

134724

**U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice**

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/OIP/BJS

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.

134724

Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report

NCJRS

JAN 25 1993

ACQUISITIONS

Drug Enforcement and Treatment in Prisons, 1990

By Caroline Wolf Harlow, Ph.D.
BJS Statistician

About 7 of every 8 prisons in the Nation tested an estimated total of 565,500 inmates for one or more illegal drugs between July 1, 1989, and June 30, 1990. In State facilities, 3.6% of the tests for cocaine, 1.3% for heroin, 2.0% for methamphetamines, and 6.3% for marijuana found evidence of drug use. In Federal prisons, 0.4% of the tests for cocaine, 0.4% for heroin, 0.1% for methamphetamines, and 1.1% for marijuana were positive.

This report uses information provided to the Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities. Data were collected from 957 State prison facilities, 250 State community-based facilities, and 80 Federal prisons operating on June 29, 1990. Censuses were also conducted in 1984, 1979, and 1974, but the 1990 census was the first to gather information on drug interdiction practices, drug testing of inmates and staff, and inmate drug treatment programs.

Other findings from the 1990 census include the following:

- Ninety-eight percent of State community-based facilities — those in which at least half of the residents may leave the facility daily — tested residents. All Federal prisons and 83% of State prisons reported that they tested inmates for drug use.
- Seventy-six percent of institutions reported testing inmates for drugs when drug use was suspected. Twenty percent tested all inmates at least once during confinement.

July 1992

This study examines how State and Federal correctional facilities seek to stop the entry and use of illegal drugs. Based on the 1990 Census of State and Federal Correctional Facilities, the report indicates that nearly 9 in 10 institutions conduct urine surveillance among the inmate population, usually on a random basis or on suspicion of use. Marijuana and cocaine were the drugs most commonly detected — in Federal facilities about 1 in 100 of the tests for marijuana and 1 in 250 tests for cocaine were positive while in State facilities about 1 in 16 tests were positive for marijuana and 1 in 28 were positive for cocaine.

I want to express my deep appreciation to the employees in the 957 State prisons, 80 Federal prisons, and the 250 community-based facilities who participated in the census. The 100-percent response rate is, I believe, important testimony to the utility and significance of national data on the operations of our Nation's correctional facilities.

Steven D. Dillingham, Ph.D.
Director

- At State confinement facilities 1.4% of tests for cocaine, 1.0% for heroin, 2.3% for methamphetamines, and 5.8% for marijuana indicated drug use.
- At State community-based facilities 8.9% of tests for cocaine confirmed the presence of the drug, as did 2.2% for heroin, 1.1% for methamphetamines, and 8.1% for marijuana.

- State confinement facilities that only tested inmates suspected of drug use had higher positive rates than facilities that tested all or random groups of inmates (6% for cocaine and 14% for marijuana versus 1.5% for cocaine and 5% for marijuana).

- State and Federal facilities used a variety of methods to prevent drugs from being brought into the institution, including questioning, patdowns, clothing exchanges, and body cavity searches.

- At admission inmates were required to exchange clothing in 88% of the Federal prisons and 59% of State prisons; inmates were patted down in 88% of Federal prisons and 78% of the State prisons.

- In the facilities using the most intrusive interdiction technique, body cavity searches, positive drug test results among inmates tested were lower than in facilities using other methods of interdiction.

- Questioning and search of belongings were widely used for visitors to both Federal and State facilities.

- Federal confinement facilities reported that they could provide drug treatment for an estimated 7,800 inmates; State confinement facilities, for 114,000; and State community-based facilities, for 9,400.

- Federal facilities were using an estimated 62% of total drug treatment capacity on June 29, 1990; State confinement facilities, 78%; and community-based facilities, 66%.

Introduction

The Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities, conducted periodically by the Bureau of the Census on behalf of the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS), included a new series of questions in 1990. (See *Methodology* on page 12 for further information about the census and the questionnaire.) This addendum — designed with the assistance of the National Institute on Drug Abuse and the Office of National Drug Control Policy — asked how facilities interdict drugs and paraphernalia among inmates, visitors, and staff and who was chosen for each method of interdiction.

In addition, the addendum gathered information on drug testing policies, practices, and outcomes. The questionnaire asked facilities to estimate the number of inmates in need of drug treatment programs and the capacity of currently available programs.

Interdiction activities

Most prison facilities patted down inmates and required them to exchange clothes upon admission or any reentry

Prison facilities perform many activities to prevent drugs and other contraband from entering. Correctional authorities commonly question inmates, pat them down, require changing into prison-furnished clothes, and search body cavities. Eighty-eight percent of Federal facilities reported that they patted down new admissions and required them to replace their clothes (table 1). Seventy-eight percent of State confinement facilities and 71% of community-based facilities patted down newly admitted inmates.¹ Fifty-nine percent of State confinement facilities and 26% of community-based facilities required

¹Community-based facilities are those in which half or more of the residents are permitted to leave unaccompanied by staff for work or study. Because inmates regularly leave community-based facilities, drug-related problems in these facilities are different from those in secured facilities.

them to substitute prison clothes. At least three-quarters of both State and Federal facilities questioned new admissions about drugs.

Table 1. Drug interdiction activities for prison inmates/residents, by type of facility, June 1990

Interdiction activity and group targeted	Federal confinement	State	
		Confinement	Community-based
Inmates at admission			
Verbal questioning	83.8%	74.9%	79.2%
Patdown	87.5	77.7	71.2
Clothing exchange	87.5	59.0	26.0
Body cavity search	61.3	45.1	14.4
Other	30.0	25.8	36.4
Inmates returning from temporary release			
Verbal questioning	72.5	66.5	68.0
Patdown	81.3	79.7	81.6
Clothing exchange	72.5	54.5	29.2
Body cavity search	63.8	47.6	20.4
Other	35.0	30.9	36.8
Number of facilities	80	957	250

Note: "Other" includes such measures as visual search, drug testing, and strip search that examines clothing and body surfaces.

B. Indicate the types of interdiction activities for inmates/residents and the groups of inmates/residents targeted.	Mark (X) all that apply					
	New admissions			Inmates/residents returning from temporary absences*		
	All (a)	Suspected drug users/couriers (b)	At random (c)	All (d)	Suspected drug users/couriers (e)	At random (f)
Type of interdiction activity						
1. Verbal questioning						
2. Patdown						
3. Clothing exchange						
4. Body cavity search						
5. Other — Specify						

*e.g., furlough, work release, study release, contact visitation, etc.

Methods of drug interdiction

Different facilities have a variety of policies and practices related to interdiction of drugs from inmates, visitors, and staff.

Facilities may physically check persons entering the facility. Inmates may be checked for drugs or other contraband when they enter a facility for the first time or reenter after an absence. (The above reproduced portion of the addendum deals with interdiction activities among inmates; similar sections asked about policies for visitors and staff.)

The checks may be relatively nonintrusive, such as verbal questioning or pat-

downs, or more intrusive, such as body cavity searches and clothing exchanges or searches of belongings. These checks may be conducted among all entering persons, random groups, or only those suspected of carrying drugs. Many prisons may use all of the approaches at different times.

The figure at right shows a general typology for the range of methods for each type of drug interdiction. A plus sign (+) indicates the use of a method and a minus sign (-) means no reported use. Type 1 facilities, for example, reported using all three methods to choose persons for an interdiction activity. Type 4 facilities reported performing an

interdiction activity on all persons but not choosing random or suspected subjects.

(The same typology is applied to drug testing. See the discussion, pages 5 to 10.)

Type of Interdiction	Who was chosen		
	All	Random	Suspected
Type 1	+	+	+
Type 2	+	+	-
Type 3	+	-	+
Type 4	+	-	-
Type 5	-	+	+
Type 6	-	+	-
Type 7	-	-	+
Type 8	-	-	-

Table 2. Criteria for drug interdiction activity for prisoners in Federal and State confinement facilities, June 1990

Who was chosen for interdiction	Summary of selection criteria	Interdiction activity							
		Verbal questioning		Patdown		Clothing exchange		Body cavity search	
		Federal	State	Federal	State	Federal	State	Federal	State
Total		100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %
All inmates, inmates chosen randomly, and inmates suspected of using drugs	type 1	6.3	9.7	13.8	9.7	6.3	4.2	2.5	2.3
All inmates and inmates chosen randomly	type 2	3.8	6.1	8.8	7.9	2.5	2.3	1.3	1.4
All inmates and inmates suspected of using drugs	type 3	3.8	9.4	2.5	8.3	1.3	8.4	6.3	3.2
All inmates but no other criteria	type 4	67.5	38.3	57.5	51.8	72.5	41.6	36.3	12.7
Inmates chosen randomly and inmates suspected of using drugs	type 5	1.3	4.6	1.3	3.3	0	3.0	1.3	2.1
Only inmates chosen randomly	type 6	3.8	3.7	5.0	3.3	3.8	3.3	2.5	1.7
Only inmates suspected of using drugs	type 7	0	9.9	0	5.5	1.3	5.3	15.0	31.1
No reported interdiction activity	type 8	13.8	18.3	11.3	10.0	12.5	31.9	35.0	45.5
Number of facilities		80	957	80	957	80	957	80	957

Note: Facilities indicated whether they performed an interdiction activity on all inmates, on suspected drug users/couriers, and on inmates at random. Criteria for selection of inmates are arranged in mutually exclusive categories.

When looking for the presence of hidden drugs, facilities were less likely to perform body cavity searches than take other interdiction measures. Sixty-one percent of Federal facilities, 45% of State confinement facilities, and 14% of State community-based facilities reported that they conducted body cavity searches among inmates at admission.

Institutions could apply an interdiction activity to all inmates, to groups of inmates selected at random, or to suspected drug users or couriers. Patting down new and returning inmates and requiring them to exchange clothes generally applied to all inmates (table 2). Over 80% of Federal facilities patted down all inmates and required an exchange of clothing. Almost 78% of State confinement facilities frisked all inmates, and 57% substituted prison clothes.

In 46% of Federal facilities and in 20% of State facilities, body cavity searches were

conducted among all entering inmates. About 39% of State confinement facilities reported that a body cavity search would be conducted when the staff suspected inmates of carrying drugs.

Most facilities searched the belongings of visitors

Staff checked visitors' belongings for drugs in 93% of Federal institutions, 87% of State confinement facilities, and 76% of the community-based (table 3). Visitors were patted down for drugs in 51% of Federal prisons, 69% of State confinement institutions, and 40% of community-based facilities.

All visitors were generally subjected to searches of their belongings (table 4). About 83% of Federal facilities and 57% of State facilities looked through the personal possessions of all visitors. Frisking visitors for drugs and checking body cavities occurred primarily if visitors were suspected of carrying drugs or para-

phernalia. Five in ten of Federal prisons and 4 in 10 of State facilities patted down visitors on suspicion. About 28% of Federal facilities and 18% of State facilities searched body cavities of visitors if the visitors were suspected of smuggling drugs.

Table 3. Drug interdiction activities for prison visitors, by type of facility, June 1990

Interdiction activity	Federal confinement	State	
		Confinement	Community-based
Verbal questioning	97.5%	78.7%	82.4%
Patdown	51.3	69.4	39.6
Belongings search	92.5	87.4	75.6
Body cavity search	27.5	22.4	5.2
Other	30.0	21.1	6.8
Number of facilities	80	957	250

Table 4. Criteria for selection of visitors for drug interdiction activities, by jurisdiction of facility, June 1990

Activity and who was chosen	Federal	State
Verbal questioning		
All visitors	83.8%	32.8%
Random groups	2.5	7.6
Suspect visitors ^a	22.5	50.5
Patdown		
All visitors	0	22.2
Random groups	2.5	5.9
Suspect visitors ^a	50.0	40.0
Belongings search		
All visitors	82.5	57.1
Random groups	5.0	6.6
Suspect visitors ^a	22.5	34.2
Body cavity search		
All visitors ^b	0	.0*
Random groups	0	.7
Suspect visitors ^a	27.5	18.4
Number of facilities	80	1,207

Note: Criteria for selection of visitors are arranged in overlapping categories.
^aLess than 0.05%.
^aVisitors suspected of bringing drugs into the facility.
^bOne State confinement facility checked body cavities of any visitor to a prisoner.

Staff were also subject to drug interdiction activities

When reporting to work, staff were patted down in about half of State confinement facilities and in more than a fifth of Federal confinement and State community-based facilities (table 5). In over 50% of Federal facilities and 40% of State facilities staff were questioned. Most interdiction activities involving staff were conducted on suspicion of smuggling drugs. About 45% of Federal facilities and 23% of State facilities interrogated staff if they were suspected of drug involvement (table 6). About 19% of Federal facilities also patted down staff on suspicion, compared to 14% of State facilities. About 23% of State facilities frisked staff members at random.

Maximum security facilities took more stringent drug interdiction measures than other facilities

Staff in Federal maximum security prisons were more likely than those in medium or minimum security facilities to search body cavities and to require all inmates to exchange clothing (table 7). All Federal maximum security institutions required all inmates to put on new prison-issued clothes upon entry or reentry. Nearly 55% of Federal maximum security facilities, compared to 38% of minimum security prisons, conducted body cavity searches of all newly admitted or returning inmates.

In maximum security prisons staff were less likely than in other Federal facilities to

question all of the inmates or to pat them down. All inmates were interrogated in 64% of maximum security prisons and frisked in 73%, while all inmates were questioned in 94% of minimum security facilities and patted down in 81%.

The staff in State maximum and medium security prisons were more likely than those in minimum security facilities to make all entering or returning inmates exchange clothes (over 60% of maximum or medium security prisons, compared to 47% of minimum security prisons). In nearly 1 in 5 maximum security State prisons, staff searched the body cavities of all new or returning prisoners. Staff performed body cavity searches on suspected inmates in over half of State maximum security facilities.

State community-based facilities were less likely than State confinement facilities to search residents to interdict drugs. Staff in about 59% of State community-based facilities patted down all inmates. In 22% of community-based facilities, the staff required all inmates to change to facility clothing, and in 15%, searched body cavities of residents suspected of having drugs.

Table 5. Drug interdiction activities for prison staff, by type of facility, June 1990

Interdiction activity	Federal confinement	State	
		Confinement	Community-based
No reported interdiction activity	17.5%	23.4%	42.0%
Verbal questioning	53.8	43.3	45.2
Patdown	21.3	49.3	24.4
Other*	35.0	25.0	11.6
Number of facilities	80	957	250

Note: Interdiction activities are overlapping categories.
*Includes such measures as drug testing, belongings search, and visual inspection.

Table 6. Criteria for selection of staff for drug interdiction activities, by jurisdiction of facility, June 1990

Activity and who was chosen	Staff	
	Federal	State
Verbal questioning		
All staff	3.8%	8.8%
Random groups	5.0	18.6
Suspected staff	45.0	22.9
Patdown		
All staff	0	11.8
Random groups	2.5	22.6
Suspected staff	18.8	14.0
Number of facilities	80	1,207

Note: Criteria for selection of staff are arranged in overlapping categories.

Table 7. Criteria of selection of inmates for drug interdiction activities, by type and security level of facility, June 1990

Activity and who was chosen	Type and security level of facility						
	Federal			State			Community-based
	Maximum	Medium	Minimum	Maximum	Medium	Minimum	
Verbal questioning							
All inmates	63.6%	75.7%	93.8%	67.3%	63.4%	61.4%	67.2%
Random groups	18.2	13.5	15.6	18.4	21.9	29.6	38.0
Suspected inmates	0	13.5	12.5	39.9	35.5	28.0	28.8
Patdown							
All inmates	72.7	86.5	81.3	74.0	78.7	79.1	58.8
Random groups	18.2	24.3	37.5	19.3	20.2	31.5	51.6
Suspected inmates	9.1	18.9	18.8	38.6	22.7	23.9	30.0
Clothing exchange							
All inmates	100.0	81.1	78.1	63.2	62.3	46.5	21.6
Random groups	0	13.5	15.6	12.1	10.9	15.2	18.4
Suspected inmates	9.1	8.1	9.4	35.4	17.8	15.2	16.0
Body cavity search							
All inmates	54.5	51.4	37.5	18.8	23.5	16.3	4.4
Random groups	0	5.4	12.5	6.3	7.4	8.2	9.6
Suspected inmates	27.3	29.7	18.8	53.4	37.2	31.5	14.8
Number of facilities	11	37	32	223	366	368	250

Note: Criteria for selection of inmates are arranged in overlapping categories.

Testing urine for drug use

Most correctional facilities tested some inmates for illegal drug use

About 87% of all correctional facilities tested inmates for illegal drug use (table 8). All Federal prisons, 83% of State confinement facilities, and 98% of State community-based facilities reported testing inmates between July 1, 1989, and June 30, 1990.

Authorities in facilities which reported data (85% of all facilities) indicated that they collected 598,000 urine specimens from 468,500 inmates. When these figures are projected to all facilities, including those which did not respond to these questions, an estimated 565,500 inmates provided 721,800 specimens from July 1, 1989, through June 30, 1990. (See "Estimation procedure" in *Methodology*.)

State minimum and medium security and community-based facilities were more likely than maximum security institutions to test inmates. About 85% of the lower security facilities and 98% of community-based facilities tested inmates, compared to 76% of the maximum security prisons.

Most State facilities testing inmates for drugs performed the tests when the staff suspected particular inmates of drug use; 76% of the institutions reported checking inmates based on suspicion of use. Forty-two percent tested both suspected inmates and random groups, and an additional 14% tested all inmates (type 1). Relatively few facilities (20%) tested all inmates at least once during confinement (types 1-4).

Criteria for conducting tests	Summary of selection criteria	Percent of facilities
Total		100 %
Not done to any inmates	type 8	13.2%
Done to:		
All systematically and Random groups/suspected	type 1	14.0%
Random groups	type 2	1.2
Suspected	type 3	2.0
All only	type 4	2.8
Random groups and Suspected	type 5	42.1
Random only	type 6	5.4
Suspected only	type 7	17.7
Other only		1.6
Number of facilities		1,285

Most large State confinement facilities tested for drugs

About 92% of State prisons with a population of 2,500 or more tested inmates, compared to around 83% of facilities with fewer than 1,000 inmates and 77% of facilities with a population between 1,000 and 2,499 (table 9). Over half of the largest facilities tested inmates on suspicion only. Over half of facilities with a population between 250 and 2,499 tested all inmates or

Table 8. Criteria for drug tests, number of inmates tested, and number of specimens collected from July 1, 1989, to June 30, 1990, by type and security level of facility

Type and security level of facility	Number of facilities	Facility conducts urine tests on inmates				Drug testing between July 1, 1989, and June 30, 1990		
		Total	Systematically on everyone at least once during stay	Randomly on samples	On indication of possible drug use	Other criteria	Number of inmates tested	Number of specimens collected
All facilities	1,285	86.7%	20.0%	62.7%	75.8%	17.3%	468,348	597,867
Federal confinement	80	100.0	31.3	96.3	93.8	23.8	57,177	59,147
Maximum	11	100.0	9.1	100.0	90.9	18.2	10,368	11,668
Medium	37	100.0	21.6	100.0	94.6	21.6	31,781	32,326
Minimum	32	100.0	50.0	90.6	93.8	28.1	15,028	15,153
State								
Confinement	955	82.5	12.3	56.5	74.1	18.4	317,246	378,394
Maximum	223	75.8	9.9	50.2	69.5	20.2	99,184	129,667
Medium	365	84.1	10.7	60.8	76.7	16.7	148,678	169,752
Minimum	367	85.0	15.3	56.1	74.4	19.1	69,384	78,975
Community-based	250	98.4	46.0	75.6	76.4	10.8	93,925*	160,326*

Note: Detail add to more than totals because some facilities tested on more than one basis. Data on criteria for testing inmates excludes 2 State confinement facilities with no data on the basis for testing. Data for number of inmates tested and number of

specimens collected exclude 185 State confinement facilities and 13 Federal confinement facilities because they had no data on at least 1 of the 2 variables. *The majority of data were estimated by respondents.

Table 9. Criteria for conducting tests for drug use in State facilities, by size of facility, June 1990

Size and type of facility	Number of facilities	Percent conducting urine tests based on			
		Total*	Combination of suspicion and either random or systematic	Random or systematic only	Suspicion only
Confinement					
1-249	386	83.2%	46.6%	11.9%	23.1%
250-499	150	85.3	57.3	4.0	21.3
500-999	226	83.2	58.8	2.7	19.5
1,000-2,499	167	76.7	53.3	4.2	19.2
2,500 or more	26	92.2	34.6	0	53.8
Community-based	250	98.4	70.0	20.4	6.4

*Includes "other" category not reported.

random groups of inmates in addition to inmates suspected of drug use. About 70% of community-based facilities tested either all inmates or random groups and inmates suspected of using drugs.

Almost all work release facilities tested for drugs

About 92% of facilities that provided special work release or prerelease programs tested inmates for drugs (table 10). Ninety-three percent of facilities that separately handled offenders reincarcerated for violating some condition of their supervised release also checked inmates

Table 10. Facilities testing inmates or residents for drug use, by function of correctional facility, June 1990

Facility function	Number of facilities	Percent
General adult population confinement	1,048	85.2%
Boot camp	23	82.6
Reception/diagnosis and classification	147	87.8
Medical treatment/hospitalization confinement	86	88.4
Alcohol/drug treatment confinement	117	88.0
Youthful offenders	27	59.3
Work release/prerelease	411	92.2
Persons returned to custody from a supervised release	91	93.4
Other	140	92.9

Note: Facilities may be classified with more than one function.

for drugs. Over 90% of facilities that performed "other" functions, such as presentence, psychiatric, or geriatric services also tested their residents. Nearly 60% of facilities for youthful offenders tested inmates.

For all inmates tested, State prisons reported higher positive rates than Federal prisons

Nationwide, 3.1% of the tests for cocaine in the 12 months before June 30, 1990,

were positive, as were 1.2% of the tests for heroin, 1.5% for methamphetamines, and 5.6% for marijuana. State facilities reported higher positive rates for drug tests than Federal facilities (table 11). In State institutions, 3.6% of tests for cocaine were positive, compared to 0.4% in Federal prisons. State facilities found 2.0% of the tests showing recent methamphetamine use and 6.3% showing marijuana use; Federal prisons found 0.1% and 1.1%, respectively.

Table 11. Number of facilities testing for specific drugs, number of tests given, and percent positive, from July 1, 1989, to June 30, 1990

Type of drug	Tests		Facilities	
	Number given	Percent positive	Number testing	Percent positive
All facilities				
Amphetamines	256,846	.8%	513	32.6%
Barbiturates	225,855	.8	472	34.1
Cocaine	379,970	3.1	712	60.0
Heroin	283,281	1.2	454	38.3
LSD	137,362	.6	275	9.8
Marijuana/hashish	396,993	5.6%	764	79.7%
Methadone	150,725	.6	304	8.6
Methamphetamines	176,300	1.5	327	21.4
Unspecified drug	124,815	.7	235	24.3
Other	83,608	1.4	162	60.5
Federal facilities				
Amphetamines	51,874	.2%	55	30.9%
Barbiturates	51,274	.1	54	33.3
Cocaine	55,393	.4	59	59.3
Heroin	45,486	.4	51	31.4
LSD	40,297	.0*	45	4.4
Marijuana/hashish	53,809	1.1%	57	77.2%
Methadone	43,338	.0*	48	6.3
Methamphetamines	49,191	.1	54	24.1
Unspecified drug	39,225	.1	42	14.3
Other	12,840	.4	13	92.3
State facilities				
Amphetamines	205,072	1.1%	458	32.8%
Barbiturates	174,581	1.0	418	34.2
Cocaine	324,577	3.6	653	60.0
Heroin	237,785	1.3	403	39.2
LSD	97,065	.8	230	10.9
Marijuana/hashish	343,184	6.3%	707	79.9%
Methadone	107,387	.8	256	9.0
Methamphetamines	127,109	2.0	273	20.9
Unspecified drug	85,590	1.0	193	26.4
Other	70,768	1.6	149	57.7

Note: Data are for 61 Federal facilities and 776 State facilities with data on all variables.
*Less than 0.05%.

Interpreting measures of drug testing

Prevalence of drug use in prisons is difficult to estimate. Part of the difficulty occurs with record keeping and reporting. A drug test determines the presence of a specific drug at a specific level. A single urine sample can be used for a single drug test or for multiple tests for different drugs. Correctional authorities were asked to report the number of tests for each drug and the number of positive tests. However, some authorities may have reported the number of urine samples taken if their records included only those figures.

Other difficulties in estimating the amount of drug use in prison include the following:

- Prisons differ in the selection of whom to test. Most facilities do not choose inmates for testing using a sample with a known probability of selection: One

cannot say that the selected inmates represent all inmates in the institution.

- Prisons differ in what drugs they test for. Prison authorities may not suspect the use of a drug and not test for it, even though the drug is used in their facility. Other prisons may conduct repeated tests for a drug seldom used.
- A single urine specimen can have more than one positive drug test from an individual using multiple drugs. Describing positive rates by type of drug will overstate the number of inmates with at least one positive test.
- Prisons differ in how often they test inmates. Drug testing may be rare in some prisons and frequent in others.
- Urine tests only detect the presence of most drugs 48 to 72 hours after use, except for PCP and marijuana, which may be detected up to 30 days after use.

This varying span, when combined with lack of random sampling, distorts any estimation of overall drug use.

- Depending on various factors, the presence of methamphetamines may not be distinguished from amphetamines; therefore, the test results for these two drugs should be considered together.
- Prisons may differ in the types of tests used. Some types are more accurate than others, producing lower numbers of false positives and false negatives. Facilities may or may not perform confirmatory tests, and they were not asked to estimate the number of false positives and false negatives.

For the above reasons, drug test results in this report are not a measure of the extent of the problem in the various kinds of facilities. Positive results should be interpreted only as indicating the percentage positive for the specific tests given.

Section II IDENTIFICATION OF DRUG ABUSERS – Continued		Number screened Mark (X) if estimate (a)	Number found positive Mark (X) if estimate (b)
E. Of the inmates tested between July 1, 1989 and June 30, 1990, indicate the number of inmates/residents screened for each drug and the number found positive.	Type of drug		
	1. Amphetamines		
	2. Barbiturates		
	3. Cocaine		
	4. Heroin		
	5. LSD		
	6. Marijuana/hashish		
	7. Methadone		
	8. Methamphetamines		
	9. Unspecified drug		
10. Other – Specify			

G. Are urinalysis tests for drug use conducted on staff of this facility?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes		<input type="checkbox"/> No – SKIP to section III		
H. Which of the following staff groups are eligible to be screened for drug use through urinalysis and on what basis? Type of employee	Mark (X) all that apply					
		Systematically (a)	At random (b)	Suspicion of use (c)	Other (d)	
	1. All staff					
	2. Staff above certain grade					
	3. Staff below certain grade					
	4. Correctional officers					
	5. Administrative staff					
	6. Clerical staff					
	7. Treatment and educational staff					
	8. Medical staff					
9. New hires/probationary status						
10. Other staff – Specify						
I. Between July 1, 1989 and June 30, 1990, how many staff were tested for drugs?					Number of employees Mark (X) if estimate	
J. Between July 1, 1989 and June 30, 1990, how many urine specimens were collected from staff?					Number of specimens Mark (X) if estimate	

Same percentage of State and Federal facilities reported positive drug tests

When facilities rather than individual drug tests are considered, Federal and State facilities were about equally likely to have found drug use in their institutions. Around 6 in 10 of both Federal and State facilities which tested for cocaine had at least one positive test. In over 2 in 10 facilities testing for methamphetamines, the use of the drug was discovered. Marijuana was detected in about 8 in 10 facilities testing.

Community-based facilities found higher rates of drug use than confinement facilities

Tests had positive outcomes for 8.9% of the cocaine tests and 8.1% of the marijuana tests administered by community-based facilities, compared to 1.4% of the cocaine tests and 5.8% of marijuana tests in confinement facilities (table 12). Methamphetamines, however, were found more often in confinement facilities (2.3% tested positive) than in community-based facilities (1.1% positive).

Among State confinement facilities, positive test results were highest in those testing on suspicion only

How inmates were selected for testing affected the rate of positive results. Those State confinement facilities testing only when drug use was suspected recorded higher rates of positive results than other facilities that tested randomly or comprehensively. When facilities tested only on suspicion of drug use, 6% of cocaine tests and 14% of marijuana tests were positive, compared to 1.5% or less for cocaine and 5% or less for marijuana when facilities tested everyone or at random.

The results for State community-based facilities were opposite those of confinement facilities. Testing on suspicion only produced a lower percentage of positive results than testing everyone or a random selection. In community-based facilities which tested on suspicion only, 4.8% were positive for cocaine and 6.4% for marijuana; in community-based facilities using other selection methods, around 9% of tests for cocaine and 8% for marijuana were positive.

The percentages of positive tests were higher in large facilities

Large prisons, whether Federal or State, had higher rates of positive drug tests. In Federal facilities with 1,000 or more inmates, 1.4% of the marijuana tests, 0.6% of the cocaine, and 0.6% of the

heroin tests were positive (table 13). In Federal facilities holding fewer than 500 inmates, the percentages were 0.5% for marijuana, 0.2% for cocaine, and none for heroin. Among State prisons, the largest facilities with 2,500 or more inmates had the highest percentages of positive tests for amphetamines, cocaine, and heroin.

Table 12. Number of drug tests given in State facilities and percent positive from July 1, 1989, to June 30, 1990, by type of drug and criteria for testing

Type of drug and facility	Number of tests given	Percent positive when facility tests inmates/residents based on			
		Total	Combination of suspicion and either random or systematic	Random or systematic only	Suspicion only
State confinement					
Amphetamines	136,121	1.1%	.6%	.4%	5.0%
Barbiturates	126,162	1.0	.8	.3	4.0
Cocaine	230,800	1.4	1.0	1.5	6.0
Heroin	172,284	1.0	.7	.5	3.7
LSD	71,064	1.0	.4	1.7	4.1
Marijuana/hashish	270,963	5.8%	5.1%	4.7%	14.3%
Methadone	76,807	1.1	.7	0	3.3
Methamphetamines	92,101	2.3	1.1	.0*	7.8
Unspecified drug	65,818	1.1	.5	.2	4.8
Other	52,559	1.8	1.2	0	13.8
State community-based					
Amphetamines	68,951	1.0%	.8%	1.4%	.2%
Barbiturates	48,419	.8	.6	1.3	.2
Cocaine	93,777	8.9	9.4	8.9	4.8
Heroin	65,501	2.2	2.4	2.0	0
LSD	26,001	.2	.3	.0*	0
Marijuana/hashish	72,221	8.1%	7.7%	8.6%	6.4%
Methadone	30,580	.2	.2	.0*	0
Methamphetamines	35,008	1.1	1.0	1.2	.2
Unspecified drug	19,772	.7	1.1	.0*	1.5
Other	18,209	.9	.9	.9	0

Note: Data are for 569 State confinement facilities and 207 State community-based facilities with data on all variables.
*Less than 0.05%.

Table 13. Positive drug tests from July 1, 1989, to June 30, 1990, by security level and size of confinement facilities

Security level and size of facility	Percent of positive tests				
	Amphetamine	Cocaine	Heroin	Marijuana	Methamphetamine
Federal					
Security level					
Maximum	.2%	.7%	1.4%	2.5%	.3%
Medium	.3	.4	.3	1.0	.2
Minimum	.0*	.3	.0*	.3	.0*
Average daily population					
1-499 inmates	.0*	.2	.0*	.5	.1
500-999	.1	.4	.3	1.0	.1
1,000-2,499	.4	.6	.6	1.4	.2
State					
Security level					
Maximum	1.6	1.0	.5	5.0	.6
Medium	1.2	1.7	1.4	6.8	4.2
Minimum	.5	1.4	.8	4.6	.5
Average daily population					
1-499 inmates	.6	1.4	1.0	6.1	2.4
500-999	.5	.9	.6	4.4	.1
1,000-2,499	.9	1.5	.6	6.9	4.7
2,500 or more	3.8	2.7	3.3	4.6	3.1

Note: Data are from 734 State confinement facilities and 62 Federal facilities with data on the number tested and number positive for a drug.
*Less than 0.05%.

The facilities holding 1,000 to 2,499 inmates had the highest rates for marijuana and methamphetamines. Among Federal prisons, the maximum security facilities had higher rates for positive drug tests than minimum security facilities. In maximum security prisons, 2.5% of the tests for marijuana, .7% of the tests for cocaine, and 1.4% of the tests for heroin were positive. In minimum security, 0.3% for marijuana, 0.3% for cocaine, and none for heroin were positive.

State medium security facilities generally had higher positive rates than maximum or minimum security prisons. For each drug in medium security facilities, the percentage positive was as follows: 6.8% for marijuana, 4.2% for methamphetamines, 1.7% for cocaine, and 1.4% for heroin. In maximum and minimum facilities, the equivalent findings were 5.0% or less for marijuana, 0.6% or less for methamphetamines, 1.4% or less for cocaine, and 0.8% or less for heroin.

Positive results from drug tests varied among facilities performing different functions

Facilities which confined inmates returned to custody for parole violations had relatively high percentages of positive drug tests (table 14). More than 9% of tests for marijuana were positive, as were 6.2% of tests for methamphetamines, 3.5% for cocaine, and 2.9% for heroin. Facilities holding inmates who participated in work release programs or who were preparing for discharge also had relatively high positive test rates: 7% for cocaine, 6.9% for marijuana, and 1.8% for heroin. Drug/alcohol treatment in facilities was associated with relatively high positive results on tests for cocaine and marijuana use — 3% for cocaine and 7.6% for marijuana.

Facilities handling youthful offenders generally had relatively low positive test results: 2.1% for marijuana and 1.5% for cocaine.

Positive drug tests were linked to interdiction activities

The State confinement facilities that questioned and frisked inmates but did not exchange clothes or search body cavities had higher rates of positive drug tests than facilities doing all these measures (table 15). The tests in the facilities using less stringent measures were 5.2% positive for cocaine, 13.5% for marijuana, and 16.2%

Table 14. Positive drug tests from July 1, 1989, to June 30, 1990, by function of facility

Facility function	Percent of positive tests				
	Amphetamines	Cocaine	Heroin	Marijuana	Methamphetamines
General adult population confinement	.7%	1.4%	.9%	5.1%	1.5%
Boot camp	.7	1.7	1.9	5.2	1.1
Reception/diagnosis and classification	1.4	1.1	1.6	4.2	.5
Medical treatment/hospitalization confinement	.4	2.0	.9	5.8	5.1
Alcohol/drug treatment confinement	1.8	3.0	1.6	7.6	1.2
Youthful offenders	.1	1.5	.5	2.1	0
Work release/prerelease	1.0	7.0	1.8	6.9	1.0
Returned to custody	2.7	3.5	2.9	9.1	6.2
Other	.6	4.3	.6	4.8	.3

Note: Data include 807 facilities with data on number of drug tests and number positive for each drug.

Table 15. Positive drug tests from July 1, 1989, to June 30, 1990, by drug interdiction activities of State confinement facilities

Interdiction activity and group targeted	Number of inmates tested	Percent of positive tests				
		Amphetamines	Cocaine	Heroin	Marijuana	Methamphetamines
Inmates						
All types	101,824	1.4%	1.2%	.6%	4.6%	.6%
Body cavity search and clothing exchange	17,444	.5	1.2	.1	2.6	0
Body cavity search	41,497	.3	.5	.8	5.1	.1
Clothing exchange	88,430	.9	1.5	1.4	6.3	.7
Verbal questioning and patdown	23,321	3.6	5.2	4.0	13.5	16.2
Patdown	17,111	.0*	.5	.2	3.9	.1
Verbal questioning	2,377	.1	1.1	.4	4.8	.2
Other	3,114	.2	1.1	1.0	2.7	0
No reported interdiction activity	254	8.3	40.2	0	28.4	0
Visitors						
All types	55,414	1.8%	.8%	.7%	3.8%	.5%
Body cavity and belongings searches	23,835	6.0	2.6	2.9	4.4	12.0
Body cavity search	4,067	.0*	.2	.1	2.1	0
Belongings search	193,121	.7	1.6	1.0	6.7	2.8
Verbal questioning and patdown	2,893	0	1.6	.2	6.0	0
Patdown	4,899	.2	.4	.2	9.9	0
Verbal questioning	8,757	.1	.8	.1	2.2	.1
Other	1,541	0	0	0	8.6	0
No reported interdiction activity	1,345	.4	7.4	0	8.3	0
Staff						
All types	26,002	3.3%	1.0%	.9%	5.4%	.9%
Verbal questioning and patdown	60,065	1.0	1.2	.6	5.5	.6
Questioning	42,529	.4	.5	1.1	5.3	6.6
Patdown	62,209	.3	1.2	.6	6.6	.0*
Other	60,704	.6	2.1	1.3	5.3	4.9
No reported interdiction activity	44,363	3.1	2.6	2.2	6.5	6.6

Note: Interdiction activities are mutually exclusive categories. "All types" for inmates and visitors includes body cavity search, clothing exchange or belongings search, patdown, and verbal questioning and may include other interdictions. For staff, "all types" includes verbal questioning, patdown and other interdiction. "Body cavity search and clothing exchange" and "body cavity and belongings searches"

include both and may include patdown, verbal questioning, and/or other. "Body cavity search," "clothing exchange," and "belongings search" may include patdown, verbal questioning, and/or other. "Verbal questioning and patdown," "patdown," and "verbal questioning" may include other. "Other" does not include any of the specified interdiction activities. *Less than 0.05%.

for methamphetamines. Tests in facilities performing all types of specific drug interdiction activities were 1.2% positive for cocaine, 4.6% for marijuana, and 0.6% for methamphetamines. Facilities which

performed all types of interdiction activities had higher positive drug test rates than facilities which did body cavity searches and/or clothing exchanges. The facilities doing all types of interdiction may have

adopted more measures as a reaction to relatively high test rates. The reported rates were from results over the 12 months before the census, while the interdiction measures were those in place on June 29, 1990.

Facilities that did not question, frisk, or search visitors had the following positive test results: 8.3% for marijuana and 7.4% for cocaine. Facilities that inspected visitors' belongings and searched body cavities when indicated, but did not both question and pat down visitors, had the following positive test percentages: 2.9% for heroin, 2.6% for cocaine, and 12% for methamphetamines.

Facilities that reported not making special efforts to interdict the supply of drugs from the staff had 2.6% positive tests for cocaine, 2.2% for heroin, and 6.6% for methamphetamines. Facilities that questioned staff, patted them down, and took other actions such as drug testing, when needed had 1.0% positive tests for cocaine and 0.9% for heroin and methamphetamines.

Drug testing of staff was highest in Federal facilities

While 83% of Federal facilities reported they tested their staff for drugs, 42% of State confinement facilities and 32% of community-based facilities checked their employees (table 16). About 55% of Federal confinement facilities tested all staff, as did 30% of State confinement facilities and 19% of community-based facilities.

Seventy-six percent of Federal facilities and about 23% of State facilities tested new employees, the primary staff category tested.

	Federal	State	
	confinement	Confinement	Community-based
Percent of staff tested	15.2%	3.5%	9.6%
Number of urine specimens tested	3,019	8,025	531
Number of facilities reporting	70	892	245
Total number of staff	16,621	220,884	5,265

A higher percentage of Federal than State facility staff were tested for drugs. Fifteen percent of Federal facility staff were tested compared to 4% of those working in State

confinement facilities and 10% in community-based facilities.

A positive test was grounds for dismissal in over a third of facilities that tested staff for drugs

In over a third of facilities, policies required that staff testing positive for drugs be dismissed. In over a seventh, affected staff were suspended (table 17). Sixty percent of State confinement facilities and 44% of community-based facilities referred positive drug detection cases to internal affairs.

Fifty-nine percent of Federal facilities referred the case to a departmentally operated program — generally an employee assistance counselor who could refer the employee for outside treatment.

Federal facilities were more likely than State facilities to keep their staff and continue to check them for drugs or to reassign them. Twenty-four percent of Federal facilities continued monitoring staff with drug tests, compared to 10% of State confinement facilities and 12% of community-based facilities.

Table 16. Staff tested for drug use, by jurisdiction and type of facility, 1990

Staff groups	Federal confinement	State	
		Confinement	Community-based
Total	100 %	100 %	100 %
None	17.5%	57.7%	67.6%
All staff and new hires	51.3%	13.2%	9.2%
All staff but not new hires	3.8	16.8	10.0
Tested some groups: ^a	27.5%	12.3%	13.2%
New hires	25.0	10.2	12.8
Staff above certain grade	21.3	.2	0
Correctional officers	1.3	3.0	.8
Administrative staff	5.0	.7	.4
Clerical staff	1.3	.3	0
Treatment and educational staff	1.3	.4	.4
Medical staff	1.3	.4	0
Other staff	2.5	.4	0
Number of facilities	80	957	250
Total number of staff	16,621	220,884	5,265
Number of staff tested	2,525	7,732	507
Number of urine specimens tested	3,019	8,025	531

Note: The variables, total number of staff, number of staff tested and number of urine specimens tested exclude 10 federal facilities, 65 State confinement facilities and 5 State community-based facilities with no data on the number of staff tested and number of urine specimens tested.
^aDetail adds to more than total because some facilities tested more than one group of staff.

Table 17. Outcome of first positive drug test of a staff member, by type of facility, 1990

Procedures upon first positive detection of staff's drug use	Percent of facilities testing staff		
	Federal confinement	State	
		Confinement	Community-based
Dismissal	36.4%	35.3%	40.7%
Suspension	16.7	15.8	12.3
Continued employment			
With urine surveillance	24.2	10.1	12.3
In another position	9.1	2.7	2.5
Referral			
To internal affairs	42.4	60.0	44.4
To departmentally operated program	59.1	21.0	23.5
To other treatment service	42.4	29.1	16.0
Other	9.1	7.9	6.2
Number of facilities reporting data	66	405	81

Enrollment in drug treatment was below capacity

Federal inmates were using 62% of the drug treatment capacity on June 29, 1990. State prisoners were using 66% of the capacity in community-based facilities and 78% in confinement facilities.

<u>Jurisdiction and type of facility</u>	<u>Percent of total capacity used</u>
Federal confinement	61.6%
State confinement	77.9%
State community-based	66.4%

Many factors play a role in these utilization figures. Inmates may refuse to participate or may have already completed the program. Inmates may not qualify — too new to the institution, not near enough to the end of their sentence, rule breakers, under administrative segregation, or in the wrong custody level. Facilities also may keep some slots open to gain flexibility to deal with unexpected situations.

Prisons offered a variety of programs

Prisons may offer many types of drug intervention or treatment: detoxification, counseling, education and/or awareness programs, urine surveillance, and treatment in special residential units within the facility. Federal facilities reported they could test 33% of inmates for drugs; State confinement facilities, 10%; and community-based facilities, 57% (table 18). Counseling was available for 14% of inmates in Federal facilities, 12% in State confinement facilities, and 48% in community-based facilities. Residential treatment program capacity was from 1% to 2% of inmate population for all types of institutions.

Of all Federal inmates, 9% were enrolled in some form of drug treatment on June 29, 1990. Among State prisoners, 14% in confinement facilities and 37% in community-based facilities were enrolled. The two most common types of programs for both Federal and State correctional facilities were education and counseling.

Drug education programs enrolled 13% of Federal prisoners, 7% of State confinement inmates, and 25% of residents in community-based facilities. Six percent of those in Federal facilities were being counseled, as were 9% of State confinement facility inmates and 32% of those in community-based facilities.

Methodology

The 1990 Census of State and Federal Adult Correctional Facilities was the fourth enumeration of State institutions and the first of Federal institutions sponsored by the Bureau of Justice Statistics and conducted by the Bureau of the Census. Earlier censuses were completed in 1974, 1979, and 1984.

Census universe

The facility universe was developed from the Census of State Adult Correctional Facilities conducted in 1984. This list was revised using the *1990 American Correctional Association Directory* and information obtained from State correctional administrators and the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

The census included: prisons; prison farms; reception, diagnostic and classification centers; road camps; forestry and conservation camps; youthful offender facilities (except in California); vocational training facilities; correctional drug and alcohol treatment facilities; and State-operated local detention facilities in Alaska, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

Facilities were included in the census if they:

- were staffed with State or Federal employees
- housed primarily State or Federal prisoners
- were physically, functionally, and administratively separate from other facilities
- were operational on the reference date, June 29, 1990.

The census also included, for the first time, 67 private facilities that were under exclusive contract by State governments to house prisoners.

Specifically excluded were —

- privately operated facilities that were not exclusively for State or Federal inmates
- military facilities
- Immigration and Naturalization Service facilities

- facilities operated and administered by local governments, including those housing State prisoners

- facilities operated by the U.S. Marshals Service

- hospital wings and wards reserved for State prisoners.

Questionnaire administration

Questionnaires were mailed to facility respondents at the end of June 1990. Second and third request forms and telephone followups went out in the fall, resulting in a final response rate of 100%.

Definitions of community-based and confinement facilities

Correctional facilities were classified as community-based if 50% or more of the residents were regularly permitted to leave the facility unaccompanied for work or study. These facilities included halfway houses, restitution centers, and pre-release, work release, and study release centers. Correctional facilities in which less than 50% of the inmates regularly left the facility unaccompanied were classified as confinement institutions.

Drug addendum

An addendum on drug control activities in State and Federal facilities was included for the first time in the 1990 census. Facilities were asked to provide information on the following:

- activities they used with inmates, visitors, and staff to keep out illegal drugs and drug paraphernalia
- inmate drug testing practices, including the criteria for testing inmates, the number of inmates tested in total and by specific drug, and the number positive
- staff drug testing, including groups and basis for testing, number tested, and procedures when tests were positive
- capacity and enrollment in various types of drug treatment and intervention programs.

Estimation procedures

When all prisons in the census did not provide data on particular variables, estimated figures were used where

indicated. Total figures were estimated by multiplying the known or reported numbers by the ratio of the total relevant population to the reported population. All figures were estimated independently and total estimates were therefore larger than the sum of all subgroup estimates. The total population figure used in the projections varied, depending upon which figure was most appropriate. The two available population figures are the average daily population and the prison count on the reference day for the census, June 29, 1990. For drug testing, table 8, the basis for estimation was the average daily population, and for drug treatment capacity and enrollment, the basis was the 1-day count.

Because the census was a complete enumeration, the results were not subject to sampling error.

Public use data tapes for each Census of Adult Correctional Facilities in the series, conducted in 1974, 1979, 1984, and 1990, are available from the National Criminal Justice Archive, P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106. 1-800-999-0960.

Caroline Wolf Harlow wrote this report under the supervision of Allen J. Beck. Corrections statistics are prepared under the general direction of Lawrence A. Greenfeld. Tom Hester edited this report, and James Stephan, Danielle Morton, and Dorothea Proctor provided statistical review. Marilyn Marbrook administered production, assisted by Betty Sherman and Jayne Pugh.

July 1992, NCJ-134724

The Bureau of Justice Statistics is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the National Institute of Justice, the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime.

Now available on microfiche

For librarians and researchers, 20 years of criminal justice statistics in complete, convenient form – free bibliographies have subject-title index and abstract for each title

Publications of the Bureau of Justice Statistics:

1985-89 (240 reports)
1971-84 (284 reports)

Reports on crime, victims, offenders, and criminal justice system operations from major data series:

- National Crime Survey
- Law enforcement management
- Prisons, jails, capital punishment
- Recidivism, parole, probation
- Courts
- Drugs and crime
- Privacy and security
- Computer crime
- Criminal justice information policy
- Federal justice statistics
- Justice expenditure and employment
- Bulletins and Special Reports
- Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics
- Report to the Nation on Crime and Justice

For more information, call the
Justice Statistics Clearinghouse
at 800-732-3277

Order form

Yes! Send me *Publications of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1985-89* microfiche library with free *Topical Bibliography* for \$190 (\$200 Canada and \$235 other foreign countries):

\$ _____

Yes! Send me *Publications of the Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1971-84* microfiche library with free *Topical Bibliography* for \$203 U.S. and Canada (\$248.25 other foreign countries):

\$ _____

Send me only the topical bibliography(ies) for *Publications of the Bureau of Justice Statistics* for \$17.50 each (\$18.50 Canada, \$22.50 other foreign countries):

1985-89

\$ _____

1971-84

\$ _____

Return with payment to:

Justice Statistics Clearinghouse/NCJRS,
Dept. F-AKD, Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20850

Name _____
Title _____
Agency _____
Address _____

Telephone (____) _____

My check for \$ _____ is enclosed.

Charge my

___ Visa

___ Mastercard

Card no. _____

Exp. date _____

Signature _____

Charge my NCJRS Deposit Account no. _____

Government Purchase Order no. (add \$2 processing fee) _____

Total of order: \$ _____

Bureau of Justice Statistics reports

See order form on last page

(Revised July 1992)

Call toll-free 800-732-3277 to order BJS reports, to be added to one of the BJS mailing lists, or to speak to a reference specialist in statistics at the Bureau of Justice Statistics Clearinghouse, National Criminal Justice Reference Service, Box 6000, Rockville, MD 20850. For drugs and crime data, call the Drugs & Crime Data Center & Clearinghouse, 1600 Research Blvd., Rockville, MD 20850, toll-free 800-666-3332.

BJS maintains these mailing lists:

- Law enforcement reports
- Drugs and crime data
- Justice expenditure and employment
- White-collar crime
- National Crime Victimization Survey (annual)
- Corrections (annual)
- Courts (annual)
- Privacy and security of criminal histories and criminal justice information policy
- Federal statistics (annual)
- BJS bulletins and special reports
- Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics (annual)

Single copies of reports are free; use NCJ number to order. Postage and handling are charged for bulk orders of single reports. For single copies of multiple titles, up to 10 titles are free; 11-40 titles \$10; more than 40, \$20; libraries call for special rates.

Public-use tapes of BJS data sets and other criminal justice data are available from the National Archive of Criminal Justice Data (formerly NCJAIN), P.O. Box 1248, Ann Arbor, MI 48106 (toll-free 800-999-0960).

National Crime Victimization Survey

Criminal victimization in the U.S.: 1991 preliminary (press release), NCJ-137218, 4/92

1990 (final), NCJ-134126, 2/92
1973-88 trends, NCJ-129392, 7/91
1989 (final), NCJ-129391, 6/91

Crime victimization in city, suburban, and rural areas, NCJ-135943, 6/92

School crime, NCJ-131645, 9/91

Teenage victims, NCJ-128129, 5/91

Female victims of violent crime, NCJ-126826, 1/91

The Nation's two crime measures: Uniform Crime Reports and the National Crime Survey, NCJ-122705, 4/90

Redesign of the National Crime Survey, NCJ-11457, 3/89

The seasonality of crime victimization, NCJ-111033, 6/88

BJS bulletins

Crime and the Nation's households, 1990, NCJ-136950, 7/92

Criminal victimization 1990, NCJ-130234, 10/91

The crime of rape, NCJ-96777, 3/85
Household burglary, NCJ-96021, 1/85
Measuring crime, NCJ-75710, 2/81

BJS special reports

Handgun crime victims, NCJ-123559, 7/90
Black victims, NCJ-122562, 4/90
Hispanic victims, NCJ-120507, 1/90

The redesigned National Crime Survey:

- Selected new data, NCJ-114746, 1/89
- Motor vehicle theft, NCJ-109978, 3/88
- Elderly victims, NCJ-107676, 11/87
- Violent crime trends, NCJ-107217, 11/87
- Robbery victims, NCJ-104638, 4/87
- Violent crime by strangers and non-strangers, NCJ-103702, 1/87
- Preventing domestic violence against women, NCJ-102037, 8/86
- Crime prevention measures, NCJ-100438, 3/86

The use of weapons in committing crimes, NCJ-99643, 1/86

Reporting crimes to the police, NCJ-99432, 12/85

The economic cost of crime to victims, NCJ-93450, 4/84

BJS technical reports

New directions for NCS, NCJ-115571, 3/89
Series crimes: Report of a field test, NCJ-104615, 4/87

Crime and older Americans information package, NCJ-104569, 5/87, \$10

Victimization and fear of crime: World perspectives, NCJ-93872, 1/85, \$9.15

The National Crime Survey: Working papers, Current and historical perspectives, vol. I, NCJ-75374, 8/82
Methodology studies, vol. II, NCJ-90307, 12/84

Corrections

BJS bulletins and special reports

Prisoners in 1991, NCJ-134729, 5/92
Capital punishment 1990, NCJ-131648, 9/91

Prisoners in 1990, NCJ-129198, 5/91

Women in prison, NCJ-127991, 4/91

Violent State prison inmates and their victims, NCJ-124133, 7/90

Prison rule violators, NCJ-120344, 12/89

Recidivism of prisoners released in 1983, NCJ-116261, 4/89

Drug use and crime: State prison inmate survey, 1986, NCJ-111940, 7/88

Time served in prison and on parole, 1984, NCJ-108544, 12/87

Profile of State prison inmates, 1986, NCJ-109926, 1/88

Imprisonment in four countries, NCJ-103967, 2/87

Population density in State prisons, NCJ-103204, 12/86

State and Federal prisoners, 1925-85, NCJ-102494, 10/86

Prison admissions and releases, 1983, NCJ-100582, 3/86

The prevalence of imprisonment, NCJ-93657, 7/85

Correctional populations in the United States:

1990, NCJ-134946, 7/92

1989, NCJ-130445, 10/91

Census of State and Federal correctional facilities, 1990, NCJ-137003, 6/92

Prisons and prisoners in the United States, NCJ-137002, 4/92

National Corrections Reporting Program: 1988, NCJ-134929, 4/92

1987, NCJ-134928, 4/92

1986, NCJ-132291, 2/92

Race of prisoners admitted to State and Federal institutions, 1926-86, NCJ-125618, 6/91

Historical statistics on prisoners in State and Federal institutions, yearend 1925-86, NCJ-111098, 6/88

Census of jails and survey of jail inmates

BJS bulletins and special reports

Jail inmates, 1981, NCJ-134726, 6/92

Women in jail, 1989, NCJ-134732, 3/92

Drugs and jail inmates, NCJ-130836, 8/91

Jail inmates, 1990, NCJ-129756, 6/91

Profile of jail inmates, 1989, NCJ-129097, 4/91

Jail inmates, 1989, NCJ-123264, 6/90

Population density in local jails, 1988, NCJ-122299, 3/90

Census of local jails, 1988, NCJ-121101, 2/90

Drunk driving, NCJ-109945, 2/88

Census of local jails, 1988:

Summary and methodology, vol. I, NCJ-127992, 3/91

Data for individual jails in the Northeast, Midwest, South, West, vols. II-V, NCJ-130759-130762, 0/91

Census of local jails, 1983: Data for individual jails, Northeast, Midwest, South, West, vols. I-IV, NCJ-112796-9, 11/88

Selected findings, methodology, summary tables, vol. V, NCJ-112796, 11/88

Probation and parole

BJS bulletins and special reports

Probation and parole:

1990, NCJ-125833, 11/91

1989, NCJ-125833, 11/90

Recidivism of young parolees, NCJ-104916, 5/87

Juvenile corrections

Children in custody: Census of public and private juvenile detention, correctional, and shelter facilities, 1975-85, NCJ-114065, 6/89

Survey of youth in custody, 1987 (special report), NCJ-113365, 9/88

Expenditure and employment

Justice expenditure and employment, 1990 (BJS bulletin), NCJ-135777, 4/92

Justice variable pass-through data, 1990: Anti-drug abuse formula grants (BJS technical report), NCJ-133018, 3/92

Justice expenditure and employment: 1988 (full report), NCJ-125619, 8/91

Extracts, 1984, '85, '86, NCJ-124139, 8/91

Courts

BJS bulletins

Prosecutors in State courts, 1990, NCJ-134500, 3/92

Pretrial release of felony defendants, 1988, NCJ-127202, 2/91

Felony sentences in State courts, 1988, NCJ-126923, 12/90

Criminal defense for the poor, 1986, NCJ-112919, 9/88

State felony courts and felony laws, NCJ-106273, 8/87

The growth of appeals: 1973-83 trends, NCJ-96381, 2/85

BJS special reports

Recidivism of felons on probation, 1986-89, NCJ-134177, 2/92

Felony case processing in State courts, 1986, NCJ-121753, 2/90

Felony case-processing time, NCJ-101985, 8/86

Felony sentencing in 18 local jurisdictions, NCJ-97681, 6/85

The prosecution of felony arrests:

1988, NCJ-130914, 2/92

1987, NCJ-124140, 9/90

Felons sentenced to probation in State courts, 1986, NCJ-124944, 11/90

Felony defendants in large urban counties, 1988, NCJ-122385, 4/90

Profile of felons convicted in State courts, 1986, NCJ-120021, 1/90

Sentencing outcomes in 28 felony courts, NCJ-105743, 8/87

Felony laws of the 50 States and the District of Columbia, 1986, NCJ-105066, 2/88, \$14.60

State court model statistical dictionary: Supplement, NCJ-98326, 9/85

1st edition, NCJ-62320, 9/80

Privacy and security

Criminal justice information policy:

Report of the National Task Force on Criminal History Record Disposition Reporting, NCJ-135836, 6/92

Attorney General's program for improving the Nation's criminal history records: BJS implementation status report, NCJ-134722, 3/92

And identifying felons who attempt to purchase firearms, NCJ-128131, 3/91

Assessing completeness and accuracy of criminal history record information: Audit guide, NCJ-133651, 2/92

Forensic DNA analysis: Issues, NCJ-128567, 6/91

Statutes requiring use of criminal history record information, NCJ-129896, 6/91

Survey of criminal history information systems, NCJ-125320, 3/91

Original records of entry, NCJ-125626, 12/90

Strategies for improving data quality, NCJ-115339, 5/89

Public access to criminal history record information, NCJ-111458, 11/88

Juvenile records and recordkeeping systems, NCJ-112815, 11/88

Automated fingerprint identification systems: Technology and policy issues, NCJ-104342, 4/87

Criminal justice "hot" files, NCJ-101850, 12/86

BJS/SEARCH conference proceedings:

National conference on improving the quality of criminal history information: NCJ-133532, 2/92

Criminal justice in the 1990's: The future of information management, NCJ-121697, 5/90

Juvenile and adult records: One system, one record? NCJ-114947, 1/90

Open vs. confidential records, NCJ-113560, 1/88

Compendium of State privacy and security legislation:

1992, NCJ-137058, 7/92

1992 full report (1, 500 pp. microfiche \$2, call for hard copy price, 7/92

Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics

BJS bulletins and special reports

Drug enforcement by police and sheriffs' departments, 1990, NCJ-134505, 5/92

State and local police departments, 1990, NCJ-133284, 12/91

Sheriffs' departments, 1990, NCJ-133283, 12/91

Police departments in large cities, 1987, NCJ-119220, 8/89

Profile of State and local law enforcement agencies, 1987, NCJ-113949, 3/89

Drugs & crime: 800-666-3332

Drugs and crime facts:

1991, NCJ-134371, 7/92

1990, NCJ-128662, 8/91

State drug resources: 1992 national directory, NCJ-134375, 5/92

Catalog of selected Federal publications on illegal drug and alcohol abuse, NCJ-132582, 10/91

Federal drug data for national policy, NCJ-122715, 4/90

Computer crime

Electronic fund transfer systems fraud, NCJ-100461, 4/86

Expert witness manual, NCJ-77927, 9/81, \$11.50

BJS special reports

Electronic fund transfer — fraud, NCJ-96666, 3/85

and crime, NCJ-92650, 2/84

Federal justice statistics

Compendium of Federal justice statistics: 1989, NCJ-134730, 5/92

1988, NCJ-130474, 1/92

Federal criminal case processing, 1980-89, with preliminary data for 1990, NCJ-130526, 10/91

The Federal civil justice system (BJS bulletin), NCJ-104769, 8/87

Federal offenses and offenders

BJS special reports

Federal sentencing in transition, 1986-90, NCJ-134727, 6/92

Immigration offenses, NCJ-124546, 8/90

Federal criminal cases, 1980-87, NCJ-118311, 7/89

Drug law violators, 1980-86, NCJ-111763, 6/88

Pretrial release and detention: The Bail Reform Act of 1984, NCJ-109929, 2/88

White-collar crime, NCJ-106876, 9/87

General

BJS bulletins and special reports

Forgery and fraud-related offenses in 6 States, 1983-88, NCJ-132445, 1/92

BJS telephone contacts, '91, NCJ-130133, 7/91

Tracking offenders, 1988, NCJ-129861, 6/91

International crime rates, NCJ-110776, 5/88

BJS national update:

July '92, NCJ-137059, 7/92

April '92, NCJ-135722, 4/92

Jan. '92, NCJ-133097, 12/91

Oct. '91, NCJ-131778, 10/91

BJS application information, FY 1992 programs, NCJ-134644, 3/92

Perestroika and the Procurator: The changing role of the prosecutor's office in the former USSR (BJS discussion paper), NCJ-134501, 3/92

Sourcebook of criminal justice statistics, 1990, NCJ-130580, 9/91

Violent crime in the United States, NCJ-127855, 3/91

BJS data report, 1989, NCJ-121514, 1/91

Publications of BJS, 1985-89:

Microfiche library, PRO30014, 5/90, \$190

Bibliography, TBO30013, 5/90, \$17.50

Publications of BJS, 1971-84:

Microfiche library, PRO30012, 10/86, \$203

Bibliography, TBO30012, 10/86, \$17.50

1990 directory of automated criminal justice information systems, Vol. 1, Corrections, \$10.60; 2, Courts, \$11.50; 3, Law enforcement, free; 4, Probation and parole, \$11.50; 5, Prosecution, \$11.50; NCJ-12226-30, 5/90

Report to the Nation on crime and justice: Second edition, NCJ-105506, 6/88

Technical appendix, NCJ-112011, 8/88

See order form on last page

Please put me on the mailing list for—

- Law enforcement reports**—national data on State and local police and sheriffs' departments, operations, equipment, personnel, salaries, spending, policies, programs
- Federal statistics**—data describing Federal case processing, from investigation through prosecution, adjudication, and corrections
- Drugs and crime**—sentencing and time served by drug offenders, drug use at time of crime by jail inmates and State prisoners, and other quality data on drugs, crime, and law enforcement
- Justice expenditure & employment**—annual spending and staffing by Federal, State, and local governments and by function (police, courts, corrections, etc.)

- Privacy and security of criminal history data and information policy**—new legislation; maintaining and releasing intelligence and investigative records; data quality issues
- BJs bulletins and special reports**—timely reports of the most current justice data in all BJS data series
- Prosecution and adjudication in State courts**—case processing from prosecution through court disposition, State felony laws, felony sentencing, public defenders, pretrial release
- Corrections reports**—results of sample surveys and censuses of jails, prisons, parole, probation, and other corrections data

- National Crime Victimization Survey**—the only ongoing national survey of crime victimization
- Sourcebook of Criminal Justice Statistics** (annual)—broad-based data from 150+ sources with addresses; 400+ tables, figures, index, annotated bibliography
- BJs National Update**—a quarterly summary of new BJS data, programs, and information services and products
- Send me a signup form for *NIJ Catalog*, free 6 times a year, which abstracts private and government criminal justice publications

To be added to any BJS mailing list, please copy or cut out this page, fill in, fold, stamp, and mail to the Justice Statistics Clearinghouse/NCJRS.

You will receive an annual renewal card. If you do not return it, we must drop you from the mailing list.

To order copies of recent BJS reports, check here and circle items you want to receive on other side of this sheet.

Name: _____

Title: _____

Organization: _____

Street or box: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

Daytime phone number: () _____

Criminal justice interest: _____

Put your organization and title here if you used home address above: _____

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
Bureau of Justice Statistics

Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300

BULK RATE
POSTAGE & FEES PAID
DOB/BJs
Permit No. G-91

Washington, D.C. 20531

**Special
Report**