

106991



National Institute of Justice / *Research Abstracts*

The Courts: Current Federal Research

Court Procedures	1
Crime Specific	3
Juvenile Justice	4
Offenders	5
Prosecution	6
Sentencing	7
Trials	8
Victims	9

August 1987: The National Institute of Justice offers a central place to find Federal research about criminal justice—the Federal Criminal Justice Research Data Base. You can keep abreast of the latest projects by requesting a search of the data base, which contains close to 1,000 projects funded by Federal agencies.

A search of the data base, which costs \$20.00, provides a printout that describes the research design, lists the contact person, start and end dates, and expected products or documentation. The data base changes frequently as new projects are added.

This Research Abstract is a synopsis of projects related to the courts culled from the data base in mid-1987. For each topic, National Institute of Justice research is listed first, followed by that of other agencies; projects are arranged chronologically by their end date.

The information in this Abstract is subject to change due to the ongoing nature of the research and the continual updating of the data base.

Other Research Abstracts are available on the following topics: drugs and crime, corrections, and law enforcement.

For more information or to search the data base, contact Nancy Pearse at the National Institute of Justice NCJRS, 301-251-5101, or write to Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20850.

About the National Institute of Justice

The National Institute of Justice is a research branch of the U.S. Department of Justice. The Institute's mission is to develop knowledge about crime, its causes and control. Priority is given to policy-relevant research that can yield approaches and information that State and local agencies can use in preventing and reducing crime. The decisions made by criminal justice practitioners and policymakers affect millions of citizens, and crime affects almost all our public institutions and the private sector as well. Targeting resources, assuring their effective allocation, and developing new means of cooperation between the public and private sector are some of the emerging issues in law enforcement and criminal justice that research can help illuminate.

Carrying out the mandate assigned by Congress in the Justice Assistance Act of 1984, the National Institute of Justice:

- Sponsors research and development to improve and strengthen the criminal justice system and related civil justice aspects, with a balanced program of basic and applied research.
- Evaluates the effectiveness of justice improvement programs and identifies programs that promise to be successful if continued or repeated.
- Tests and demonstrates new and improved approaches to strengthen the justice system and recommends actions that can be taken by Federal, State, and local governments and private organizations and individuals to achieve this goal.
- Disseminates information from research, demonstrations, evaluations, and special programs to Federal, State, and local governments, and serves as an international clearinghouse of justice information.
- Trains criminal justice practitioners in research and evaluation findings, and assists practitioners and researchers through fellowships and special seminars.

Authority for administering the Institute and awarding grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements is vested in the NIJ Director. In establishing its research agenda, the Institute is guided by the priorities of the Attorney General and the needs of the criminal justice field. The Institute actively solicits the views of police, courts, and corrections practitioners as well as the private sector to identify the most critical problems and to plan research that can help resolve them.



James K. Stewart
Director

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

106991

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by

Public Domain/NIJ

U.S. Department of Justice

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Research on courts

Court Procedures

NIJ research

Appellate Court Adaptation to Workload Increases.
Thomas Marvell, Court Studies, Inc., Southern Bank Building, 306 South Henry Street, Williamsburg, VA 23185. 804-229-9772. Begin: May 1984. End: January 1986.

This project was a longitudinal study of the effects of procedural and managerial changes on appellate court productivity during the past 15 years. Findings suggested the most productive size for appellate courts, the best balance of manpower between judges and staff aides, and the effects of each major procedural change on case productivity.

Drug Use as a Predictor of Rearrests and/or Failure to Appear.

Eric Wish, Narcotic & Drug Research, Inc., 55 West 125th Street, New York, NY 10027. 212-870-8348. Begin: October 1983. End: December 1987.

This project measured the extent to which drug users on pretrial release differ from nonusers in incidence of rearrest and failure to appear for trial and to assess whether urinalysis test results can be used to improve identification of high-risk defendants.

National Baseline Information Estimating Offender Processing Cost.

Joan Jacoby, Jefferson Institute of Justice Studies, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, DC 20005. 202-737-6551. Begin: September 1983. End: March 1986.

Estimating the cost incurred by criminal justice agencies while processing offenders through the various stages of the system is the subject of this project. Cost estimates were fully loaded; i.e., including salaries, fringe benefits, and overhead.

Impact of Case Assignment on Criminal Court Productivity.

Randall Guynes, Institute of Economic & Policy Studies, 1013 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314. 703-549-7686. Begin: May 1984. End: March 1986.

Court decisions may be based on concerns about due process, court output, or the offender's diagnostic needs. Decisions that are based on concerns about court output are the least time consuming and most oriented toward producing dispositions. This research investigated the possibility of increasing the use of decisional adjudications in criminal cases.

Public Danger as a Criterion in Pretrial Release Decisions.

Mary Toborg Associates, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, DC 20006. 202-293-0888. Begin: March 1983. End: May 1986.

This project assessed the nature of State laws that permit the court to consider dangerousness in pretrial release decisions. It assessed the nature of these laws, their implementation, and impact.

Classification Systems for the Accused: An Empirical Analysis.

Mary Toborg, Mary Toborg Associates, Inc., 2000 K Street NW., Washington, DC 20006. 202-293-0888. Begin: May 1984. End: May 1986.

This project was designed to develop a statistical model for classifying arrestees with respect to their risk of committing new crimes and their risk of not appearing for trial.

Development and Validation of an Index of Criminal History.

Susan Welch, University of Nebraska, Political Science Department, Lincoln, NE 68588. 402-472-2341. Begin: September 1984. End: June 1986.

Criminal records affect most decisions concerning a case—pretrial release, bail, and sentencing. Yet there is no single index or measure of criminal record. This project identified measures of criminal records that most highly correlate with sentencing and bail-setting decisions.

Misdemeanor Probation: Managing the Change.

Malcolm MacDonald, Texas Adult Probation Commission, 8100 Cameron Road, Austin, TX 78753. 512-473-9467. Begin: October 1985. End: June 1986.

Beginning in 1987, Texas will pay only for felony probation. Misdemeanants make up the majority of probationers in Texas, therefore this project involved planning, analysis, and training for a significant transition.

Plea Bargaining and Proposition 8 Politics: The Impact of California's Ban on Felony Negotiation.

Jerome Skolnik, University of California, M-11 Wheeler Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720. 415-642-8111. Begin: January 1986. End: July 1986.

Effects of a "ban" on felony plea bargaining were described and evaluated. Changes in stability and organizational structure in San Diego and Alameda Counties were the focus of investigation.

Implementation of Delay Reduction Programs in Urban Trial Courts.

Barry Mahoney, National Center for State Courts, 300 Newport Avenue, Williamsburg, VA 23187. 303-534-3063. Begin: September 1984. End: May 1987.

This project involved analysis of case processing time. It concentrated on learning the current pace of litigation in the

courts, how case processing times have changed, and what causes fast and slow processing time. Case studies isolated the factors that contribute to successful court delay programs.

Budgetary Incentives and Reducing Delay in Criminal Courts.

Thomas Church and Milton Heumann, State University of New York, P.O. Box 9, Albany, NY 12201. 518-442-3300. Begin: December 1984. End: August 1987.

New York City allocated \$8.25 million over 3 years to its six district attorneys' offices to be distributed according to their success in reducing their backlog of cases and long-term jail cases. The analysis of this project was the impact the budgetary incentives had on individual and organizational behavior in the court system.

Use of Volunteer Lawyers to Supplement Judicial Resources.

Alexander Aikman, National Center for State Courts, Western Regional Office, 720 Sacramento Street, San Francisco, CA 94108. 415-557-1515. Begin: July 1983. End: March 1987.

Six experiments were conducted using volunteer lawyers in a variety of judicial capacities. Results suggest that such programs are successful and can contribute to an effective delay reduction program.

The Organizational Context of Case Processing.

Mary Lee Luskin, Indiana University Foundation, P.O. Box 1847, Bloomington, IN 47402. 812-335-5820. Begin: May 1986. End: March 1987.

Data on the organizational structures and policies of prosecutors' offices in Minnesota were collected and merged with existing data on case processing time, sentencing outcomes, case characteristics, and defendant characteristics. Results provided information about the effects of case- and court-level characteristics on case processing time and sentence severity.

The Use of Masters and Monitors in Jail Crowding Litigation.

Howard R. Messing, 300 Holiday Drive, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33316. 305-522-2300. Begin: January 1987. End: August 1987.

Masters and monitors are appointed by the courts as part of the resolution of jail crowding and jail conditions lawsuits. This project will examine the roles masters and monitors play and will produce a manual to assist those assigned to carry out this responsibility. It also will provide information to local jurisdictions to evaluate affirmative and workable options for dealing with local jail crowding and its attendant problems.

Assessing the Utility of Bail Guidelines.

John Goldkamp, Temple University, Broad Street & Montgomery Avenue, Philadelphia, PA 19122. 215-787-1378. Begin: September 1984. End: April 1988.

This project builds on prior successful bail guideline developments in Philadelphia. Three new sites (Boston, Phoenix, and Miami) have been selected where bail guidelines will be developed, implemented, and assessed.

An Evaluation of Mental Health Expert Assistance Provided to Indigent Criminal Defendants.

National Center for State Courts, 300 Newport Avenue, Williamsburg, VA 23185. 804-253-2000. Begin: November 1986. End: August 1988.

This study will compare and contrast practices and procedures for providing mental health expert assistance to indigent criminal defendants in three court systems. Courts selected for the study have cost-efficient and fully operational programs. Each site will be studied using forensic mental health screening and evaluation as the framework against which practices and procedures are compared.

Other research agencies

Pretrial Release: Improved Information for Decision-Making.

Bureau of Justice Statistics.
David Jones, Department of Crime Control and Public Safety, P.O. Box 27687, Raleigh, NC 27611. 919-733-5013. Begin: May 1985. End: April 1986.

To determine the effectiveness of an existing pretrial release system, this project quantitatively described the opportunity for pretrial release systems and the risks involved with pretrial release.

Feasibility Study for National Pretrial Data Base.

Bureau of Justice Statistics.
Alan Henry, Pretrial Services Resources Center, 918 F Street, NW., Washington, DC 20004. 202-638-3080. Begin: November 1983. End: May 1986.

This study determined the feasibility of collecting accurate, comprehensive data on persons awaiting trial. The data collected included actions taken by criminal justice agencies such as previous pretrial release decisions and actions taken by the accused such as rearrest or failure to appear.

The Negotiation Process in Ordinary Litigation.

National Science Foundation.
Herbert Kritzer, University of Wisconsin, 500 Lincoln Drive, Madison, WI 53706. 608-262-1234. Begin: May 1984. End: May 1986.

While more civil disputes are settled out of court than are eventually adjudicated, little is known about the actual process by which settlement is reached. This research examined the bargaining and negotiation process and identified types of negotiation practices.

U.S. Supreme Court Judicial Data Base.

National Science Foundation.
Herold Spaeth, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48823. 517-355-1855. Begin: June 1984. End: December 1986.

The data base contains comprehensive information on the cases that came before the court from 1953 to the present including information on judges' votes, decisions and opinions, lower court rulings, and a range of other variables.

Prosecution of Felony Arrests. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Barbara Boland, Abt Associates, Inc., 4250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, DC 20008. 202-362-2800. Begin: March 1986. End: May 1987.

Because methods for counting cases and measuring case processing vary, comparison across jurisdictions is difficult. This project analyzed data from PROMIS and other sources to create data tables that are consistent across jurisdictions.

Experimental Study of Effectiveness and Perceived Fairness of Court-Annexed Arbitration. National Science Foundation.

E. Allen Lind, Rand Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90406. 213-393-0411. Begin: July 1985. End: July 1988.

An experimental program in North Carolina is randomly assigning cases to a control group that receives traditional pretrial treatment and an experimental group that involves an arbitration program. The research promises to contribute to an understanding of perceptions of justice, the nature and impact of dispute resolution mechanisms, and the efficiency of the actual litigation process.

Federal Statistics Project. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Joan Mullen, Abt Associates, Inc., 55 Wheeler Street, Cambridge, MA 02138. 617-492-7100. Begin: August 1985. End: August 1988.

This project extends and expands the activities relating to the development and analysis of a comprehensive Federal criminal justice data base. The data base, the first systemwide resource for research, traces Federal processing from investigation through prosecution, adjudication, and corrections.

Crime Specific

NIJ research

Governor's Project for Legislative Reform of Organized Crime and Narcotic Laws.

Penny Wakefield, National Criminal Justice Association, 444 North Capitol Street, NW., Washington, DC 20001. 202-347-4900. Begin: February 1984. End: February 1986.

This project continued previous work to analyze the magnitude of disparity among the 50 States concerning organized crime drug-enforcement laws, and to develop an objective, neutral "State Officials' Guide for Legislative Reform of Organized Crime and Narcotic Laws."

Pretrial Diversion Program for Incest Offenders: Guidelines.

Arnold Binder, University of California, Irvine, CA 92717. 714-856-5481. Begin: October 1984. End: March 1986.

This project was designed to develop an effective screening procedure of intrafamily sexual abuse offenders based on likely recidivism and amenability to treatment. The project evaluated programs in Orange and Sacramento Counties in California.

Plea Bargaining and Proposition 8 Politics: The Impact of California's "Ban" on Felony Negotiations.

Jerome Skolnik, University of California, M-11 Wheeler Hall, Berkeley, CA 94720. 415-642-8111. Begin: January 1986. End: July 1986.

Proposition 8 banned plea bargaining in felony cases. Effects of the reform on the felony prosecution process and sentencing outcome are being examined in San Diego and Alameda Counties. Statewide trends are included to amplify county findings.

Using Offense-Related Variables to Identify Career Criminals.

Alfred Blumstein, Carnegie-Mellon University, 5000 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, PA 15213. 412-578-2175. Begin: September 1982. End: December 1986.

Attempts to identify career criminals prospectively from self-reports face ethical and empirical problems. To avoid those problems, this project explored the feasibility of developing a less controversial approach to identifying career criminals using official arrest histories. The approach relies on empirical estimates of criminal career parameters, and the variation of the parameters.

The Impact of Rape Reform Legislation.

Julie Horney, University of Nebraska, Lincoln, NE 68588. 402-472-3677. Begin: October 1985. End: September 1987.

This project will assess the impact of various types of rape reform legislation on arrest, charging, conviction, and sentencing, as well as on victim reporting and victim treatment by the system. Data from 1970 to 1984 will be collected in five sites.

The Indianapolis Domestic Violence Prosecution Experiment.

David A. Ford, Indiana University Foundation, 355 Lansing Street, Indianapolis, IN 46202. 317-264-2449. Begin: January 1986. End: January 1988.

Following a case assignment procedure that gives victims the authority to drop charges, one group of defendants will be prosecuted and a comparable group will be diverted to rehabilitative counseling programs in lieu of prosecution. The resulting deterrent effect on repeat violence by the offender will be examined.

Child Abuse Prosecution and Investigation Study.

Kenneth R. Freeman, Los Angeles District Attorney's Office, 210 W. Temple Street, Room 18000, Los Angeles, CA 90012. 213-974-3725. Begin: April 1987. End: May 1988.

Standard prosecution methods may break down when the victim is a young child. This study is designed to find more effective ways to prevent victims of child sexual abuse from being revictimized by the criminal justice system and to improve the conviction rate for guilty offenders.

Evaluation of Administrative Per Se Laws.

Kathryn Stewart, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, 1777 N. California Blvd., Walnut Creek, CA 94596. 415-939-6666. Begin: January 1987. End: March 1988.

Administrative per se laws, which allow courts to revoke a drunk driver's license, impose a serious penalty without the necessity of judicial processing. This study will be on the specific deterrence effects of administrative per se laws. The evaluation will compare recidivism rates of 1,000 drunk driving offenders in each of four States for a 3-year period before and after the implementation of the law.

Urine Testing of Offenders: A Manual for Practitioners.

Narcotic and Drug Research, Inc., 55 West 125th Street, New York, NY 10027. 212-870-8348. Begin: November 1986. End: May 1988.

Previous research has indicated that urine testing is a reliable means of identifying drug use among arrestees and that periodic drug testing of pretrial releasees is effective in reducing their rearrest rates. This project will produce a manual to guide practitioners in establishing urine testing programs that are technically competent, meet reliability standards, and are legal. In addition, data for a drug/use forecasting program will be collected in geographically diverse cities to track drug use over time.

Other research agencies

Modeling the Effects of DWI Policy Changes on the Criminal Justice System.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. David Edwards and Tom Epperlein, Arizona Department of Public Safety, P.O. Box 6638, Phoenix, AZ 85005. 602-262-8082. Begin: July 1985. End: June 1986.

In DWI cases, what effect does banning plea bargaining and imposing mandatory sentencing have on the criminal justice system? This study examined the systemwide effect from arrest through release.

The Impact of Rape Reform Legislation.

National Science Foundation. Julie Horney and Cassica Spohn, University of Nebraska, Omaha, NE 68101. 402-472-3677. Begin: July 1985. End: January 1988.

The impact and implementation of change is influenced by complex interactions between formal law, informal norms, and routinized expectations of behavior. The researchers are studying change in rape reform legislation in six cities over a 14-year period (1970-1984).

National Center for the Prosecution of Child Abuse.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Benjamin Shapiro, American Prosecutors Research Institute, 1033 North Fairfax Street, Alexandria, VA 22314. 202-724-8491. Begin: November 1985. End: October 1988.

The National Center is a program to improve the local prosecution of child physical and sexual abuse cases. It provides technical assistance, training, and clearinghouse activities.

Juvenile Justice

Other research agencies

Program of Executive Sessions for Examining the Juvenile Justice System.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Mark Moore and George Kelling, Harvard College, JFK School of Government, Cambridge, MA 02138. 617-495-1113. Begin: December 1984. End: February 1986.

This project created a forum for Federal, State, and local public and private experts. These individuals convened to discuss current policies and policy revisions concerning juvenile crime. The resulting papers and publications formed the basis for continuing critical discussions about issues facing the juvenile justice system.

Prosecutor Training in Juvenile Justice.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Cliff Roberson and Michael McGown, National College of District Attorneys, University of Houston Law Center, Houston, TX 77004. 202-724-5940. Begin: June 1982. End: March 1986.

Prosecutors in juvenile courts face special challenges. This project developed a training curriculum for the National College of District Attorneys. The training addressed the following issues: the role of the prosecutor, the defense attorney, priority prosecution, evidence, and confidentiality.

Juvenile Court Judges Training Project.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Louis W. McHardy, National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, P.O. Box 8978, Reno, NV 89507. 702-784-6012. Begin: April 1979. End: April 1986.

The instruction developed in this project emphasizes deinstitutionalization and due process, explores the alternative of restitution, and urges that children not serve in the same facility as adults.

Juvenile Justice Records and Record Systems.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. Tom Wilson, SEARCH Group, Inc., 925 Secret River Drive, Sacramento, CA 95831. 916-392-2250. Begin: September 1985. End: September 1986.

This project reviewed and documented characteristics of existing juvenile justice records and recordkeeping systems. The results describe the contents, accuracy, and organization of juvenile records and identified the systems' responsibility for maintaining and disclosing such records.

Juveniles Waived to Maryland's Criminal Justice System.

Bureau of Justice Statistics. Charles Wellford, University of Maryland, South Administration Building, College Park, MD 20742. 301-454-4538. Begin: August 1985. End: August 1986.

In response to a legislative directive to study the need for a maximum security facility to house violent juvenile offenders, this project developed a profile of juveniles waived to adult court between 1982 and 1983.

The Impact of Juvenile Court Interventions on Delinquent Careers. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Barry Krisberg, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, 77 Maiden, San Francisco, CA 94108. 415-956-5651. Begin: August 1982. End: October 1986.

This was a continuation of a study to rigorously assess the impact of various levels of court intervention on delinquent behavior, attitudes, and juvenile justice costs.

Juvenile Justice Reform. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Ralph Rossum, Claremont McKenna College, Rose Institute for State and Local Government, Claremont, CA 91711. 714-621-8000. Begin: November 1984. End: October 1986.

This project developed a model code to guide States in dealing with crimes committed by juveniles. The project conducted a national conference, 3 regional conferences, and 10 intensive liaison-training sessions. A guidebook and training materials for legislators and policymakers were developed.

Evaluate Serious Habitual Offender/Drug Involved (SHO-DI) Juveniles. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Terry W. Koepsell, Koepsell Associates, P.O. Box 212, Great Falls, VA 22066. 703-759-4147. Begin: September 1983. End: September 1987.

This project evaluates the SHO-DI program, which is designed to increase the effectiveness of police, juvenile probation-intake, prosecutors, judges, and corrections (or aftercare) agencies to deal with and suppress juvenile criminal activity and drug use. SHO-DI focuses especially on juveniles who are serious, repeat, habitual offenders.

Offenders

NIJ research

Constancy and Change in the Criminal Career.

Kimberly Kempf, University of Pennsylvania, 3451 Walnut Street, Franklin Building, Philadelphia, PA 19014. 215-898-7111. Begin: September 1984. End: February 1986.

This study examined the continuity of criminal careers and determined whether consistent or varying patterns of criminal behavior exist during the progression from youth through adolescence to adulthood.

A Study of the Evolution of Criminal Careers.

Carol Jesness, California Youth Authority, 4241 Williamsborough Drive, Sacramento, CA 95823. 916-445-9626. Begin: October 1983. End: February 1986.

Using Rand's work on selective incapacitation, the California Youth Authority examined criminal careers. The study described changes in criminal careers, estimated the predictability of future criminal behavior, and evaluated how selective incapacitation can be used in setting sentencing policy.

National Baseline Information Estimating Offender Processing Cost.

Joan Jacoby, Jefferson Institute of Justice Studies, 1411 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005. 202-887-0170. Begin: September 1983. End: March 1986.

This project estimated the cost criminal justice agencies incur while processing offenders through the stages of prosecution—from investigation through imprisonment and parole. The model can be used to advise decisionmakers of the cost implications of policy and procedural changes.

Selection Criteria for Career Criminal Prosecution.

Marcia Chaiken, Brandeis University, National Institute for Sentencing Alternatives, Waltham, MA 02254. 617-736-2000. Begin: July 1984. End: September 1986.

Prosecutorial efficiency would be significantly enhanced if prosecutors focused on career criminals. This project evaluated different kinds of criteria for identifying these offenders. The criteria were derived from a legislative directive, from the prosecutor's definition, or from research.

Developmental Factors Associated with Sexual Dangerousness.

Robert Prentky, Brandeis University, 415 South Street, Waltham, MA 02254. 617-697-8161. Begin: September 1985. End: August 1987.

Rapists and child molesters will participate in a self-administered interview that will be combined with archival data (psychiatrists' reports, criminal history data) to construct a life-path typology of sexual dangerousness. The project will compare predicted recidivism with actual recidivism.

Strategies to Incapacitate Narcotics Wholesalers.

Police Executive Research Forum, 2300 M Street NW., Washington, DC 20037. 202-466-7820. Begin: December 1986. End: March 1988.

This project will address the gap in drug enforcement emphasis that now occurs between the Federal strike force—which targets high-level narcotics manufacturers and importers—and local street sellers. The study will focus on strategies to incapacitate middle-level cocaine and heroin wholesalers and will highlight particular vulnerabilities inherent in wholesaling operations. In addition to a report, the project will produce a manual of recommended strategies for drug unit investigators and police administrators.

Other research agencies

Subtyping of Sexual Offenders. National Institute of Mental Health.

Raymond Knight, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA 02254. 617-647-2479. Begin: May 1980. End: March 1987.

This project developed a rich data base to increase knowledge of subtyping and prognosis of sexually dangerous persons. The study used 1,300 clinical files of male sexual offenders who were judged as possibly dangerous and admitted to treatment over the past 20 years.

Prosecution

NIJ research

Public Danger as a Criterion in Pretrial Release Decisions.

Mary Toborg, Toborg Associates, Inc., 1725 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20006. 202-293-0888. Begin: March 1983. End: May 1986.

This project assessed State laws that permit the court to consider dangerousness in pretrial release decisions. It assessed the nature of these laws, their implementation, and impact.

Illicit Money Laundering Activities: Strategies to Combat Them.

Clifford Karchmer, Battelle Memorial Institute, 4000 NE 41st Street, Seattle, WA 98105. 206-525-3130. Begin: May 1984. End: July 1986.

In recent years, organized crime and narcotics traffickers have increasingly used money laundering techniques to protect their illegal profits. This project developed a manual that transmits to State and local officials the techniques Federal investigators have learned about money laundering, its detection, prosecution, and sanctioning.

Improving Evidence Gathering Through Police-Prosecutor Coordination.

Tony Lukin, Office of Snohomish County Prosecutor, 3000 Rockefeller, Everett, WA 98201. 206-259-9333; Edward Conners, Research Management Associates, Inc., 911 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314. 703-836-6777; James Garofalo, Research Foundation of SUNY, Hindelang Criminal Justice Research Center, P.O. Box 9, Albany, NY 12201. 518-442-5213. Begin: January 1985. End: December 1986.

These three projects are based on previous NIJ findings. Each of the projects will develop strategies to enhance the quality of arrests and conviction rates. Sites include Snohomish County (Everett), Washington; Garden Grove, California; Indianapolis, Indiana; Newport News, Virginia; and selected New York counties.

The Reliability of Hypnotically Induced Testimony in the Criminal Justice System.

Martin Orne, Institute for Experimental Psychiatry, 290 Sycamore Avenue, Marion Station, PA 19066. 215-472-1055. Begin: January 1982. End: January 1987.

Hypnosis has been found to be a useful investigative tool although the accuracy of recall for witnesses remains problematic.

Convicting Guilty Criminals: Experiment in Police-Prosecutor Relations.

Susan Martin, Police Foundation, 1001 22nd Street NW., Washington, DC 20037. 202-833-1460. Begin: January 1985. End: March 1987.

This project developed, implemented, and evaluated a low-cost strategy for reducing felony case attrition. The

project tested the impact of investigative checklists, supervisory reviews, and weekly feedback on felony case dispositions for individual patrol officers and their supervisors in Baltimore County, Maryland.

Improving Evidence Gathering Through a Computer-Assisted Case Intake Program.

William McDonald, Georgetown University, 37th and O Streets, NW., Washington, DC 20057. 202-624-8220. Begin: November 1984. End: June 1987.

A computer-assisted case intake procedure was developed for burglary, the most common felony committed in Nashville, Tennessee. The procedure simulates prosecutors' questions and the procedures they follow. The aim is to improve the accuracy and case charging decisions and case outcomes.

Reducing Avoidable Felony Case Attrition.

Joan Petersilia, Rand Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90406. 213-393-0411. Begin: November 1984. End: June 1987.

Many cases presented to the prosecuting attorney are dismissed for legitimate reasons, but many others are dropped needlessly. This research examined ways to reduce avoidable felony case attrition by improving police-prosecutor relations.

Enhancing Police and Prosecutors' Ability to Successfully Apply Asset Seizure and Forfeiture Laws and Procedures.

National Criminal Justice Association, 444 North Capitol Street NW., Washington, DC 20001. 202-374-4900. Begin: December 1986. End: October 1987.

This project will modify and enhance a previously developed curriculum on drug trafficking asset seizure and forfeiture procedures for police, prosecutors, police management, and line personnel. The project will produce an instruction manual and a presentation of the program based on the model curriculum.

Child Abuse Prosecution and Investigation Study.

Los Angeles District Attorney, Room 18000, 210 W. Temple Street, Los Angeles, CA 90012. 213-974-3725. Begin: November 1986. End: October 1987.

The criminal justice system may inadvertently revictimize child victims because the standard ways of dealing with children frequently break down when the child is marginally competent because of age, physical disability, or mental infirmity. This study is investigating ways of more effectively preventing victims of child sexual abuse from being revictimized by the system. The various types of child abuse cases, the manner in which they enter the system, and techniques for dealing with them are being examined. The research will produce a handbook for prosecutors and police to use as a legal reference and "how to."

Other research agencies

Longitudinal Study of Personal Injury Litigation. National Science Foundation.

Lawrence Friedman, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA 94305. 415-723-2465. Begin: July 1983. End: January 1986.

Using data from 1880 to 1980, this project evaluated personal injury litigation from Alameda County, California, as well as supplementary information on population growth, industrial and economic development, legal change, and related community indicators.

Leviticus Project Association. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Andy Hantwerker, Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services, 805 East Broad Street, Richmond, VA 23219. 804-323-3560. Begin: January 1985. End: March 1986.

This grant continued the work of the Leviticus Project to identify, investigate, and prosecute criminal conspirators engaged in crimes associated with the coal mining industry in Appalachia.

Prosecutor Training in Juvenile Justice. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Susan Martin, Police Foundation, 1001 22nd Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037. 202-833-1460. Begin: January 1985. End: October 1986.

Prosecutors in juvenile courts face special challenges. This project developed a training curriculum for the National College of District Attorneys. The training addressed the following issues: the role of the prosecutor, the defense attorney, priority prosecution, evidence, and confidentiality.

An Investigation of the Relationship Between Criminal Justice Policies and Outcome. Bureau of Justice Statistics. Stephen Klein, Rand Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90406. 213-393-0411. Begin: July 1985. End date: September 1986.

This project developed a data base to answer such questions as: What is the effect of determinate sentencing on sentence differentials? What are the major factors that lead to case filings? How does jail and prison overcrowding affect sentencing decisions? What impact do organizational and structural differences have on case outcomes?

Factors Influencing Eyewitness Identification and the Construction of Unbiased Lineups. National Science Foundation.

John Brigham, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306. 904-644-2525. Begin: May 1985. End: November 1986.

This project involved six studies on issues relevant to eyewitness testimony. The first two studies examined the length of time between witnessing an event and attempting an identification. The remaining four investigated the effect of race, training, and level of experience on the construction of fair lineups and measures of lineup fairness.

Deception, Lie Detection, and the Dynamics of Legal Decisionmaking. National Science Foundation.

Benjamin Kleinmuntz, University of Illinois, Chicago, IL 60680. 312-996-7000. Begin: June 1984. End: December 1986.

The legal system depends on its ability to judge witness credibility. In an effort to reveal deception, the legal system turns to polygraphic examinations. This research investigated the polygraph experts' decisionmaking process—how polygraph experts assess evidence and make decisions about the results of the polygraph.

The Influence of Economic Conditions and Mediating Institutions on Crime and Criminal Justice. National Science Foundation.

Richard McGahey, New York University, Washington Square, New York, NY 10003. 212-598-1212. Begin: July 1985. End: January 1987.

This project examined not only the impact of economic conditions and economic change on the level of crime, but also the influence of mediating institutions such as families, schools, and neighborhoods. Using rigorous quantitative tests of alternative models, the project illuminated how mediating factors may account for the influence of the economy on crime and reciprocally how changes in criminal justice processes influence crime, social change, and the economy.

Development of a Diagnostic Polygraph Test and Evaluation of Blood Pressure Recording Methods for Polygraph Examination. Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Forensic Science Research Supervisor, FBI Academy, Quantico, VA 22135. 703-640-3308. Begin: February 1984. End: Ongoing.

This experimental research is developing a polygraph technique to give polygraph examiners the ability to distinguish among different roles that a subject may have taken in a crime (e.g., perpetrator, accomplice, witness, innocent).

Explosive Overpressure Measurements. Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Forensic Science Research Supervisor, FBI Academy, Quantico, VA 22135. 703-640-3308. Begin: Unknown. End: Ongoing.

Courts are increasingly requiring forensic explosives experts to base opinions concerning the destructive capability of improvised explosive devices on actual laboratory experiments. This project seeks to implement a means of measuring blast overpressures to give an objective basis for comparing explosives.

Sentencing

NIJ research

An Analysis of Who Receives Probation.

Joan Petersilia, Rand Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90406. 213-393-0411. Begin: October 1982. End: February 1986.

This research provided an analysis of who receives felony probation, who succeeds on it, and the impacts of alternative sentencing options.

Development and Testing of Selective Incapacitation Policies.

Peter Greenwood, Rand Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, CA 90406. 213-393-0411. Begin: September 1983. End: February 1986.

Prison and jail overcrowding have generated research to predict the amount of crime that could be avoided by using selective sentencing or release. This project extends previous research using official records data from the California Youth Authority for two cohorts over a 10-year period.

A Comparison of Sentences for Sex Offenders.

Jane Chapman, American Bar Association, Criminal Justice Section, 750 North Lakeshore Drive, Chicago, IL 60611. 202-331-2260. Begin: October 1984. End: March 1986.

Many child advocates criticize the courts for being too lenient in sexual abuse cases, but virtually no data are available on actual sentencing practices. This project compared criminal sanctions in each State for sexual offenses against both children and adults.

Effectiveness of Client-Specific Planning as Client Advocacy and Alternative Sentencing.

William Clements, University of Delaware, Sociology Department, Newark, NJ 19716. 302-451-6636. Begin: October 1985. End: June 1986.

This project was designed to aid policymakers, correctional administrators, and practitioners interested in seeking alternatives to incarceration. It assessed the viability and effectiveness of the National Center on Institutions and Alternatives Specific Planning Project to determine if the program reduces recidivism more effectively than incarceration and traditional probation.

Crime Control Effects of Sentencing Reform.

Colin Loftin, University of Maryland, South Administration Building, College Park, MD 20742. 301-454-5129. Begin: July 1984. End: September 1986.

In the past decade, 39 States have inaugurated sentencing reforms. This project developed estimates of the crime that is prevented due to alternative sentencing policies.

Evaluation of the Minnesota Determinate Sentencing System.

Terance Miethe, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Department of Sociology, Blacksburg, VA 24061. 703-961-6878. Begin: August 1985. End: December 1986.

This evaluation of the 1980 Minnesota Determinate Sentencing Guidelines assessed trends in case processing and changes in sentencing practices. Preliminary findings indicate a significant reduction in sentencing disparities without additional strain on correctional resources.

The Effects of Sentences on Subsequent Criminal Behavior.

Jack McCarthy, Administrative Office of the Courts, Office of Courts, Trenton, NJ 08625. 609-292-9580. Begin: January 1985. End: February 1987.

Focusing on robbery, burglary, and drug offenses, this project tracked offenders from 1977 to the time they committed

subsequent offenses. The effects of various sentences on subsequent recidivism were evaluated.

Trials

NIJ research

Juror's Death Penalty Beliefs and Conviction Proneness.

James Luginbuhl, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC 27695. 919-737-2254. Begin: September 1984. End: August 1986.

Jurors who strongly oppose the death penalty are typically not permitted to serve on juries of capital offenses. This project examined whether juries that are selected in capital trials are more likely to convict the defendant than are juries in noncapital trials.

Scientific Evidence in the Courtroom: Overcoming Jurors' Inferential Problems.

Ronald Mizokawa, University of Washington, 22 Administration Building, Seattle, WA 98195. 206-543-2100. Begin: October 1985. End: September 1986.

What influence does the mode of delivery have on jurors who are presented with probable evidence? This study evaluated the effects on the factual inferences jurors draw in criminal and civil courts.

Reducing Trial Time.

Dale Sipes, National Center for State Courts, 300 Newport Avenue, Williamsburg, VA 23187. 804-253-2000. Begin: November 1985. End: November 1987.

This project examines in detail the length of criminal and civil trials in different States, the time consumed by the various components of trials, and the factors that account for the wide variations that are found. The project is designed to identify practices and procedures that appear to reduce trial length without impairing fairness.

Other research agencies

Statistical Assessments as Evidence in the Courts. National Science Foundation.

David Goshin, National Academy of Sciences, 2101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20418. 202-334-2000. Begin: July 1985. End: January 1986.

This project stimulated thinking about and research on ways in which the burgeoning use of statistics in litigation affects the justice system and court processes. The project considered how courts handle and adapt to statistical evidence and developed an agenda of further research.

The Effects of Evidence on Inferential Processes of Juror and Juries. National Science Foundation.

Sarah Tanford, Purdue University, Lafayette, IN 47907. 317-494-4600. Begin: July 1984. End: January 1986.

This study advanced our understanding of the dynamics of legal decisionmaking. It used highly realistic videotape to identify the inferences that explain how jurors assess evidence and make legal judgments that are based on various procedures—such as the judge's instruction to the jury.

The Bilingual Courtroom: The Impact of the Court Interpreter on Juror's Perceptions of Witnesses and Attorneys. National Science Foundation. Susan Berk-Seligson, State University of New York, Stony Brook, NY 11790. 516-246-5000. Begin: July 1985. End: January 1987.

Jury decisionmaking is affected by a variety of factors. This research evaluated the impact of court interpreters on juror's and attorney's perceptions of witnesses.

The Effects of Pretrial Publicity on Jury Behavior and Decisions. National Science Foundation. Nibert Kerr, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48823. 517-355-1855. Begin: May 1985. End: October 1987.

The tensions between the First Amendment right of a free press and the Sixth Amendment right to a speedy and impartial jury is the subject of this project. A major phase is a laboratory experiment that systematically varies the nature of the pretrial publicity, the timing between exposure to pretrial information and the actual trial, the type of voir dire questioning, as well as the strength of judicial admonitions.

Victims

NiJ research

Victim Appearance at Sentence and Parole Hearings in California. Edwin Villmoare, McGeorge School of Law, 3200 Fifth Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95817. 916-739-7129. Begin: November 1983. End: January 1986.

California's Proposition 8 gave victims the right to appear and be heard at sentencing proceedings and at parole eligibility hearings, but victim appearances seem to have had little effect on sentencing. The possible impact is severely limited by the high percentage of cases plea bargained, the determinate sentencing laws, and the strong indication that victims are not aware of the right to appear.

Study of Robbery Murder and Robbery Serious Victim Injury. Philip Cook, Duke University, 4875 Duke Station, Durham, NC 27706. 919-684-2323. Begin: March 1983. End: June 1986.

A major aim of this project was to seek means for reducing serious injuries and deaths in robberies. The research was designed to enhance prosecutorial and sentencing strategies targeted against violent career criminals.

Effects of Criminal Court Testimony on Child Sexual Assault Victims. Gail Goodman, University of Denver, Psychology Department, Denver, CO 80208. 303-871-3717. Begin: September 1985. End: August 1987.

Despite the current focus on child sexual abuse, little scientific data exist concerning the effects of criminal involvement on children. This project measures the effects of court testimony and related experiences on children and distinguishes children who are likely to be retraumatized by court involvement. The study also identifies the types of cases that go to trial, children's feelings about court involvement, and their reactions to testifying.

The Impact of the Courts on the Sexually Abused Child. Desmond Runyan, University of North Carolina, 300 Bynum Hall-008A, Chapel Hill, NC 27514. 919-962-1136. Begin: October 1985. End: September 1987.

This project will follow a group of 100 sexually abused children for 18 months after the initial sexual abuse is reported. Comparisons will be made between children whose cases receive criminal court attention and those that do not; children who do and do not testify; children whose perpetrator was or was not incarcerated; and children who are placed in foster care and those who remain at home.

Authorization-Implementation of Victim Impact Statements.

Maureen McLeod, State University of New York, Hindelang Criminal Justice Research Center, P.O. Box 9, Albany, NY 12201. 518-442-3300. Begin: January 1986. End: September 1987.

Victim impact statements are oral or written descriptions of the effects of the crime on the victim. This project examines the rationale for and implementation of victim impact statements. Statutes, case law, and administrative rules are being reviewed, and probation administrators, prosecutorial personnel, and parole board administrators are being surveyed to elicit information on local practice.

Other research agencies

Crime Victim's Model Legislation Office of Victims of Crime. Dan Eddy, National Association of Attorneys General, 444 North Capitol Street, Washington, DC 20001. 202-628-0435. Begin: June 1984. End: August 1986.

This project continued collection of model legislation drafted in response to specific recommendations of the President's Task Force on Victims of Crime. Model statutes were brought before State legislatures for consideration. States likely to pass new legislation are receiving intensive assistance.

The Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs, coordinates the criminal and juvenile justice activities of the following program Offices and Bureaus: National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and Office for Victims of Crime.

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

Washington, D.C. 20531

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300

BULK RATE
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOJ/NIJ
Permit No. G-91