or attempted murder; assault with or possession of a deadly weapon; escape; arson; property destruction; and sometimes self-

¹ It is important to note that these longitudinally collected statistics about administrative segregation cannot be compared directly to the snapshot SHU statistics reported above due to the timeframes in which the information was collected.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

mutilation (Cooke, 1996; Drury & DeLisi, 2010; Edens, Poythress, & Lilienfeld, 1999; Gadon, Jonstone, & Cooke, 2006; Guy, Edens, Anthony, & Douglas, 2005; Harer & Langan, 2001; Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002; Kroner & Mills, 2001; McCorkle, Miethe, & Drass, 1995; Wilson, Desmarais, Nicholls, Hart, & Brink, 2013). Various models have been developed to help researchers understand the causes of prison violence including the deprivation, importation, coping, and situational models. Presumably, validation of a model should inform assessment and intervention efforts.

Deprivation model. The deprivation model maintains that inmate misbehaviour is due to strain caused by deprivations experienced in institutional life (Sykes, 1958). A study by Jiang and Fisher-Giorlando (2002) found that inmates living in more restrictive cellblocks were more likely to have violent incidents. These authors suggested that inmates adjust to the deprivations of prison life by developing a subculture that is in opposition to the prison authorities, which leads to aggressive behaviours and rule violations. Alternatively, McCorkle, Miethe, and Drass (1995) looked at inmate deprivation, prison management, and the external environment of the prison to determine violence. They collected data from 371 state prisons in the US Department of Justice and measured individual and collective violence in adult males. The inmate deprivation model variables were the least useful for predicting inmate and staff assaults and riots.

Importation model. This model asserts that in-prison behaviours reflect the inmate's pre-prison traits, socialization experiences, background, and values (Irwin & Cressey, 1962). It has been supported by various studies that found that inmates with pre-prison qualities like substance use, a drug-related or extensive criminal history, high aggression, young age, or low education are more likely to engage in violence in prison (Drury & DeLisi, 2010; Jiang & Fisher-Giorlando, 2002; Lahm, 2008). For example, Walters and Crawford (2013) examined age, marital status,

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

street gang affiliation, criminal thinking, prior drug abuse, and criminal history in 3039 consecutive admissions to a male medium security federal prison and found that importation factors significantly impacted high and high-moderate severity infractions like assaults and escapes, providing some support for the importation model. Indeed, a meta-analysis that included 39 studies identified predictors of prison misconducts and concluded that criminal history and antisocial attitudes were among the strongest (Gendreau, Goggin, & Law, 1997).

Other models. A number of other models, like the coping or situational models, also seek to identify underlying causes of prison behaviours. The coping model contends that misconducts are due to inmates having insufficient resources and skills to cope with life inside prison (Zamble & Porporino, 1990). A longitudinal study by Zamble and Porporino (1990) suggested that it was offenders' maladaptive and ineffective coping behaviours in and out of prison that lead to violence and criminality. The authors also suggested that inadequate coping strategies are only one of several important determinants of criminal behaviour including socialization patterns and time use (e.g., planning ahead versus living impulsively). Blevins, Johnson, Listwan, Cullen, and Lero Jonson (2010) suggested that general strain theory could integrate the deprivation and importation models with the coping model. They proposed that inmates with increased restrictions will act out more than those with more freedoms, and that if inmates are deprived of the means to reach their personal goals (e.g., of gaining some education or finding work) they may direct their efforts to more deviant goals. The situational model, on the other hand, states that inmate behaviours are influenced primarily by situational factors such as season, location, and relationships between staff and inmates. In support of this model, Jiang and Fisher-Giorlando (2002) found that inmates were less likely to be violent in working blocks compared to their cellblocks. Each model described above has made a contribution to the explanation of

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

prison violence and as such the academic literature has provided no consensus of support for one particular theory or combination of theories.

Dealing with prison violence. Byrne and Hummer (2007) have suggested that the current control-based prison violence reduction strategies should be challenged. Moreover, they asserted that risk classification should be linked to treatment services and classification strategies should focus on changing rather than controlling inmates. In contrast, one increasingly popular method of responding to unruly prisoners has been the strategy of using solitary confinement, administrative segregation, “special housing” units, and the like. Toch (2001, p. 381) suggested that Supermax confinement creates ticking “time bombs” that are even more likely to be violent, due at least in part, to the self-fulfilling prophecy. He advocates for programming to counteract this effect. Indeed, criminal sanctioning without provision of appropriate rehabilitative services is in itself unsuccessful at rehabilitating inmates (Andrews et al., 1990). Likewise, a summary of meta-analyses on offender treatment outcomes concluded that appropriate treatments do, in fact, reduce offender recidivism, particularly those that adhere to cognitive, behavioural, and social learning theories (Smith, Gendreau, & Swartz, 2009). While in-prison interventions typically apply the risk, needs, and responsivity model put forth by Andrews, Bonta, and Hoge (1990) with demonstrated efficacy, Toch’s (2001) concerns may imply an alternative approach to mitigate segregation’s apparent iatrogenic effect. In 1984, research by Gendreau and Bonta concluded that some people simply adapt better to conditions of sensory deprivation and that most segregated inmates complained more about how they were treated by staff than by the physical conditions of their confinement. While these findings may sound promising to advocates for this type of inmate control strategy, more recent literature refutes these earlier findings. King, Steiner, and Ritchie Breach (2008) have suggested that the SHU causes inmates’

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

mental health to deteriorate, leading to violent outbursts and thus validating why they were put there in the first place. A qualitative study by O’Keefe (2008) involved extensively interviewing supermax prison inmates in Colorado about their experiences. Numerous concerns were raised about the nature of why inmates were placed in the segregation facility. The author expressed particular concern for segregating inmates who caused multiple minor in-prison offences rather than one or a few particularly violent or disruptive offences. O’Keefe (2008) further suggested that long-term conditions of segregation reduce the inmate’s ability to be successfully reintegrated into the general prison population or to the community upon release.

Research on potential individual-level and institutional-level factors that are related to placement in administrative or disciplinary segregation has suggested that inmates in segregation have higher static and dynamic risk ratings, are younger, and have more extensive criminal histories and violent offences, among other factors (Lovell, Cloyes, Allen, & Rhodes, 2000; Motiuk & Blanchette, 1997). An important institutional-level factor included crowding and increased spatial density and its subsequent effects on increasing inmate misconducts (Franklin, Franklin, & Pratt, 2006; Gendreau, Goggin, & Law, 1997).

Suggestions have been made for the improvement of segregation facilities. Interestingly, Wong and colleagues (2005) analyzed a group of 31 seriously violent and personality-disordered male federal offenders who were transferred from the SHU in Quebec to the Regional Psychiatric Centre (RPC) where they received specialized treatment before being returned to lower security prisons. Eighty percent of the offenders remained in mainstream security prisons for the whole 20-month follow up period. Thus, the authors recommended a transitional strategy to facilitate reintegration via a maximum-security step-down treatment-oriented facility.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Alternatively, Cooke and Johnstone (2010; 2012) investigated the improved behaviours of otherwise typically high-risk, unmanageable inmates at Barlinnie Special Unit in Scotland using the Promoting Risk Intervention by Situational Management (PRISM) scheme. PRISM is a set of structured professional guidelines for assessing and managing the risk of violence within institutions. The premise of PRISM is that the prison environment can influence violence. The authors draw from the Stanford Prison Experiment (Zimbardo, Haney, Banks, & Jaffe, 1982) to suggest that personality factors have limited predictive power for observed behaviours and that situational characteristics are more important to consider. The creators of PRISM have suggested that it is more effective to change the prison environment to influence inmates' behaviours than to change persistent personality characteristics (Cooke & Johnstone, 2010). PRISM was developed based on the Barlinnie institution, which houses high-risk offenders with lengthy sentences and histories of violent crimes. The institution provides these inmates with better living conditions, more daily activities, more autonomy, and more staff-prisoner consultations than typical high-security institutions. A review showed fewer assaults and serious incidents at Barlinnie (Cooke & Johnstone, 2010). While there is already a strong link between person-centered variables and violence, a considerable piece of the puzzle includes the consideration of situational variables (Gadon, Johnstone, & Cooke, 2006). In fact, the authors theorize that once situational factors leading to violence are diffused, any residual violence can be deemed as person-centered and treated as such (Cooke, Wozniak, & Johnstone, 2008).

Mental Health Concerns

In May 2013 the Bureau of Prisons (BOP; GAO, 2013) provided a report on the monitoring of and improvements needed in segregated housing. They concluded that, despite the growing use of segregated housing in the US and the belief that segregation helps maintain

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

prison and inmate safety, improvements were needed. Specifically, they found that the monitoring of the administrative segregation facility was lacking, and as a result some conditions of inmate confinement were not consistently being met. While the BOP has not yet evaluated the impact of segregation on prison safety or on inmates' functioning in the long-term, they have estimated that it does help to maintain prison safety with the disclaimer that long-term segregation may actually have a deleterious effect on inmates overall (GAO, 2013, pp. 41-42). While in theory appropriate screening before admission should mitigate, at least to some extent, this detrimental impact, these findings raise concerns about the mental health of inmates kept in segregation facilities.

Madrid v. Gomez. Since the US case of *Madrid v. Gomez* (1998) regarding the conditions of segregation, concerns about segregation's impact on inmate mental health have grown. In October 1990, inmates from the Pelican Bay State Prison in California filed a class-action lawsuit against the California Department of Corrections for the unconstitutional conditions of their confinement. The complainants alleged such practices as being subjected to excessive use of force, being provided inadequate medical and mental health care, and inhumane conditions including increased risk of assault. The court ruled in favor of the inmates regarding certain conditions that constituted cruel and unusual punishment and violation of due process (*Madrid v. Gomez*, 1998). This case is highly influential regarding inquiries into the use and practices of segregation facilities in the US.

Colorado. On March 19, 2013, Colorado prison director Tom Clements was shot dead in his home. The perpetrator was Evan Ebel, a paroled offender who had spent much of his eight-year prison sentence in administrative segregation. This incident raised many questions about the safety of releasing inmates from segregation directly to the community, and whether inmates are

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

receiving appropriate treatment within prison and during their transition out of the facility. Tom Clements's successor, Rick Raemisch, has since expressed his concerns about the mental health issues he believed are *caused* by solitary confinement (Dukakis, 2014). Furthermore, Evan Ebel's father, Jack Ebel, had advocated for his son, stating that being locked up alone for hours had been a serious detriment to his mental health and asked for law makers to consider alternatives to solitary confinement for mentally ill inmates (McKinley, 2013).

Unfortunately, the literature does suggest that mentally ill inmates are typically overrepresented in administrative segregation facilities. A study by Hodgins and Cote (1991) evaluated 41 of 62 SHU inmates in Quebec in late spring 1988 and found that 29% of SHU inmates had a severe mental disorder (i.e., schizophrenia, major depression, and bipolar disorder), 61% had alcohol dependency issues, 50% had drug dependency issues, 12.2% had depressive neurosis, 51% had generalized anxiety disorder, and a third had tried to commit suicide. Most of these issues were found to be more prevalent in the SHU population than in the general prison population; having schizophrenia or major depressive disorder were the exceptions (Hodgins & Cote, 1991). In an attempt to identify the prevalence of mental disorder in a general prison population, Brink, Doherty, and Boer (2001) assessed the mental health status of 267 randomly selected male federal offenders newly admitted to a Canadian facility between February and September 1999. The authors found 30.2% had a mood disorder, 8.4% had a psychotic disorder (including schizophrenia), 18.3% had an anxiety disorder, and 75.7% had a substance use disorder suggesting different but comparable rates of mental illness between SHU offenders and the general prison population. Hodgins and Cote (1991) had concluded that mentally ill inmates who are more disorganized, disruptive, and lacking self-control are more often assigned to the

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

SHU while withdrawn mentally disordered inmates (e.g., those with major depressive disorder) stay in the general prison population.

Lovell (2008) interviewed and reviewed the medical and institutional behavioural records of 87 inmates in Washington's Supermax facilities and found serious mental health issues in 45% of the inmates. O'Keefe, Klebe, Metzner, Dyoskin, Fellner, and Stucker (2013) assessed male inmates with and without mental illness in administrative segregation, general population, or special-needs prison, to determine whether it is possible that the harsh environment of segregation causes or exacerbates mental illness *or* there is a selection bias such that mentally ill inmates are more likely to be sent into segregation due to an inability to adapt to the prison setting. Their main finding was that non-mentally ill segregated inmates still had more symptoms of mental illness than non-mentally ill general population inmates, and that there were no differences between the groups in changes in their psychological symptoms over time (O'Keefe et al., 2013). Brandt (2012) purported that the mentally ill may be more represented in SHU-like facilities because they are more likely to act out, and because they require some protection from other inmates. The author also suggested that housing the mentally ill in such conditions may exacerbate their problems and they may ultimately be *less* equipped for successful eventual release into the community. Moreover, in 2014 the ACLU condemned the use of solitary confinement for mentally ill inmates altogether.

Self-injurious behaviour. According to the annual report of the OCI (2013), in the previous five years there had been a threefold increase in the number of self-injuries in federal prisons. Inmates who self-injure are typically kept in segregation to increase the ability for staff to monitor their behaviours to ensure offender safety. This can, however, prove detrimental to the inmate in the long term. The OCI went on to suggest that conditions of confinement and

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

segregation may, in fact, exacerbate the mental health issues experienced by the inmate, who may then turn to self-injury to cope with or escape the deprivations (OCI, 2013). Interestingly, the OCI also stated that:

the known protective/preventive factors for self-injury in prisons – less time locked in a cell; employment; meaningful associations with others; engaging in correctional programs; regular and quality contacts with family – appear to conflict with security and incident driven responses that, in chronic cases, are reduced to simply keeping an offender alive. (OCI, 2013, p. 17)

Brandt (2012) made the similar point that institutions often struggle with the “dual role” of rehabilitating versus managing inmates. The author suggested that the institution will typically err on the side of managing inmates, to the neglect of rehabilitating inmates. Reasons cited include staff expertise and lack of resources, thus resulting in a lack of adequate care for mentally ill inmates.

Contingency Management

Canada has been influenced by policies in the US and UK that have promoted increased structure in the prison system, including having powerful incentives for good conduct (Gendreau, Listwan, & Kuhns, 2011). In October 2007 the CSC Review Panel released a report outlining various suggestions for improving public safety (Sampson, Glascon, Glen, Louis, & Rosenfeldt, 2007). The Panel suggested that inmates be provided more powerful incentives to increase their desire to leave the segregation environment. An answer to this problem may be contingency management (CM) programs. CM is based on the principles of operant conditioning and contiguity. The most commonly known method is the Token Economy where inmates earn tokens or points through good behaviour which they can later exchange for various goods,

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

activities, services, social reinforcers, and even eventual release (Gendreau et al., 2011). CM programs are praised for being self-rehabilitating and transparent, and teaching inmates to exhibit personal responsibility. A recent meta-analysis found that with the use of CM programs, particularly Token Economies, inmates showed major improvements in institutional adjustment, educational, and work related behaviours that appeared stable across gender and age groups (Gendreau, Listwan, Kuhns, & Exum, 2014). A limitation of CM programs, however, is the amount of work and commitment required of the institution for consistency. The entire prison culture and functioning of the institution must change to accommodate CM programs and this may prove difficult (Murphy, Rhodes, & Taxman, 2012). However, it has been suggested that CM programs may be particularly appropriate and useful with high-risk or particularly disruptive offenders due to their strict structure and use of immediate rewards (Gendreau et al., 2011; Sampson et al., 2007).

Current Study

While the current practices of segregation facilities continue to be debated in the academic literature and in reviews of correctional policies, it appears that these types of hyper-security prisons are here to stay and that there may in fact be an important role for them to play in the correctional system. Hence it seems useful to consider how these practices can be refined to ensure the facilities are running as efficiently as possible; ideally practices should improve institution and public safety, while being attentive to offenders' needs. The current research consists of two important studies: Study One involves developing a comprehensive profile of SHU inmates, and Study Two involves conducting a Program Development Evaluation to identify clusters of inmates who share similar problems for the purpose of targeting appropriate treatments. The goal is to move beyond simple description of SHU cases by examining an

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

empirical approach to identifying inmates and their most salient needs. An empirical analysis of SHU cases will provide staff with better means for understanding offender needs and matching these to risk-relevant interventions. For example, if we can identify the common distinguishing characteristics of SHU inmates, we can use this information to inform interventions to proactively change inmate behaviours. Finding effective ways to improve inmate behaviours to reduce SHU admissions, length of stay, or exit criteria can be beneficial at multiple levels. Individual offenders and staff both benefit, while institutions will be more stable and safe. As well, these benefits will yield financial savings given the increased cost of the SHU.

Research Questions

The current study seeks to answer three research questions:

- 1) What are the typical distinguishing characteristics of SHU inmates?*
- 2) What are the common problems experienced by SHU inmates?*
- 3) Are there subtypes of SHU inmates, and how might this inform case management?*

This research is largely exploratory due to the limited amount of literature and availability of information about the SHU facility, despite the developing abundance of literature on administrative segregation. Due to the exploratory nature of this research, no specific hypotheses have been made; however it is believed that a unique profile exists for SHU inmates that can help to inform differential intervention.

Method

Study One: SHU Profile

Purpose

The purpose of Study One of the study is to develop a comprehensive profile of SHU inmates with the goal of differentiating SHU inmates from inmates in administrative segregation.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Sample

The current research is intended to build upon a study conducted by Helmus (2015) that resulted in the development of a prediction tool for administrative segregation. The original research utilized a large population of inmates serving a federal sentence under the jurisdiction of CSC, some of who were also admitted to administrative segregation during their incarceration. Helmus (2015) identified the factors that most successfully predicted admission to administrative segregation and developed the Risk of Administrative Segregation Tool (RAST), described in more detail below. The dataset is archival in that it has already been collected by CSC through the Offender Management System (OMS). The Helmus (2015) dataset included all 14,007 male federal offenders. Female offenders were not included in the final sample because they are not admitted to the SHU. The potential predictor variables included 413 items from the Static Factors Assessment (SFA), Dynamic Factors Intake Assessment (DFIA), and the Custody Rating Scale (CRS), as well as demographic information, current offence information, special notes raised by CSC staff, information on gang affiliations, and information from previous federal sentences; all of which were available at offender intake or shortly thereafter. The men in the sample represented all admission to CSC custody from April 1, 2007 to March 31, 2010. For the total sample, the average sentence length was 4.4 years and the mean age at admission was 35.3 years. For the SHU inmates, average sentence length was 12.3 years and the mean age at admission was 25.9 years. For the administrative segregation sample, average sentence length was 5.7 years and the mean age at admission was 31.0 years.

For the current study, a smaller sample ($n = 3,666$) was drawn from the larger dataset and consists of all inmates who were admitted either to administrative segregation ($n = 3616$) or to the SHU ($n = 50$) at some time during their sentence. One quarter of the administrative

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

segregation sample was Aboriginal ($n=895$); of the 50 SHU inmates, roughly one third ($n=16$) were Aboriginal. Approximately 20% of each group was francophone and 58% of inmates within each group were currently single. Information on the average length of time until SHU admission and average length of time the inmates spent in the SHU is available in Table 1 below. The available information indicated that nine of the inmates were still in the SHU at the time of data analysis, while 13 were no longer in the SHU (this information was missing for the remaining inmates).

Table 1
Time Variables for SHU Inmates (days)

	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range	
				Min.	Max.
Time until SHU	49	1034.20	637.56	134	2463
Length of (first) ¹ stay	13	415.31	392.35	63	1399

¹Information was not available for second SHU admissions.

Measures/Predictor Variables

The Risk of Administrative Segregation Tool (RAST) was used to guide variable selection. The RAST is a static actuarial tool used to predict admission to administrative segregation within two years of admission and of at least six days, for reason of jeopardizing security or inmate-in-danger. It contains six items: age at admission, prior convictions, admission to administrative segregation in previous federal sentence, sentence length, criminal versatility in current convictions, and prior conviction for violence. Initial construction of the tool has yielded good predictive accuracy ($AUC = .79$; Helmus, 2015). These six items, along with the total RAST scale score, were included in analyses. Possible scores range from zero to 13.

Additionally, a number of variables not included in the RAST were selected that were deemed relevant to the institutional violence literature and SHU inmates in particular. These five

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

variables were chosen from the 413 items collected from the SFA, DFIA, CRS, and general OMS data and included: flag for high profile case, substance abuse, offense severity, admission to any type of segregation in previous federal sentence, and gang membership.²

Lastly, variables that had an odds ratio greater than 1.75 or less than .75 and were significant at the $p = .001$ level from Helmus' (2015) study were included in the analyses. Altogether, 169 variables were assessed. The complete list of variables and their response options is available in Appendix A.

Analyses

Group comparisons were run between SHU inmates and administrative segregation inmates. Cohen's d effect sizes were calculated for ordinal and continuous variables while odds ratios were calculated for dichotomous variables. These effect sizes and their confidence intervals were calculated following the formulas of Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, and Rothstein (2009). Additionally, to offset the issue of empty cells for odds ratios, a statistical procedure advised by Fleiss (1994) was utilized that involves adding 0.5 to each cell. To facilitate comparisons, odds ratios were converted to Cohen's d effect sizes using a formula recommended by Sánchez-Meca, Marín-Martínez, and Chacón-Moscoso (2003). Cut offs for small, medium, and large Cohen's d correspond to .20, .50, and .80, respectively (Cohen, 1988). Odds ratios reported in this study indicate the odds of being in the SHU if a particular variable is present over the odds of being in the SHU if the variable is not present (as opposed to being in administrative segregation). In other words, it reflects the increase in the odds of being in SHU when the risk factor is present. Cohen's d was selected for continuous variables because it is more robust to low base rates (e.g., the distribution of cases between SHU versus administrative segregation)

² Initially, conviction for a terrorism offence, and mental health issues were included in this list however these variables were not available.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

than point-biserial correlations (Babchishin & Helmus, 2014). Although AUCs are a similar effect size statistic suitable for group differences (Babchishin & Helmus, 2014), they are sensitive to restriction of range in the predictor variable (Hanson, 2008). In other words, the fewer the values in the predictor variable, the smaller the AUC will get (e.g., examining age as a categorical ordinal variable versus as a continuous variable). Although AUCs have the advantage of being suitable for ordinal and continuous predictors (whereas Cohen's d is technically intended only for continuous variables), Cohen's d is one of the most commonly used statistics in psychology research and is intuitively understandable to many researchers (Borenstein et al., 2009). Odds ratios were selected because they are one of the more commonly used effect sizes for examining two dichotomous variables, and they are relatively insensitive to base rates (Borenstein et al., 2009).

An important limitation of the current data is that it involves comparing a group of 50 SHU inmates to a much larger group of 3,616 administrative segregation inmates, which is an exceptionally low base rate for the dichotomous grouping variable. Although Cohen's d and odds ratios are known for being particularly robust to low base rates (as discussed above), this does create an issue of power as statistical power is based not only on overall sample size but also the size of each cell (for odds ratios) and each group (for Cohen's d). This means that the magnitude of the effect sizes should not be unduly influenced by the base rate, the variance of the effect sizes will be. Specifically, the low base rate will contribute to larger variances and wider confidence intervals (making it harder to achieve statistical significant). Fortunately however, given that the variance is affected by both the total sample size *and* the base rate, the large overall sample size will offset this limitation somewhat.

Results

A total of 169 variables were assessed to develop a profile of SHU inmates: seven from the RAST, five chosen based on the review of the literature, and 157 that were the best predictors from the Helmus (2015) study. Cohen's d effect sizes were used for ordinal/continuous variables and odds ratios were used for dichotomous variables.³ Effect sizes were computed such that positive Cohen's d values indicate the SHU group scored higher on the risk factor than the administrative segregation group; thus, negative values indicate the SHU group scored lower on the risk factor than the administrative segregation group. A significant Cohen's d value is indicated by a 95% confidence interval that does not include zero. Alternatively, significant odds ratios are indicated by a 95% confidence interval that does not include one. The complete results list for all variables is available in Appendix C; the most salient results will be discussed here.

RAST

Only three out of the seven RAST variables, including the full-scale score, were significant (see Table 2). The total RAST score appears to be a moderate distinguishing variable for SHU inmates ($d=.62$, 95% CI=.34 to .91). Sentence length has the next highest effect size ($d=.61$, 95% CI=.33 to .89), and age at admission has the third highest effect size ($d=.45$, 95% CI=.17 to .73)

³ As mentioned previously, Cohen's ds were also computed from odds ratios for easy comparisons between continuous and dichotomous variables.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Table 2
Effect Sizes for RAST Variables

Variable Name	SHU Cases				Admin Seg [†]			Cohen's		95% CI		
	N	%	Mean	SD	N	%	Mean	SD	d	Lower	Upper	
Admission to administrative segregation in previous federal sentence (RAST_admis_Aseg_d)	50	-	-	-	3,616	-	-	-	.20	-.14	.55	
Yes	19	38.0	-	-	1,111	30.7	-	-	-	-	-	
No	31	62.0	-	-	2,505	69.3	-	-	-	-	-	
Prior conviction for violence (RAST_OSRI0_d)	48	-	-	-	3,548	-	-	-	.37	-.07	.82	
Yes	41	82.0	-	-	2,571	71.1	-	-	-	-	-	
No	8	16.0	-	-	977	27.0	-	-	-	-	-	
Age at admission (RAST_age3_c)	50	-	2.46	.542	3,616	-	2.11	.787	.45*	.17	.73	
50+	0	0	-	-	151	4.2	-	-	-	-	-	
40-49.9	1	2.0	-	-	497	13.7	-	-	-	-	-	
25-39.9	25	50.0	-	-	1788	49.4	-	-	-	-	-	
< 25	24	48.0	-	-	1180	32.6	-	-	-	-	-	
Prior convictions (RAST_priorcon2_c)	50	-	1.50	.763	3,616	-	1.58	.710	-.11	-.39	.17	
0-1	8	16.0	-	-	469	13.0	-	-	-	-	-	
2-4	9	18.0	-	-	588	16.3	-	-	-	-	-	
5+	33	66.0	-	-	2559	70.8	-	-	-	-	-	
Sentence length (RAST_sentence4_c)	50	-	3.08	1.122	3,616	-	2.57	.831	.61**	.33	.89	
2 years	4	8.0	-	-	156	4.3	-	-	-	-	-	
2-3 years	5	10.0	-	-	1415	39.1	-	-	-	-	-	
3-10 years	20	40.0	-	-	1708	47.2	-	-	-	-	-	
10+ years	21	42.0	-	-	337	9.3	-	-	-	-	-	
Criminal versatility in current convictions (RAST_versatility3_c)	48	-	1.13	.606	3,590	-	1.05	.637	.13	-.16	.41	
0 categories	6	12.0	-	-	644	17.8	-	-	-	-	-	
1-2 categories	30	60.0	-	-	2123	58.7	-	-	-	-	-	
3+ categories	12	24.0	-	-	823	22.8	-	-	-	-	-	
Total RAST score (RAST_scale4full_c)	48	-	9.38	1.746	3,590	-	8.33	1.692	.62**	.34	.91	

[†]Admin Seg[†] refers to Administrative Segregation.

*Indicates a significant small effect size.

**Indicates a significant moderate effect size.

***Indicates a significant large effect size.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Additional Variables

Two out of the five additional variables selected from the literature review were significant (see Table 3). Being affiliated with a gang or organized crime was moderately to strongly associated with SHU inmates ($d=.71$, 95% CI=.36 to 1.07). Additionally, the inmate's offense severity score had a moderate significant Cohen's d effect size ($d=.63$, 95% CI=.35 to .91). Due to the low odds ratios and negative Cohen's d it appears that being in the SHU is associated with having lower levels of substance abuse problems. However, this relationship is weak and not significant (see Appendix C).

Offense History

Aside from general offence severity, most of the additional historical offence severity variables assessed did not have large effect sizes (see Appendix C). Those in the low to moderate significant effects include: using weapons against the victim in a previous offence ($d=.45$, 95% CI=.09 to .80), causing serious injury to the victim in a previous offence ($d=.54$, 95% CI=.14 to .93), and using violence ($d=.43$, 95% CI=.08 to .78), weapons ($d=.50$, 95% CI=.17 to .84), and causing serious injury to the victim in their current offence ($d=.61$, 95% CI=.26 to .96).

Current Offense

When looking at the inmate's current offence, arson, attempted murder, assault, homicide, game betting, administration of justice, public order offence, and possession of weapons or explosives all had moderate to strong effect sizes (see Table 4). Having a current indeterminate life sentence was also strongly associated with SHU inmates ($d=.98$, 95% CI=.61 to 1.36). However, the number of current convictions the inmate had was not ($d=-.12$, 95% CI=-.40 to .16).

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Table 3
Effect Sizes for Five Additional Variables

Variable Name	SHU Cases				Admin Seg ¹			Cohen's <i>d</i>	95% CI	
	<i>N</i>	%	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	%	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Lower	Upper
Flagged as high profile (FLAG_HIGH_PROFILE_d)	50	-	-	-	3,612	-	-	-	.21	-.33 .76
Yes	5	10.0	-	-	282	7.8	-	-	-	-
No	45	90.0	-	-	3,330	92.1	-	-	-	-
Previous admission to any type of segregation (No_admis_seg_any_d)	50	-	-	-	3,616	-	-	-	.19	-.16 .53
Yes	19	38.0	-	-	2,849	68.8	-	-	-	-
No	31	62.0	-	-	1,127	31.2	-	-	-	-
Affiliated with gang or organized crime (ASS05_2_d)	45	-	-	-	3,439	-	-	-	.71**	.36 1.07
Yes	23	46.0	-	-	836	23.1	-	-	-	-
No	22	44.0	-	-	2,603	72.0	-	-	-	-
Offense severity score (OFFSEVER_c)	50	-	2.08	.634	3,616	-	1.72	.570	.63**	.35 .91
0	0	0	-	-	2	0.1	-	-	-	-
1	8	16.0	-	-	1231	34.0	-	-	-	-
2	30	60.0	-	-	2162	59.8	-	-	-	-
3	12	24.0	-	-	221	6.1	-	-	-	-
DFIA substance abuse domain score (Substance_Abuse_c)	39	-	3.26	.850	2,753	-	3.33	.821	-.09	-.40 .23
No difficulty	10	20.0	-	-	626	17.3	-	-	-	-
Some difficulty	9	18.0	-	-	603	16.7	-	-	-	-
Considerable difficulty	20	40.0	-	-	1524	42.1	-	-	-	-

¹ Admin Seg¹ refers to Administrative Segregation.
 *Indicates a significant small effect size.
 **Indicates a significant moderate effect size.
 ***Indicates a significant large effect size.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Table 4
Effect Sizes of Inmate Current Offenses

Variable Name	SHU Cases		Admin Seg ¹		Cohen's <i>d</i>	95% CI	
	N	%	N	%		Lower	Upper
Abduction / Kidnapping	48	-	3,590		-.46	-1.44	.53
Yes	1	2.0	225	6.2	-	-	-
No	47	94.0	3,365	93.1	-	-	-
Arson	48	-	3,590		.91***	.23	1.59
Yes	3	6.0	60	1.7	-	-	-
No	45	90.0	3,530	97.6	-	-	-
Attempted Murder	48	-	3,590		1.28***	.66	1.89
Yes	4	8.0	43	1.2	-	-	-
No	44	88.0	3,547	98.1	-	-	-
Break and Enter	48	-	3,590		-.02	-.41	.38
Yes	12	24.0	933	25.8	-	-	-
No	36	72.0	2,657	73.5	-	-	-
Assault	48	-	3,590		.71**	.37	1.06
Yes	28	56.0	1,077	29.8	-	-	-
No	20	40.0	2,513	69.5	-	-	-
Fraud	48	-	3,590		-.70	-1.68	.29
Yes	1	2.0	325	9.0	-	-	-
No	47	94.0	3,265	90.3	-	-	-
Homicide	48	-	3,590		.88***	.51	1.25
Yes	15	30.0	351	9.7	-	-	-
No	33	66.0	3,239	89.6	-	-	-
Impaired Driving	48	-	3,590		-.21	-1.20	.78
Yes	1	2.0	154	4.3	-	-	-
No	47	94.0	3,436	95.0	-	-	-
Game / Betting	48	-	3,590		2.61***	.23	4.99
Yes	0	0	0	0	-	-	-
No	48	96.0	3,590	99.3	-	-	-
Sexual Moral	48	-	3,590		-.17	-1.87	1.53
Yes	0	0	48	1.3	-	-	-
No	48	96.0	3,542	98.0	-	-	-
Administration of Justice	48	-	3,590		-.79	-1.33	-.25
Yes	5	10.0	1,142	31.6	-	-	-
No	43	86.0	2,448	67.7	-	-	-
Other Offense	48	-	3,590		.11	-.24	.46
Yes	28	56.0	1,929	53.3	-	-	-
No	20	40.0	1,661	45.9	-	-	-
Other Property Offense	48	-	3,590		-.12	-.54	.29
Yes	10	20.0	901	24.9	-	-	-
No	38	76.0	2,689	74.4	-	-	-
Possession of Drugs	48	-	3,590		-.33	-.99	.33
Yes	3	6.0	418	11.6	-	-	-
No	45	90.0	3,172	87.7	-	-	-

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Table 4 (continued)

Variable Name	SHU Cases		Admin Seg ¹		Cohen's <i>d</i>	95% CI	
	N	%	N	%		Lower	Upper
Public Order Offense	48	-	3,590		.57**	.19	.94
Yes	14	28.0	508	14.0	-	-	-
No	34	68.0	3,082	85.2	-	-	-
Robbery	48	-	3,590		-.29	-.70	.13
Yes	10	20.0	1091	30.2	-	-	-
No	38	76.0	2,499	68.1	-	-	-
Sexual Offense	48	-	3,590		-.55	-1.54	.43
Yes	1	2.0	262	7.2	-	-	-
No	47	94.0	3,328	92.0	-	-	-
Theft	48	-	3,590		-.32	-.82	.18
Yes	6	12.0	740	20.5	-	-	-
No	42	84.0	2,850	78.8	-	-	-
Drug Trafficking	48	-	3,590		-.58	-1.24	.08
Yes	3	6.0	601	16.6	-	-	-
No	45	90.0	2,989	82.7	-	-	-
Weapons / Explosives	48	-	3,590		.51**	.16	.86
Yes	19	38.0	800	22.1	-	-	-
No	29	58.0	2,790	77.2	-	-	-

¹ "Admin Seg" refers to Administrative Segregation.

*Indicates a significant small effect size.

**Indicates a significant moderate effect size.

***Indicates a significant large effect size.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Prison Adjustment

While admission to any previous segregation did not have a significant effect size, having previously been in segregation for interfering with an investigation had a moderate effect size ($d=.65$, 95% CI=.17 to 1.12). Having a history of involvement in institutional incidences had a large effect size ($d=.80$, 95% CI=.21 to 1.39). In particular, being involved in a serious incident ($d=.64$, 95% CI=.30 to .98), an incident involving assault ($d=.42$, 95% CI=.07 to .77), or an incident involving death ($d=1.34$, 95% CI=.77 to 1.90) have moderate to strong associations with SHU inmates. Less serious incidents were not strongly associated with SHU admissions at all (see Appendix C).

Criminogenic Needs

Employment. Examining criminogenic needs also revealed differences between SHU and Administrative Segregation inmates. For instance, the DFIA domain score for employment was marginally associated with SHU admissions ($d=.38$, 95% CI=.06 to .70). Specifically, lacking in a skill area, trade, or profession ($d=.86$, 95% CI=.19 to 1.53), as were being unemployed 50% of the time or more ($d=1.04$, 95% CI=.26 to 1.82), and having no employment history at all ($d=.78$, 95% CI=.43 to 1.13) had moderate to large effect sizes.

Personal/Emotional. Notably, the DFIA domain score for personal or emotional variables was moderately associated with SHU admissions ($d=.50$, 95% CI=.19 to .82). Nine out of the 20 specific variables examined were considered moderate to strong effects as displayed in Table 5.

Marital/Family. The DFIA domain score for marital or family was not strongly associated with SHU admission ($d=.24$, 95% CI=-.08 to .56), however the specific family/marital variable of having been investigated or arrested for child abuse or neglect appears to be

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

approaching a moderate negative association with being in the SHU ($d=-.41$, 95% CI=-2.10 to 1.29).

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Table 5
Effect Sizes for DFIA Personal/Emotional Domain

Variable Name	SHU Cases		Admin Seg ¹		Cohen's <i>d</i>	95% CI	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%		Lower	Upper
Physical prowess problematic (PER02_d)	39	-	2,728	-	.71**	.31	1.10
Yes	14	28.0	409	11.3	-	-	-
No	25	50.0	2,319	64.1	-	-	-
Ethnicity is problematic (PER04_d)	37	-	2,726	-	.30	-.49	1.08
Yes	2	4.0	112	3.1	-	-	-
No	35	70.0	2,614	72.3	-	-	-
Has disregard for others (PER12_d)	38	-	2,732	-	.33	-.22	.88
Yes	33	66.0	2,127	58.8	-	-	-
No	5	10.0	605	16.7	-	-	-
Socially unaware (PER13_d)	39	-	2,731	-	.37	-.01	.75
Yes	18	36.0	870	24.1	-	-	-
No	21	42.0	1,861	51.5	-	-	-
Poor conflict resolution (PER20_d)	39	-	2,726	-	.72	-.06	1.50
Yes	37	74.0	2,239	61.9	-	-	-
No	2	4.0	487	13.5	-	-	-
Is not conscientious (PER29_d)	39	-	2,704	-	.37	-.03	.77
Yes	26	52.0	1,399	38.7	-	-	-
No	13	26.0	1,305	36.1	-	-	-
Diagnosed as disordered in the past (PER36_d)	37	-	2,696	-	.46*	.06	.86
Yes	14	28.0	601	16.6	-	-	-
No	23	46.0	2,095	57.9	-	-	-
Diagnosed as disordered currently (PER37_d)	37	-	2,666	-	.15	-.37	.66
Yes	6	12.0	372	10.3	-	-	-
No	21	62.0	2,294	63.4	-	-	-
Difficulty solving interpersonal problems (PER08_2_d)	49	-	3,517	-	.60**	.02	1.19
Yes	45	90.0	2,774	76.7	-	-	-
No	4	8.0	743	20.5	-	-	-
Ability to generate choices is limited (PER09_2_d)	48	-	3,526	-	.50**	.03	.97
Yes	41	82.0	2,496	69.0	-	-	-
No	7	14.0	1,030	28.5	-	-	-

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Variable Name	SHU Cases		Admin Seg ¹		Cohen's <i>d</i>	95% CI	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%		Lower	Upper
Difficulty setting realistic goals (PER11_2_d)	48	-	3,475	-	.25	-.09	.60
Yes	22	44.0	1,244	34.4	-	-	-
No	26	52.0	2,231	61.7	-	-	-
Impulsive (PER14_2_d)	49	-	3,541	-	-.15	-.65	.35
Yes	43	86.0	3,172	87.7	-	-	-
No	6	12.0	369	10.2	-	-	-
Empathy skills are limited (PER15_2_d)	49	-	3,455	-	.61**	.24	.98
Yes	35	70.0	1,630	45.1	-	-	-
No	14	28.0	1,825	50.5	-	-	-
Narrow and rigid thinking (PER16_2_d)	47	-	3,479	-	.72**	.29	1.15
Yes	38	76.0	1,926	53.3	-	-	-
No	9	18.0	1,553	42.9	-	-	-
Frequently acts in aggressive manner (PER17_2_d)	49	-	3,504	-	.83***	.33	1.34
Yes	43	86.0	2,201	60.9	-	-	-
No	6	12.0	1,303	36.0	-	-	-
Time management skills problematic (PER21_2_d)	45	-	3,387	-	.27	-.10	.64
Yes	30	60.0	1,887	52.2	-	-	-
No	15	30.0	1,500	41.5	-	-	-
Low frustration tolerance (PER23_2_d)	48	-	3,442	-	.58**	.17	1.00
Yes	38	76.0	2,007	55.5	-	-	-
No	10	20.0	1,435	39.7	-	-	-
Hostile (PER24_2_d)	48	-	3,496	-	.87***	.50	1.24
Yes	33	66.0	1,189	32.9	-	-	-
No	15	30.0	2,307	63.8	-	-	-
Engages in thrill-seeking behaviour (PER27_2_d)	47	-	3,456	-	.37*	.02	.73
Yes	29	58.0	1,602	44.3	-	-	-
No	18	36.0	1,854	51.3	-	-	-
Manipulates others to achieve goals (PER30_2_d)	47	-	3,416	-	.07	-.29	.42
Yes	28	56.0	1,939	53.6	-	-	-
No	19	38.0	1,477	40.8	-	-	-

¹ Admin Seg¹ refers to Administrative Segregation.

*Indicates a significant small effect size.

**Indicates a significant moderate effect size.

***Indicates a significant large effect size.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Associates. The effect size for the DFIA domain score for associates is also minimal ($d=.35$, 95% CI=.04 to .67). Having criminal friends ($d=1.68$, 95% CI=.70 to 2.67) and having relations that are described as predatory ($d=.62$, 95% CI=.23 to 1.00) had stronger relations.

Community function. As well, the DFIA domain score for community function was only minimally related to being in the SHU ($d=.34$, 95% CI=.03 to .66) while having limited constructive leisure activities was fairly strongly related to SHU admissions ($d=.77$, 95% CI=.18 to 1.36, OR=3.54, 95% CI=1.34 to 9.37).

Attitudes. The DFIA domain score for attitudes has a moderate effect size ($d=.65$, 95% CI=.33 to .96). Four out of the ten specific variables assessed show moderate to strong effect sizes, these include believing that the elderly have no value ($d=.90$, 95% CI=.22 to 1.58, OR=4.42, 95% CI=1.43 to 13.65), displaying negative attitudes towards the criminal justice system ($d=.87$, 95% CI=.21 to 1.53, OR=4.22, 95% CI=1.42 to 12.54) and the correctional system ($d=.58$, 95% CI=.15 to 1.01, OR=2.59, 95% CI=1.27 to 5.27), and having attitudes that support instrumental violence ($d=1.25$, 95% CI=.59 to 1.91, OR=7.82, 95% CI=2.63 to 23.23).

Summary of risk and need measures. Overall dynamic, static, and CRS scores are all moderately to strongly associated with SHU admission. Reintegration potential and motivation level are both negatively associated with SHU admission indicating that lower motivation and reintegration potential has a larger association with being in the SHU. These results are displayed in Table 6.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Table 6
Effect Sizes for Overall Scores, Reintegration Potential, and Motivation

Variable Name	SHU Cases				Admin Seg [†]				Cohen's		95% CI	
	N	%	Mean	SD	N	%	Mean	SD	d	Lower	Upper	
Overall dynamic factors score	49	-	2.94	.242	3,556	-	2.76	.469	.39*	.10	.67	
Low	0	0	-	-	67	1.9	-	-	-	-	-	
Medium	3	6.0	-	-	720	19.9	-	-	-	-	-	
High	46	92.0	-	-	2769	76.6	-	-	-	-	-	
Overall static factors score	49	-	2.82	.441	3,557	-	2.55	.581	.47*	.18	.75	
Low	1	2.0	-	-	161	4.5	-	-	-	-	-	
Medium	7	14.0	-	-	1263	34.9	-	-	-	-	-	
High	41	82.0	-	-	2133	59.0	-	-	-	-	-	
Overall CRS score	50	-	2.64	.598	3,616	-	2.12	.623	.84***	.56	1.11	
Low	3	6.0	-	-	506	14.0	-	-	-	-	-	
Medium	12	24.0	-	-	2156	59.6	-	-	-	-	-	
High	35	70.0	-	-	954	26.4	-	-	-	-	-	
Level of reintegration potential	50	-	1.18	.482	3,616	-	1.71	.775	-.68**	-.96	-.40	
Low	43	86.0	-	-	1767	48.9	-	-	-	-	-	
Medium	5	10.0	-	-	1137	31.4	-	-	-	-	-	
High	2	4.0	-	-	712	19.7	-	-	-	-	-	
Level of motivation	50	-	1.56	.501	3,616	-	1.88	.555	-.57**	-.85	-.29	
Low	22	44.0	-	-	805	22.3	-	-	-	-	-	
Medium	28	56.0	-	-	2449	67.7	-	-	-	-	-	
High	0	0	-	-	362	10.0	-	-	-	-	-	

[†] Admin Seg[†] refers to Administrative Segregation.

*Indicates a significant small effect size.

**Indicates a significant moderate effect size.

***Indicates a significant large effect size.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Criminal history. Youth court record (YCR), adult court record (ACR), and sex offence history (SOH) effect sizes are displayed in Appendix C. Seven of the nine variables examined from the inmates' youth court records have moderate to strong effect sizes, suggesting prior history is importantly related to SHU admission. Results from the adult court record indicate that having a prior failure on community supervision is negatively related to SHU admission. Previously being in segregation for disciplinary infractions is positively associated with SHU admissions, as well as being re-classified to a higher level of security. Additionally, having less than six months since the last incarceration and having no crime free period of one year or more are positively associated with SHU admission. Relative to other segregation inmates, it appears that SHU inmates are a more chronic or persistent type of offender, reflecting early criminal involvement, as reflected in the youth court records and adult court records. None of the variables from the sex offence history records had significant effect sizes.

Study Two: SHU Problems Survey

Purpose

While forensic psychiatric facilities are faced with the challenging task of providing treatment interventions to particularly difficult patients, the SHU is faced with the similar task of providing treatment services to the most problematic inmates (Amellal, 2012). The purpose of Study Two is to assist in planning effective intervention strategies for the rehabilitation of inmates in the SHU by identifying common problems shared by SHU inmates. By identifying problems experienced by offenders, recommendations can be made for appropriate programming (Quinsey, Cyr, & Lavalley, 1988) to subgroups of SHU inmates.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Sample

The dataset consists of the ratings by CSC staff on community and institutional problems of current SHU inmates ($n=32$). Three of the inmates included in the sample had not yet been transferred to the SHU but were either waiting to be on the next inter-regional transfer or were within the assessment period. The reasons for the offenders' transfers into the SHU from another facility are displayed in Table 7. Four SHU inmates were transferred for non-violent reasons: being a National Security case or attempting escape. The remaining 28 SHU inmates were transferred due to displaying particularly violent or aggressive behaviours toward staff or other inmates.

Table 7
SHU Inmate Reasons for Transfer

Reason for transfer	<i>N</i> ¹	%
Alleged/Convicted of Murdering co-inmate	2	6.3
Allegedly ordered a contract on a staff member	1	3.1
Allegedly planned to escape/escaped from an escort	2	6.3
Attempted or committed an assault on staff	9	18.8
Committed a serious assault against another inmate	6	18.8
Demonstrated an undue risk to female staff because of sexual deviancy	3	3.1
Displayed ongoing threatening/violent/sexual behaviour towards staff and/or inmates	5	15.6
National security case	2	6.3
Took staff hostage	5	12.5

¹Total *N* does not equal 32 because three inmates had two reasons for transfer coded: two attempted or committed an assault on staff *and* demonstrated undue risk to female staff, one attempted or committed an assault on staff *and* took staff hostage.

Measure

An "Inmate Problems Survey" was developed for the file coding process. It was largely based on the "Patient Problem Survey" developed originally by Quinsey and colleagues (1988), and included several additional problems that were deemed particularly relevant to a corrections population, and the SHU in particular. The final survey consisted of 47 community problems and 54 institutional problems. The complete Inmate Problems Survey is provided in Appendix B.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Analyses

Each inmate problem was categorically coded as either absent, present, not-applicable, or unknown. Typically, research of this type would employ cluster analysis (Quinsey, et al., 1988); however, for the purposes of this research and given the sample size, simple descriptive frequencies and percentages for each variable were run. SHU inmates were divided into two groups based on reason for transfer into the SHU: violent ($n = 28$), and non-violent ($n = 4$). Non-violent inmates' reasons for transfer to the SHU included being a National Security Case and allegedly planning to escape or escaping from an escort; the remaining reasons for transfer comprised the violent group. A table displaying the frequencies of the presence or absence of each institutional and community variable is available in Appendix E.

Inter-Rater Reliability. Inter-rater reliability analyses were conducted based on five cases. Two raters coded all 101 variables for each of the five cases. Overall, a low level of agreement was found. Percent agreement ranged from 0% to 100% (median = 60%, mean = 56%). Forty-eight of the variables were able to be analyzed using Cohen's Kappa, and the reliability ranged from $\kappa = -.364$ to $.615$ (median = $.118$; mean = $.204$), indicating poor agreement. Only the ratings of coder one were used for analyses.

Results

A total of 101 variables were assessed to identify problems experienced by SHU inmates: 47 community problems and 54 institutional problems. All variables were rated as either absent, present, not-applicable, or unknown for each SHU inmate. Number of cases and percentages were assessed to identify the frequencies with which the inmates experienced the problems. A table displaying the results for the total sample is available in Appendix D. The most salient results will be discussed here.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Community Problems

Approximately half of all SHU inmates displayed substance abuse problems within the community. Alcohol abuse was present in 46.9% ($n = 15$) of inmates and drug use was noted in 56.3% ($n = 18$) of the inmates. Alcohol abuse and drug use were almost completely absent in non-violent inmates with only one inmate (25%) having drug use noted. Alcohol abuse was present in 53.6% ($n = 15$) of violent inmates, while drug use was present in 60.7% ($n = 17$) of violent inmates.

Violent crime was coded as present for all of the inmates in both the violent and non-violent groups. Almost all of the inmates ($n = 31$, 96.9%) had the presence of threatening behaviour, and a majority had possession of weapons coded as present ($n = 24$, 75.0%). Most offenders did not have gang membership coded as a problem present in the community, only 18.8% ($n = 6$) of offenders having this problem present.

Psychotic speech was present in 18.8% ($n = 6$) of the inmates, and 15.6% ($n = 5$) inmates displayed psychotic behaviour in the community. Depression was present for 6.3% ($n = 2$) of the inmates while anxiety was present for 9.4% ($n = 3$) inmates. Additionally, 15.6% ($n = 5$) inmates had the presence of suicidal ideations or attempts. For each of these variables, the presence is representative of the violent group as presence or absence was generally unknown for the non-violent group.

Institution Problems

All of the SHU inmates had previous admission to any type of segregation. Over half ($n = 22$, 68.8%) displayed violence toward other inmates with 21 (75.0%) of the violent group and only one (25%) of the non-violent group displaying this behaviour. Gang membership remained present for only 18.8% ($n = 6$) of the SHU inmates. Almost all, 87.5% ($n = 28$) of the inmates

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

displayed both assaultive behaviours and noncompliance with rules, while 81.3% ($n = 26$) had problems with threatening violence.

In terms of presentation while incarcerated, less than half of the inmates ($n = 12$, 37.5%) had a mental health diagnosis. Depression was present for 15.6% ($n = 5$) of the SHU inmates, and anxiety was present for 12.5% ($n = 4$) of the inmates. Only 6.3% ($n = 2$) displayed psychotic speech while 12.5% ($n = 4$) had the presence of psychotic action. While 21.9% ($n = 7$) had the presence of suicidal ideations or attempts in the institution, 31.3% ($n = 10$) displayed physical self-abuse.

Discussion

Study One: SHU Profile

Beyond concerns about the effectiveness and outcomes of segregation are concerns about the lack of information about inmates assigned to a facility such as the SHU. Vague entry and exit criteria and programming goals, delivery process, and opportunities, and the lack of outcome assessments and efficacy studies are major concerns regarding these facilities in general and the SHU in particular. Not knowing enough about *who* is incarcerated in segregation limits staff ability to appropriately target their efforts. Additionally, concerns regarding the four-month delay between transfer to the SHU and the initial comprehensive evaluation is paramount. By including more comprehensive assessment regarding who is in the SHU, the top-down process of implementing strategies for improvement at the inmate level and institution level can begin.

The purpose of Study One was to develop a comprehensive profile of SHU inmates; this was done by identifying variables of interest that were available at intake or shortly thereafter, and comparing SHU inmates to a population of administrative segregation inmates. The Helmus (2015) study informed us of the unique qualities of the administrative segregation population, but

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

what we wanted to know was how we can differentiate SHU inmates from those in administrative segregation – *what are the distinguishing characteristics of SHU inmates?*

Out of the 169 variables assessed during this exploratory study there were a number of interesting findings regarding SHU inmates in comparison to those in administrative segregation. While CSCs annual report provided sufficient information about demographics of SHU offenders, this research more closely examined the characteristics of SHU inmates that distinguish them from inmates in another type of segregation. While the RAST has good predictive validity for assessing risk of entering administrative segregation (Helmus, 2015), the total score was only moderately strong at distinguishing SHU inmates from administrative segregation inmates, which suggests that these groups differ in important ways beyond RAST scores.

While interpreting these findings it is important to keep in mind that the scores given to the inmates can often be very subjective and depend on the rater, their relationship with the inmate, and any number of other variables that might intervene with objectivity. Because of this, discrepancies between scores for similar variables were occasionally noted. For example, gang affiliation for SHU inmates as rated on the personal/emotional DFIA domain indicated 23 out of 45 SHU inmates as being gang affiliated, while the associates domain rating indicated 12 out of 36 SHU inmates as gang affiliated. Missing data also accounts for such anomalies.

Several offense severity variables, particularly causing serious injury to victims using weapons, had large effect sizes while causing minor injuries to victims did not. Additionally and unsurprisingly, being involved in institutional incidents that involved assault or death had large effect sizes. Institutional incidents might be driven by negative attitudes toward the criminal justice and correctional systems, as well as having attitudes that support instrumental violence

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

(Blais, Solodukhin, & Forth, 2014). Having previous offences in youth court and having failures during community supervision or disciplinary reports in their youth had significant effect sizes possibly suggesting that the violent behaviours of these inmates began early. Results from the adult court records indicate having short timeframes between crimes and having prior supervision failures is also associated with being a SHU inmate. However, number of current offences does not appear to be a distinguishing variable. Interestingly, nor does having a history of sex offending appear to be a distinguishing variable. Violent behaviours in and out of the institution, having relations that can be described as predatory, and having attitudes that support instrumental violence, might suggest a level of psychopathy in SHU inmates (Blais et al., 2014), and is consistent with the mandate of these institutions to secure the most violent and dangerous offenders.

Dynamic needs effect sizes further helped to describe a profile of SHU inmates. Having issues with remaining employed and not having a particular trade or skill, having criminal friends, and lacking constructive leisure activities indicates that these inmates may be lacking stability and direction while out in the community. Moreover, having problematic physical prowess, difficulty solving interpersonal problems, a limited ability to generate choices, narrow and rigid thinking, frequent aggressive behaviour, and engaging in thrill-seeking behaviours leads to the perfect storm of violent tendencies and the inability to successfully function in the community. Interestingly, however, variables such as having poor conflict resolution skills, or having disregard for others are not strong distinguishers at least comparing administrative segregation and SHU cases. Also of note is the fact that being diagnosed with a serious mental disorder in the past was approaching moderate strength as an effect size while such a diagnosis

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

currently was not. Having low motivation levels and being rated as low potential reintegration is consistent with the current picture of SHU inmates.

Study Two: SHU Problems Survey

The purpose of Study Two was to identify common problems experienced by SHU inmates, and to determine whether subtypes of SHU inmates could be identified, thereby informing differential intervention. Through a program development evaluation, Quinsey and colleagues (1988) were able to identify clusters within a forensic psychiatric sample that included personality disorders, institutional management problems, psychotics, and social isolates, among others. Through the identification of the common symptomologies within the patient clusters, the authors were able to make recommendations about programming services. While a full cluster analysis was not conducted on the current unique sample of SHU inmates, given the sample size, the results of this study have indeed displayed some interesting trends.

Firstly, mental health problems like psychotic speech and behaviours, depression, and suicidal ideations or attempts, ranged from approximately six percent to 19% in the community, and within the institution a mental health diagnosis was present in 38% of the sample. In comparison, the OCI (Service, 2010) reports that approximately 11% of federal offenders have a mental health diagnosis. These findings support the literature that suggests individuals in segregation have higher rates of mental illness than non-segregated inmates (Hodgins & Cote, 1991; Metzner & Fellner, 2010). Additionally, the increase in mental health issues once incarcerated in the SHU might indicate some level of causation. While fewer inmates displayed psychotic speech and behaviours, the frequency of depression doubled from the community to the institution. While in the community, depression was present for 6.3% of the inmates and 15.6% of the inmates while in the institution. These rates are similar to those found by Brink and

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

colleagues (2001) who estimated that approximately 18% of federal offenders have major depression disorder compared to approximately six percent in the community. Suicidal ideations and attempts also increased from the community to the institution. Additionally, self-injury was present in 31% of the inmates while in the institution. Interestingly, the OCI (2015) has reported that 12.8% of males admitted to segregation have a history of self-injury. Despite the results that rates of depression are similar within SHU inmates as they are within general federal offenders, the overall results indicate that mental health issues may be exacerbated within the SHU.

Violent behaviours are a common problem among SHU inmates. Violent crime was present for all inmates in the sample, including those in the non-violent subtype. In comparison, it has been reported that 68% of federal offenders are serving a sentence for a violent offense (Public Safety Canada, 2013). Additionally, all inmates in the sample had previous admissions to segregation, and over half showed violence toward other inmates. The OCI reports approximately half (48.5%) of incarcerated individuals have a history of having been in segregation at some point (OCI, 2015). Importantly, these findings support the SHUs mandate to house particularly violent or disruptive inmates.

Interestingly, substance use did not appear to play an important role as a problem experienced by SHU inmates. Alcohol abuse was present for nearly half (47%) of the inmates while in the community, and drug use was present for over half (56%). Comparatively, Brink and colleagues (2001) estimated approximately 50% of federal offenders have an alcohol abuse problem. Interestingly, however, substance use had a larger presence within the violent subtype than the non-violent. While these results ought to be interpreted carefully due to the small sample size, particularly of the non-violent group, they indicate a need to further examine the role of substance use in this population.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Quinsey and colleagues (1988) found clusters of patients whose idiosyncratic needs necessitated the application of specific individual and group programs. For example, the ways in which staff interact with a psychotic patient ought to be different from the ways in which they interact with an antisocial patient. While the goal of the current research was to identify potential subgroups of SHU inmates (e.g., violent, terrorists, high profile cases), ultimately, the ability to determine these subtypes was limited due to the small number of cases. After dividing the sample into violent and non-violent inmates, however, initial results do appear to show some trends towards differences between the groups. In the absence of a more historical assessment that has been more reliably coded on a larger sample, our results are limited, but they indicate that these inmates may not need different programming than is currently available. The results regarding violent behaviours and poor institutional adjustment indicate that SHU inmates are slightly more antisocial; however, there are not enough distinct subgroups to suggest that unique programming would be beneficial or cost effective. Rather than implementing new policies for the treatment of a few cases, the better strategy might be to provide direct services where needed on a case-by-case basis, at a higher dosage. Additionally, a more thorough intake assessment that includes inmate problems may be beneficial for better understanding this population and guiding treatments.

Overall Study

The current research findings did not demonstrate dramatic differences between SHU inmates and other segregation inmates. Indeed, while SHU inmates do appear to have more violent tendencies than inmates in administrative segregation or the general prison population, they do not display a set of qualities that differs radically from other offenders that would necessitate the need for greatly varied programming. The disproportionate number of

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Aboriginals in the SHU does, however, call for the availability of culture-specific programming within the institution. The findings ultimately call into question the true purpose of the SHU, and highlight the importance of a cost-benefits analysis. Moving forward, this exploratory study sets the stage for future research determining the efficacy of facilities like the SHU.

Limitations. An important limitation of Study One to consider when interpreting the results is the size differences between the SHU sample and administrative sample. These uneven group sizes can affect statistical power, and thus the ability to accurately see effects. An additional, and particularly salient, limitation is the amount of data that was missing in the dataset and particularly within the SHU sample; for example, information on entry and exit dates to determine length of time spent in SHU and whether inmates were still in the SHU at the time of data analysis. An additional important limitation to consider is that official records of any kind are always subject to error, particularly when it comes to ratings by staff members. However, limitations of this nature are unavoidable when relying on large organizations like CSC to provide datasets for analysis. These limitations are also not uncommon within archival data. While archival data allows for insight into large amount of offender data, it is limited to a snapshot of time. More prospective data collection would be highly beneficial for this type of research. Tracking offender change over time, as well as conducting qualitative interviews with staff and inmates, would provide a better avenue for developing an offender profile.

There are several additional limitations to consider for Study Two. Low inter-rater reliability suggests that the data collection procedure may not have adequately captured the nature of the sample. Poor reliability was likely due to the coders' unfamiliarity with the cases. Additionally, many of the disagreements resulted from the raters using the "unknown" and "absent" options in different ways. Further training would likely remedy this problem. As well,

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

utilizing officers who are familiar with and have access to the inmates to code the cases would likely increase agreement and reliability, as was done in Quinsey et al. (1988). This would also help to reduce the problem of missing data. Another important limitation is the small sample size in the non-violent group. This severely limits the available analyses and interpretations of the results.

Future Directions. At least for the time being, segregation facilities like the SHU maintain an important role within the correctional system. Future research on facilities of this nature should include the further development of inmate profiles, along with information on the staff that work there, and the relationships between the two. Greater transparency around the functioning of these types of facilities is essential to the future of segregation research. Whether the vagueness of available information is due to a lack of development and guidelines, or an unwillingness to share information, both are detrimental to external researchers' ability to further our understanding of these facilities. Lastly, and possibly most importantly, is the call for statistically strong efficacy studies regarding the outcomes for inmates who have been in the SHU and similar facilities. By understanding the nature of SHU inmates along with the effect that this type of incarceration has on people, we can determine whether these facilities are truly doing what they are intended to do, or alternatively what changes need to be made to improve their functioning for the safety of the institution *and* the inmates.

References

- Amellal, D. (2012). *The Special Handling Unit*. Retrieved from Correctional Services Canada website: <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/pblct/lt-en/2006/31-2/3-eng.shtml>
- American Civil Liberties Union (2014). *The dangerous overuse of solitary confinement in the United States: ACLU Briefing paper*. New York: Author. Retrieved from <https://www.aclu.org/dangerous-overuse-solitary-confinement-united-states>
- Andrews, D. A., Bonta, J., & Hoge, R. D. (1990). Classification for effective rehabilitation: Rediscovering psychology. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 17, 19-52. doi: 10.1177/0093854890017001004
- Andrews, D. A., Zinger, I., Hoge, R. D., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., & Cullen, F. T. (1990). Does correctional treatment work? A clinically relevant and psychologically informed meta-analysis. *Criminology*, 28, 369-404.
- Arbour, L. (1996). *Commission of inquiry into certain events at the Prison for Women in Kingston*. (Cat No. CP32-62/3-1997E). Ottawa, ON: Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- Babchishin, K. M., & Helmus, L. (2014). *Problems with using correlations for dichotomous variables: An evaluation of proposed solutions with real-world data*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Bench, L. L., & Allen, T. D. (2003). Investigating the stigma of prison classification: An experimental design. *The Prison Journal*, 83, 367-382. doi: 10.1177/0032885503260143
- Blais, J., Solodukhin, E., & Forth, A. E. (2014). A meta-analysis exploring the relationship between psychopathy and instrumental versus reactive violence. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41, 797-821. doi: 10.1177/0093854813519629

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

- Blevins, K. R., Johnson Listwan, S., Cullen, F. T., & Lero Jonson, C. (2010). A general strain theory of prison violence and misconduct: An integrated model of inmate behaviour. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 26, 148-166. doi: 10.1177/1043986209359369
- Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T., & Rothstein, H. R. (2009). *Introduction to meta-analysis*. Wiltshire, England: Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Brandt, A. L. S. (2012). Treatment of persons with mental illness in the criminal justice system: A literature review. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 51, 541-558. doi: 10.1080/10509674.2012.693902
- Brink, J. H., Doherty, D., & Boer, A. (2001). Mental disorder in federal offenders : A Canadian prevalence study. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 24, 339-356.
- Brown, S. L., & Motiuk, L. L. (2005). *The Dynamic Factors Identification and Analysis (DFIA) component of the Offender Intake Assessment (OIA) process: A meta-analytic, psychometric and consultative review* (Research Report No. R-164). Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service Canada.
- Bureau of Prisons. (n.d.). *About Our Facilities*. Retrieved from Federal Bureau of Prisons website: http://www.bop.gov/about/facilities/federal_prisons.jsp
- Byrne, J., & Hummer, D. (2007). In search of the “Tossed Salad Man” (and others involved in prison violence): New strategies for predicting and controlling violence in prison. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, doi:10.1016/j.avb.2007.02.001
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cooke, D. J. (1996). Predicting offending in prison: The predictive validity of the prison behaviour rating scales. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 1, 65-82.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

- Cooke, D. J., & Johnstone, L. (2010). Somewhere over the rainbow: Improving violence risk management in institutional settings. *International Journal of Forensic Mental Health*, 9, 150-158. doi: 10.1080/14999013.2010.526463
- Cooke, D. J., & Johnstone, L. (2012, August). A look through the PRISM. *The Psychologist*, 25. Retrieved from www.thepsychologist.org.uk
- Cooke, D.J., Wozniak, E., & Johnstone, L. (2008). Casting light on prison violence in Scotland: Evaluating the impact of situational risk factors. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 35, 1065-1078. doi: 10.1177/0093854808318867
- Commissioner's Directive. (2004). *Special Handling Unit* (Policy Bulletin No. 179). Retrieved from <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/text/plcy/cdshtm/551-cde-eng.shtml>
- Correctional Services Canada. (2014). *Offender Complaints and Grievances* (CD No. 081). Retrieved from <http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/acts-and-regulations/081-cd-eng.shtml>
- Correctional Services Canada, National Advisory Committee of the Special Handling Unit. (2014). *Annual Report from the National Advisory Committee of the Special Handling Unit for Fiscal Year 2013-2014*.
- Corrections and Conditional Release Act (CCRA) (S. C. 1992, c. 20). Retrieved from <http://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-44.6/>
- Drury, A. J., & DeLisi, M. (2010). The past is prologue: Prior adjustment to prison and institutional misconduct. *The prison Journal*, 90, 331-352. doi: 10.1177/0032885510375676
- Dukakis, A. (2014, March 19). Clements murder investigation continues, as do his prison reforms. *Colorado Public Radio*. Retrieved from <http://www.cpr.org/news/story/clements-murder-investigation-continues-do-his-prison-reforms>

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

- Edens, J. F., Poythress, N. G., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (1999). Identifying inmates at risk for disciplinary infractions: A comparison of two measures of psychopathy. *Behavioural Sciences and the Law*, 17, 435-443.
- Fleiss, J. L. (1994). Measures of effect size for categorical data. In H. Cooper & L. V. Hedges (Eds.), *Handbook of research synthesis* (pp. 245-260). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Franklin, T. W., Franklin, C. A., & Pratt, T. C. (2006). Examining the empirical relationship between prison crowding and inmate misconduct: A meta-analysis of conflicting research results. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34, 401-412. doi: 10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2006.05.006
- Gadon, L., Johnstone, L., & Cooke, D. (2006). Situational variables and institutional violence: A systematic review of the literature. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 26, 515-534. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2006.02.2002
- Gendreau, P., & Bonta, J. (1984). Solitary confinement is not cruel and unusual punishment: People sometimes are! *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 26, 467-478.
- Gendreau, P., Goggin, C. E., & Law, M. A. (1997). Predicting prison misconducts. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 24, 414-431. doi: 10.1177/0093854897024004002
- Gendreau, P., Listwan, S. J., & Kuhns, J. B. (2011, April). *Managing prisons effectively: The potential of contingency management programs*. Retrieved from Government of Canada – Public Safety Canada website: <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/2011-04-mp/index-eng.aspx>
- Gendreau, P., Listwan, S. J., Kuhns, J. B., & Exum, M. L. (2014). Making prisoners accountable: Are contingency management programs the answer? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 41, 1079-1102. doi: 10.1177/0093854814540288

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

- Goetting, A., & Howsen, R. M. (1986). Correlates of prisoner misconduct. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 2, 49-67.
- Government Accountability Office (2013, May). *Bureau of Prisons: Improvements needed in Bureau of Prisons' monitoring and evaluation of impact of segregated housing*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/assets/660/654349.pdf>
- Guy, L. S., Edens, J. F., Anthony, C. & Douglas, K. S. (2005). Does psychopathy predict institutional misconduct among adults? A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73, 1056-1064. doi: 10.1037/0022-006X.73.6.1056
- Hanson, R. K. (2008). What statistics should we use to report predictive accuracy? *Crime Scene*, 15(1), 15-17. Available from <http://www.cpa.ca/cpasite/userfiles/Documents/Criminal%20Justice/Crime%20Scene%202008-04.pdf>
- Harer, M. D., & Langan, N. P. (2001). Gender differences in predictors of prison violence: Assessing the predictive validity of a risk classification system. *Crime & Delinquency*, 47, 513-536. doi: 10.1177/0011128701047004002
- Helmus, L. (2014). *Developing and validating a risk assessment scale to predict inmate placements in administrative segregation in the Correctional Service of Canada* (Unpublished doctoral prospectus). Carleton University, Ottawa.
- Hodgins, S., & Cote, G. (1991). The mental health of penitentiary inmates in isolation. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 33, 175-182.
- Irwin, J. & Cressey, D. (1962). Thieves, convicts, and the inmate subculture. *Social Problems*, 54, 590-603. doi: 10.1525/sp.1962.10.2.03a00040

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

- Jiang, S., & Fisher-Giorlando, M. (2002). Inmate misconduct: A test of the deprivation, importation, and situational models. *The Prison Journal*, 82, 335-358. doi: 10.1177/003288550208200303
- King, K., Steiner, B., & Ritchie Breach, S. (2008). Violence in the supermax: A self-fulfilling prophecy. *The Prison Journal*, 88, 144-168. doi: 10.1177/0032885507311000
- Kroner, D. G., & Mills, J. F. (2001). The accuracy of the risk appraisal instruments in predicting institutional misconduct and new convictions. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 28, 471-489. doi: 10.1177/009385480102800405
- Kupers, T. A., Dronet, T., Winter, M., Austin, J., Kelly, L., Cartier, W., Morris, T. J., Hanlon, S. F., Sparkman, E. L., Kumar, P., Vincent, L. C., Norris, J., Nagel, K., & McBride, J. (2009). Beyond supermax administrative segregation: Mississippi's experience rethinking prison classification and creating alternate mental health programs. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36, 1037-1050. doi: 10.1177/0093854809341938
- Lahm, K. F. (2008). Inmate-on-inmate assault: A multilevel examination of prison violence. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35, 120-137. doi: 10.1177/0093854807308730
- Lovell, D. (2008). Patterns of disturbed behaviour in a supermax population. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 35, 985-1004. doi: 10.1177/0093854808318584
- Lovell, D., Cloyes, K., Allen, D., & Rhodes, L. (2000). Who lives in super-maximum custody? A Washington State study. *Federal Probation*, 64(2): 33-38.
- Madrid v. Gomez, Nos. 96-17277, 97-16237. (July 2, 1998).
- McCorkle, R. C., Miethe, T. D., & Drass, K. A. (1995). The roots of prison violence. A test of the deprivation, management, and "not so total" institution models. *Crime & Delinquency*, 41, 317-331. doi: 10.1177/0011128795041003003

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

McKinley, C. (2013, March 22). Friends of Colorado Shooting Suspect Evan Ebel Remember a Dark, Scary Kid. *The Daily Beast*. Retrieved from

<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2013/03/22/friends-of-colorado-shooting-suspect-evan-ebel-remember-a-dark-scary-kid.html>

Mears, D. P. (2006). *Evaluating the effectiveness of supermax prisons*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Justice Policy Center. Retrieved from

www.urban.org/uploadedPDF/411326_supermax_prisons.pdf

Mears, D. P. (2008). An assessment of supermax prisons using an evaluation research framework.

The Prison Journal, 88, 43-68. doi: 10.1177/0032885507310964

Mears, D. P., & Castro, J. L. (2006). Wardens' views on the wisdom of supermax prisons. *Crime & Delinquency*, 52, 398-431. doi: 10.1177/0011128705279484

Metzner, J. L., & Fellner, J. (2010). Solitary confinement and mental illness in U.S. prisons: A challenge for medical ethics. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 38, 104-108.

Motiuk, L. L., & Blanchette, K. (1997). *Case characteristics of segregated offenders in federal corrections*. Research Report R-57. Ottawa, ON: Correctional

Murphy, A., Rhodes, A. G., & Taxman, F. S. (2012). Adaptability of contingency management in justice settings: Survey findings on attitudes toward using rewards. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 43, 168-177. doi: 10.1016/j.jsat.2011.11.004

Office of the Correctional Investigator Canada. (2010). *Annual report of the office of the Correctional Investigator: 2009-2010*. (Cat. No.: PS100-2010E-PDF). Ottawa, ON: Author.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

- Office of the Correctional Investigator Canada. (2012). *Annual report of the office of the Correctional Investigator: 2011-2012*. (PS100-2012E-PDF). Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Office of the Correctional Investigator Canada. (2013). *Annual report of the office of the Correctional Investigator: 2012-2013*. (PS100-2013E-PDF). Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Office of the Correctional Investigator Canada. (2015). *Administrative segregation in federal corrections 10 year trends*. Retrieved from Government of Canada website:
<http://www.oci-bec.gc.ca/cnt/rpt/oth-aut/oth-aut20150528-eng.aspx#bookmark6>
- O'Keefe, M. L. (2008). Administrative segregation from within: A corrections perspective. *The Prison Journal*, 88, 123-143. doi: 10.1177/0032885507310999
- O'Keefe, M. L., Klebe, K. J., Metzner, J., Dvoskin, J., Fellner, J., & Stucker, A. (2013). A longitudinal study of administrative segregation. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 41, 49-60.
- Pizarro, J. M., & Narag, R. E. (2008). Supermax prisons: What we know, what we do not know, and where we are going. *The Prison Journal*, 88, 23-42. doi: 10.1177/0032885507310530
- Pizarro, J., & Stenius, V. M. K. (2004). Supermax prisons: Their rise, current practices, and effect on inmates. *The Prison Journal*, 84, 248-264. doi: 10.1177/0032885504265080
- Porporino, F. J. (1986). Managing violent individuals in correctional settings. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 1, 213-237. doi: 10.1177/088626086001002005
- Power, J., & Brown, S. (2010). *Self-Injurious behaviour: A review of the literature and implications for corrections*. Research Report R-216. Ottawa, ON: Correctional Service of Canada.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

- Public Safety Canada. (2013). *Corrections and Conditional Release Statistical Overview* (Report No. 1713-1073). Retrieved from <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/crrctns-cndtnl-rls-2013/index-eng.aspx>
- Quinsey, V. L., Cyr, M., Lavallee, Y-J. (1988). Treatment opportunities in a maximum security psychiatric hospital: A problem survey. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 11, 179-194.
- Sampson, R., Glascon, S., Glen, I., Louis, C., & Rosenfeldt, F. (2007). *A roadmap to strengthening public safety*. A report to the Correctional Services of Canada review panel. Ottawa, ON. Retrieved from <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/cntrng-crm/csc-scc-rvw-pnl/report-rapport/toc-eng.aspx>
- Sánchez-Meca, J., Marín-Martínez, F., & Chacón-Moscoso, S. (2003). Effect-size indices for dichotomized outcomes in meta-analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 8, 448-467.
- Service, J. (2010). *Under warrant: A review of the implementation of the Correctional Service of Canada's 'mental health strategy'*. Retrieved from Office of the Correctional Investigator website: <http://www.oci-bec.gc.ca/cnt/rpt/oth-aut/oth-aut20100923-eng.aspx#TOC6A>
- Smith, P., Gendreau, P., & Swartz, K. (2009). Validating the principles of effective intervention: A systematic review of the contributions of meta-analysis in the field of corrections. *Victims & Offenders*, 4, 148-169. doi: 10.1080/15564880802612581
- Solicitor General Canada. (1987). *Development of a security classification model for Canadian federal offenders: A report to the offender management division*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Sykes, G. M. (1958). *The society of captives*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Toch, H. (2001). The future of supermax confinement. *The Prison Journal*, 81, 376-388. doi: 10.1177/0032885501081003005

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

- U.S. Department of Justice (2013, May 31). *Re: Investigation of the State Correctional Institution at Cresson and Notice of Expanded Investigation*. Washington, DC: Author.
Retrieved from http://www.justice.gov/crt/about/spl/documents/cresson_findings_5-31-13.pdf
- Walters, G. D., & Crawford, G. (2013). In and out of prison: Do importation factors predict all forms of misconduct of just the more serious ones? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41, 407-413. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2013.08.001>
- Wilson, C. M., Desmarais, S. L., Nicholls, T. L., Hart, S. D., & Brink, J. (2013). Predictive validity of dynamic factors: Assessing violence risk in forensic psychiatric inpatients. *Law and Human Behavior*. doi: 10.1037/lhb0000025
- Wong, S. C. P., Vander Veen, S., Leis, T. A., Parrish, H., Gu, D., Usher Liber, E., & Middleton, H. L. (2005). Reintegrating seriously violent and personality-disordered offenders from a supermaximum security institution into the general offender population. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 49, 362-375. doi: 10.1177/0306624X05274501
- Zamble, E., & Porporino, F. (1990). Coping, imprisonment, and rehabilitation: Some data and their implications. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 17, 53-70. doi: 10.1177/0093854890017001005
- Zimbardo, P.G., Haney, G., Banks, W.C., & Jaffe, D. (1982). The psychology of imprisonment: Privation, power, and pathology. In J.C. Brigham & L.S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Contemporary issues in psychology* (pp. 230-245). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Appendix A

Complete List of Variables

Table A1

Variables Analyzed in Study One

	Variable	Variable Name(s)	Description	Response Options
	Age at admission	age3	Age with 4 categories	0 = 50+ 1 = 40-49.9 2 = 25-39.9 4 = Less than 25
	Prior convictions	Priorcon2	CRS priorcon reduced to 3 categories	0 = 0 to 1 prior convictions 1 = 2 to 4 prior convictions 2 = 5 or more prior convictions
	Admission to administrative segregation in previous federal sentence	No_admis_Aseg_any_dich	Admissions to Administrative Segregation in a previous federal sentence	0 = no previous admissions 1 = admitted to administrative segregation in a previous federal sentence
	Sentence length	sentence4	Sentence with 4 categories but 2 points difference between first 2 cats	0 = 2 years 2 = more than 2 years but less than 3 years 3 = 3 years up to (but not including) 10 years 4 = 10 years or more (including indeterminate sentences)
	Criminal versatility in current convictions	versatility3	Versatility 0, 1-2, 3+ (number of offence categories represented by the current convictions)	0 = 0 categories 1 = 1-2 categories 2 = 3 or more categories
	Prior conviction for violence	OSR10	Prior conviction for a violent offence	0 = no prior convictions for a violent offence 1 = prior conviction for a violent offence
	Total RAST score	scale4full	Sum scores of all items: scale 4 with no missing info except osr10	Range: 0 - 14
	Flagged as high profile	FLAG_HIGH_PROFILE	Offender is flagged as high profile	0 = No 1 = Yes
	Substance abuse	Substance_Abuse	DFIA Substance Abuse	0002 = no

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

			Domain Score	current difficulty 0003 = some difficulty 0004 = considerable difficulty
		ALDRUGS	Alcohol drug use score	0 = No identifiable problems 1 = Abuse affecting one or more life areas 2 = Serious abuse affecting several life areas
		SUB18	Substance abuse: Abuses drugs (solvents, prescription drugs, etc.)	0 = No 1 = Yes
		SUB15	Substance abuse: Uses drugs on a regular basis	0 = No 1 = Yes
		SUB19	Substance abuse: Uses drugs during leisure time	0 = No 1 = Yes
		SUB20	Substance abuse: Uses drugs in social situations	0 = No 1 = Yes
		SUB21	Substance abuse: Uses drugs to relieve stress	0 = No 1 = Yes
		SUB27	Substance abuse: Prior substance abuse assessment(s)	0 = No 1 = Yes
		SUB12_2	Substance abuse: Alcohol or drug use has resulted in law violations	0 = No 1 = Yes
		SUB14_2	Substance abuse: Early age drug use	0 = No 1 = Yes
		SUB16_2	Substance abuse: Has gone on drug-taking bouts/binges	0 = No 1 = Yes
		SUB17_2	Substance abuse: Has combined the use of different drugs	0 = No 1 = Yes
		SUB23_2	Substance abuse: Drug use interferes with interpersonal relationships	0 = No 1 = Yes
	Offense severity	OFFSEVER	Total offense severity score	0 = Low 1 2 3 = High
		OSR02	Previous offences – type of convictions: Previous serious offences	0 = No 1 = Yes
		OSR06	Previous offences – type of convictions: Arson/fire-setting	0 = No 1 = Yes

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

		OSR09	Previous offences – type of convictions: Forcible confinement/kidnapping	0 = No 1 = Yes
		OSR10	Previous offences – type of convictions: Violence (assault, robbery)	0 = No 1 = Yes
		OSR25	Previous offences – degree of force used on victim: Violence used against victim	0 = No 1 = Yes
		OSR26	Previous offences – degree of force used on victim Weapons used against victim	0 = No 1 = Yes
		OSR28	Previous offences – degree of physical harm to victim: Serious injury (wounding, maiming, disfiguring)	0 = No 1 = Yes
		OSR29	Previous offences – degree of physical harm to victim: Minor injury (hitting, slapping, striking)	0 = No 1 = Yes
		OSR3336	Sum of OSR33 through OSR36: Previous offences – sentence length: over 24 years, 10 to 24 years, 5 to 9 years, 1 day to 4 years	0 = 1 day to 4 years 1 = 5 to 9 years 2 = 10 to 24 years 3 = over 24 years
		OSR37	Current offences – type of conviction: Current serious offences	0 = No 1 = Yes
		OSR60	Current offences – degree of force used on victims: Violence used against victim	0 = No 1 = Yes
		OSR61	Current offences – degree of force used on victims: Weapons used against victim	0 = No 1 = Yes
		OSR63	Current offences – degree of physical harm to victims: Serious injury (wounding, maiming, disfiguring to victim)	0 = No 1 = Yes
		OSR64	Current offences – degree of physical harm to victims: Minor injury (hitting, slapping, striking) to victim	0 = No 1 = Yes
		Off_sever_tot	Offense severity total score	Range: 1 - 44
	Admission to any	No_admis_seg_any_dich	Previous admission to	0 = No

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

	type of segregation in previous federal sentence		any type of segregation	1 = Yes
		No_Admis_Seg_Danger_dich	Previous admission to segregation for inmate-in-danger	0 = No 1 = Yes
		No_Admis_Seg_Security_dich	Previous admission to segregation for jeopardizing security	0 = No 1 = Yes
		No_Admis_seg_interfere_dich	Previous admission to segregation for interfering with investigation	0 = No 1 = Yes
		No_admis_seg_other_dich	Previous admission to segregation for other reasons	0 = No 1 = Yes
		No_admis_seg_discip_dich	Previous admission to disciplinary segregation	0 = No 1 = Yes
	Gang affiliation	ASS05_2	Affiliated with gang or organized crime	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER06	Personal/emotional: Gang member	0 = No 1 = Yes
	Aboriginal	Aboriginal	Is the offender Aboriginal?	0 = No 1 = Yes
	Offender age at admission	Age_Admission	What was the offender's age at the time of admission?	-
	Sentence length	Sentence_length_all	Aggregate sentence length (years)	-
	Current offence	ABDUCT_KIDNAP	Current offence: Abduction / Kidnapping	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ARSON	Current offence: Arson	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ATTEMPT_MURDER	Current offence: Attempted murder	0 = No 1 = Yes
		B_AND_E	Current offence: Break and Enter	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ASSAULT	Current offence: Assault	0 = No 1 = Yes
		FRAUD	Current offence: Fraud	0 = No 1 = Yes
		HOMICIDE	Current offence: Homicide and related	0 = No 1 = Yes
		IMPAIRED_DRVG	Current offence: Impaired Driving	0 = No 1 = Yes
		GAME_BET	Current offence: Moral – game / betting	0 = No 1 = Yes
		SEXUAL_MORAL	Current offence: Moral – sexual	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ADMIN_JUST	Current offence: Administration of justice	0 = No 1 = Yes
		OTHER_OFFENCE	Current offence: Other offences	0 = No 1 = Yes
		OTHER_PROP	Current offence: Other property offences	0 = No 1 = Yes

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

		POSS_DRUG	Current offence: Possession of Drugs	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PUBLIC_ORDER	Current offence: Public order offences	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ROBBERY_OFFENCE	Current offence: Robbery	0 = No 1 = Yes
		SEXUAL_OFFENCE	Current offence: Sexual offence	0 = No 1 = Yes
		THEFT	Current offence: Theft	0 = No 1 = Yes
		TRAFFIC_DRUGS	Current offence: Traffic / Importing drugs	0 = No 1 = Yes
		WEAPON_EXPLOSIVE	Current offence: Weapon and Explosive	0 = No 1 = Yes
	Involvement in institutional incidences	INVOLINC	Has a history of involvement in institutional incidents	0 = No prior involvement 1 = Any prior involvement
		INCIDSEV	Prior involvement in one or more incidents in serious category	0 = No 1 = Yes
		any_incident	Past sentence: involvement in any incident	0 = No 1 = Yes
		incid_death_dich	Past sentence: incidents involving death	0 = No 1 = Yes
		incid_assault_dich	Past sentence: incidents involving assault	0 = No 1 = Yes
		incid_esc_Ual_dich	Past sentence: incidents involving escape or UAL	0 = No 1 = Yes
		incid_contra_unauth_dich	Past sentence: incidents involving contraband or unauthorized item	0 = No 1 = Yes
		incid_behav_dich	Past sentence: incidents related to behaviour	0 = No 1 = Yes
		incid_self_inj_dich	Past sentence: incidents involving self-injury	0 = No 1 = Yes
		incid_property_dich	Past sentence: incidents involving property	0 = No 1 = Yes
		incid_misc_dich	Past sentence: miscellaneous incidents	0 = No 1 = Yes
		incid_violence_dich	Past sentence: incidents related to death or assault	0 = No 1 = Yes
	Number of current convictions	CCR_sum	Number of current convictions	1 = One current conviction 2 = 2-4 current convictions 3 = 5-9 current convictions 4 = 10-14 current convictions 5 = 15+ current convictions

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

	DFIA Scores	Employment	DFIA – Employment Domain Score	0001 = Factor seen as an asset 0002 = No current difficulty 0003 = Some difficulty 0004 = Considerable difficulty
		Marital_Family	DFIA – Marital / Family Domain Score	0001 = Factor seen as an asset 0002 = No current difficulty 0003 = Some difficulty 0004 = Considerable difficulty
		Associates	DFIA - Associates Domain Score	0001 = Factor seen as an asset 0002 = No current difficulty 0003 = Some difficulty 0004 = Considerable difficulty
		Community_Function	DFIA – Community function domain score	0001 = Factor seen as an asset 0002 = No current difficulty 0003 = Some difficulty 0004 = Considerable difficulty
		Personal_Emotional	DFIA – Personal / Emotional Domain Score	0002 = No current difficulty 0003 = Some difficulty 0004 = Considerable difficulty
		Attitudes	DFIA – Attitudes Domain Score	0001 = Factor seen as an asset 0002 = No current difficulty 0003 = Some difficulty 0004 =

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

				Considerable difficulty
		OVERALL_DYNAMIC_FACTOR_E	Overall Dynamic Factors Score	1 = Low 2 = Medium 3 = High
	Static score	OVERALL_STATIC_FACTOR_E	Overall Static Factors Score	1 = Low 2 = Medium 3 = High
	CRS score	CRS_SCORE	Overall CRS Score	1 = Low 2 = Medium 3 = High
	Life sentence	Lifer	Is the current sentence indeterminate?	0 = No 1 = Yes
	Previous federal incarceration	Past_Federal_Sentence	Does the offender have a previous federal sentence?	0 = No 1 = Yes
	Criminal History	Crim_Hist_Rec_Total	Criminal history record total score	Range: 0 - 36
	Reintegration potential	REINTEGRATION_POTENTIAL2	Level of reintegration potential	1 = Low 2 = Medium 3 = High
	Motivation level	MOTIVATION_LEVEL2	Level of motivation	1 = Low 2 = Medium 3 = High
	Employment	EMP13	Employment: Lacks a skill area / trade / profession	0 = No 1 = Yes
		EMP17	Employment: Unemployed 90% or more	0 = No 1 = Yes
		EMP18	Employment: Unemployed 50% or more	0 = No 1 = Yes
		EMP03_2	Employment: Has less than a high school diploma	0 = No 1 = Yes
		EMP08	Employment: Has concentration problems	0 = No 1 = Yes
		EMP22_2	Employment: Has no employment history	0 = No 1 = Yes
		EMP16_2	Employment: Unemployed at the time of arrest	0 = No 1 = Yes
		EMP19_2	Employment: Unstable job history	0 = No 1 = Yes
	Marital & Family	FAM27_2	Marital/Family: Has been investigated/arrested for child abuse/neglect	0 = No 1 = Yes
	Associates	ASS08	Associates: Relations are described as predatory	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ASS02_2	Associates: Associates with substance abusers	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ASS03_2	Associates: Has many criminal acquaintances	0 = No 1 = Yes

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

		ASS04_2	Associates: Has many criminal friends	0 = No 1 = Yes
	Community function	COM01_2	Community Function: Unstable accommodation	0 = No 1 = Yes
		COM15_2	Community Function: Constructive leisure activities are limited	0 = No 1 = Yes
	Personal & Emotional	PER02	Personal/Emotional: Physical prowess problematic	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER04	Personal/Emotional: Ethnicity is problematic	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER12	Personal/Emotional: Has disregard for others	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER13	Personal/Emotional: Socially unaware	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER20	Personal/Emotional: Poor conflict resolution	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER29	Personal/Emotional: Is not conscientious	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER36	Personal/Emotional: Diagnosed as disordered in the past	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER37	Personal/Emotional: Diagnosed as disordered currently	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER08_2	Personal/Emotional: Difficulty solving interpersonal problems	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER09_2	Personal/Emotional: Ability to generate choices is limited	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER11_2	Personal/Emotional: Difficulty setting realistic goals	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER14_2	Personal/Emotional: Impulsive	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER15_2	Personal/Emotional: Empathy skills are limited	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER16_2	Personal/Emotional: Narrow and rigid thinking	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER17_2	Personal/Emotional: Frequently acts in aggressive manner	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER21_2	Personal/Emotional: Time management skills problematic	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER23_2	Personal/Emotional: Low frustration tolerance	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER24_2	Personal/Emotional: Hostile	0 = No 1 = Yes
		PER27_2	Personal/Emotional: Engages in thrill-seeking	0 = No 1 = Yes

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

			behaviour	
		PER30_2	Personal/Emotional: Manipulates others to achieve goals	0 = No 1 = Yes
	Attitudes	ATT11	Attitudes: Basic life skills have no value	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ATT13	Attitudes: Elderly have no value	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ATT15	Attitudes: Ethnically intolerant	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ATT01_2	Attitudes: Displays negative attitudes towards criminal justice system	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ATT04_2	Attitudes: Displays negative attitudes towards correctional systems	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ATT10_2	Attitudes: Values a substance-abusing lifestyle	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ATT18_2	Attitudes: Disrespects personal belongings	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ATT19_2	Attitudes: Disrespects public or commercial property	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ATT22_2	Attitudes: Attitudes support instrumental/goal- oriented violence	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ATT23_2	Attitudes: Difficulty setting long-term goals	0 = No 1 = Yes
	Youth court record	YCR01	Previous offences in youth court	0 = No 1 = Yes
		YCR08	Youth dispositions: community supervision	0 = No 1 = Yes
		YCR09	Youth dispositions: open custody	0 = No 1 = Yes
		YCR10	Youth dispositions: secure custody	0 = No 1 = Yes
		YCR11	Failure during community supervision	0 = No 1 = Yes
		YCR12	Disciplinary transfers from open to secure custody	0 = No 1 = Yes
		YCR13	Disciplinary report in secure custody	0 = No 1 = Yes
		YCR14	Attempt escape/ UAL/escape from secure custody	0 = No 1 = Yes
		YCR15	Transfer from secure custody to adult facility	0 = No 1 = Yes
	Adult court record	ACR01	Previous offences in adult court	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ACR08	Prior sanctions:	0 = No

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

			Community supervision	1 = Yes
		ACR09	Prior sanctions: Provincial terms	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ACR10	Prior sanctions: Federal terms	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ACR11	Failure during community supervision	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ACR12	Segregation for disciplinary infractions	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ACR13	Attempt escape/UAL escape	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ACR14	Reclassified to higher level of security	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ACR15	Failures on conditional release	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ACR16	Less than 6 months since last incarceration	0 = No 1 = Yes
		ACR17	No crime free period of 1 year or more	0 = No 1 = Yes
	Sex offence history	SOH06	Incest – current sentence	0 = No 1 = Yes
		SOH07	Pedophilia – current sentence	0 = No 1 = Yes
		SOH09	Other current sex offence	0 = No 1 = Yes
		SOH17	Sex victims were female children (under 12)	0 = No 1 = Yes
		SOH22	Sex victims were male children (12 -17 years)	0 = No 1 = Yes
	CRS: Sentence length score	SENTLEN	Sentence length score	Range: 0 - 4
	CRS: Involve in last 5 years	INVOLPAS	Prior involvement in institutional incidents during last five years of incarceration	1 = involved in an assault (no weapon or serious physical injury) 2 = involved in a riot or major disturbance 3 = involved in an assault (with weapon / causing serious physical injury)
	CRS: Street stability adjustment score	STREETAD	Street stability adjustment	Range: 0 - 2
	CRS: Street stability risk score	STREETRI	Street stability risk	Range: 0 - 2

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Appendix B

Inmate Problems Survey

Variable	Absent	Present	Non-applicable	Unknown
<i>Community Problems</i>				
Alcohol abuse	☐	☐	☐	☐
Drugs	☐	☐	☐	☐
Murder or attempt within family	☐	☐	☐	☐
Murder or attempt outside of family	☐	☐	☐	☐
Nonsexual violent crime	☐	☐	☐	☐
Sexual crime (adult victim)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Sexual crime (child victim)	☐	☐	☐	☐
Fire setting	☐	☐	☐	☐
Theft or economic offence	☐	☐	☐	☐
Property destruction	☐	☐	☐	☐
Vagrancy	☐	☐	☐	☐
Threatening	☐	☐	☐	☐
Possession of arms	☐	☐	☐	☐
Psychotic speech	☐	☐	☐	☐
Psychotic behaviour	☐	☐	☐	☐
Inappropriate suspicion	☐	☐	☐	☐
Confusion	☐	☐	☐	☐
Depression	☐	☐	☐	☐
Mania	☐	☐	☐	☐
Anxiety	☐	☐	☐	☐
Anger	☐	☐	☐	☐
Criminal associates	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unemployment	☐	☐	☐	☐
Poor use of leisure time	☐	☐	☐	☐
Social withdrawal	☐	☐	☐	☐
Medication difficulties	☐	☐	☐	☐
Marital/family problems	☐	☐	☐	☐

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Difficulties in work place	☐	☐	☐	☐
Difficulties in halfway house	☐	☐	☐	☐
Health problems	☐	☐	☐	☐
Budget problems	☐	☐	☐	☐
Inadequate housekeeping	☐	☐	☐	☐
Poor community resource utilization	☐	☐	☐	☐
Assertion deficits	☐	☐	☐	☐
Feeling like a failure	☐	☐	☐	☐
Feeling empty	☐	☐	☐	☐
Prostituting self	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Gang membership	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Convicted of terrorism offence	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Mental health diagnosis	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Multiple convictions	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Criminal versatility	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Suicidal ideations or attempt	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Rigid thinking / stubbornness	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Impulsive / lack of inhibition	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Entitled	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Lack of motivation	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Rejects responsibility of actions	☐	☐	☐	☐

Institutional Problems

Poor reading skills	☐	☐	☐	☐
Poor work skills	☐	☐	☐	☐
Limited general knowledge	☐	☐	☐	☐
Limited sexual knowledge	☐	☐	☐	☐
Limited knowledge of community resources	☐	☐	☐	☐
Poor conversational skills	☐	☐	☐	☐
Psychotic speech	☐	☐	☐	☐
Psychotic action	☐	☐	☐	☐
Inappropriate suspicion	☐	☐	☐	☐
Confusion	☐	☐	☐	☐

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Assaultive	☐	☐	☐	☐
Threatening violence	☐	☐	☐	☐
Pro-criminal speech	☐	☐	☐	☐
Insulting, teasing	☐	☐	☐	☐
Social withdrawal	☐	☐	☐	☐
Assertive deficits	☐	☐	☐	☐
Inappropriate dependence	☐	☐	☐	☐
Shyness	☐	☐	☐	☐
Lack of consideration	☐	☐	☐	☐
Impulsive / *lack of inhibition	☐	☐	☐	☐
Poor manners	☐	☐	☐	☐
Irritable	☐	☐	☐	☐
Sexual harassment	☐	☐	☐	☐
Suggestible	☐	☐	☐	☐
Depression	☐	☐	☐	☐
Mania	☐	☐	☐	☐
Anxiety	☐	☐	☐	☐
Anger	☐	☐	☐	☐
Poor self-care	☐	☐	☐	☐
Poor room care	☐	☐	☐	☐
Medication noncompliance	☐	☐	☐	☐
Noncompliance with rules	☐	☐	☐	☐
Insolence	☐	☐	☐	☐
Manipulation	☐	☐	☐	☐
Property destruction	☐	☐	☐	☐
Stealing	☐	☐	☐	☐
Poor use of leisure time	☐	☐	☐	☐
Inactivity	☐	☐	☐	☐
Physical self-abuse	☐	☐	☐	☐
Problems with staff	☐	☐	☐	☐
Aggressive with female staff	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Gang membership	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Violence toward other inmates	☐	☐	☐	☐

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

*Previous admission to segregation (any)	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Mental health diagnosis	☐	☐	☐	☐
*High-profile flag	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Suicidal ideation or attempt	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Lack of understanding own criminality	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Rigid thinking / stubbornness	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Entitled	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Disrespectful of staff	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Disrespectful of other inmates	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Lack of motivation	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Inconsistent program participation	☐	☐	☐	☐
*Rejects responsibility of actions	☐	☐	☐	☐

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Appendix C

Effect Sizes for All Variables

Table C1

Effect Sizes for All Dichotomous Variables

Variable Name	SHU Cases		Admin Seg ¹		<i>d</i>	95% CI		Odds Ratio	95% CI	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%		Lower	Upper		Lower	Upper
RAST_admis_Aseg_d: Admission to administrative segregation in previous federal sentence	50	-	3,616	-	.20	-.14	.55	1.40	.79	2.47
Yes	19	38.0	1,111	30.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	31	62.0	2,505	69.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
RAST_OSR10_d: Prior conviction for violence	48	-	3,548	-	.37	-.07	.82	1.86	.88	3.90
Yes	41	82.0	2,571	71.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	8	16.0	977	27.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
FLAG_HIGH_PROFILE_d: Flagged as high profile	50	-	3,612	-	.21	-.33	.76	1.43	.58	3.48
Yes	5	10.0	282	7.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	45	90.0	3,330	92.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUB12_2_d: Alcohol or drug use has resulted in law violations	50	-	3,616	-	-.32	-.67	.03	.59	.33	1.05
Yes	32	64.0	2,708	74.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	18	36.0	908	25.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUB14_2_d: Early age drug use	47	-	3,511	-	-.05	-.41	.31	.93	.51	1.67
Yes	30	60.0	2,293	63.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	17	34.0	1,218	33.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUB15_d: Uses drugs on a regular basis	39	-	2,716	-	.08	-.33	.48	1.13	.58	2.22
Yes	27	54.0	1,793	49.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	12	24.0	923	25.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUB16_2_d: Has gone on drug-taking binges	46	-	3,433	-	-.18	-.52	.17	.75	.42	1.33
Yes	23	46.0	1,964	54.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	23	46.0	1,469	40.6	-	-	-	-	-	-

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

SUB17_2_d: Has combined the use of different drugs	47	-	3,437	-	-.08	-.43	.26	.87	.49	1.54
Yes	25	50.0	1,943	53.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	22	44.0	1,494	41.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUB18_d: Abuses drugs (solvents, prescription drugs, etc.)	39	-	2,744	-	-.16	-.59	.27	.77	.38	1.57
Yes	29	58.0	2,152	59.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	10	20.0	592	16.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUB19_d: Uses drugs during leisure time	39	-	2,721	-	-.11	-.51	.30	.84	.43	1.65
Yes	27	54.0	1,970	54.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	12	24.0	751	20.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUB20_d: Uses drugs in social situations	39	-	2,711	-	-.09	-.50	.32	.87	.44	1.70
Yes	27	54.0	1,946	53.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	12	24.0	765	21.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUB21_d: Uses drugs to relieve stress	37	-	2,651	-	-.06	-.45	.34	.91	.48	1.74
Yes	21	42.0	1,560	43.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	16	32.0	1,091	30.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUB23_2_d: Drug use interferes with interpersonal relationships	47	-	3,480	-	-.26	-.60	.09	.66	.37	1.16
Yes	22	44.0	1,996	55.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	25	50.0	1,484	41.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
SUB27_d: Prior substance abuse assessment(s)	36	-	2,718	-	.27	-.13	.67	1.57	.81	3.04
Yes	22	44.0	1,353	37.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	14	28.0	1,365	37.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
OSR02_d: Previous serious offences	49	-	3,549	-	.23	-.24	.70	1.47	.67	3.20
Yes	42	84.0	2,820	78.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	7	14.0	729	20.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
OSR06_d: Previous offence - Arson/fire-setting	48	-	3,547	-	.55	-.12	1.22	2.49	.82	7.50
Yes	3	6.0	106	2.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	45	90.0	3,441	95.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
OSR09_d: Previous offence - Forcible confinement/kidnapping	48	-	3,549	-	.15	-.52	.81	1.28	.43	3.83
Yes	3	6.0	201	5.6	-	-	-	-	-	-

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

No	45	90.0	3,348	92.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
OSR10_d: Previous offence - Violence (assault/robbery)	49	-	3,548	-	.37	-.07	.82	1.86	.88	3.90
Yes	41	82.0	2,571	71.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	8	16.0	977	27.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
OSR25_d: Previous offence - Violence used against victim	48	-	3,479	-	.30	-.10	.69	1.63	.85	3.11
Yes	36	72.0	2,233	61.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	12	24.0	1,246	34.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
OSR26_d: Previous offence - Weapons used against victim	44	-	3,334	-	.45	.09	.80	2.09	1.16	3.77
Yes	21	42.0	1,014	28.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	23	46.0	2,320	64.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
OSR28_d: Previous offence - Serious injury to victim (wounding, maiming, disfiguring)	40	-	3,302	-	.54	.14	.93	2.42	1.25	4.67
Yes	13	26.0	557	15.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	27	54.0	2,745	75.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
OSR29_d: Previous offence - Minor injury to victim (hitting, slapping, striking)	47	-	3,347	-	.34	-.04	.73	1.76	.93	3.31
Yes	34	68.0	1,983	54.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	13	26.0	1,364	37.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
OSR37_d: Current serious offence(s)	49	-	3,556	-	.56	-.03	1.14	2.50	.95	6.61
Yes	45	90.0	2,851	78.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	4	8.0	705	19.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
OSR60_d: Current offence – Violence used against victim	49	-	3,549	-	.43	.08	.78	2.03	1.13	3.65
Yes	32	64.0	1,694	46.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	17	34.0	1,855	51.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
OSR61_d: Current offence – Weapons used against victim	49	-	3,522	-	.50	.17	.84	2.30	1.31	4.03
Yes	23	46.0	980	27.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	26	52.0	2,542	70.3	-	-	-	-	-	-

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

OSR63_d: Current offence: Serious injury to victim (wounding, maiming, disfiguring)	48	-	3,533	-	.61	.26	.96	2.74	1.55	4.84
Yes	21	42.0	785	21.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	27	54.0	2,748	76.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
OSR64_d: Current offence: Minor injury to victim (hitting, slapping, striking)	49	-	3,538	-	.13	-.21	.48	1.25	.70	2.21
Yes	19	38.0	1,200	33.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	30	60.0	2,338	64.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No_admis_seg_any_d: Previous admission to any type of segregation	50	-	3,616	-	.19	-.16	.53	1.37	.77	2.41
Yes	19	38.0	2,849	68.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	31	62.0	1,127	31.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
No_admis_seg_danger_d: Previous admission to segregation for inmate-in-danger	50	-	3,616	-	.07	-.33	.47	1.12	.58	2.18
Yes	11	22.0	744	20.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	39	78.0	2,872	79.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
No_admis_seg_discip_d: Previous admission to disciplinary segregation	50	-	3,616	-	.45	.00	.90	2.10	1.00	4.43
Yes	8	16.0	314	8.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	42	84.0	3,302	91.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
No_admis_seg_interfere_d: Previous admission to segregation for interfering with investigation	50	-	3,616	-	.65	.17	1.12	2.91	1.32	6.39
Yes	7	14.0	202	5.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	43	86.0	3,414	94.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
No_admis_seg_security_d: Previous admission to segregation for jeopardizing security	50	-	3,616	-	.32	-.03	.67	1.70	.96	3.00
Yes	19	38.0	967	26.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	31	62.0	2,649	73.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
No_admis_seg_other_d: Previous admission to segregation for other reasons	50	-	3,616	-	-.87	-2.57	.82	.24	.01	3.85
Yes	0	0	145	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	50	100	3,471	96.0	-	-	-	-	-	-

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

ASS05_2_d: Affiliated with gang or organized crime	45	-	3,439	-	.71	.36	1.07	3.25	1.81	5.83
Yes	23	46.0	836	23.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	22	44.0	2,603	72.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER06_d: Gang member	36	-	2,593	-	.68	.26	1.10	3.07	1.54	6.12
Yes	12	24.0	369	10.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	24	48.0	2,224	61.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
Aboriginal_d: Aboriginal	50	-	3,606	-	.22	-.13	.58	1.45	.80	2.62
Yes	16	32.0	895	24.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	34	68.0	2,711	75.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
ABDUCT_KIDNAP_d	48	-	3,590	-	-.46	-1.44	.53	.47	.09	2.41
Yes	1	2.0	225	6.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	47	94.0	3,365	93.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
ARSON_d	48	-	3,590	-	.91	.23	1.59	4.49	1.47	13.71
Yes	3	6.0	60	1.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	45	90.0	3,530	97.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
ATTEMPT_MURDER_d	48	-	3,590	-	1.28	.66	1.89	8.25	2.99	22.75
Yes	4	8.0	43	1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	44	88.0	3,547	98.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
B_AND_E_d	48	-	3,590	-	-.02	-.41	.38	.97	.51	1.86
Yes	12	24.0	933	25.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	36	72.0	2,657	73.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
ASSAULT_d	48	-	3,590	-	.71	.37	1.06	3.24	1.83	5.75
Yes	28	56.0	1,077	29.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	20	40.0	2,513	69.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
FRAUD_d	48	-	3,590	-	-.70	-1.68	.29	.32	.06	1.62
Yes	1	2.0	325	9.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	47	94.0	3,265	90.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
HOMICIDE_d	48	-	3,590	-	.88	.51	1.25	4.26	2.31	7.86
Yes	15	30.0	351	9.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	33	66.0	3,239	89.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
IMPAIRED_DRVG_d	48	-	3,590	-	-.21	-1.20	.78	.70	.14	3.60
Yes	1	2.0	154	4.3	-	-	-	-	-	-

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

No	47	94.0	3,436	95.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
GAME_BET_d	48	-	3,590	-	2.61	.23	4.99	74.03	1.45	3769.54
Yes	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	48	96.0	3,590	99.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
SEXUAL_MORAL_d	48	-	3,590	-	-.17	-1.87	1.53	.75	.05	12.39
Yes	0	0	48	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	48	96.0	3,542	98.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
ADMIN_JUST_d	48	-	3,590	-	-.79	-1.33	-.25	.27	.11	.66
Yes	5	10.0	1,142	31.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	43	86.0	2,448	67.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
OTHER_OFFENCE_d	48	-	3,590	-	.11	-.24	.46	1.20	.68	2.12
Yes	28	56.0	1,929	53.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	20	40.0	1,661	45.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
OTHER_PROP_d	48	-	3,590	-	-.12	-.54	.29	.81	.41	1.62
Yes	10	20.0	901	24.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	38	76.0	2,689	74.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
POSS_DRUG_d	48	-	3,590	-	-.33	-.99	.33	.58	.20	1.74
Yes	3	6.0	418	11.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	45	90.0	3,172	87.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
PUBLIC_ORDER_d	48	-	3,590	-	.57	.19	.94	2.55	1.37	4.74
Yes	14	28.0	508	14.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	34	68.0	3,082	85.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
ROBBERY_OFFENCE_d	48	-	3,590	-	-.29	-.70	.13	.62	.31	1.24
Yes	10	20.0	1091	30.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	38	76.0	2,499	68.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
SEXUAL_OFFENCE_d	48	-	3,590	-	-.55	-1.54	.43	.40	.08	2.04
Yes	1	2.0	262	7.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	47	94.0	3,328	92.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
THEFT_d	48	-	3,590	-	-.32	-.82	.18	.59	.26	1.35
Yes	6	12.0	740	20.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	42	84.0	2,850	78.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
TRAFFIC_DRUGS_d	48	-	3,590	-	-.58	-1.24	.08	.38	.13	1.14

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Yes	3	6.0	601	16.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	45	90.0	2,989	82.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
WEAPON_EXPLOSIVE_d	48	-	3,590	-	.51	.16	.86	2.30	1.29	4.10
Yes	19	38.0	800	22.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	29	58.0	2,790	77.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
INVOLINC_d: Has a history of involvement in institutional incidents	50	-	3,616	-	.80	.21	1.39	3.74	1.42	9.87
Yes	46	92.0	2,655	73.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	4	8.0	961	26.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
INCIDSEV_d: Prior involvement in one or more incidents in serious category	50	-	3,616	-	.64	.30	.98	2.87	1.65	5.01
Yes	27	54.0	1,046	28.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	23	46.0	2,570	71.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
any_incident_d: Past sentence - Involvement in any incident	50	-	3,616	-	.19	-.15	.53	1.36	.78	2.39
Yes	21	42.0	1,259	34.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	29	58.0	2,357	65.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
incid_assault_d: Past sentence - Incident involving assault	50	-	3,616	-	.42	.07	.77	1.99	1.12	3.54
Yes	18	36.0	804	22.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	32	64.0	2,812	77.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
incid_behav_d: Past sentence - Incident related to behaviour	50	-	3,616	-	.31	-.05	.66	1.66	.92	2.99
Yes	16	32.0	810	22.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	34	68.0	2,806	77.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
incid_contra_unauth_d: Past sentence – Incident involving contraband or unauthorized item	50	-	3,616	-	.05	-.34	.44	1.09	.57	2.07
Yes	12	24.0	830	23.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	38	76.0	2,786	77.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
incid_death_d: Past sentence: Incident involving death	50	-	3,616	-	1.34	.77	1.90	9.08	3.58	23.02
Yes	5	10.0	47	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	45	90.0	3,569	98.7	-	-	-	-	-	-

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

incid_esc_Ual_d: Past sentence - Incident involving escape or UAL	50	-	3,616	-	.05	-.45	.55	1.08	.47	2.48
Yes	6	12.0	429	11.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	44	88.0	3,187	88.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
incid_misc_d: Past sentence - Miscellaneous incidents	50	-	3,616	-	.19	-.17	.55	1.36	.75	2.46
Yes	16	32.0	940	26.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	34	68.0	2,676	74.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
incid_property_d: Past sentence – Incident involving property	50	-	3,616	-	.44	-.03	.92	2.08	.95	4.56
Yes	7	14.0	276	7.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	43	86.0	3,340	92.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
incid_self_inj_d: Past sentence – Incident involving self-injury	50	-	3,616	-	.23	-.43	.89	1.46	.49	4.38
Yes	3	6.0	173	4.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	47	94.0	3,443	95.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
incid_violence_d: Past sentence – Incident related to death or assault	50	-	3,616	-	.41	.06	.76	1.97	1.11	3.51
Yes	18	36.0	809	22.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	32	64.0	2,807	77.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lifer_d: Current sentence indeterminate	50	-	3,616	-	.98	.61	1.36	5.08	2.73	9.45
Yes	14	28.0	262	7.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	36	72.0	3,354	92.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
Past_Federal_Sentence_d: Has previous federal sentence	50	-	3,616	-	.02	-.32	.36	1.03	.59	1.81
Yes	21	42	1,495	41.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	29	58	2,121	58.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
EMP03_2_d: Has less than a high school diploma	46	-	3,407	-	.29	-.26	.83	1.60	.65	3.91
Yes	41	82.0	2,811	77.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	5	10.0	596	16.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
EMP08_d: Has concentration problems	36	-	2,669	-	.24	-.15	.64	1.50	.78	2.87
Yes	17	34.0	1,000	27.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	19	38.0	1,669	46.2	-	-	-	-	-	-

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

EMP13_d: Lacks a skill area/trade/profession	36	-	2710	-	.86	.19	1.53	4.11	1.36	12.40
Yes	33	66.0	1,896	52.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	3	6.0	814	22.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
EMP16_2_d: Unemployed at the time of arrest	46	-	3,460	-	.17	-.25	.59	1.32	.66	2.64
Yes	36	72.0	2,506	69.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	10	20.0	954	26.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
EMP17_d: Unemployed 90% or more	36	-	2,642	-	.80	.33	1.27	3.75	1.73	8.09
Yes	28	56.0	1,248	34.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	8	16.0	1,394	38.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
EMP18_d: Unemployed 50% or more	35	-	2,599	-	1.04	.26	1.82	5.59	1.54	20.27
Yes	33	66.0	1,834	50.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	2	4.0	765	21.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
EMP19_2_d: Unstable job history	45	-	3,471	-	.59	.00	1.18	2.66	1.00	7.05
Yes	41	82.0	2,695	74.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	4	8.0	776	21.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
EMP22_2_d: Has no employment history	46	-	3,488	-	.78	.43	1.13	3.61	2.02	6.45
Yes	21	42.0	660	18.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	25	50.0		78.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
FAM27_2_d: Has been investigated/arrested for child abuse/neglect	46	-	3503	-	-.41	-2.10	1.29	.51	.03	8.34
Yes	0	0	72	2.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	46	100	3,431	94.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
ASS02_2_d: Associates with substance abusers	47	-	3,500	-	.05	-.45	.56	1.09	.47	2.50
Yes	41	82.0	2,991	82.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	6	12.0	509	14.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
ASS03_2_d: Has many criminal acquaintances	49	-	3,477	-	.77	.00	1.54	3.57	1.00	12.79
Yes	47	94.0	2,927	80.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	2	4.0	550	15.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
ASS04_2_d: Has many criminal friends	47	-	3,392	-	1.68	.70	2.67	16.09	3.16	81.93
Yes	46	92.0	2,233	61.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	1	2.0	1,159	32.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
ASS08_d: Relations are described as predatory	38	-	2,704	-	.62	.23	1.00	2.76	1.46	5.23

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Yes	17	34.0	615	17.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	21	42.0	2,089	57.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
COM01_2_d: Unstable accommodation	48	-	3,477	-	.26	-.09	.60	1.53	.87	2.71
Yes	28	56.0	1,673	46.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	20	40.0	1,804	49.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
COM15_2_d: Constructive leisure activities are limited	47	-	3,489	-	.77	.18	1.36	3.54	1.34	9.37
Yes	43	86.0	2,554	70.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	4	8.0	935	25.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER02_d: Physical prowess problematic	39	-	2,728	-	.71	.31	1.10	3.22	1.68	6.19
Yes	14	28.0	409	11.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	25	50.0	2,319	64.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER04_d: Ethnicity is problematic	37	-	2,726	-	.30	-.49	1.08	1.64	.45	5.98
Yes	2	4.0	112	3.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	35	70.0	2,614	72.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER12_d: Has disregard for others	38	-	2,732	-	.33	-.22	.88	1.73	.70	4.29
Yes	33	66.0	2,127	58.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	5	10.0	605	16.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER13_d: Socially unaware	39	-	2,731	-	.37	-.01	.75	1.84	.98	3.44
Yes	18	36.0	870	24.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	21	42.0	1,861	51.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER20_d: Poor conflict resolution	39	-	2,726	-	.72	-.06	1.50	3.27	.90	11.79
Yes	37	74.0	2,239	61.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	2	4.0	487	13.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER29_d: Is not conscientious	39	-	2,704	-	.37	-.03	.77	1.83	.95	3.54
Yes	26	52.0	1,399	38.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	13	26.0	1,305	36.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER36_d: Diagnosed as disordered in the past	37	-	2,696	-	.46	.06	.86	2.15	1.11	4.16
Yes	14	28.0	601	16.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	23	46.0	2,095	57.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER37_d: Diagnosed as disordered currently	37	-	2,666	-	.15	-.37	.66	1.27	.54	2.98
Yes	6	12.0	372	10.3	-	-	-	-	-	-

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

No	21	62.0	2,294	63.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER08_2_d: Difficulty solving interpersonal problems	49	-	3,517	-	.60	.02	1.19	2.71	1.03	7.16
Yes	45	90.0	2,774	76.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	4	8.0	743	20.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER09_2_d: Ability to generate choices is limited	48	-	3,526	-	.50	.03	.97	2.28	1.05	4.99
Yes	41	82.0	2,496	69.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	7	14.0	1,030	28.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER11_2_d: Difficulty setting realistic goals	48	-	3,475	-	.25	-.09	.60	1.52	.86	2.68
Yes	22	44.0	1,244	34.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	26	52.0	2,231	61.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER14_2_d: Impulsive	49	-	3,541	-	-.15	-.65	.35	.78	.34	1.79
Yes	43	86.0	3,172	87.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	6	12.0	369	10.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER15_2_d: Empathy skills are limited	49	-	3,455	-	.61	.24	.98	2.74	1.48	5.07
Yes	35	70.0	1,630	45.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	14	28.0	1,825	50.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER16_2_d: Narrow and rigid thinking	47	-	3,479	-	.72	.29	1.15	3.27	1.60	6.67
Yes	38	76.0	1,926	53.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	9	18.0	1,553	42.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER17_2_d: Frequently acts in aggressive manner	49	-	3,504	-	.83	.33	1.34	3.96	1.73	9.06
Yes	43	86.0	2,201	60.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	6	12.0	1,303	36.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER21_2_d: Time management skills problematic	45	-	3,387	-	.27	-.10	.64	1.56	.85	2.89
Yes	30	60.0	1,887	52.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	15	30.0	1,500	41.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER23_2_d: Low frustration tolerance	48	-	3,442	-	.58	.17	1.00	2.62	1.32	5.21
Yes	38	76.0	2,007	55.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	10	20.0	1,435	39.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER24_2_d: Hostile	48	-	3,496	-	.87	.50	1.24	4.19	2.29	7.69
Yes	33	66.0	1,189	32.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	15	30.0	2,307	63.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER27_2_d: Engages in thrill-seeking behaviour	47	-	3,456	-	.37	.02	.73	1.85	1.03	3.31

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Yes	29	58.0	1,602	44.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	18	36.0	1,854	51.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
PER30_2_d: Manipulates others to achieve goals	47	-	3,416	-	.07	-.29	.42	1.11	.62	1.99
Yes	28	56.0	1,939	53.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	19	38.0	1,477	40.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
ATT11_d: Basic life skills have no value	39	-	2,720	-	.37	-.05	.79	1.84	.92	3.67
Yes	11	22.0	489	13.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	28	56.0	2,231	61.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
ATT13_d: Elderly have no value	39	-	2,707	-	.90	.22	1.58	4.42	1.43	13.65
Yes	3	6.0	57	1.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	36	72.0	2,650	73.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
ATT15_d: Ethnically intolerant	37	-	2,662	-	.35	-.43	1.14	1.80	.49	6.57
Yes	2	4.0	100	2.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	35	70.0	2,562	70.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
ATT01_2_d: Displays negative attitudes towards criminal justice system	49	-	3,547	-	.87	.21	1.53	4.22	1.42	12.54
Yes	46	92.0	2,692	74.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	3	6.0	855	23.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
ATT04_2_d: Displays negative attitudes towards correctional systems	49	-	3,538	-	.58	.15	1.01	2.59	1.27	5.27
Yes	40	80.0	2,201	60.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	9	18.0	1,337	37.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
ATT10_2_d: Values substance-abusing lifestyle	45	-	3,493	-	-.03	-.41	.34	.94	.51	1.75
Yes	30	60.0	2,360	65.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	15	30.0	1,133	31.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
ATT18_2_d: Disrespects personal belongings	47	-	3,512	-	-.07	-.41	.28	.90	.51	1.58
Yes	24	48.0	1,889	52.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	23	46.0	1,623	44.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
ATT19_2_d: Disrespects public or commercial property	47	-	3,499	-	.06	-.29	.40	1.10	.62	1.94
Yes	25	50.0	1,779	49.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	22	44.0	1,720	47.6	-	-	-	-	-	-

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

ATT22_2_d: Attitudes support instrumental/goal-oriented violence	49	-	3,500	-	1.25	.59	1.91	7.82	2.63	23.23
Yes	46	92.0	2,203	60.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	3	6.0	1,297	35.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
ATT23_2_d: Difficulty setting long-term goals	48	-	3,530	-	.41	-.07	.88	1.96	.90	4.27
Yes	41	82.0	2,608	72.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	7	14.0	922	25.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
YCR01_d: Previous offences in youth court	48	-	3,531	-	.68	.21	1.16	3.08	1.41	6.73
Yes	41	82.0	2,268	62.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	7	14.0	1,263	34.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
YCR08_d: Youth dispositions – community supervision	48	-	3,484	-	.66	.23	1.09	2.95	1.45	6.02
Yes	39	78.0	2,037	56.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	9	18.0	1,447	40.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
YCR09_d: Youth dispositions – open custody	48	-	3,457	-	.27	-.08	.61	1.55	.88	2.73
Yes	24	48.0	1,354	37.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	24	48.0	2,103	58.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
YCR10_d: Youth dispositions – secure custody	48	-	3,476	-	.51	.16	.86	2.33	1.30	4.16
Yes	30	60.0	1,442	39.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	18	36.0	2,034	56.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
YCR11_d: Failure during community supervision	45	-	3,388	-	.71	.32	1.11	3.24	1.69	6.22
Yes	33	66.0	1,534	42.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	12	24.0	1,854	51.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
YCR12_d: Disciplinary transfers from open to secure custody	45	-	3,215	-	.59	.15	1.03	2.66	1.29	5.49
Yes	9	18.0	286	7.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	36	72.0	2,929	81.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
YCR13_d: Disciplinary report in secure custody	40	-	3,029	-	1.04	.66	1.41	5.54	2.97	10.31
Yes	19	38.0	426	11.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	21	42.0	2,603	72.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
YCR14_d: Attempt escape/UAL/escape from secure custody	47	-	3,359	-	.54	.12	.96	2.44	1.22	4.89

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Yes	10	20.0	345	9.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	37	74.0	3,014	83.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
YCR15_d: Transfer from secure custody to adult facility	47	-	3,429	-	.57	-.10	1.24	2.55	.85	7.71
Yes	3	6.0	102	2.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	44	88.0	3,327	92.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACR01_d: Previous offences in adult court	49	-	3,554	-	-.39	-.80	.03	.53	.27	1.05
Yes	39	78.0	3,117	86.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	10	20.0	437	12.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACR08_d: Prior sanctions – Community supervision	49	-	3,549	-	-.47	-.82	-.11	.46	.26	.83
Yes	32	64.0	2,842	78.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	17	34.0	707	19.6	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACR09_d: Prior sanctions – Provincial terms	49	-	3,547	-	-.11	-.50	.28	.83	.44	1.58
Yes	37	74.0	2,778	76.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	12	24.0	769	21.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACR10_d: Prior sanctions – Federal terms	49	-	3,551	-	.16	-.18	.50	1.30	.74	2.28
Yes	22	44.0	1,370	37.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	27	54.0	2,181	60.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACR11_d: Failure during community supervision	49	-	3524	-	-.28	-.63	.07	.63	.35	1.13
Yes	31	62.0	2,571	71.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	18	36.0	953	26.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACR12_d: Segregation for disciplinary infractions	48	-	3,361	-	.54	.17	.90	2.42	1.32	4.44
Yes	33	66.0	1,584	43.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	15	30.0	1,777	49.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACR13_d: Attempt escape/UAL escape	47	-	3,532	-	-.16	-.56	.24	.77	.39	1.49
Yes	11	22.0	1,028	28.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	36	72.0	2,504	69.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACR14_d: Reclassified to higher level of security	46	-	3,465	-	.49	.14	.84	2.25	1.26	4.01
Yes	21	42.0	945	26.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	25	50.0	2,520	69.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACR15_d: Failures on conditional release	48	-	3,522	-	.16	-.19	.50	1.30	.73	2.30
Yes	28	56.0	1,822	50.4	-	-	-	-	-	-

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

No	20	40.0	1,700	47.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACR16_d: Less than 6 months since last incarceration	48	-	3,544	-	.59	.25	.94	2.66	1.51	4.69
Yes	27	54.0	1,151	31.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	21	42.0	2,393	66.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
ACR17_d: No crime free period of 1 year or more	48	-	3,543	-	.41	.07	.76	1.98	1.12	3.50
Yes	21	42.0	1,003	27.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	27	54.0	2,540	70.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOH06_d: Incest – current sentence	49	-	3,553	-	.04	-1.66	1.74	1.06	.06	17.57
Yes	0	0	33	0.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	49	100	3,520	97.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOH07_d: Pedophilia – current sentence	49	-	3,549	-	-.36	-2.05	1.34	.55	.03	9.09
Yes	0	0	63	1.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	49	100	3,486	96.4	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOH09_d: Other current sex offence	49	-	3,553	-	.11	-1.59	1.82	1.21	.07	20.03
Yes	0	0	29	0.8	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	49	100	3,524	97.5	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOH17_d: Sex victims were female children (under 12)	49	-	3,541	-	-.74	-2.43	.95	.29	.02	4.80
Yes	0	0	117	3.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	49	100	3,424	94.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
SOH22_d: Sex victims were male children (12-17 years)	49	-	3,544	-	.18	-1.53	1.88	1.34	.08	22.32
Yes	0	0	26	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-
No	49	100	3,518	97.3	-	-	-	-	-	-

¹“Admin Seg” refers to Administrative Segregation.

Table C2

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Effect Sizes for all Continuous/Ordinal Variables

Variable Name	SHU Cases				Admin Seg ¹				Cohen's <i>d</i>	95% CI	
	<i>N</i>	%	Mean	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	%	Mean	<i>SD</i>		Lower	Upper
RAST_age3_c: Age at admission	50	-	2.46	.542	3,616	-	2.11	.787	.45	.17	.73
50+	0	0	-	-	151	4.2	-	-	-	-	-
40-49.9	1	2.0	-	-	497	13.7	-	-	-	-	-
25-39.9	25	50.0	-	-	1788	49.4	-	-	-	-	-
< 25	24	48.0	-	-	1180	32.6	-	-	-	-	-
RAST_priorcon2_c: Prior convictions	50	-	1.50	.763	3,616	-	1.58	.710	-.11	-.39	.17
0-1	8	16.0	-	-	469	13.0	-	-	-	-	-
2-4	9	18.0	-	-	588	16.3	-	-	-	-	-
5+	33	66.0	-	-	2559	70.8	-	-	-	-	-
RAST_sentence4_c: Sentence length	50	-	3.08	1.122	3,616	-	2.57	.831	.61	.33	.89
2 years	4	8.0	-	-	156	4.3	-	-	-	-	-
2-3 years	5	10.0	-	-	1415	39.1	-	-	-	-	-
3-10 years	20	40.0	-	-	1708	47.2	-	-	-	-	-
10+ years	21	42.0	-	-	337	9.3	-	-	-	-	-
RAST_versatility3_c: Criminal versatility in current convictions	48	-	1.13	.606	3,590	-	1.05	.637	.13	-.16	.41
0 categories	6	12.0	-	-	644	17.8	-	-	-	-	-
1-2 categories	30	60.0	-	-	2123	58.7	-	-	-	-	-
3+ categories	12	24.0	-	-	823	22.8	-	-	-	-	-
RAST_scale4full_c: Total RAST score	48	-	9.38	1.746	3,590	-	8.33	1.692	.62	.34	.91
Substance_Abuse_c: DFIA substance abuse domain score	39	-	3.26	.850	2,753	-	3.33	.821	-.09	-.40	.23
No difficulty	10	20.0	-	-	626	17.3	-	-	-	-	-
Some difficulty	9	18.0	-	-	603	16.7	-	-	-	-	-
Considerable difficulty	20	40.0	-	-	1524	42.1	-	-	-	-	-
ALDRUGS_c: Alcohol/drug use score	50	-	1.24	.847	3,616	-	1.32	.798	-.10	-.38	.18
0 - No problems	13	26.0	-	-	756	20.9	-	-	-	-	-
1	12	24.0	-	-	932	25.8	-	-	-	-	-

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

2 – Serious abuse	25	50.0	-	-	1928	53.3	-	-	-	-	-
OFFSEVER_c: Offense severity score	50	-	2.08	.634	3,616	-	1.72	.570	.63	.35	.91
0	0	0	-	-	2	0.1	-	-	-	-	-
1	8	16.0	-	-	1231	34.0	-	-	-	-	-
2	30	60.0	-	-	2162	59.8	-	-	-	-	-
3	12	24.0	-	-	221	6.1	-	-	-	-	-
OSR3336_c: Sentence length	28	-	.96	.429	2,321	-	.99	.578	-.05	-.42	.32
0	3	6.0	-	-	335	9.3	-	-	-	-	-
1	23	46.0	-	-	1734	48.0	-	-	-	-	-
2	2	4.0	-	-	199	5.5	-	-	-	-	-
3	0	0	-	-	47	1.3	-	-	-	-	-
4	0	0	-	-	6	0.2	-	-	-	-	-
Off_sever_tot_c: Offence severity total score	49	-	22.27	7.446	3,556	-	18.34	8.065	.49	.21	.77
Age_Admission_c: Offender age at admission	50	-	25.88	5.894	3,616	-	31.03	9.475	-.55	-.82	-.27
Sentence_length_all_c: Aggregate sentence length (years)	50	-	12.28	10.45	3,616	-	5.68	6.581	.99	.71	1.27
CCR_sum_c: Number of current convictions	49	-	2.27	1.076	3,554	-	2.39	1.058	-.12	-.40	.16
1	15	30.0	-	-	712	19.7	-	-	-	-	-
2-4	12	24.0	-	-	1376	38.1	-	-	-	-	-
5-9	18	36.0	-	-	1002	27.7	-	-	-	-	-
10-14	2	4.0	-	-	269	7.4	-	-	-	-	-
15+	2	4.0	-	-	189	5.2	-	-	-	-	-
Employment_c: DFIA Employment domain score	39	-	3.03	.707	2,753	-	2.78	.659	.38	.06	.70
Factor an asset	0	0	-	-	19	0.5	-	-	-	-	-
No difficulty	9	18.0	-	-	909	25.1	-	-	-	-	-
Some difficulty	20	40.0	-	-	1481	41.0	-	-	-	-	-
Considerable difficulty	10	20.0	-	-	344	9.5	-	-	-	-	-
Marital_Family_c: DFIA Marital/Family	39	-	2.67	.898	2,753	-	2.49	.751	.24	-.08	.56

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

domain score											
Factor an asset	1	2.0	-	-	57	1.6	-	-	-	-	-
No difficulty	21	42.0	-	-	1655	45.8	-	-	-	-	-
Some difficulty	7	14.0	-	-	665	18.4	-	-	-	-	-
Considerable difficulty	10	20.0	-	-	376	10.4	-	-	-	-	-
Associates_c: DFIA Associates domain score	39	-	3.46	.720	2,753	-	3.18	.796	.35	.04	.67
Factor an asset	0	0	-	-	15	0.4	-	-	-	-	-
No difficulty	5	10.0	-	-	625	17.3	-	-	-	-	-
Some difficulty	11	22.0	-	-	969	26.8	-	-	-	-	-
Considerable difficulty	23	46.0	-	-	1144	31.6	-	-	-	-	-
Community_Function_c: DFIA Community function domain score	39	-	2.54	.682	2,753	-	2.34	.579	.34	.03	.66
Factor an asset	0	0	-	-	20	0.6	-	-	-	-	-
No difficulty	22	44.0	-	-	1919	53.1	-	-	-	-	-
Some difficulty	13	26.0	-	-	680	18.8	-	-	-	-	-
Considerable difficulty	4	8.0	-	-	134	3.7	-	-	-	-	-
Personal_Emotional_c: DFIA Personal/Emotional domain score	39	-	3.87	.339	2,753	-	3.52	.700	.50	.19	.82
Factor an asset	0	0	-	-	0	0	-	-	-	-	-
No difficulty	0	0	-	-	330	9.1	-	-	-	-	-
Some difficulty	5	10.0	-	-	659	18.2	-	-	-	-	-
Considerable difficulty	34	68	-	-	1764	48.8	-	-	-	-	-
Attitudes_c: DFIA Attitudes domain score	39	-	3.79	.469	2,753	-	3.27	.808	.65	.33	.96
Factor an asset	0	0	-	-	12	0.3	-	-	-	-	-
No difficulty	1	2.0	-	-	592	16.4	-	-	-	-	-
Some difficulty	6	12.0	-	-	791	21.9	-	-	-	-	-
Considerable difficulty	32	64.0	-	-	1358	37.6	-	-	-	-	-
OVERALL_DYNAMIC_FACTOR_E_c: Overall dynamic factors score	49	-	2.94	.242	3,556	-	2.76	.469	.39	.10	.67
Low	0	0	-	-	67	1.9	-	-	-	-	-

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Medium	3	6.0	-	-	720	19.9	-	-	-	-	-
High	46	92.0	-	-	2769	76.6	-	-	-	-	-
OVERALL_STATIC_FACTOR_E_c: Overall static factors score	49	-	2.82	.441	3,557	-	2.55	.581	.47	.18	.75
Low	1	2.0	-	-	161	4.5	-	-	-	-	-
Medium	7	14.0	-	-	1263	34.9	-	-	-	-	-
High	41	82.0	-	-	2133	59.0	-	-	-	-	-
CRS_SCORE_c: Overall CRS score	50	-	2.64	.598	3,616	-	2.12	.623	.84	.56	1.11
Low	3	6.0	-	-	506	14.0	-	-	-	-	-
Medium	12	24.0	-	-	2156	59.6	-	-	-	-	-
High	35	70.0	-	-	954	26.4	-	-	-	-	-
Crim_Hist_Rec_Total_c	35	-	19.57	8.222	2,706	-	16.92	7.466	.35	.02	.69
REINTEGRATION_POTENTIAL2_c: Level of reintegration potential	50	-	1.18	.482	3,616	-	1.71	.775	-.68	-.96	-.40
Low	43	86.0	-	-	1767	48.9	-	-	-	-	-
Medium	5	10.0	-	-	1137	31.4	-	-	-	-	-
High	2	4.0	-	-	712	19.7	-	-	-	-	-
MOTIVATION_LEVEL2_c: Level of motivation	50	-	1.56	.501	3,616	-	1.88	.555	-.57	-.85	-.29
Low	22	44.0	-	-	805	22.3	-	-	-	-	-
Medium	28	56.0	-	-	2449	67.7	-	-	-	-	-
High	0	0	-	-	362	10.0	-	-	-	-	-
SENTLEN_c	50	-	2.10	1.233	3,616	-	1.46	.850	.75	.47	1.03
INVOLPAS_c: Prior involvement in institutional incidents during last 5 years of incarceration	50	-	.94	.890	3,616	-	.43	.850	.80	.52	1.08
1 – involved in an assault (no weapon or serious physical injury)	21	42.0	-	-	2360	65.3	-	-	-	-	-
2 = involved in a riot or major disturbance	11	22.0	-	-	971	26.9	-	-	-	-	-
3 – involved in an assault (with weapon/causing serious physical injury)	18	36.0	-	-	285	7.9	-	-	-	-	-

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

STREETAD_c	50	-	1.76	.476	3,616	-	1.46	.586	.51	.23	.79
0	1	2.0	-	-	172	4.8	-	-	-	-	-
1	10	20.0	-	-	1597	44.2	-	-	-	-	-
2	39	78.0	-	-	1847	51.1	-	-	-	-	-
STREETRI_c	50	-	1.88	.558	3,616	-	1.47	.600	.68	.40	.96
0	1	2.0	-	-	180	5.0	-	-	-	-	-
1	8	16.0	-	-	1575	43.6	-	-	-	-	-
2	37	74.0	-	-	1840	50.9	-	-	-	-	-
3	4	8.0	-	-	21	0.6	-	-	-	-	-

¹"Admin Seg" refers to Administrative Segregation.

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Appendix D

Results Table for Study Two

Table D1

Frequencies of Problems Experienced by SHU Inmates

Variable	Absent		Present		Not-Applicable		Unknown	
<i>Community Problems</i>	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Alcohol abuse	15	46.9	15	46.9	0	0	2	6.3
Drugs	12	37.5	18	56.3	0	0	2	6.3
Murder or attempt within family	32	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Murder or attempt outside of family	21	65.6	11	34.4	0	0	0	0
Nonsexual violent crime	32	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sexual crime (adult victim)	21	65.6	11	34.4	0	0	0	0
Sexual crime (child victim)	28	87.5	4	12.5	0	0	0	0
Fire setting	28	87.5	4	12.5	0	0	0	0
Theft or economic offence	7	21.9	25	78.1	0	0	0	0
Property destruction	24	75.0	6	18.8	0	0	2	6.3
Vagrancy	30	93.8	2	6.3	0	0	0	0
Threatening	1	3.1	31	96.9	0	0	0	0
Possession of weapons	8	25.0	24	75.0	0	0	0	0
Psychotic speech	0	0	6	18.8	0	0	26	81.3
Psychotic behaviour	2	6.3	5	15.6	0	0	25	78.1
Inappropriate suspicion	2	6.3	0	0	0	0	30	93.8
Confusion	0	0	1	3.1	0	0	31	96.9
Depression	1	3.1	2	6.3	0	0	29	90.6
Mania	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	100
Anxiety	0	0	3	9.4	0	0	29	90.6
Anger	0	0	12	37.5	0	0	20	62.5
Criminal associates	16	50	16	50	0	0	0	0
Unemployment	7	21.9	13	40.6	0	0	12	37.5
Poor use of leisure time	1	3.1	0	0	0	0	31	96.9
Social withdrawal	7	21.9	2	6.3	0	0	23	71.9

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Medication difficulties	3	9.4	3	9.4	0	0	26	81.3
Marital/family problems	7	21.9	23	71.9	0	0	2	6.3
Difficulties in work place	5	15.6	4	12.5	6	18.8	17	53.1
Difficulties in halfway house	0	0	6	18.8	25	78.1	1	3.1
Health problems	25	78.1	6	18.8	0	0	1	3.1
Budget problems	2	6.3	1	3.1	0	0	29	90.6
Inadequate housekeeping	0	0	1	3.1	0	0	31	96.9
Poor community resource utilization	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	100
Assertion deficits	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	100
Feeling like a failure	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	100
Feeling empty	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	100
Prostituting self	31	96.9	1	3.1	0	0	0	0
Gang membership	25	78.1	6	18.8	0	0	1	3.1
Convicted of terrorism offence	31	96.9	1	3.1	0	0	0	0
Mental health diagnosis	23	71.9	8	25.0	0	0	1	3.1
Multiple convictions	3	9.4	29	90.6	0	0	0	0
Criminal versatility	15	46.9	17	53.1	0	0	0	0
Suicidal ideations or attempt	3	9.4	5	15.6	0	0	24	75.0
Rigid thinking / stubbornness	1	3.1	19	59.4	0	0	12	37.5
Impulsive / lack of inhibition	10	31.3	21	65.6	0	0	1	3.1
Entitled	0	0	1	3.1	0	0	31	96.9
Lack of motivation	1	3.1	0	0	0	0	31	96.9
Rejects responsibility of actions	26	81.3	4	12.5	0	0	2	6.3
Variable	Absent		Present		Not-Applicable		Unknown	
<i>Institutional Problems</i>	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Poor reading skills	7	21.9	3	9.4	0	0	22	68.8
Poor work skills	17	53.1	12	37.5	0	0	3	9.4
Limited general knowledge	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	100
Limited sexual knowledge	0	0	1	3.1	0	0	31	96.9
Limited knowledge of community resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	100
Poor conversational skills	26	81.3	2	6.3	0	0	4	12.5
Psychotic speech	26	81.3	2	6.3	0	0	4	12.5

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Psychotic action	26	81.3	4	12.5	0	0	2	6.3
Inappropriate suspicion	23	71.9	6	18.8	0	0	3	9.4
Confusion	29	90.6	3	9.4	0	0	0	0
Assaultive	4	12.5	28	87.5	0	0	0	0
Threatening violence	6	18.8	26	81.3	0	0	0	0
Pro-criminal speech	21	65.6	11	34.4	0	0	0	0
Insulting, teasing	17	53.1	15	46.9	0	0	0	0
Social withdrawal	25	78.1	4	12.5	0	0	3	9.4
Assertive deficits	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	100
Inappropriate dependence	31	96.9	1	3.1	0	0	0	0
Shyness	27	84.4	0	0	0	0	5	15.6
Lack of consideration	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	100
Impulsive / lack of inhibition	11	34.4	21	65.6	0	0	0	0
Poor manners	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	100
Irritable	20	62.5	6	18.8	0	0	6	18.8
Sexual harassment	20	62.5	12	37.5	0	0	0	0
Suggestible	28	87.5	3	9.4	0	0	1	3.1
Depression	27	84.4	5	15.6	0	0	0	0
Mania	32	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anxiety	28	87.5	4	12.5	0	0	0	0
Anger	13	40.6	19	59.4	0	0	0	0
Poor self-care	31	96.9	1	3.1	0	0	0	0
Poor room care	30	93.8	2	6.3	0	0	0	0
Medication noncompliance	11	34.4	5	15.6	16	50	0	0
Noncompliance with rules	4	12.5	28	87.5	0	0	0	0
Insolence	16	50	16	50	0	0	0	0
Manipulation	22	68.8	10	31.3	0	0	0	0
Property destruction	20	62.5	12	37.5	0	0	0	0
Stealing	30	93.8	1	3.1	0	0	1	3.1
Poor use of leisure time	20	62.5	9	28.1	0	0	3	9.4
Inactivity	22	68.8	8	25.0	0	0	2	6.3
Physical self-abuse	22	68.8	10	31.3	0	0	0	0

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Problems with staff	11	34.4	21	65.6	0	0	0	0
Aggressive with female staff	21	65.6	11	34.4	0	0	0	0
Gang membership	25	78.1	6	18.8	0	0	1	3.1
Violence toward other inmates	10	31.3	22	68.8	0	0	0	0
Previous admission to segregation (any)	0	0	32	100	0	0	0	0
Mental health diagnosis	20	62.5	12	37.5	0	0	0	0
High-profile flag	25	78.1	7	21.9	0	0	0	0
Suicidal ideation or attempt	25	78.1	7	21.9	0	0	0	0
Lack of understanding own criminality	23	71.9	9	28.1	0	0	0	0
Rigid thinking / stubbornness	3	9.4	28	87.5	0	0	1	3.1
Entitled	27	84.4	3	9.4	0	0	2	6.3
Disrespectful of staff	14	43.8	18	56.3	0	0	0	0
Disrespectful of other inmates	23	71.9	9	28.1	0	0	0	0
Lack of motivation	14	43.8	17	53.1	0	0	1	3.1
Inconsistent program participation	7	21.9	25	78.1	0	0	0	0
Rejects responsibility of actions	24	75.0	8	25.0	0	0	0	0

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Appendix E

Results Table for Subgroups in Study Two

Table E1

Frequencies of Inmate Problems by Subgroups

Variable	Violent				Non-Violent				Total			
	Absent		Present		Absent		Present		Absent		Present	
<i>Community Problems</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Alcohol abuse	11	39.3	15	53.6	4	100.0	0	0	15	46.9	15	46.9
Drugs	9	32.1	17	60.7	3	75.0	1	25.0	12	37.5	18	56.3
Murder or attempt within family	28	100.0	0	0	4	100.0	0	0	32	100	0	0
Murder or attempt outside of family	19	67.9	9	32.1	2	50.0	2	50.0	21	65.6	11	34.4
Nonsexual violent crime	0	0	28	100.0	0	0	4	100.0	0	0	32	100
Sexual crime (adult victim)	17	60.7	11	39.3	4	100.0	0	0	21	65.6	11	34.4
Sexual crime (child victim)	24	85.7	4	14.3	4	100.0	0	0	28	87.5	4	12.5
Fire setting	24	85.7	4	14.3	4	100.0	0	0	28	87.5	4	12.5
Theft or economic offence	6	21.4	22	78.6	1	25.0	3	75.0	7	21.9	25	78.1
Property destruction	22	78.6	5	17.9	2	50.0	1	25.0	24	75.0	6	18.8
Vagrancy	26	92.9	2	7.1	4	100.0	0	0	30	93.8	2	6.3
Threatening	0	0	28	100.0	1	25.0	3	75.0	1	3.1	31	96.9
Possession of arms	8	28.6	20	71.4	0	0	4	100.0	8	25.0	24	75.0
Psychotic speech	6	21.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	18.8
Psychotic behaviour	1	3.6	5	17.9	1	25.0	0	0	2	6.3	5	15.6
Inappropriate suspicion	2	7.1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6.3	0	0
Confusion	0	0	1	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.1
Depression	1	3.6	2	7.1	0	0	0	0	1	3.1	2	6.3
Mania	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Anxiety	0	0	3	10.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9.4
Anger	0	0	12	42.9	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	37.5
Criminal associates	15	53.6	13	46.4	1	25.0	3	75.0	16	50	16	50.0
Unemployment	6	21.4	11	39.3	1	25.0	2	50.0	7	21.9	13	40.6
Poor use of leisure time	1	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.1	0	0

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Social withdrawal	5	17.9	1	3.6	2	50.0	1	25.0	7	21.9	2	6.3
Medication difficulties	3	10.7	3	10.7	0	0	0	0	3	9.4	3	9.4
Marital/family problems	5	17.9	21	75.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	7	21.9	23	71.9
Difficulties in work place	4	14.3	4	14.3	1	25.0	0	0	5	15.6	4	12.5
Difficulties in halfway house	6	21.4	22	78.6	0	0	3	75.0	0	0	6	18.8
Health problems	22	78.6	5	17.9	3	75.0	1	25.0	25	78.1	6	18.8
Budget problems	1	3.6	1	3.6	1	25.0	0	0	2	6.3	1	3.1
Inadequate housekeeping	0	0	1	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.1
Poor community resource utilization	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assertion deficits	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Feeling like a failure	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Feeling empty	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Prostituting self	27	96.4	1	3.6	4	100.0	0	0	31	96.9	1	3.1
*Gang membership	23	82.1	4	14.3	2	50.0	2	50.0	25	78.1	6	18.8
*Convicted of terrorism offence	28	100.0	0	0	3	75.0	1	25.0	31	96.9	1	3.1
*Mental health diagnosis	19	67.9	8	28.6	4	100.0	0	0	23	71.9	8	25.0
*Multiple convictions	2	7.1	26	92.9	1	25.0	3	75.0	3	9.4	29	90.6
*Criminal versatility	14	50.0	14	50.0	1	25.0	3	75.0	15	46.9	17	53.1
*Suicidal ideations or attempt	3	10.7	5	17.9	0	0	0	0	3	9.4	5	15.6
*Rigid thinking / stubbornness	1	3.6	17	60.7	0	0	2	50.0	1	3.1	19	59.4
*Impulsive / lack of inhibition	7	25.0	20	71.4	3	75.0	1	25.0	10	31.3	21	65.6
*Entitled	0	0	1	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.1
*Lack of motivation	1	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.1	0	0
*Rejects responsibility of actions	22	78.6	4	14.3	4	100.0	0	0	26	81.3	4	12.5
	Violent				Non-Violent				Total			
Variable	Absent		Present		Absent		Present		Absent		Present	
<i>Institutional Problems</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>%</i>
Poor reading skills	7	25.0	3	10.7	0	0	0	0	7	21.9	3	9.4
Poor work skills	15	53.6	10	35.7	2	50.0	2	50.0	17	53.1	12	37.5
Limited general knowledge	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Limited sexual knowledge	1	3.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.1
Limited knowledge of community resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	00

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Poor conversational skills	22	78.6	2	7.1	4	100.0	0	0	26	81.3	2	6.3
Psychotic speech	22	78.6	4	14.3	4	100.0	0	0	26	81.3	2	6.3
Psychotic action	22	78.6	4	14.3	4	100.0	0	0	26	81.3	4	12.5
Inappropriate suspicion	20	71.4	5	17.9	3	75.0	1	25.0	23	71.9	6	18.8
Confusion	25	89.3	3	10.7	4	100.0	0	0	29	90.6	3	9.4
Assaultive	1	3.6	27	96.4	3	75.0	1	25.0	4	12.5	28	87.5
Threatening violence	3	10.7	25	89.3	3	75.0	1	25.0	6	18.8	26	81.3
Pro-criminal speech	21	75.0	7	25.0	0	0	4	100.0	21	65.6	11	34.4
Insulting, teasing	14	50.0	14	50.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	17	53.1	15	46.9
Social withdrawal	21	75.0	4	14.3	4	100.0	0	0	25	78.1	4	12.5
Assertive deficits	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Inappropriate dependence	27	96.4	1	3.6	4	100.0	0	0	31	96.9	1	3.1
Shyness	23	82.1	0	0	4	100.0	0	0	27	84.4	0	0
Lack of consideration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Impulsive / *lack of inhibition	8	28.6	20	71.4	3	75.0	1	25.0	11	34.4	21	65.6
Poor manners	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Irritable	17	60.7	5	17.9	3	75.0	1	25.0	20	62.5	6	18.8
Sexual harassment	16	57.1	12	42.9	4	100.0	0	0	20	62.5	12	37.5
Suggestible	24	85.7	0	0	4	100.0	0	0	28	87.5	3	9.4
Depression	23	82.1	5	17.9	4	100.0	0	0	27	84.4	5	15.6
Mania	28	100.0	0	0	4	100.0	0	0	32	100	0	0
Anxiety	25	89.3	3	10.7	3	75.0	1	25.0	28	87.5	4	12.5
Anger	10	35.7	18	64.3	3	75.0	1	25.0	13	40.6	19	59.4
Poor self-care	27	96.4	1	3.6	4	100.0	0	0	31	96.9	1	3.1
Poor room care	26	92.9	2	7.1	4	100.0	0	0	30	93.8	2	6.3
Medication noncompliance	11	39.3	5	17.9	0	0	0	0	11	34.4	5	15.6
Noncompliance with rules	4	14.3	24	85.7	0	0	4	100.0	4	12.5	28	87.5
Insolence	14	50.0	14	50.0	2	50.0	2	50.0	16	50	16	50
Manipulation	21	75.0	7	25.0	1	25.0	3	75.0	22	68.8	10	31.3
Property destruction	18	64.3	10	35.7	2	50.0	2	50.0	20	62.5	12	37.5
Stealing	26	92.9	1	3.6	4	100.0	0	0	30	93.8	1	3.1
Poor use of leisure time	17	60.7	8	28.6	3	75.0	1	25.0	20	62.5	9	28.1

PROFILE OF SHU INMATES

Inactivity	18	64.3	8	28.6	4	100.0	0	0	22	68.8	8	25.0
Physical self-abuse	18	64.3	10	35.7	4	100.0	0	0	22	68.8	10	31.3
Problems with staff	9	32.1	19	67.9	2	50.0	2	50.0	11	34.4	21	65.6
Aggressive with female staff	17	60.7	11	39.3	4	100.0	0	0	21	65.6	11	34.4
Gang membership	23	82.1	4	14.3	2	50.0	2	50.0	25	78.1	6	18.8
Violence toward other inmates	7	25.0	21	75.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	10	31.3	22	68.8
Previous admission to segregation (any)	0	0	28	100.0	0	0	4	100.0	0	0	32	100
Mental health diagnosis	16	57.1	12	42.9	4	100.0	0	0	20	62.5	12	37.5
High-profile flag	23	82.1	5	17.9	2	50.0	2	50.0	25	78.1	7	21.9
Suicidal ideation or attempt	21	75.0	7	25.0	4	100.0	0	0	25	78.1	7	21.9
Lack of understanding own criminality	20	71.4	8	28.6	3	75.0	1	25.0	23	71.9	9	28.1
Rigid thinking / stubbornness	2	7.1	25	89.3	1	25.0	3	75.0	3	9.4	28	87.5
Entitled	25	89.3	1	3.6	2	50.0	2	50.0	27	84.4	3	9.4
Disrespectful of staff	11	39.3	17	60.7	3	75.0	1	25.0	14	43.8	18	56.3
Disrespectful of other inmates	19	67.9	9	32.1	4	100.0	0	0	23	71.9	9	28.1
Lack of motivation	13	46.4	14	50.0	1	25.0	3	75.0	14	43.8	17	53.1
Inconsistent program participation	7	25.0	21	75.0	0	0	4	100.0	7	21.9	25	78.1
Rejects responsibility of actions	21	75.0	7	25.0	3	75.0	1	25.0	24	75.0	8	25.0