

Koba
Associates,
Inc.

2001 S Street, N.W. Suite 302 Washington, D.C. 20009 202/265-9111

LOAN DOCUMENT

RETURN TO:

NCJRS

P. O. BOX 24036 S. W. POST. OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20024

NCJRS

MAR 17 1977

ISSUES PAPER

ACQUISITIONS

PHASE I EVALUATION OF
COEDUCATIONAL CORRECTIONS

CONTRACT # J-LEAA-009-77

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE
LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

February 4, 1977

40006

Prepared under contract number J-LEAA-009-77 from the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official positions or policies of the U. S. Department of Justice.

DRAFT
ISSUES PAPER

PHASE I EVALUATION OF
COEDUCATIONAL CORRECTIONS

For
National Institute for Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice
Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
U. S. Department of Justice

Prepared by
KOBAS ASSOCIATES, INC.

J. G. Ross, Project Director
E. Heffernan, Associate Project Director
J. R. Sevick, Research Associate
F. T. Johnson, Project Manager

February 4, 1977

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Background	1
B. Purpose	2
C. Definition	3
1. An adult institution.	4
2. The major purpose of which is the custody of sentenced felons.	4
3. Under a single institutional administration.	5
4. Having one or more programs or areas in which male and female inmates are present and in interaction.	5
D. Scope	6
E. Procedure	6
F. Organization	7
G. Special Acknowledgement	8
II. HISTORICAL ISSUES	9
A. Sexual Non-differentiation of Offenders	9
B. Sexual Segregation of Offenders	12
C. Coeducational Corrections	15
1. Reduction of the corrosive aspects of confinement.	18
2. Reduction of institutional control problems.	19
3. Separation of troublesome populations.	19
4. Normalization of the institutional environment.	20
5. Reduction of adjustment problems experienced by releasees.	20
6. Realization of economies of scale.	21
7. Relief of immediate or anticipated overcrowding.	21
8. Provision of an inexpensive light/heavy work force.	21
9. Expansion of treatment and program options.	22
10. Relief of immediate or anticipated legal pressure.	22
11. As an experiment.	23
III. ASSUMPTIONS AND THEORETICAL ISSUES	25
A. Assumptions	25
1. Irrational and irresponsible behavior: isolation and control.	25

	<u>Page</u>
2. Maladaptive behavior: behavioral and attitude change.	26
3. Rational violation of criminal statutes: custody within a normal environment.	27
4. Economic motivation: development of marketable skills.	28
5. Conclusions.	29
B. Theoretical Issues	30
1. Reduction of institutional control problems.	31
2. Reduction through normalization of the corrosive effects of confinement.	33
3. Provision of expanded treatment potential.	35
4. Provision of expanded program options.	39
5. Reduction of adjustment problems experienced by releasees.	41
6. Reduction of institutional costs through realization of economies of scale.	44
7. Reallocation of system-wide resources.	46
8. Conclusion.	48
IV. CO-CORRECTIONAL TYPOLOGIES AND OPERATIONAL ISSUES	49
A. Typologies of Co-corrections	49
1. Characteristics of integration.	49
2. Characteristics of the institutional environment.	51
3. Conclusion.	53
B. Operational Issues	53
1. Relative goal priorities.	56
2. Administrative support for change.	56
3. Articulation of an institutional philosophy.	57
4. Size.	57
5. Location.	58
6. Security level.	59
7. Open/closed.	60
8. Architectural design.	61
9. Phasing-in.	63
10. Resident composition.	65
11. Staff composition.	69
12. Staff-resident interaction.	73
13. Program structure.	74
14. Community response.	76
15. Policy on physical contact.	76
16. Impact of research.	78
17. Phasing-out.	79

	<u>Page</u>
V. EVALUATIVE ISSUES	80
A. Background	80
B. Issues Formulation	82
1. Descriptive issues.	82
2. Evaluative issues.	84
VI. CONCLUSION	86
NOTES	87
BIBLIOGRAPHY	92

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

The National Evaluation Program has as goals the timely assessment and extension of the state of knowledge in certain "topic areas," in response to the requirements of policy- and decision-makers for sound information on major criminal justice hypotheses, results, and national standards. Candidate "topic areas" for assessment under the National Evaluation Program are identified annually through a survey of issues and concerns among State Planning Agencies and LEAA Regional and National Offices. Implemented NEP Phase I assessments focus on the actual processes involved in a given "topic area," and can efficiently identify facilitating and impeding factors in law enforcement and criminal justice activities. As a result, several completed NEP Phase I's have revealed broad discrepancies between program theory/policy and operating program activities, allowing early consideration of policy decisions in the "topic area."¹

The topic of coeducational correctional institutions has received widespread attention in the popular press, and has captured increasing interest from administrators and scholars in many areas of the country. The National Advisory Commission of Criminal Justice Standards and Goals has called coeducational programs "an invaluable tool for exploring and dealing with social and emotional problems related to identity conflicts that many offenders experience."² The Commission urged the abolition of the present sexually segregated system and the

adoption of "a fully integrated system based on all offenders' needs."³ Several factors suggest a probable further proliferation of coed institutions, including the Commission's endorsement, overcrowding in single-sex institutions, the expressed need for expanded program options for women offenders, possible changes in correctional administrators' philosophies, and the higher costs of maintaining separate institutions for women. These conditions suggest the timeliness of performing a Phase I assessment of co-corrections. The Phase I assessment of co-corrections will identify important issues related to the topic area, describe coed institutions currently operational, assess the state of knowledge about the efficacy of co-corrections in achieving its objectives, and delineate potential research designs which might be employed in further exploration of the effects of implementing the co-correctional concept at both the national and local levels.

B. Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to present, in modified catalog form, the range of issues associated with the concept of coeducational correctional institutions. Because of the recent development of, and relative paucity of published information about co-corrections, much discussion of its anticipated effects - - its advantages and disadvantages - - has been either conjectural, representing hopes and fears rather than direct experience, or at the "gut level" impression stage, rather than the product of systematic observation. Such issues, raised through discussion with "experts," have been included in this paper, because their articulation plays an important role in a fuller understanding of the concept. This paper will hopefully convey to the reader a preliminary understanding of the

breadth of perspectives impinging on such questions as:

- o How innovative are coeducational correctional institutions?
- o What have been the rationales behind their development?
- o What functions do co-correctional institutions potentially serve?
- o What unanticipated consequences have been encountered in development of coed programs?
- o What typological refinements might be made within the universe of co-correctional institutions regarding the level of "co-education," and the relationship of this concept to other dimensions of correctional activity?
- o What potential implementation problems exist in relation to co-corrections?
- o What evaluation problems potentially arise in evaluation of co-corrections?

C. Definition

To be defined as a coeducational correctional institution for the purposes of this study, an institution must be:

- o An adult institution.
- o The major purpose of which is the custody of sentenced felons,
- o Under a single institutional administration,
- o Having one or more programs or areas where male and female inmates from the institution are present and in interaction.

I. An Adult Institution.

In order to give this study a manageable scope, but with a moderate degree of arbitrariness, juvenile institutions and institutions which regularly contain minors in the population have been excluded. The exclusion of juvenile institutions is made primarily because of the differences between adult and juvenile offenders: juveniles have often been incarcerated for "status" offenses which would not even be crimes if committed by adults, and hence juvenile criminality is not comparable with that of adults; juveniles are also generally regarded as differing vastly from adults in values, emotional maturity, personal goals, and corresponding treatment modalities. Moreover, juvenile facilities have traditionally been coed in many places (in some, for over a century), and public response to such institutions has been not merely less resistant than towards adult institutions, but even supportive of their function in fostering a "normal" adolescence. The exclusion of juvenile institutions, however, does not apply to institutions for youthful offenders, if the population consists of eighteen year olds and above, or to institutions which restrict the population of one sex, while admitting a full age range from the opposite sex.

2. The Major Purpose of Which is the Custody of Sentenced Felons.

This aspect of the definition excludes jails and specialized adult institutions, such as diagnostic centers, camps, and halfway houses. This exclusion is made on the assumption that institutional confinement will, unless the walls of Jericho come tumbling down, continue to be the primary means of maintaining

custody. This does not exclude institutions which occasionally house misdemeanants or pre-sentence cases, or circumstances in which a given institution is the single institution within the jurisdiction for one sex.

3. Under a Single Institutional Administration.

This excludes separate institutions which may have a certain number of shared programs or services. In particular, this excludes co-ordinate (or brother-sister) institutions, both those on the same grounds but under separate institutional administrations, as well as institutions between which certain inmates are bussed to share particular activities, such as dances, work-and study-release, and medical services. Such an exclusion is made on the basis that, although such institutions may share certain goals and functions with institutions having a single administration, the operations of the institutions may be markedly different; furthermore, the sharing of certain programs and services by two or several institutions cannot remotely be considered an innovative practice.

4. Having One or More Programs or Areas in Which Male and Female Inmates are Present and in Interaction.

This excludes institutions in which males and females are both present, but separated. The implication is that opportunities are made available, within the institutional confines, for regular, daily interaction between male and female inmates in one or more facets of institutional life, including vocational, academic, therapy, recreation, social, industrial, religious, and other programs and activities. The term "daily contact" is avoided lest this be interpreted to imply that in co-educational correctional institutions sexual congress between male and female

inmates is ordinarily, if ever, officially condoned. Indeed, outside of Northern Europe, sexual contact between male and female prisoners is generally strictly proscribed. The terms "intermingling," "cohabitation," and "coexistence" are all frequently used in reference to co-corrections, and allow insight into the meaning of the term: the lives of male and female inmates are potentially interwoven into the same institutional fabric; they are inhabitants of the same institution and, in varying degrees, are subject to the same controls and participate in the same programs; theirs is a shared life which, to a degree varying between and within institutions, might mirror the breadth of potential structured and spontaneous interactions that occur "outside, in the free."

D. Scope

The scope of this issues paper entails presentation of numerous theoretical, operational, and evaluation-related issues in concise, catalog form. The definition of the term "coeducational correctional institution," as indicated above, generally means an adult institution the major purpose of which is the custody of sentenced felons. The scope of the study, however, excludes juvenile institutions; jails; specialized institutions, such as camps, half-way houses, and diagnostic centers; and coordinate institutions. The scope of the study will be further refined through the iterative process of the NEP.

E. Procedure

Information used in this report consists of:

- o Background information: books, articles, papers;
- o Program information: grant applications, proposals, feasibility studies,

master plans, progress reports, final reports, evaluations; and

o Expert opinion.

Background information was collected through review of related journals; several searches of the National Criminal Justice Reference Service library; contacts with the ABA National Resource Center on Women Offenders; and references contained in published and unpublished works. Program information was obtained through a search of LEAA's Grant Management Information System (revealing only one, small grant for co-correctional activity); through a "locator" survey of all state corrections Directors/Commissioners, which identified many existing or planned coed institutions; and by direct contact with the central research office of the Bureau of Prisons, and the chief administrator of each identified, self-perceived, coed institution. Expert opinion was crucial in conceptualizing the issues outlined in this paper, due to both the paucity of published information on the subject, and the high degree of current activity in the area.

F. Organization

The body of this paper is organized into four parts. Chapter II reviews the historical precedents and rationales for sexually integrated imprisonment. Chapter III traces the underlying assumptions behind co-corrections, and adumbrates the major theoretical hypotheses about the function of co-corrections, alternate hypotheses expressing potential counterindicating effects, and alternative interventions. Chapter IV presents typologies of co-corrections, and reviews potential operational problems to implementing coed programs. Chapter V capsulizes the most important research efforts in the area, and outlines several problems related

to research on co-corrections.

G. Special Acknowledgement

A special word of appreciation is expressed to the many "experts" in the field, particularly the current and former wardens and superintendents of co-correctional institutions, who shared their impressions with us. Although such "expert opinion" is constantly mirrored in the historical, theoretical and, particularly, operational issues sections of this paper, it has often been infeasible to specify the sources of certain impressions; moreover, reference to such informal sources by name was regarded as inappropriate in this first NEP product.

II. HISTORICAL ISSUES

The purpose of this section is to place the concept of sexually integrated prisons within an historical context. This chapter provides preliminary discussion of the following questions:

- o How truly innovative are co-correctional institutions? What historical precedents exist for confinement of male and female inmates in common?
- o What factors brought about the sexually segregated prison, and what are the drawbacks generally attributed to sexually segregated incarceration, differentially, for males and females?
- o What factors renewed the use of sexual "mix" in prisons?

A. Sexual Non-differentiation of Offenders

From the mid-seventeenth until the late nineteenth century, men and women often occupied almshouses, jails and dungeons mixed with children, the insane, and the deaf.⁴ The use of imprisonment as punishment, rather than detention, did not come into practice until the rise of industrialism, and the forms of punishment meted out before this time -- exile, physical pain, branding, and dismemberment -- were similarly administered to men and women with minimal sexual differentiation.⁵ Early prisons for detention consisted of large rooms where men, women and children lived, ate, and slept amidst terrible, unsanitary conditions, where they

were often visited by the "jaded gentry."

It is represented as a scene of promiscuous and unrestricted intercourse, and universal riot and debauchery. There was no labor no separation of those accused, but yet untried, nor even of those confined for debt only, from convicts sentenced for the foulest crimes; no separation of color, age, or sex, by day or by night; the prisoners lying promiscuously on the floor, most of them without anything like bed or bedding. . . Intoxicating liquors abounded, and indeed were freely sold at a bar kept by one of the officers of the prison. Intercourse between the convicts and persons without was hardly restricted. . . It need hardly be added, that there was no attempt to give any kind of instruction, and no religious service whatsoever.

With the spread of the late eighteenth century prison reform philosophies came efforts to provide an alternative to the degradation of the open-room prison, and the finality of execution. Solitary confinement, instruction in the scriptures, and daily labor were viewed as appropriate means to change criminal behavior. The Pennsylvania System, begun by the Quakers, provided removal from corrupting peers, time for reflection and self-examination, and guidance in biblical precepts;⁷ the Auburn System was built on the use of solitary confinement encouraged by the Quakers, but added congregate work by day to separation and enforced silence by night.⁸ By the mid-nineteenth century, the former system of privately owned prisons had been replaced by a nationwide system of state institutions. Although "women convicts" were housed in such institutions, their low numbers meant it was often unfeasible to provide them either supervision by a matron, or "moral instruction." Dorothea Dix's pioneering work on Prisons and Prison Discipline, written in 1845, contains the following passage on "women convicts:"⁹

Very few, usually no women-convicts, are found in the State prisons in Maine, New-Hampshire, and Vermont. In Massachusetts these are

not committed to the State prison, but are sent to the House of Corrections, severally in Middlesex, Essex, and Suffolk counties; in the other counties they are sometimes detained in the jails. In each of the local prisons above named, matrons govern the women's department. In Connecticut prison there are 20 women under the supervision of an excellent matron. Unfortunately the present discipline of this prison affords for the women no period but Sundays for instruction, except in mechanical labors. In New-York all the women state convicts are sent to a prison at Sing Sing; these average about 72, and are under the direction of a matron, who, with her assistants, are much interested in the improvement of those under their charge. New-Jersey prison has but two women-convicts, and no matron. The Eastern Penitentiary has 20 women-convicts. This department I have often visited, and always found in order; neatness and good behavior appear to be the rule and practice of the prison; the exceptions being very rare. The matron is vigilant, and fills her station in a manner to secure respect and confidence. The women are chiefly employed in making and repairing apparel, and have full time for the use of books, and the lessons which are assigned weekly by the ladies who visit the prison to give instruction. In the Eastern District, a portion of the women-convicts, since the building of the Philadelphia, Chester, and Dauphin county prisons, have been sentenced to these, where they come under similar discipline. In the Moyamensing prison they possess corresponding moral advantages and means of receiving instruction, as those who are sent to the State prison. In the Western Penitentiary are 7 women-convicts, no matron; in Ohio prison are 6 women-convicts, no matron; in Virginia prison are 15 women-convicts, no matron; in the Washington prison, D.C., 4 women, a year since, no matron; in the Maryland prison were 15 women under the charge of an energetic matron, who earnestly desires to maintain order, without resorting to severe restraints and punishments; these cannot be always dispensed with. There is too little provision for moral instruction in this department.

Dix concluded that fiscal considerations warranted the sentencing of women offenders not to State prisons, but nearer to home, to the country houses of correction:

The product of women's labor in the State prisons, fails to meet the expenses of their department. I should judge it greatly more advantageous in all respects, to sentence women-convicts to the county houses of correction, rather than connect their prisons, with those of the men-convicts, especially also if their numbers are so few that it is judged inexpedient to appoint a matron.

B. Sexual Segregation of Offenders

The question addressed by nineteenth century prison reformers was not usually whether to segregate "women-convicts," but in what isolated location to place them. At the turn of the eighteenth century, an Englishwoman named Mrs. Fry, dedicated as she was to inmates as redeemable human beings, suggested the classification of prisoners by age, sex, and offense history.¹⁰ Efforts at reform reached fever pitch in 1870 at the National Congress on Penitentiary and Reformatory Discipline, where complaints were voiced about the unconscionable idleness of prisoners, reports of brutality, and the mixing of women, children and hard-core male convicts.¹¹ The first separate prison for women, the Indiana Women's Prison, opened in 1873. The guiding principle of the Indiana prison was that women criminals should be rehabilitated apart from men, isolated from the corruption and chaos of the outside world.¹² Discipline, regularity, obedience, and systematic religious education were expected to help the women form orderly habits and appropriate moral values. Other jurisdictions followed suit: Framingham opened in 1877, a reformatory for women in New York in 1891, Westfield Farm in 1901, the District of Columbia's women's prison in 1910, and a New Jersey institution for women in 1913.¹³ Among the expressed factors behind development of separate facilities for women were: fear of sexual exploitation by male guards, not inmates; provision of avenues for career development of female superintendents; development of special programs for women; and fostering independence in women, by giving them total responsibility for maintaining the institution and its proximate farmland.¹⁴ By 1971, when the first coed adult prison opened, there were approximately forty separate state institutions for female offenders.¹⁵

After several generations of sexually segregating inmates, male and female prisoners are subject to differential treatment, according to Arditi, because of two factors: the vast differences in facilities for each sex, due to differences in population sizes; and stereotypical assumptions about the different security and rehabilitative problems of male and female offenders.¹⁶ The disparities in treatment caused by scale differences between male and female institutions include:

- o Remoteness. Because it is generally unfeasible for women's institutions to be much smaller than they already are, women are situated further from friends, family, attorneys, and are impeded in keeping track of possessions, or becoming involved in work or study release.
- o Heterogeneity. Separation of females according to classification regarding security risk, as is done with males, is unfeasible, except within institutions, if then.
- o Institutional Services. Medical, religious, and counseling services are often unavailable to women.

In addition, several differences in treatment are influenced by stereotyping:

- o Physical Environment. Women's facilities are more "bucolic," less "forbidding," more "commodious," display less concern with security and more concern with "homelike" atmosphere, personal choice in clothes, private rooms, etc.
- o Recreational Facilities. Women's institutions much less frequently have gymnasiums, playing fields, sufficient recreation staffs, or varied recreational programs, but often permit more trips outside the prison

than men's institutions.

- o Staffing. At female institutions, much higher staff/inmate ratios prevail, staff are more sexually integrated, and staff-inmate relationships are often "mother-daughter" ones, rather than ones predicated on enforcement of discipline.
- o Educational and Vocational Programs. The larger number of teachers in men's institutions permits more specialization in educational programs, but better teacher/inmate ratio in women's institutions permits more individual attention. Men and women are offered different types of vocational programs; male prisons offer a wider variety of programs; men are often assigned to an institution on the basis of vocational needs.
- o Industrial Programs. Men are again provided with a far greater variety of programs to a degree which cannot be explained by scale differences alone.

In summary assessment of the differential effect of the dual system, Arditi states that women are disadvantaged by remoteness, heterogeneity, and low program facility level; men by harsh physical surroundings, lower staff/inmate ratio, and a strict regime; both males and females by being treated according to sex-role stereotypes. Moreover, it might be added, women are restricted by a dependency-oriented, passive-aggressive institutional atmosphere and males by a pervasive homosexual inmate culture characterized by an aggressive, confrontational structure. As a result, male inmates are under pressure to achieve "normalization," while the lack of program flexibility and the absence of choice of

institution leads women to move away from dependency into an atmosphere in which there exists a wider range of programs and relationships.

Certain single-sex institutions have offered variation on the theme of "single-sex institution" by being linked to opposite-sex institutions. Nagel suggests that when women's institutions assume the function of satellite institutions, they take on the characteristics related to security and maintenance of custody usually associated with men's institutions:

Our impression was that there was at least one good reason for locating the women's facility distant and administratively separate from the men's prison. Essentially, it is that the satellite women's institutions which we visited are much more controlling, custody-oriented and repressive than are those which were independent of the influence of male correctional philosophy and practice. The satellites use the terms (warden, maximum security, count-up, lock-up), the hardware (television surveillance, segregation cells, barbed-wire topped fences, electrically operated exterior doors), the controls (supervised movements, frequent head-counts, body searches, and closely supervised correspondence and visits), and have the same preoccupation with escapes and homosexuality as do their adjoining male counterparts.

If Nagel's observation is accurate, and this "repression" is the usual effect of being cast as a satellite institution, what then would be the result of restoring the sexual "mix" prevailing approximately a century or more ago, in the atmosphere of contemporary correctional philosophies?

C. Coeducational Corrections

The twentieth century coeducational correctional institution may be regarded as an innovative intervention, "a new planet on the horizon," or a reversion to the former circumstance in which women were placed within men's institutions solely for reasons of limited numbers and economy of scale, depending on one's

perspectives. Regardless, it is a phenomenon on the correctional horizon which has received support at both the Federal and State levels, as well as from the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, which called for the abandonment of "the current system of separate institution based upon sex," and development of "a fully integrated system based on all offenders' needs."¹⁸

The opening of the first coed institution for adults took place in November of 1971, when the former "narcotics farm" run by the Public Health Service in Fort Worth was shifted to the jurisdiction of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons and was reopened with a combined male and female population. The opening of this institution demonstrated, in part, an effort to extend to adults in the Federal system the experience with juveniles already considered a preliminary success at KYC Morgantown. During the ensuing five years, although the institution at Morgantown closed, several institutions have sprung up elsewhere; a second Federal "narcotics farm" at Lexington was converted to a coed prison; the Federal Youth Center at Pleasanton, California, opened as a coed facility (for youth, not juveniles). In addition, over a dozen states have either already opened a coed correctional institution,¹⁹ or are at the operational planning stage of opening one,²⁰ either by opening the doors of a traditionally single-sex institution to the opposite sex, or by expropriating a facility previously used for non-correctional purposes. Moreover, several states and other jurisdictions have a coed facility "on the drawing boards,"²¹ and coed corrections has been the subject of open discussion, a feasibility study, or an actual proposal.

The proposal to open a coed institution, or merely to construct an opposite-sex unit on the grounds of a single-sex facility, has, in some instances, met vocal opposition and aroused public indignation against the "embarrassing" prospect of

"coddling" prisoners by condoning "intermingling" between male and female inmates, whom it is thought should be deprived of normal human pleasures; as much as to say, "homosexuality is the prisoner's unnatural lot."²² While no coed adult institution has reverted to single-sex status, or been converted to some other purpose, two existing coed institutions in Illinois are now "phasing out" through attrition, and will complete the process of restoring existing coed institutions to their former single-sex condition. These closings have occurred primarily because the factors which brought about the original conversion (e.g., low crime rates among women, and consequent underutilization of space in the single state all-female institution) were no longer valid, or because of unanticipated consequences (e.g., increased staffing and program costs). Despite isolated closings and some negative responses from the public toward "permissive" treatment of offenders, the universe of coed correctional institutions, though small, is an expanding one.

The re-emergence of the sexually mixed adult correctional institution has occurred against a background dominated by surging costs of institutionalization; legal decisions regarding equal opportunities as a result of the women's movement; shifts in crime patterns among women; and evolution of correctional philosophy from restraint to rehabilitation, and from rehabilitation to reintegration. The range of rationales behind the planning and/or implementation of co-corrections reflects these circumstances. Coed programs have come into being with widely divergent goal-priorities, and sometimes under circumstances which foster less deliberate design and planning, and more rapid action through the mechanism of administrative fiat. Indeed, the decision to "go coed" sometimes occurs outside the department or division of corrections, and on the desks of budget analysts.

Therefore, the chronicle of coed program development shows both witting and happenstance modifications in program objectives, as original purposes have given way to new goals, or as once subordinate objectives have taken on greater importance. The principal, articulated purposes behind development of coed programs are:

- o Reduction of the corrosive aspects of confinement.
- o Reduction of institutional control problems.
- o Separation of troublesome populations.
- o Normalization of the institutional environment.
- o Reduction of adjustment problems experienced by releasees.
- o Realization of economies of scale.
- o Relief of immediate or anticipated overcrowding.
- o Provision of an inexpensive light/heavy work force.
- o Expansion of treatment and program options.
- o Relief of immediate or anticipated legal pressures.
- o As an experiment.

1. Reduction of the Corrosive Aspects of Confinement.

"The nature of imprisonment," states the Report of the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, "does not have to be as destructive in the future as it has been."²³ Regardless of the prevailing philosophy of corrections -- whether premised on restraint, rehabilitation, or reintegration -- the reduction of certain corrosive aspects of confinement has recently been viewed almost univocally as desirable. Ruback cited the reduction of the pervasive homosexuality associated with single-sex institutions as one of the

two problems which co-corrections was designed to solve.²⁴ Among the expectations involved in the development of co-corrections have been the reduction of homosexual and violent behavior and concomitant increments in "humanizing," "mellowing," a "softening" of callous personalities, a generalized "warming over," and replacement of the violent institutional subcultures with less violent and more encompassing correctional communities.

2. Reduction of Institutional Control Problems.

Co-corrections has been adopted not only from the perspective of humanitarian treatment of prisoners, but also from the angle of sound institutional management. Closely allied to the reduction of the destructive effects of confinement is the reduction of institutional control problems. Indeed, these two rationales for co-corrections represent two sides of the same coin: for example, the knifings and assaults associated with situational homosexuality constitute negative effects of confinement, and are also among the most severe control problems presented for management. The current use of co-corrections as primarily an anodyne for a restless male population; to "round out rough corners," or "heal wounded male egos," has also been suggested.

3. Separation of Troublesome Populations.

Coed programs have been developed as a mechanism through which to separate certain inmates considered likely to be involved in "trouble," from a predominately same-sex population, i.e., to separate females likely to be the subject/source of, or to precipitate/incite "trouble" (e.g., riots) from a predominantly female population; to separate males likely to be the object/target of

"trouble" (e.g., witnesses in controversial cases, those convicted of certain types of crimes, persons regarded as likely to elicit homosexual assault, and transitional transsexuals) from a predominantly male population.

4. Normalization of the Institutional Environment.

The normalization of institutional life has been a guiding principle behind development of coed programs. The concept "normalization" has more than one meaning, e.g., "making prison more like the 'outside,'" "the growth process of learning to deal with real-life problems through graduated experience," "feeling good to see the ladies again," and "having some choice, and developing responsibility." "Normalcy" has potential application to all aspects of institutional life, and not just to the presence of males and females within the same walls; e.g., to staff-inmate interaction, control over lights, visiting times, activity schedules, mail censorship, inmate media, etc. The presence of both males and females, however, is central to the normalization anticipated in a coed prison.

5. Reduction of Adjustment Problems Experienced by Releasees.

Consistent with a partial re-orientation of correctional philosophy to a reintegrative model, several means have been adopted to improve chances of post-release reintegration into the larger community, including the coed prison. Ruback cited reduction of "difficulties of adjustment to society almost all inmates experience on release" as the second of two reasons for originally implementing coed programs.²⁵ By providing a two-sex experience in prison, the shock of release is expected to be "cushioned," by reducing the number and intensity of readjustments to be made.

6. Realization of Economies of Scale.

To reduce the high per capita costs of under-capacity single-sex institutions, coed prisons have been implemented to make maximum use of available space, staff, or facilities. Realization of economies of scale in one institution, ordinarily a former women's institution, is often complemented by reduction of overcrowding in another.

7. Relief of Immediate or Anticipated Overcrowding.

Severe or immanent overcrowding of single-sex institutions for both males and females has led to the transfer of the "bursting" population's "surplus" to an underutilized opposite-sex institution. Occasionally, such a move has been triggered by the occurrence of emergency conditions, as a temporary solution. A basic purpose behind development of coed prisons has been the dearth of minimum or medium security facilities, primarily for males, but also for females.

8. Provision of an Inexpensive Light/Heavy Work Force.

The opposite sex has, in several instances, been introduced into a previously single-sex institution as a light/heavy work force: females as a "laundry room crew," and males as "maintenance staff," or to work heavy farm equipment. In the previously all-female institution at Dwight, for example, younger males were shipped in to make better use of available facilities, but were soon shipped out, "because they added a whole new dimension to our heterogeneity." These younger males were replaced by a group of older, less truculent males, which could nevertheless perform adequately the available heavy labor.

9. Expansion of Treatment and Program Options.

Existing co-correctional programs have been implemented to expand treatment and program options not only for women, but also for elderly offenders, those handicapped by chronic health and psychiatric problems, and for pre-release males. To accommodate changes in the demography of prison populations toward a higher percentage of women displaying offense patterns not traditionally associated with women, efforts have been made to reduce disparities in treatment of especially female offenders. This expansion of treatment and program options applies not only to increases in medical, religious, counseling, vocational, academic, recreational, and industrial programs, but to providing means for developing healthy relationships with the opposite sex. The National Advisory Commission for Criminal Justice Standards and Goals states that: "In sexually segregated facilities, it is very difficult for offenders . . . to develop positive, healthy relationships with the opposite sex."²⁶

10. Relief of Immediate or Anticipated Legal Pressure.

Coed prisons have been designed to comply with immediate or anticipated court decisions regarding the rights of female offenders to equal protection (medical services, proximity to parole authorities, vocational and academic programs, work-release, per-inmate square footage). Although the traditional standard of review permitted justification of differences in treatment of males and females in accord with "obvious" differences between the sexes (e.g., State v. Heitman), more recent decisions (e.g., Commonwealth v. Daniel) have been resolved according to an intermediate standard of review, by which "hypothetical legislative justifications" are insufficient.²⁷ Cases such as Daniel enumerate a

principle which, according to Ardit, "refuses to accept a legislative rationale a priori, but rather asks for substantial and empirically grounded justifications which seem reasonable and which are narrowly drawn to reflect real -- and relevant -- differences between men and women."²⁸ Under this intermediate standard of review, states could argue that sexual segregation is necessary to prevent violence, protect privacy and rehabilitation of females, or is rational because men are more violent. However, the anticipated Equal Rights Amendment may require that differences due to classification of prisoners, a prison's physical environment, and rehabilitative programs, would all have to be based on sexually neutral criteria. Short of the passage of ERA, several jurisdictions (including the District of Columbia and Philadelphia County) have experienced legal pressures for equal protection of female offenders in several suits, which have led to the consideration and design of plans for coed facilities.

11. As an Experiment.

Provision of a "demonstration model," and replication of an ostensibly successful experiment elsewhere, have served as rationales for opening coed correctional institutions. Charles Campbell, the first warden at FCI Fort Worth, states that although there was no "definitive rationale" for co-corrections, there was "a feeling that it was one of many things that needed to be tried."²⁹ The coed pilot program opened in the moral development unit of the Connecticut Correctional Institution for Women at Niantic consists of an effort to extend to a coed environment a program already effected among youthful male offenders. The extension of coed experiences with juveniles to adult populations has obviously played an extremely important role in the spread of adult coed programs. To

prepare for this replication of juvenile coed programs, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals states that: "coeducational programs . . . have demonstrated clearly that a mixed population has a positive program impact (with juveniles)." ³⁰ Subsequently, other institutions have been modeled after Fort Worth, Framingham, and probably other institutions. So in one sense correctional planners have been "grasping at straws," but in another sense they have endeavored to "keep a good thing going."

III. ASSUMPTIONS AND THEORETICAL ISSUES

A. Assumptions

A review of the reasons for the earlier presence of sexually undifferentiated prisons, the movement toward the strict separation of the sexes, the development of autonomous institutions for women, and the present emergence of co-correctional facilities with varying degrees of institutional integration of the sexes, shows that process reflects a variety of underlying assumptions regarding the functions of prisons, the characteristics of the incarcerated populations, as well as questions about space utilization and economies of size and program.

Not only are changes observed over time in regard to the dominant philosophy of corrections, but at any given time, diverse and sometimes conflicting assumptions are found to be incorporated within a single institution or program. Co-corrections, rather than reflecting a particular well-integrated set of assumptions, is an excellent example of the diversity of correctional philosophies which may be simultaneously operative. Leaving aside for the moment the strictly economic motivation for some decision-making in regard to co-corrections, the development of sexually integrated facilities has been justified within the context of several major models of criminal behavior and institutional functions.

1. Irrational and Irresponsible Behavior: Isolation and Control.

The first criminal justice model tends to view criminal behavior as fundamentally irrational and irresponsible action, with stress on the aggressive and anti-social nature of the behavior. The function of prison becomes essentially one

of restraint. This view has its roots not only in the popular "lock them up and throw away the key" philosophy, but also in the development and acceptance of genetic and bio-social theories of criminality as well as certain forms of conflict theory. In this model the focus of the programs within the institution is on order and control. These are achieved usually through isolation from outside contact and extensive physical security measures, supported by the provision of sufficient work and activity to insure a stable prison environment. A usual component of this model is a strict staff-line authority structure and the presence of a sharp distinction between staff and inmate status. In addition to the tension generated between the staff and inmates within a controlled and restricted environment, a regular source of disruptive behavior within a single-sex institution flows from the aggressive behavior associated with the situational homosexual systems which arise within the facility. Within the context of this model, the development of co-corrections is viewed as a source of control which lessens the level of aggressive homosexuality, "softens" the behavior of male inmates and stimulates behaviors and changes in appearance supportive of inmate morale. Or, in certain circumstances, co-correctional institutions provide custody for inmates whose backgrounds would make it difficult for them to be sent to any of the single-sex institutions within the jurisdiction.

2. Maladaptive Behavior: Behavioral and Attitude Change.

The second model, associated with a perception of criminal behavior as a manifestation of maladjustment, considers the function of the prison to be a locus of behavioral and attitudinal change. With rehabilitation as a focus, stress is laid on the development of positive interpersonal relationships, a sense of personal

adequacy, and an array of coping skills to assure adjustment after release. Generally, the rehabilitative model de-emphasizes security and replaces the guarded relationship with a patient- or client-professional relationship. Psychological, rather than physical controls tend to be present within the prison. In turn, selected community contacts are developed to provide reinforcement for behavioral change. However, community and staff contacts may not provide the range of relationships which a single-sex institution by its nature restricts. Therefore co-corrections within this model is seen as an opportunity for the development of positive heterosexual relationships within a protective environment, as well as providing access to wider treatment options.

3. Rational Violation of Criminal Statutes: Custody within a Normal Environment.

The third model has its roots in classical concepts of jurisprudence, which assumes that the criminal act represents a rational, or at least volitional, violation of criminal statutes, and that as punishment, the offender is under the custody of the state for a given period of time. As Fogel succinctly describes the "justice" model of corrections, following arguments similar to those of Morris and the authors of Struggle for Justice,³¹ a prison sentence ". . . is simply a deprivation of liberty for a fixed period of time."³² Associated with this position regarding the nature of criminal acts are certain assumptions regarding the prisoners and the prison. The prisoner is viewed as essentially "normal" and the prison's function is to be as non-destructive of the person as possible during the period of custody. Within this context, while the function of the prison is custody, the focus of the program within the institution would be considered one of normalization of the prison

environment and the preparation for reintegration into society. Combining some of the insights of Murton and Morris, the position assumes the need for the opportunity to make responsible decisions both in regard to the programs available within the institution and the structuring of the institutional life itself.³³ Concomitantly, communication and contact with others is to be sustained at as high a level as possible, limited only by the requirements of the maintenance of custody. Usually this involves work and study release and continued contact with family, friends and other persons either within or outside the institution. A third dimension of normalization within this environment is the presence of both sexes within the institution. If this occurs through the integration of the inmate population, then co-corrections is incorporated as an integral component of the "justice" model of corrections.

4. Economic Motivation: Development of Marketable Skills.

A fourth criminal justice model, sometimes viewed as a variation of the justice model, derives from the assumption that a major reason for the prisoner's violation of criminal statutes is the inability of the offender to obtain economic security through legitimate employment, either as a result of a lack of education or skills, or the presence of addictions which either lessen the ability to hold steady employment, or are too expensive to be maintained by legitimate means. Within the justice or reintegrative model it is generally assumed that the prison will maintain or provide access to programs which will provide education and employable skills, and/or reduce addictions. The provision of greater, if not equal, access for both men and women to these programs produces a second rationale for the

development of co-correctional programs, since the size, location or security level of either men's or women's prisons may limit the feasibility of adequate programs.

5. Conclusion.

In the above analysis it becomes clear that the objectives of a particular co-correctional institution may simultaneously reflect a range of correctional philosophies, while men and women may be present within significantly different correctional settings in the same institution. Table 1 summarizes the relationships between prevailing philosophies regarding the nature of the criminal act, those dealing with the function of imprisonment, and co-correctional strategies.

TABLE 1

Basic Correctional Philosophies and Co-Correctional Strategies

Nature of the Criminal Act	Function of imprisonment	Function of Co-corrections
Irrational, irresponsible and anti-social behavior	Restraint through isolation and control	Weakening of disruptive homosexual systems, support for inmate morale, and protective control
Maladaptive behavior	Rehabilitation through behavioral and attitude change	Development of positive heterosexual relationships and the provision for wider treatment options
Rational violation of criminal statutes	Custody as a sanction within a normal environment	Presence of both sexes within the institution
Violation based on economic needs	Development of legitimate, marketable skills	Equal access to education and work programs

Given the diversity of assumptions which may underlie the introduction of co-correctional institutions, it is essential to examine systematically the implications of each anticipated function of sexual integration.

B. Theoretical Issues

In this subsection, the key theoretical issues, or the basic hypotheses about the effects of sexually integrated prisons, are outlined. These hypotheses reflect the primary expectations and/or impressions of administrators, researchers, budget analysts, inmates, treatment staff, journalists, etc., and are elaborated under the heading "subordinate hypotheses." These subordinate hypotheses are not necessarily dependent on each other, but comprise partial reformulations of, and refinements upon, the basic hypothesis. In addition, for each basic hypothesis, there exist certain alternative hypotheses, representing either unanticipated consequences, or effects overlooked in the basic hypothesis; these, similarly, reflect the thinking of a wide range of "expert opinion." Finally, alternative interventions, which may achieve the effect specified in the basic hypotheses while minimizing the negative effects associated with alternate hypotheses, are presented.

Rather than launching into lengthy disquisitions on the effects of sexually integrated prisons, this subsection presents, in catalog form, the subordinate hypotheses, alternative hypotheses, and alternative interventions associated with the following theoretical issues:

- o Sexually integrated prisons lead to a reduction of institutional control problems.
- o Sexually integrated prisons lead to a reduction, through normalization of the institutional environment, of the corrosive effects

of confinement.

- o Sexually integrated prisons provide expanded treatment potential.
- o Sexually integrated prisons provide expanded program options.
- o Sexually integrated prisons lead to a reduction of adjustment problems experienced by releasees.
- o Sexually integrated prisons lead to a reduction of institutional costs through realization of economies of scale.
- o Sexually integrated prisons lead to the reallocation of system-wide resources.

1. Reduction of institutional control problems.

a. Subordinate hypotheses. Related to the reduction of institutional control problems, the following hypotheses have been articulated:

- o Co-corrections reduces problematic relationships traditionally associated with prison life which have constituted the greatest control problems for institutional management; i.e., co-corrections lowers institutional violence as reflected in fewer incident reports and disciplinaries, and decreased predatory homosexuality.
- o Co-corrections leads to a reduction of the violent subcultures associated with prison life, and replaces it with a larger institutional community. "The difference from other institutions ... is the absence of the aggressive, exploitative, and sometimes violent 'rackets' which 'run the lines' elsewhere, and the relative lack of pressures to become involved or to 'protect' the rackets since the residents are not forced into the 'con' role by either the

staff or the fellow residents."³⁴

b. Alternate hypotheses. These alternate hypotheses have been expressed regarding the effects of co-corrections on institutional control problems.

- o Homosexuality among women persists, but rarely has force associated with it.
- o Male-identified female homosexuals can present an increased control problem when males are introduced into a formerly single-sex women's institution, as a function of resentment to male competition and withdrawal of payment.
- o The gang structure of the streets is sometimes transported relatively intact from the city to a coed "joint." leading to the same control problems customarily faced by the police.
- o Violent homosexual behavior is merely replaced in the coed prison by violent heterosexual behavior.
- o By introducing a normal behavior which is forbidden, co-corrections leads to "cat-and-mouse-games" over heterosexual physical contact, merely transferring the focus of institutional control problems, and adding the increased burden of potential pregnancy.

c. Alternate interventions. Two principal alternative interventions have been suggested to reduce institutional control problems:

- o Conjugal and family visitation reduces homosexuality and increases cooperation among inmates, but lacks some of the negative side-effects associated with co-corrections.

- o An open, sexually segregated prison offers an equally effective and less costly solution to institutional control problems, such as situational homosexuality and institutional violence.
- o A sexually integrated staff, particularly the introduction of female staff to male institutions, may provide a "quieting", controlling influence.

2. Reduction through normalization of the corrosive effects of confinement.

a. Subordinate hypotheses. These subordinate hypotheses further specify the effects of co-corrections in reducing the corrosive effects of confinement:

- o Co-corrections leads to a humanization of the environment, through reduction in the number of assaults, senseless beatings, and homosexual rapes.
- o Co-corrections leads to a reduction in negative atmosphere, low morale, and high tension levels, and development of a generally "pleasant," "wholesome", "natural" atmosphere.
- o Co-corrections leads to improvements/normalization in appearance, either through "caring if their shirt's tucked in," or changes from cross-sex to sex-appropriate appearance.
- o The co-correctional setting provides a more normal atmosphere by multiplying the number of affective relational opportunities usually available within a prison environment. The coed institu-

tion replaces the condition in single-sex settings "where relationships tend to be structured by adaptive patterns to the deprivation of normal affective relationships with normal relational opportunities."³⁵

b. Alternate hypotheses. Several alternate hypotheses have been expressed about the impact of co-corrections on the dehumanizing aspects of confinement:

- o The transported gang structure of the streets, sometimes found relatively intact inside coed institutions, leads to the flourishing of the usual street activities, including pimping and prostitution.
- o Inside a coed institution, "making a living" and enjoying "forbidden amenities" continues to go on, sub rosa.
- o Women in coed institutions are often subject to unjustified restrictions on movement, effectively occupying an "institution within an institution."
- o The frustrations of a "look-but-don't-touch" policy lead to increased homosexuality in certain populations.

c. Alternative interventions. Four alternative interventions may be associated with co-corrections' impact on the corrosive aspects of confinement:

- o Conjugal visitation reduces much of the negative atmosphere associated with prisons, and reduces homosexuality. It prevents "sliding backwards" into the violent subcultures traditionally associated with confinement.

- o The maintenance of mother-child relationships during incarceration provides a more effective program for reducing homosexual relationships among confined women, by providing an object upon which to "shower affections."
- o An open, sexually segregated prison offers an equally effective, and less costly solution to homosexuality, institutional violence, and other corrosive effects of confinement.
- o A sexually integrated staff can provide a normalization of the institutional environment, even given a limited population of female offenders.

3. Provision of expanded treatment potential.

- a. Subordinate hypotheses. The following subordinate hypotheses further specify the expanded treatment potential anticipated in co-corrections:
 - o The greater normalization and reduced violence of coed institutions provides the general framework for the unravelling of the therapeutic process, by increasing self-esteem.
 - o "A coed institution would provide a more normal situation in which inmates could evaluate their feelings about themselves and others and establish their identities in a more positive way."³⁶
 - o Improvements in, and normalization of, appearance both reflects and engenders heightened self-esteem, which increases inmate potential receptiveness to both treatment programs and unstructured interactions with the opposite sex.

- o The provision of an environment which severely sanctions sexual contact curtails the perpetuation of the type of exploitative relationships exclusively experienced by many inmates previously, and encourages development of interpersonal "coping skills." Inmates learn how to be "friends" with the opposite sex, after years of exploitive relationships. Furthermore, "the coeducational program can be an invaluable tool for exploring and dealing with social and emotional problems related to identity conflicts that many offenders experience."³⁷
- o The walk partner relationship provides the nucleus of a network of relationships which develop between the friends of walk partners. The development of wholesome relationships between men and women transcending the usual divisions by offense and background leads to further relationships between the friends of the walk partners, which also break down usual convict structures.
- o Multiplication of the pool of potential affective relational opportunities increases the number of potentially "redeeming" relationships available to each inmate.
- o The walk partner relationship encourages program participation especially for males; program participation further reinforces a growing sense of self-esteem.
- o Interactions with the opposite sex bolster an increasing sense of selfesteem.
- b. Alternate hypotheses. A multitude of alternate hypotheses have been expressed about the effects of co-corrections on the therapeutic

potential of rehabilitative programs:

- o If security is tightened upon the introduction of a less tractable male population, a therapeutic atmosphere is replaced by a strictly custodial one. "Cat-and-mouse-games" prevent the spontaneous interaction needed for a therapeutic process to occur.
- o Proscriptions against sexual contact between inmates, even between married couples in the same institution, interfere with therapy by heightening sexual frustrations and creating a generally repressive atmosphere. Such artificial restraints set on the development of relationships impede the dynamic of the therapeutic process.
- o Alternatively, proscriptions against sexual contact are only nominally enforced: "sex is as plentiful as dope," and dope is abundant.
- o The walk partner relationship encourages mutual exploitation, continues development of unproductive habits, and prevents personal growth by narrowing down options. "The relationship of male loser and female loser sets an environment that tends to reinforce negative attitudes."³⁸
- o The type of exploitive sexual relationship experienced by many inmates on the street is maintained by certain factors operating within coed institutions, including: the opportunity for covert sexuality; the "hush" policy on the part of some administrators; the disproportionate number of males found in many coed institutions; and reinforcement of traditional sex-role stereotypes as a facet of "normalization."

- o The "greater immaturity" among women inmates leads in a coed institution to interference with the men's rehabilitation, by leading the men "into trouble," and causing them to "go too far."
- o Placement in a co-correctional setting leads to withdrawal from activity among certain populations, such as those long confined to sexually segregated institutions, thereby curtailing continued development of a sense of confidence.
- o The predominant configuration of attitudes towards development of non-traditional interpersonal "coping skills" engenders enforcement of "normalization" at the cost of personal growth. As one inmate at Fort Worth stated, "I feel they are geared more toward men's problems. They don't look at the way women are now. They have that stereotype of women -- old stereotype."³⁹
- o The coed institution fosters continued dependency, as a facet of normalization, in women whose real need is increased self-reliance.
- o The coed institution serves to suppress and control homosexual, acting-out behavior, rather than encouraging its manifestation as a first step toward treatment.
- o Coed institutions develop tensions over the destruction of long-term relationships with persons on the "outside" through familiarization, real or imagined, with others "in the joint," producing barriers to the therapeutic process within the institution, and reducing the therapeutic influences of the larger community.

c. Alternative interventions. Three types of alternative interventions have been suggested for the expansion of treatment potential:

- o Conjugal and family visitation creates an atmosphere more conducive to rehabilitation, and helps maintain an inmate's image as masculine or feminine.
- o Mother-child visitation programs provide a framework in which women may deal with their limitations as mothers.
- o A single-sex institutional experience provides an environment more appropriate for the development of independence and self-reliance among "passive" women. "It is my conviction that the convicted female needs a protracted time away from male exposure. This gives them ample opportunity to discover their own identity and to come to a realistic understanding of their responsibilities and to cope with the fact that they are going to have to meet these responsibilities by themselves and through their own resources."⁴⁰

4. Provision of expanded program options.

a. Subordinate hypotheses. The following subordinate hypotheses have been expressed about the expansion of program options in coed institutions:

- o Coed institutions provide greater diversification and flexibility in program offerings than single-sex institutions.
- o Because the true program needs of inmates transcend sexual differences, program requirements and participation for male and female inmates can be expected to be similar.

- o Increased program participation further reduces institutional control problems, as reflected in disciplinary reports.
- b. Alternate hypotheses. Several alternate hypotheses have been articulated about the expansion of program options in coed institutions, focusing primarily on the program options available for women:
 - o The introduction of women to a men's institution causes no significant modification of programming; only the introduction of males into a women's institution leads to a significant modification of programming, including programs for women.
 - o Programs in coed institutions are geared more toward men's needs, because men are generally in the majority; separate programming for women is often destroyed in favor of programs more appropriate to traditional male interests.
 - o Even if programs responsive to female interests are made available in response to requests, women generally do not avail themselves of these opportunities, or are forced out of limited program slots by male inmates.
 - o Even if programs themselves are geared to women's interests, programs are not appropriately packaged for maximum participation by women.
 - o Women often need training more basic than that provided in coed institutions, and consequently avoid programming and "sit around and play patty-cake."
 - o Women limit their program participation because their sentences

tend to be longer than those of the men, and they cannot "see the light at the end of the tunnel."

- o Women fail to take advantage of available programs because they spend much time in "being too busy to program because they're always fixing their hair," or "cleaning their boyfriend's laundry." Pressure upon a woman in a co-correctional institution to have a walk partner for the sake of protection narrows program options by deterring program participation; even for males, focus on the walk partner reduces programming.
 - o Restrictions on the movements of inmates, especially women, limit opportunities and/or interest in program participation.
 - c. Alternative interventions. Two options have been most vocally expressed to expand institutional program availability:
 - o An open, sexually segregated institution provides the wider program resources of the larger, "outside" community, while minimizing the disincentives for program participation. A single-sex institution provides the sheltered environment required by many women to develop vocational, academic, and other skills.
 - o A coordinate relationship between a male and female institution leads to as much diversification of programs as the coed institution, and reduces the factors which discourage participation in programs by women in coed institutions.
5. Reduction of adjustment problems experienced by releasees.
- a. Subordinate hypotheses. The following subordinate hypotheses are related to the reduction of adjustment problems experienced by releasees:

- o The wider range of programs and relationships available in a coed institution plays an important role in the movement out of the "convict bag" of "do your own time," and in the maintenance of self-esteem and family ties among those with strong ties to the "outside."
 - o The increased self-esteem produced by the coed environment leads to decreased identification with a criminal-projected life-style.
 - o Development of interpersonal "coping skills" respecting the opposite sex reduces certain adjustment problems upon release to the streets, and improves family and marital relationships with those on the outside.
 - o Improvements/normalization in appearance incurred in coed institutions eases the transition to the "outside" by reducing negative reactions by "straights."
 - o Participation in the expanded programming available in coed institutions provides the skills needed for legitimate economic survival and changing the conditions of one's life in the "free world."
 - o Reduction in the dehumanizing aspects of confinement and decreased subculture identification, coupled with increments in "coping skills," family stability, and legitimate survival skills, lead to reduced recidivism.
- b. Alternate hypotheses. The alternative hypotheses regarding the impact of co-corrections on the reduction of adjustment problems experienced by

releasees include:

- o The placement of a relatively small female population into a coed institution may mean that this population is located relatively further from potential release site than male offenders in the same institution, or women in small institutions.
- o The presence of the opposite sex within the coed institution puts a strain upon, and "alienates affections" between, the incarcerated person and those in the outside whose support will probably be necessary to "make it" after release, leading to decreased stability in these relationships, and is therefore counterproductive from the standpoint of post-release adjustment.
- o Program structures which fail to provide for graduated re-entry into the "outside" do not adequately prepare the inmate for release into the larger community; it may create a separate world with its own life, but not a bridge to the free world.
- o Program structures which do not encourage, or require, inmate "choice" in program selection and assignment, do not develop the sense of responsibility needed to "make it" on the "outside".
- o Because of parole provisions, the continuation of most relationships developed during incarceration after release is impossible; such restrictions against maintaining even most healthy relationships developed "in the joint" after release adds to the burden of adjustment.

c. Alternative interventions. Several alternative interventions for increasing prospects of post-release adjustment have been suggested:

- o Smaller coed institutions will partially alleviate the placement of women further from anticipated point of release than is customary for men, increasing the likelihood for reintegration into the community.
- o Conjugal visitation reduces strains placed on marriages, prevents marital break-up, and aids post-release adjustment.
- o. Mother-child visitation and living-in programs increase a woman's capacity to be a contribution to her family after release, and reduce the burden of re-adjustment.
- o Furlough programs are particularly important in maintaining family ties and normal sexual adjustment.
- o An open, sexually segregated prison offers an equally effective and less costly solution to reducing post-release adjustment problems than a closed, coed institution.

6. Reduction of institutional costs through realization of economies of scale.

- a. Subordinate hypotheses. These subordinate hypotheses are associated with realization of economies of scale:
 - o Introduction of the opposite sex into an underutilized single-sex institution reduces per capita costs.
 - o The introduction of the opposite sex into a formerly single sex institution can reduce the costs associated with hiring sex-typed institutional maintenance staffs (men to perform heavy labor,

women to cook and wash laundry).

b. Alternate hypotheses. Alternate hypotheses reflect primarily the unanticipated costs of "going coed:"

- o Introduction of a female population occupying several security levels to a male institution poses special housing requirements not associated with an homogeneous male population.
- o "Going coed" may involve substantial architectural modifications.
- o Co-corrections involves increased costs associated with expansion of program offerings, especially if males are introduced into a previously all-female institution.
- o Coed institutions lead to increased staffing, to supervise programs and/or operate the increased number of treatment programs.
- o Requirements for dual supervision lead to mounting costs.
- o Co-corrections leads to increased pregnancy costs.
- o Introduction of women into a single-sex institution for males entails costs associated with delivery of increased medical services.
- o The provision of "sheltered," sexually segregated, duplicate programs within the coed institution provides no benefit in terms of realization of economies of scale.
- o The lack of participation by females in programs often designed and implemented at their request constitutes a misuse of funds.

c. Alternative interventions. These are the alternative interventions to going coed in terms of realization of economies of scale within the institution:

- o An open, sexually segregated institution provides most of the advantages of a coed institution, without incurring many of the added costs of "going coed."
- o An all-male population, which is homogeneous in terms of classification, may make more effective use of under-utilized bed-space than either an all-female or sexually integrated population, and underutilized space should be used primarily for male confinement; this means that the institutional level is often not the appropriate focus of cost-effectiveness measures.

7. Reallocation of system-wide resources.

a. Subordinate hypotheses. The subordinate hypotheses concerning reallocation of system-wide resources are:

- o Reduction in institutional control problems may yield a de-emphasis on controlling, and increased focus on "facilitative" roles for correctional staffs.
- o "Developing coeducational programs not only will serve to improve programs, but also will require more women in correctional positions."⁴¹
- o The proliferation of coed prisons may make jobs more meaningful for correctional staff, and increase personal growth.
- o The focus of coed prisons on programming will increase the options generally available to women.
- o Development of coping skills, vocational interests, and other modifications in behavior will lead to a reduction in costs to the

criminal justice support system (parole, after-care, etc.), and also reduce welfare costs, increase the tax base, etc.

b. Alternative hypotheses. Several alternative hypotheses regarding the potential effects of co-corrections have been offered:

- o Increasing acceptance of co-corrections could lead to the destruction of the single-sex women's institution, and withdrawal of the opportunity for women to be incarcerated in sexually segregated facilities.
- o Increasing acceptance of coed institutions will place a burden upon the courts to fill the number of places set aside for women in coed institutions.
- o Co-corrections leads to competition between male and female administrators.
- o Destruction of the single-sex women's institution will adversely impact the staff and career structures for women in the correctional system, so that women as both staff and inmates become even more marginal in the correctional system.

c. Alternative interventions. These alternatives to co-corrections have been suggested:

- o Increased pooling of resources among groups of contiguous states will permit continued availability to females of the option well-assured to males, by virtue of their greater numbers: the choice between sexually segregated and sexually integrated facilities in

which to be confined.

- o Mother-child visitation programs maintain family links and thereby reduce the burden on quasi-legal agencies in the care of offspring of female offenders, and provide "a first step towards the prevention of another generation of violators."⁴²
- o Playing "chess games" among several single-sex institutions within a jurisdiction might achieve the maximum utilization of available bedspace, without incurring the problems associated with co-corrections, e.g., females from an underutilized institution could be moved to a smaller institution, and the female institution converted to other correctional use; or the security level of underutilized single-sex institutions might be re-defined to permit greater access to overcrowded populations of the same sex.

8. Conclusion.

The projected purposes of establishing a particular institution as co-correctional may bear minimal correspondence with the developmental objectives of another institution. A review of the descriptive literature, and communications with correctional administrators and planners, suggests that a typology of co-correctional institutions might facilitate a review of the operational issues involved in co-corrections.

IV. CO-CORRECTIONAL TYPOLOGIES AND OPERATIONAL ISSUES

The potential disparity among assumptions and objectives both between and within co-correctional institutions was implicit through Chapter III, Assumptions and Theoretical Issues. That the relative goal priorities between and within institutions are in flux -- perhaps in a state of tension -- suggests the possible utility of constructing typologies of co-correctional institutions. Co-correctional typologies might deal with not only levels of sexual integration, but also with environmental variables. The development of such typologies, albeit in a tentative manner, may provide an expanded framework for understanding both the operational issues encountered in the process of translating co-correctional theory into reality, and certain issues related to evaluation design.

A. Typologies of Co-corrections

In the development of co-correctional typologies for the purpose of descriptive analysis, as a basis for possible assessment, or for any other purpose, a distinction must be made between the characteristics of the integration of the sexes within a given facility, and the institutional environment within which the integration occurs. A critical issue is the degree to which a particular form of integration is related to institutional goals or environment.

1. Characteristics of Integration.

While a larger number of variables would probably be taken into account in a full description of a given co-correctional situation, an examination of existing limited descriptive literature suggests that four variables are critical in the development of a typology of co-correctional populations:

- o The proportion of males and females in the population;
- o The age structure in terms of both distribution and symmetry;
- o The level of integration in terms of both the number of programs and activities shared, and the type of contact allowed; and
- o The security levels of the two populations.

TABLE 2
Typology of Co-corrections

Type	Characteristics
Fully-integrated	<p>Sexes proportionately equal (no greater than 2 to 1 ratio) for both sexes.</p> <p>Symmetrical and non-restricted age range.</p> <p>Contact between the sexes limited only by statutory restrictions; no restrictions on programs or activities.</p> <p>Equal security levels for both sexes.</p>
Semi-integrated	<p>Presence of two or more of the characteristics of a fully integrated institution.</p>
Quasi-integrated	<p>Presence of one of the characteristics of a fully integrated institution.</p>
Token-integrated	<p>Predominantly male or female (greater than 2 to 1 ratio).</p> <p>Asymmetrical and restricted age range between sexes.</p> <p>Restricted contact; non-sex related programs restricted to males or females.</p> <p>Differing security levels.</p>

On the basis of the four variables outlined above, a typology indicating four levels of integration is presented in Table 2. This typology assumes that all institutions fit the basic definition of a coeducational correctional institution contained in Chapter I.

The typology in Table 2 represents an operational form which could be modified as the specific characteristics of existing programs, and their modification over the course of time, would require. A change in the arbitrary assignment of equal weight to each attribute as a basis for classifying a particular co-correctional program as fully-, semi-, quasi-, or token-integrated might be suggested when the typology is tested against practices.

2. Characteristics of the Institutional Environment.

The construction of a sophisticated operational typology of institutional environments is extremely complex since it requires a determination of critical variables and the development of criteria for the ordering of those variables. The following typology does not attempt to be anything more than suggestive, and is based on two major variables which relate directly to models of correctional philosophy discussed in Chapter III.

The first variable is the degree of isolation of the inmate population, or, in other terms, the level of contact and communication with the wider community which is allowed and available. Generally the models can be placed along a continuum, with the restraint model associated with highly restricted community contact and communication, the rehabilitation model with wider but controlled contact and communication, and the reintegrative model with relatively unrestricted communication and contact.

The second major variable is related to control. A high level of physical constraint, combined with restricted and superior-subordinate relations between staff and inmate, is associated with the restraint mode. The rehabilitation model assumes more limited physical constraint and the substitution of psychological and program controls and with greater contact between staff and inmates based on the client or patient relationship. The reintegrative model is associated with the presence within the institution of mutually developed controls, with the relationships between staff and inmates based on the particular division of labor operative at any given time (i.e., shared programs, custodial requirements, administrative councils, work contacts).

However, empirically these variables may not be so neatly related to a given correctional philosophy, and differing forms of control may be associated with a range of contact and communication levels. A typology resembling that in Table 3 may be constructed for the description of institutional environments.

TABLE 3

Institutional Environment: Community Contact and Control

Control Type	Community Contact and Communication		
	Restricted	Selective	Open
High physical controls and social distance			
Psychological and program controls in a client relationship			
Mutual decisions on controls with relationships based on division of labor within custodial restraints.			

3. Conclusion.

The function of these typologies is to demonstrate the ways in which the dimension of co-correctional activity, or sexual integration, may be associated with particular levels of control and community contact. While it may be difficult to visualize, each institution should be able to be placed within the social space described by the intersection of the three dimensions of integration, control and community contact.

B. Operational Issues

If theoretical issues constitute the basic hypotheses regarding the function and effects of co-corrections, operational issues represent junctions in the translation of theory into practice. Operational issues deal with problems of implementation, arising where decisions are made about the co-correctional program's structure and direction. Among the most common operational issues are the following:

- o How important is an early determination of goal priorities?
- o What should be the locus of administrative support for co-corrections?
- o Does administrative turnover "make or break" a program as potentially innovative as co-corrections?
- o Does articulation of an institutional philosophy play an important role in program development?
- o Are there any size constraints for making a coed institution operative?
- o Does a coed institution have any special location requirements?
- o Must a co-correctional institution be minimum security?
- o Is it a prerequisite that a coed institution be "open?"

- o How extensive and what types of architectural modifications are necessary when a single-sex institution "goes coed," or when an institution formerly used for non-correctional purposes is converted into a co-correctional institution?
- o What architectural specifications are needed in a coed institution built "from scratch?"
- o Should co-corrections be phased-in?
- o What is the appropriate resident composition for a coed institution?
- o Which types of offenders should be screened out?
- o Is it better to have an homogeneous or heterogeneous inmate population?
- o What should be the male/female ratio?
- o How should staff for co-correctional institutions be selected?
- o What is the appropriate background and training for co-correctional staff?
- o Do certain modes of staff-inmate interaction work better in coed institutions?
- o What is the appropriate program structure for a co-correctional institution?
- o Should sexually segregated programs be maintained?
- o Should inmates be encouraged to develop their own programs?
- o Should inmates be allowed to exercise "choice" in determining their level of individual program participation?
- o Should the community be encouraged to participate in programs within the institution?

- o What should be the mode of joint staff-inmate participation in programs?
- o How important is obtaining a supportive response from the larger community for co-correctional activity?
- o What is the appropriate policy on physical contact between inmates in a coed institution, and to what extent should experience with co-corrections be permitted to modify the original policy statement?
- o What role should research findings be allowed to play in modifying program structure and orientation?
- o When should co-corrections be phased-out?

Passing these decision points occurs against a background of shifting, diverse, and potentially antithetical objectives, with varied levels of sexual integration, and differences between institutions along dimensions of communication and control. Decisions are generally made as a function of availability of resources, and/or the anticipated effects of proposed or alternate activities. Many of these questions transcend, based on the current state of knowledge, the phenomenon of co-corrections. Moreover, the literature permits, at best, weak conclusions about what decisions are more effective than others. While all the permutations of goal priorities, levels of integration, and environmental variables cannot be taken into account, the intention here is to suggest the diversity of responses to particular issues, to indicate the context for different courses of action, and to note, where possible, the relative importance associated with each issue. In the absence of a substantial literature on co-corrections, and due to the recent implementation of this intervention, extensive use is made of the impressions of practitioners and other

"expert opinion" in formulating implementation problem perspectives..

1. Relative Goal Priorities.

The imposition of co-corrections on a single-sex institution, or the introduction of co-corrections into a single-sex system, is often followed by re-evaluation of goal priorities. An initial focus on realization of economies of scale may reduce the potential importance of program priorities. Programmatic interests may come as an apparent afterthought, and an equilibrium may be established between several goals as objectives become ordered. Though nearly a universal phenomenon upon the introduction of co-corrections, the appropriate goal hierarchy for a given institution seems to be repeatedly determined in response to multiple needs, including administrative support for change.

2. Administrative Support for Change.

The absence of support for co-corrections has occasionally been in evidence on both the state and Federal levels. This tentativeness about accepting the conversion to co-correctional status may have several effects: adoption of an inadequate "trial period;" filtering down of the administration's hesitancy about program direction; absence of clear role expectations; and early program termination. The delicacy of the administration's position with respect to opinion of the public, the legislature, and to acceptance of the program by line-staff, may ordinarily require frequent changes, retreats, and clarifications of policy. The lack of acceptance of co-corrections, at such institutions as Terminal Island, has often been regarded as a major factor in reversion of planned co-correctional facilities to single-sex status; similarly, the renowned success of the FCI at Fort Worth has often been associated with consistent support by both central office and institutional administration. A reversion into a "jungle atmosphere" has been cited

at several institutions after the turnover from an original, mission-oriented administration to a new administration; however, such occurrences, even if documented, can probably not be associated with any particular type of institution.

3. Articulation of an Institutional Philosophy.

"The program setting," states Campbell, "may be more important than the program itself."⁴³ While the nature of the prevailing philosophy may play an important role in any institutional setting, the articulation of an institutional philosophy bearing high face validity may be necessary to provide direction for a co-correctional program. At issue is not whether a particular philosophy is more conducive to achievement of multiple objectives; a philosophy of shared responsibility and community engagement may, or may not, be indispensable to achieving normalization within custody. The decision to articulate an institutional philosophy, consistent or inconsistent with prevailing or intended activities, may itself be important in establishing a direction for an emerging program.

4. Size.

The size of a coed institution seems limited by four factors: the available physical plant, the dimensions of the jurisdiction's female offender population, institutional objectives, and location. Most existing co-correctional institutions are small to medium in size, because the majority formerly housed the jurisdiction's entire population of women offenders. A recent trend toward acquisition of non-correctional facilities for the housing of sexually integrated populations might signal the declining importance of physical plant in determining institutional size, except that other factors seem to limit the suitability of structures for co-

corrections. The dimensions of a jurisdiction's female offender population determine either institutional size (if an effort is made to prevent the population from becoming disproportionately male), or the level of integration (if the population is predominated by one sex). Program objectives seem to influence size: the notion of "critical mass" means that if a population is too small, the possibility of certain types of relationships being established may be reduced, e.g., women may be deprived of contact with older women. At the same time, development of larger institutions means that residents are located further from eventual release site, especially women for whom the choice of placement in a coed or single-sex institution is often reduced or eliminated by replacement of the women's institution by a coed institution: one aspect of normalization (community contact) is thereby seemingly sacrificed for another (sexual integration). Location of an institution only indirectly influences size, insofar as community resources are necessary to operate the institutional program. In the final analysis, each existing institution probably has a real population limit, in terms of physical space for living and programs, strain on community resources, and the institution's capability to absorb, or orient, incoming populations.⁴⁴

5. Location.

While the location of a coed institution is obviously related to the location of available underutilized facilities, and to the projected size of the institution, institutional objectives may also be an important determinant of location. That non-correctional facilities in urban locations have increasingly been earmarked for correctional planning may reflect implied institutional objectives; the projected size of an institution is similarly related to the anticipated

relationship with the surrounding community. If the focus of the program is on control of inmate behavior, then isolation and distance from population centers is likely. Focus on equal access to work and educational programs for males and females tends to require an urban location for work- and study-release. If access to community services and contacts is viewed as an important component of normalization, then an urban location may again appear appropriate, unless the institution is small enough that it would not strain the community resources available in a rural setting. In practice, location may be determined by other factors; e.g., a particular setting may be chosen primarily based on the ease with which architectural modifications might be completed. The factors contributing to the decision where to locate a coed institution probably depend on whether the action is preceded by deliberate planning, or administrative expediency.

6. Security Level.

At the time the FCI at Fort Worth was in transition towards becoming a co-correctional institution, one of the few prerequisites identified for development of a co-correctional facility was that it be either minimum or medium security. This is based on the assumption that the higher the security level, the greater the need to restrict movement, with consequent decrements in program participation, opportunities to develop responsibility and interpersonal coping skills, and an overall reduction in the normalization of the institutional atmosphere, in terms of the level of integration feasible, and other environmental variables. This set of expectations would not preclude the potential for using co-corrections to achieve economies of program, except insofar as restrictions on movement might impede program utilization, or to control inmate behavior by reducing homosexuality and

bolstering morale. However, even the use of co-corrections in "tight" environments to control behavior has been questioned. Ruback, for example, noted the high tension levels often perceived in co-ordinate institutions where contact is highly restricted.⁴⁵ In practice, most coed institutions include maximum security residents, because of the inclusion within the facility of the jurisdiction's entire female offender population. This may result in a wide range of time-in-sentence statuses and security levels for the women, and, in the context of proscriptions against physical contact and perceived needs for special "protection," may lead to "scaling up" security, and subjection of low risk inmates to additional restraint. Heffernan and Krippel recommended consideration of the phasing-out of maximum security prisons in favor of Fort Worth-like institutions, with high risk behavior controlled by the temporary use of local maximum security facilities.⁴⁶ From another perspective, it could be argued that such a de-emphasis on security could unduly subject low-risk inmates to threats of violence.

7. Open/Closed.

It has often been perceived as crucial that a coed institution be an open institution: a facility not surrounded by a wall of security fence manned with armed guards, which allows residents to leave the grounds for certain purposes, and allows outside visitors into the institution. Although an open institution may be incompatible with the objective of control and isolation, it seems compatible with other objectives. Contact with community members of the opposite sex may complement the therapeutic effects of sexual integration in the institution, especially when an institution is predominantly of one sex. Access to work- and

study-release programs in the community may be indispensable, in some circumstances, to development of marketable, legitimate skills. The higher level of sexual integration occasioned by openness to the community complements that component of normalization achieved within the inmate population. In addition, by allowing residents to leave the institution, the perceived obligation to enforce proscriptions against physical contact may be relieved. Moreover, increased visibility to the community may reduce suspicions regarding the institution's activities. Most lingering questions about whether a coed institution should be open or closed seem to focus around issues of control: how can the activities of inmates be monitored outside the institution? or when they have visitors inside? how can contact between inmates outside the institution be controlled? finally, does release to the community present circumstances for continued reinforcement or exploitive relationships?

8. Architectural Design.

Were the physical plant for a co-correctional facility begun "from scratch," it would be possible to design the structure to fit the program specifications and the planned level of sexual integration. Problems related to separation of living and dining areas, recreational facilities, classrooms, lavatories, etc., could be anticipated in relation to the intended function of the coed program. The more conventional schema, however, either presents the administrator of a single-sex institution with limited notice to appropriately modify the institution for the "invasion" of the opposite sex, or, in other circumstances, confronts the planner with modifying an institution previously used for non-correctional purposes. The perceived significance of architectural design for co-corrections is high, and is

reflected in the comment of one state commissioner from the South who states that, "neither the climate nor the physical plant here are conducive to co-corrections."

Decisions concerning matters of structural modifications probably entail attention to projected points of sexual mix, the amount of space necessary to adequately house the new population, equivalence of facilities for each sex, and heterogeneity of security levels within the institution. When an opposite sex population is introduced to a formerly single-sex institution, certain steps generally seem to follow: construction of some partitions; "carving out" sleeping space, by isolating a floor, wing, or cottages; adding screens, or bars, or cellblocks, if the new population displays more heterogeneity in security levels. Questions of access to day- and rec-rooms, and other facilities, and of possible routing of one sex through the others' quarters to reach these, may necessitate consideration of further modifications. Resentment for the opposite sex may develop in the original resident population if certain areas are restricted for use of the new residents. Physical limitations may reduce or increase the levels of integration originally intended. If the male/female ratio is highly unequal, the minority sex may receive private sleeping and toilet facilities, and certain other facilities. The picture described above may represent a step toward "an institution within an institution": again, the "scaling up" of security and increased restrictions on movement due to either the introduction of a less "passive" male population, or the greater heterogeneity in security levels of the total population.

The expropriation by corrections departments of physical plants formerly used for non-correctional purposes, such as hospitals, youth camps, and college campuses, often offers advantages in ease of separation of living units. Facilities

formerly housing coed populations may already contain dual living, dining, toilet, and recreational facilities. Conversely, if control and isolation are given high priorities, such institutions present potential problems. Adaptation of both a defensive perimeter and security for each building may be difficult. In addition, such facilities may be situated on spacious grounds which cannot be adequately patrolled.

Seen from another perspective, issues about architectural design for a co-correctional institution may be related to questions about the appropriate locus of control in correctional settings. Should the physical structure appear "stark" or "warm"? Should physical or psychological controls be applied? Such questions may be at the heart of the matter: is the function of sexual integration control and isolation, therapy, access to programs, normalization of the institutional environment, or economies of space and program? The types of architectural design problems associated with introduction of co-corrections are likely related to the functions co-corrections is expected to serve.

9. Phasing-In.

The accomplishment of the intended level of sexual integration might be facilitated by a process of phasing-in, or completing the integration in stages. Such a staging process has been regarded as useful in permitting confrontation of unforeseen difficulties in a manageable way. Staging has been effected in at least four ways. First, residents of one sex may be introduced to an institution formerly used for non-correctional purposes, as was the case for Fort Worth, and allowed to become somewhat accustomed to the new institution before the influx of the opposite sex. Introducing one sex before the other has two potential advantages: it

allows the institution to become operational before the need to make "special adjustments" because of the opposite sex's presence, and it allows residents of one sex to experience what many inmates seem to regard as important for appreciation of the coed setting: a look at the same institution without the presence of the opposite sex, and again after the integration.⁴⁷ However, it could be argued that the adjustments required of staff and administration by the process of "going coed" should not be circumvented or delayed. Second, commitments of the introduced sex may be made while the number of the resident sex is lowered by attrition, until the desired ratio is achieved. This procedure potentially places inequitable pressures on the new population, because of a high prevailing male/female ratio, and might produce significant levels of anxiety in both residents and staff if the process is drawn out, and speculation about "adjustments" becomes rife. Third, a pilot program may introduce a small number of the opposite sex into a single-sex institution and subject them to a high level of integration. The pilot program in the "Just Community" at Niantic, Connecticut, for example, was begun partially as a training ground for staff later to be relocated to the coed state institution at Cheshire, originally scheduled for opening in 1976.⁴⁸ The pilot group at the Kennedy Youth Center similarly consisted of volunteer non-offenders, asked to be as contemptuous of proposed rules as possible, in order to test the system effectively.⁴⁹ While pilot programs are probably effective for staff training, they may not provide a realistic appraisal of many problems normally encountered in the coed setting. Moreover, unless the new "experimental" population is restricted in contact to only the comparable opposite sex population, inequitable pressures on the experimental population might be anticipated. Fourth, the full complement of the new population may be brought to its new surroundings, but be only gradually

integrated with the former resident population on a program-by-program basis, perhaps as a reward for successful adaptation to certain co-correctional settings. While this approach has clear economic advantages, and allows time for staff adjustment, it also represents the danger of "freezing" at a lower level of integration than intended.

10. Resident Composition.

The differing circumstances under which co-corrections is initially implemented present varying degrees of control over the composition of the original inmate population. However, even when the original coed population is determined by statute or emergency conditions, two questions arise as program objectives are formulated and priorities are established: what are the appropriate criteria for selection and exclusion of inmates? what is the desirable and intended overall population balance?

a. Selection criteria. Among the selection criteria used in existing co-correctional institutions are the following, the first three the most important: age; time-in-sentence status; history of non-violence; proximity to anticipated geographical release point; the nature of referral; eligibility for special programs; and inmate choice. The sex of a prospective resident obviously does not, in itself, constitute a selection factor; the ratio of males to females is considered in the context of population balance.

Existing coed institutions display four main types of composition regarding the age of residents: a full range of both sexes; a restricted but symmetrical population of both sexes, probably young; a full range of the female population, but a

male population restricted to the young; a full range of the female population, but a male population restricted to the old. Program objectives seem to be related to selection criteria regarding age. Institutions placing a high priority on control tend to select an older, "steadier" population of males to complement an heterogeneous female population, although introduction of a younger female population into a male population unrestricted according to age with a low level of sexual integration would not be inconsistent with the intent of control. However, integration of younger, sexually naive males to a female population unrestricted according to age might be viewed as presenting potential problems respecting control over sexual contact, as was experienced at KYC Morgantown. Focus on treatment tends to bring about special interest in younger males, and either young or all females. Concern with equal access to work and study programs similarly tends to bring about high admissions of young males and females of all ages. Programs predicated on normalization tend to require a full range of ages of both sexes, as the basis for development of a wider range of relationships. If realization of economies of space and provision of an inexpensive work force are intended, less tractable individuals, regardless of age, would probably be excluded, leading to selection of older persons.

The types of composition in coed programs according to time-in-sentence parallel those given above for age: a full range of both sexes; a restricted (short-term) range for both sexes; a full range of females, but males restricted to pre-release or short-term status; a full range of females, but males restricted to long-termers, with specific other characteristics. A coed institution primarily concerned with control and isolation might exclude those regarded as "hard," "in the life," on the assumption that they are inextricably wound in the subcultures of institutional life, and could not be tempered by a co-correctional setting. A

program focus on treatment might lead to exclusion of long-termers, except that this would further restrict the smaller female population, with the result that generally short-term males and a full range of females would be selected. Concern with achieving equal access to work and study programs might lead to selection of those in pre-release status and all females; long-termers would probably be excluded on the assumption that restrictions on movement and low motivation would limit program participation, but with females accepted despite this rationale. A program predicated on normalization of the institutional environment might focus on those in pre-release status, but might also include a full range of females to create a greater sexual parity, and might even admit a full range of both sexes. Giving high priority to realization of economies of scale might lead to exclusion of long-termers with special space requirements, unless these facilities are already available, or if no other alternative exists in the jurisdiction.

A history of violence generally serves to screen-out those otherwise appropriate for a particular coed setting. Programs concerned primarily with control might exclude those with a history of violence, especially sex offenders, on the assumption that such persons could not adjust to the temptations of a coed setting. Focus on equal access to programs might, again, exclude individuals for whom restrictions on movement would hinder program participation. Similarly, concern with space utilization would, again, exclude those presenting special space requirements. In the context of normalization, Heffernan and Krippel suggest that a history of violence need not be an automatic disqualifier, stating that past violence is not a good predictor of future behavior.⁵⁰ Finally, in the context of a therapeutic program designed to develop healthy attitudes toward the opposite sex, a coed environment might be viewed as the only appropriate institutional setting in

which to rehabilitate sex offenders.

Four other selection criteria have less widespread application to existing co-correctional institutions. Eligibility for special programs, such as the functional unit programs at FCI Fort Worth for alcoholics, drug addicts, and the chronically ill, may be a criterion with limited application outside the Federal system. Proximity to anticipated geographical release point only has application if there is a choice between two or more institutions, and would exclude most state systems as far as women are concerned. The nature of the referral to the institution, either by transfer or direct court admission, again, is a criterion which has little meaning for female offenders in a jurisdiction where only one institution exists for their confinement. Inmate choice of a coed institution over a single-sex institution is a criterion which also has meaning only in the Federal system, and in certain state systems; whether inmates choose the coed environment, or are "thrown" into it, may turn out to be a significant factor in program outcomes.

Circumstances may seemingly conspire to create a population disproportionately constituted of one sex, with similar ethnic, class, and educational backgrounds, occupying a constricted age range, representing similar life-orientations and offense histories; or, alternatively, especially in a jurisdiction in which a high proportion of offenders are housed in a single institution, a wide range of ages, offense histories, time-in-sentence status, etc. The question of the appropriate population balance, especially in regard to the ratio of males to females, is important in a discussion of the co-correctional inmate population.

b. Population balance. Questions about the appropriate "mix" in a co-correctional institution of persons of differing characteristics, including biological

sex, can be translated into the issue of "heterogeneity." An homogeneous population might be viewed as more desirable than an heterogeneous one in several contexts: restraint simpler to achieve; the purposes of therapy easier to identify; appropriate programs more readily packaged; special housing requirements limited. However, an heterogeneous population, representing both sexes, and a variety of time-in-sentence statuses, offense histories, and other characteristics, has also been viewed as providing a mechanism for reduction of the violence associated with homosexual inmate subcultures, and a framework for expanding treatment potential and program options.

The effects of heterogeneity are most easily demonstrated in the context of differing goal priorities through the most visible component of heterogeneity, sexual integration. Achievement of the intended level of control, in the context of heterogeneity, translates into the question: "how many persons of the opposite sex are needed to reduce situational homosexuality and associated violence?" In terms of therapy, an important question might be: "how many persons of the opposite sex are needed to allow access to both integrated therapy groups, and single-sex consciousness raising?" In terms of program access, the question "what balance is needed to prevent inequitable pressures on one sex?" arises. In a sense, achievement of the most visible mode of normalization in the inmate population hinges on the answer to the question, "are there enough women to go around?"

II. Staff Composition.

The importance of the background and attitudes of co-correctional staff is reflected in a statement by the Superintendent at one of the first coed state institutions: "It's not that we're afraid. It's just that it's all so unprecedented."

Certain questions about staffing, although significant, seem to transcend the phenomenon of co-corrections, such as: does equality in socio-economic status ease tensions between correctional officers and residents? should staff be unspecialized? should treatment personnel serve in directive or facilitative roles? should correctional officers play the role of pseudo treatment staff, or assume the role of "institutional police?" Of particular interest in a discussion of co-corrections, however, are staff attitudes and staff balance.

a. Staff attitudes. Minor states that three of the four major problems which developed at KYC Morgantown were staff-related.⁵¹ Although the inclusion of juveniles in the KYC population would exclude it from the operational definition of "co-correctional institution," the experiences of staff at Morgantown are instructive because, as the Superintendent quoted above states: "It's all just so unprecedented."

First, the co-correctional setting may result in staff behavior premised on its attitudes both toward the opposite sex and the concept of intermingling of the sexes in prison. Staff members may worry that association with this "experiment" may impede career development if it fails, or remains a "curiosity piece." He or she, if coming from a single-sex institution, may be uncomfortable with the prospect of supervising the opposite sex. Objections from his/her spouse may arise involving the potentially exploitive position a staff member may have in regard to an inmate of the opposite sex.

Perhaps a more crucial subject than the potential stigma attached to co-corrections is the subject of "male morality" in the sexually integrated setting.⁵² Is it possible to trust a male staff member with an inmate of the opposite sex? Under

what circumstances should a correctional officer be permitted to search an inmate of the opposite sex? More than trust in the staff member is involved: the real danger here appears to be the influence and pervasiveness of rumor, and the subsequent "willingness of the administrator to place men in a position where his [sic] reputation and career could be endangered."⁵³ This expectation could deter staff enthusiasm for the coed concept.

Similar potential problems arise in the staff's attitudes toward the opposite sex, and ensuing behaviors towards inmates. If staff members have negative attitudes toward inter-racial dating, female promiscuity and criminality, and concomitant tolerance of a male's "natural right to fornication,"⁵⁴ then these may be reflected in treatment of inmates and in views toward intermingling of the sexes. Though from the perspective of control and isolation, such attitudes may appear acceptable, from the vantage point of treatment or normalization this may not hold true. Yet the potential conflict between treatment and normalization is clearly reflected in this context, represented in the statement by a staff member that "any woman who doesn't wear a pants suit is asking to be raped."

In response to the problems above, institutional policies and practices appear to be modified in several ways. Extensive guidelines for conduct between guards and inmates of the opposite sex may be developed, and prospective staff members may be screened for sexual prejudice in certain positions. On the other hand, co-correctional institutions may be perceived to require intensification of staff functions and require increased specialization in certain areas. Proscriptions against physical contact may, in certain circumstances, lead to a larger custodial staff for proper enforcement. Requirements for dual supervision may be forthcoming, as a means of protecting staff and inmates from potential exploitation by

the opposite sex. In conclusion, staff attitudes toward co-corrections may influence both staff selection and utilization.

b. Staff balance. Whether staff should be drawn from traditional backgrounds, or from a variety of backgrounds, and the appropriate level of sexual integration among staff, are the two main questions related to staff balance. While correctional and treatment staffs have traditionally been derived from particular sources, such as retired military, and professional counselors, the appropriateness of such selection procedures has been questioned. Heffernan and Krippel state that "it appears . . . that neither a highly selected or specialized staff is required. In fact, heterogeneity of backgrounds appears as essential for staff as it is for residents."⁵⁵

However, the sexual integration among institutional staff is the only component of heterogeneity that has self-evident relevance to the co-correctional setting. Although legal requirements for non-discriminatory hiring practices may reduce control over the sexual composition of staff, other factors also influence the male/female staff ratio. The usefulness of a sexually integrated staff for achievement of co-correctional objectives has often been suggested in the context of control, treatment, and normalization: the presence of female correctional officers seems to have a "quieting" effect on male prisoners; where resident sexual integration is low, a more even staff ratio may contribute to the normalization of the institutional environment through increased presence of the minority sex; the increased presence of the minority sex may also aid the process of treatment. Ruback states that sufficient presence of the opposite sex as staff and volunteers may be as effective as a sexually integrated inmate population in achieving the

objectives associated with co-corrections.⁵⁶ The sexual integration of staff is not without attendant problems. A high percentage of female correctional staff at a predominantly male institution may be perceived as a security risk. Inmates' attitudes toward the functions and abilities of the sexes may lead to problems related to staff utilization; e. g. , inmates may prefer a male counselor, or warden, or guard, because traditional attitudes may attribute greater proficiency to males in certain roles. Finally, female staff in particular may view implementation of co-corrections, and the diminished role of the single-sex female institution, as a threat to career development.

12. Staff-Resident Interaction.

As has already been mentioned, the interaction of staff and residents of the opposite sex is an area from which many problems can arise. From a managerial standpoint, disputes with union representatives may develop over questions concerning staff duties and working conditions in the co-correctional setting. Which areas of responsibility should be off-limits to the opposite sex? Is there a policy concerning a staff member escorting an inmate of the opposite sex in a private area of the institution or outside the institution? Do male or female staff members who have equal rank also have similar duties?

The vulnerability of the staff member to accusations of improper behavior with the opposite sex is not the only complication of the co-correctional situation. Especially in institutions which are premised on reduction of status distance between inmates and staff, romantic involvements between staff and inmate are a real possibility. Other problems may arise from the resentment an inmate of one sex may have toward a staff member of the opposite sex.

Ultimately, questions about the appropriate mode of interaction between staff and inmates in a co-correctional institution transcend the phenomenon of co-corrections. An institution placing high priority on control and isolation might implement dual supervision and enforce strict status distance between staff and inmates. Program focus on the treatment function of co-corrections might lead to a higher level of staff-inmate interaction. Ostensible "normalization" of the institutional environment through sexual integration of the resident population may be accompanied by increased autonomy and reduced concern with control. Should status distance be maintained? Is the function of staff to protect the community from inmates, and inmates from each other? or to treat and care for them? or to enter into a mutual venture, a shared process of change, in which the keeper and the kept know each other "as one person?" While co-corrections may eventually be shown to be more effective if accompanied by a particular mode of staff-inmate interaction, the current state of knowledge does not appear to permit such a conclusion.

13. Program Structure.

Program structures in existing co-correctional institutions display variations in the level of sexual integration, the extent and nature of staff-inmate program participation, the amount and type of community participation within the institution, the settings for community-based activities, the amount of inmate choice exercised in the development of programs, and along other dimensions. In their study of the co-correctional FCI Fort Worth, Heffernan and Krippel state that: "Those programs which seem to be most consequential in effecting change are those involving persons from the community, programs developed by the

residents themselves and programs where the staff is not involved as staff. The opportunity for residents to choose how they will do their time and make decisions about their future is a significant part of precipitating change."⁵⁷ However, there is little evidence that any factor other than the level of sexual integration in programs is really germane to a discussion of coeducational corrections. While community-based, staff-inmate, and inmate-developed programs may be perceived as effective in a particular co-correctional setting, it does not appear to follow that co-corrections is a critical variable in program success, or that these program formats are critical to co-corrections.

The level of sexual integration in programs seems to be related to the functions co-corrections is perceived to fulfill. The objective of control may not be perceived to be aided by permitting contact in unstructured situations, so that maintaining control while making maximum use of space may even lead to extensive program duplication. If equal access to work and study programs is a major function of a particular co-correctional institution, the primary points of contact will probably be these programs, possibly to the exclusion of social contacts. The therapeutic function would probably require extensive informal, unstructured contacts between males and females, but may also be complemented by integrated therapy and segregated consciousness raising groups. If the perceived function of co-corrections is normalization of the institutional environment, the points of contact would presumably be more frequent. The reduction of costs often anticipated through implementation of co-corrections would perhaps be most likely achieved where the points of contact are most frequent and, conversely, occasions for program development are lowest; in practice, however, unless the "appropriate population" is found, institutions developed to realize economies of scale do not

seem to encourage other than highly structured contact. Indeed, the process of program development seems to reflect budget constraints, emerging goal priorities, the characteristics of a given inmate population, and other factors.

14. Community Response.

The potential significance of community support for co-corrections is shown in the statement by a Superintendent of a state co-correctional institution, that "getting community acceptance is the key. If we could get their support, we could take the storm fence down." While the importance of community support is obvious in the case of an open, co-correctional institution, its general importance may not be so obvious. An innovation as controversial as co-corrections may depend on eventual community acceptance for continued political viability. The function of control seems to be served by encouraging community support in the recovery of escapes. The treatment of co-correctional residents may be complemented by the presence of opposite sex community members within the institution. The concept of normalization might be expanded by the flow of community members into the institution. In particular, if the goal of co-corrections is in any sense the cushioning of shock upon release to the community, it would be useful to have community acceptance, both during imprisonment, to facilitate a process of gradual re-entry, and after release. In a narrower sense, however, the community response to co-corrections has meaning only insofar as it has impact on the level of integration in the institution.

15. Policy on Physical Contact.

The promulgation of regulations on physical contact normally ac-

companies the implementation of co-corrections. However, differences exist between institutions, and within institutions over time, in the level of contact regarded as punishable, and the severity of sanctions when a violation occurs. The type of contact necessary to warrant sanctions ranges from visual contact (at one juvenile institution), through holding hands, placing an arm around another, and kissing, to sexual intercourse. Punishments include placement in solitary, isolation from opposite sex contact, withdrawal of privileges such as furloughs and study-release, and "shipping out" to a single-sex institution. The type of infraction warranting the maximum punishment varies between institutions, and even within a given institution, it appears that policy (or practice) may liberalize with increased experience with co-corrections. Why do proscriptions against physical contact exist? Are they enforced?

Proscriptions against physical contact are presumably regarded as a prerequisite for maintaining a modicum of order and control, and perhaps exist to mirror the attitude that criminals should be denied access to certain pleasures accorded the rest of society. In other words, because one of the most controversial aspects of the co-correctional setting is the possibility of heterosexual activity among inmates, a policy proscribing physical contact is needed to protect public sensibilities, and reduce recriminations based on a suspicion of "what's going on in there?" Prevention of pregnancies is of particular importance, not merely because of the associated expense, but also to avoid the ire of angry parents and spouses. On the other hand, the therapeutic function of co-corrections is partially premised on the existence of opportunities for interaction with the opposite sex in an environment which proscribes contact and which, therefore, should reduce the potential for mutual exploitation. While introduction of opportunities for a

"natural" behavior which is forbidden may be argued as inconsistent with a "normalized" environment, sanctions for even incidental contact may be applied because "one thing leads to another."

Are regulations enforced? Are they equally applied to males and females? For hetero- and homosexual activity? The availability of birth control materials, but only the pill, to women in certain co-correctional facilities suggests lack of enforcement. Said a staff member at one co-correctional facility, "sex is as plentiful as dope." If acceptance of the males' "natural right to fornication" is in effect, actions for physical contact may be more stringent against women; the relative shortage of women, however, suggests that even if it is believed that "women make men go too far," a common response by staff in the co-correctional setting is to "look the other way." Such ostensible obliviousness towards sexual activity may exist particularly in "normalized" institutions. Are hetero- and homosexual activity equally forbidden? In a "normalized" environment, especially one equating aberrance with homosexuality, this might be expected. However, homosexual activity is probably still regarded as the inmates' "unnatural lot," especially because "it don't get a baby." Minor states, "sexual behavior is practiced at all institutions. The choice is not -- whether we shall have sexual behavior going on, or not have sexual behavior going on; but rather, what kind of sexual behavior will be going on -- homosexual behavior or heterosexual behavior. What type is judged by society to be most normal?"⁵⁸

16. Impact of Research.

Because the co-correctional phenomenon often occurs simultaneously with several other "experimental" programs, and because its rationales and goals

are so various, it may be difficult to separate the effects of sexual integration from other interventions. However, little evidence exists that much effort has been expended to identify the effects of co-corrections. In the case of the Heffernan-Krippel report on the co-correctional program at the Fort Worth FCI, however, research findings based on limited hard data brought about major program changes, not only within the institution but purportedly elsewhere. The apparent expansion of the universe of co-correctional institutions may bring about more interest in evaluation. The warden at the first state co-correctional institution to begin the process of phasing-out made a remark suggestive of this possible outcome saying, "If I do it again, I'll have a good research program."

17. Phasing-Out.

The absence of clearly articulated goal priorities probably hinders sound decisions about when to phase-out a co-correctional program. Existing institutions in the process of phasing-out seem to represent fiscal resources as the primary factor behind dissolution of the program. For example, in one instance, the circumstances which occasioned implementation of co-corrections, the underutilization of bed-space in the state's women's institution, was reportedly invalidated by a four-fold increase in the number of female offenders in state custody. In another instance, anticipated cost-reductions were apparently offset by unanticipated expenses, for dual supervision and program expansion. Consequently, when to "pull up anchor" and dismantle a co-correctional program may, in practice, be as independent of design and dependent on administrative fiat as is ostensibly the initial decision to phase-in.

V. EVALUATIVE ISSUES

A. Background

Review of the readily available research materials on co-correctional institutions suggests that evaluative studies in the area are limited. Several research designs exist, including those of Cavior,⁵⁹ Heffernan,⁶⁰ and Jackson,⁶¹ but Cavior's remains at the proposal stage, while Heffernan's and Jackson's were only partially implemented. In the case of the two latter studies, focusing on the Fort Worth FCI, the difficulty in obtaining either an adequate data base within the institution and/or compatible comparative data from other single-sex and co-correctional institutions, was a major factor in the non-completion of the original research design.

Two studies of the co-correctional institutions at Framingham, Massachusetts (Almy, et al.;⁶² Benedict, et al.⁶³) seem to display a more restricted research design, but provide some data on recidivism, program participation and completion rates with limited comparative data. A more extensive study of Framingham was earlier projected by Edith Flynn, but administrative changes within the institution hindered its completion.⁶⁴

In the most extensive study of co-corrections to date, the two year Heffernan-Krippel research project at FCI Fort Worth, co-corrections were examined in the context of a medium-security, open institution housing a population heterogeneous in regard to age, race and offense type, as well as sex, and with an explicit correctional philosophy of "mutuality," and "community engagement." In addition to its descriptive purposes, this study was designed "to explore the question of the

degree to which the approaches to corrections embodied in the programs at Fort Worth can be reproduced in other institutional settings."⁶⁵ Co-corrections was conceptualized in the Heffernan-Krippel study as one component of a total program involving "normalization." The possible interrelations among these components, including co-corrections, within the Fort Worth FCI was developed in the section of the Final Report on the possible replication of these components in other institutional settings. Data was collected on differential program participation, disciplinary levels and rates between the two sexes, and some comparative data on recidivism was used. This differential analysis of recidivism rates has been continued at Fort Worth, with the most recent up-date published in November, 1976.⁶⁶

Jackson's study provides comparative data on institutional environments for males and females at Fort Worth, and, on a limited basis, with women at Alderson and the Kennedy Youth Center, and men in comparable units at Seagoville. However, Jackson's descriptive study, like Heffernan and Krippel's, focuses on the Fort Worth program as a whole, and only secondarily on co-corrections.

Some efforts have been made to develop instrumentation useful in research on co-corrections. Cavior and Cohen have developed and tested a scale to assess resident and staff attitudes toward co-corrections in two co-correctional and two male institutions⁶⁷. In their introduction, Cavior and Cohen stress that the scale is for descriptive and program purposes, rather than for evaluative use.

In summary, while several research designs exist which have both descriptive and evaluative components, and although some other descriptive research is available (e.g., Patrick and McCurdy;⁶⁸ Patrick⁶⁹), at the present time there

appears to be virtually no systematic evaluative research on co-corrections completed. Additional studies in progress may be revealed through further search.

B. Issues Formulation

In examining the present literature on the subject of co-corrections, and the descriptions of difficulties encountered in developing or implementing both descriptive and evaluative designs, several substantive research issues emerge.

1. Descriptive Issues.

a. Separating dimensions. The co-correctional program, as noted above, is one dimension of an institutional environment, and the degree to which co-correctional factors can be isolated and evaluated apart from the total institutional setting is problematic. Cavior notes that: "[in the federal system] co-corrections has always been embedded in a package of correctional programs which effect institution atmosphere (emphasis on all kinds of community programs, decreased emphasis on security and control and an emphasis on positive staff-inmate relationships)."⁷⁰ As a result, a major issue is the extent to which additional descriptive data of institutional programs, etc., must be gathered to provide any meaningful evaluative framework.

b. Decision-making. In turn, within a relatively short time period there have been constant modifications within the institutions of what have been designated as critical variables: sex proportions, age distribution, program content, contact restrictions, and security level. It would, therefore, seem necessary to provide a graphic presentation of the flow of causal decision-making in regard to each of these variables in order to clarify the perceived relationships between

TABLE 4

"Success" Measures

<u>Goals or Outcomes</u>	<u>Internal and External Measures</u>
Normalization and reintegration	Measures of institutional environment Staff and inmate attitudes toward co-corrections Recidivism rates Measures of physical appearance ⁷¹
Access to work and education programs	Number of integrated programs available Participation in programs by sex Program completion by sex Post-release employment by sex
Control and high inmate morale	Number of disciplinaries for sexual and assault behavior, by sex Inmate transfers/staff transfers Measures of institutional environment
Attitude and behavior change	Inmate and staff attitudes toward co-corrections Participation in treatment programs by sex Program outcome measurements by sex (self-concepts, etc.) Post-release studies of family and marital stability, etc., by sex Development of programs for heterosexual relation family counseling, etc. Recidivism rates
Space and program utilization	Institutional cost analysis of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o custody o program development o construction System cost analysis of alternative utilization

these components of an integrated inmate population, within the context of more encompassing institutional and/or system decision-making.

2. Evaluative Issues.

a. Measuring success. Since co-corrections has been introduced for a wide range of reasons, it is clear that measurement of the "success" of co-corrections is dependent on the clarification of the objectives and the specification of measurements appropriate of those objectives. Table 4 suggests the types of measures potentially corresponding to the program objectives discussed in Chapter III.

b. Availability of data. Another major issue is the presence or absence of data to provide the above measurements for:

- o Any given institution;
- o In pre-and post-form when co-corrections has been introduced into an existing institution;
- o In comparison with comparable single-sex institutions.

c. Comparability of data. A related issue is the degree to which comparative data may be obtained from institutions outside the jurisdiction of the given institution. Are there significant differences between jurisdictions which invalidate cross-comparison, regardless of the presence of similar sex ratios, security, etc.?

d. Quasi-experimental design. A final evaluative issue is the degree to which it would be possible to provide for quasi-experimental control groups of

both sexes within a jurisdiction when a co-correctional program is instituted or when modifications are made in existing program components, when the single women's institution in the state is used as the co-correctional facility.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper the major issues associated with the phenomenon of co-corrections have been presented. The types of issues considered here include the precedents for co-corrections, rationales for "going coed," assumptions behind and major hypotheses associated with this intervention, typological refinements, obstacles to implementation, and evaluation problems. The purpose of the issues paper has been to put the issues "on the table," so while this issues paper reaches an end, in no other sense is it meant to represent a "conclusion." If this issues paper has embodied a wide range of issues associated with the co-correctional concept, the next phase of the project will involve efforts to anchor these impressions and expectations more firmly in experience.

NOTES

1. National Evaluation Program, "Report on activities," unpublished paper, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, December, 1976.
2. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, Corrections, (Washington, D.C.: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1973), p. 379.
3. Ibid., p. 379.
4. See Katherine W. Burkhardt, Women in prison, (Garden City: Doubleday, 1973).
5. See Miriam A. DeFord, Stone walls, (Philadelphia: Chilton, 1962).
6. F. C. Gray, Prison discipline in America, (London: J. Murray, 1847), pp. 15-16. See also DeFord, op. cit.
7. Norval Morris, The future of imprisonment, (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1974), p. 4.
8. See Harry E. Barnes, The Story of punishment, (Boston: Stratford, 1930).
9. Dorothea L. Dix, Prisons and prison discipline in the United States, (New Jersey: Patterson Smith, 1845), pp. 107-8.
10. DeFord, op. cit.
11. Burkhardt, op. cit.
12. Burkhardt, op. cit.; see also DeFord, op. cit.
13. See American Correctional Association, Manual for correction standards (3rd ed.), (College Park: American Correctional Association, 1966).
14. See Eugenia Leckerkerker, Reformatories for women in the United States, (1931); Eunice Gibson, "Women's prisons: laboratories for penal reform," Wisconsin Law Review, 1, 1973.
15. See American Correctional Association, Annual directory, (College Park: American Correctional Association, 1971).
16. Ralph R. Arditi, Frederick Goldberg, M. Martha Hartle, John H. Peters, and William R. Phelps, "The sexual segregation of American prisons," Yale Law Journal, 1973, 82, pp. 1229-1273.

17. William G. Nagel, The new red barn: a critical look at the modern American prison, (New York: Walker, 1973), p. 53.
18. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, op. cit., p. 379.
19. A tentative list of such states includes: Connecticut, Idaho, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Vermont, and Wisconsin.
20. A tentative list of such states includes: Colorado, Indiana, and Tennessee.
21. A tentative list of such states and other jurisdictions includes: Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Philadelphia County.
22. See Barry Ruback, "The sexually integrated prison: a legal and policy evaluation," American Journal of Criminal Law, 3 (3), 1975; see also Alex Comfort, "Institutions without sex," Social Work, 12, 1967.
23. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, op. cit., p. 349.
24. Ruback, op. cit., p. 312.
25. Ibid., p. 312.
26. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, op. cit., p. 379.
27. See Arditi, op. cit., pp. 1247-8.
28. Ibid., pp. 1247-8.
29. Charles F. Campbell, "Co-corrections -- FCI Fort Worth after three years," unpublished paper, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, no date, p. 2.
30. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, op. cit., p. 379.
31. American Friends Service Committee, Struggle for justice: a report on crime and punishment in America, (New York: Hill and Wange, 1971).
32. David Fogel, Correctional Service News, (New York Department of Correctional Services, 1 (11), 1976), p. 2. See also David Fogel, We are the living proof: the justice model of corrections, (Cincinnati: W. H. Anderson, 1975); Franklin Zimring, "Making the punishment fit the crime," Hastings Center Report: Institute of Society, Ethics and Life Sciences, 6 (6), 1976, pp. 13-17.

33. See Morris, op. cit. See also Tom Murton, Shared decision-making as a treatment technique in prison management, (Minneapolis: Murton Foundation for Criminal Justice, 1975), pp. 131-2: "One purpose of the prison is to train offenders for successful integration into the free world yet the prison model is antithetical to this endeavor. The re-integration process would be enhanced by creation of a prison environment similar to that in the free world. This environment should include shared decision-making among administrators, staff and inmates. This method forces inmates to accept responsibility for their decisions and the consequences of their behavior."
34. Esther Heffernan and Elizabeth Krippel, "Final report on research: Fort Worth FCI," unpublished report, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, March, 1975, p. 31.
35. Ibid., p. 35.
36. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, op. cit., p. 379.
37. Ibid., p. 379.
38. Jacqueline K. Crawford, "Two losers don't make a winner," The Grapevine, American Association of Wardens and Superintendents, 8 (2), November-December, 1975, p. 2.
39. Consad Research Corporation, Bureau of Prisons female and co-correctional addict client outcome evaluation, (Pittsburgh: Consad Research Corporation, 1975), pp. 6-7.
40. Crawford, op. cit., p. 2.
41. National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, op. cit., p. 3.
42. Crawford; op. cit., p. 3.
43. Campbell, op. cit., p. 21.
44. Heffernan and Krippel, for example, note that at the Fort Worth FCI trouble begins when size exceeds 525, but that is unclear whether this is a function of sheer size, or of the high rates of new admissions and consequently high disorientation.
45. Ruback, op. cit., p. 313.
46. Heffernan and Krippel, op. cit., p. 101.
47. The Consad report, Bureau of Prisons female and co-correctional addict client outcome evaluation, contains a discussion of "the implicit 'theory' that prisoners should first recognize that prison is unpleasant and only then be permitted to experience the relative openness of the Fort Worth environment lest they not be deterred from future crime." p. 6.8.

48. Financial constraints have pushed back the scheduled opening until 1982.
49. Loren Karacki, John A. Minor, Helene E. Cavior and Bill Kennedy, "Going coed: a case study of the establishment of a coed program at a previously all male institution," unpublished paper, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, 1972, pp. 5-6.
50. Heffernan and Krippel, op. cit., p. 101.
51. John A. Minor, "The coed program at the Kennedy Youth Center: a look at the process of program development," unpublished paper, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, April, 1972, p. 10.
52. Ibid., p. 10.
53. Ibid., p. 11.
54. Ibid.
55. Heffernan and Krippel, op. cit., p. 107.
56. Ruback, op. cit., pp. 323-324.
57. Jerome Mabli, Judy Patrick, and Maria Sanfilippo, "A review of research at the Federal Correctional Institution at Fort Worth," unpublished report, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, November, 1975, p. 4.
58. Minor, op. cit., p. 13.
59. Helene E. Cavior, "Evaluation of co-corrections in the Federal Bureau of Prisons: a research proposal," unpublished research proposal, no date.
60. Esther Heffernan, "Research design for Fort Worth FCI study," unpublished research proposal, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, March, 1973.
61. Dorothy Jackson, "Resident socialization and interpersonal relations in the Fort Worth Correctional Institution," unpublished research proposal, March, 1973.
62. Linda Almy, Vikki Bravo, Leslie Burd, Patricia Chin, Linda Cohan, Frank Gallo, Anthony Giorgianni, Jeffrey Gold, Mark Jose, and John Noyes, "Study of a coeducational correctional facility," unpublished masters' thesis, Boston University, 1975.
63. Paul E. Benedict, Carolyn Brewer, Juliana Matthews, Joseph Polhemus, Sharon Schwarz, Layne C. Suss, Robin Teicholz, Dolores Thomas, Jan Tuemmler, Alan Tweedy, and Curtis Wilkins, "The effects of a coeducational facility: a continued analysis," unpublished masters' thesis, Boston University, 1976.

64. Edith E. Flynn, "Fort Worth and Framingham: report for the Harvard Center for Criminal Justice," unpublished manuscript, no date.
65. Heffernan and Krippel, op. cit., p. 1.
66. Jerome Mabli, "Fort Worth research summary: 'success rates'," unpublished paper, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, November, 1976.
67. Helene E. Cavior and Stanley H. Cohen, "The development of a scale to assess resident and staff attitudes toward co-corrections," unpublished paper, January, 1977.
68. Jane Patrick and M. McCurdy, "Women's unit ethnographic study: Fort Worth FCI," unpublished report, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, May, 1976.
69. Jane Patrick, "Doing time: an ethnography of a co-correctional institution," unpublished report, U.S. Bureau of Prisons, May, 1976.
70. Helene E. Cavior, Letter to James Ross, February 24, 1976.
71. Suggestive in this regard is: Norman Cavior and L. Ramona Howard, "Facial attractiveness and juvenile delinquency among black and white offenders," Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 1 (2), 1973, pp. 202-213.

CONTINUED

1 OF 2

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alper, B. S. Prisons inside-out: alternatives in correctional reform. Cambridge: Ballinger, 1974.
- Almy, L., Bravo, V., Burd, L., Chin, P., Cohan, L., Gallo, F., Georgianni, A., Gold, J., Jose, M., & Noyes, J. Study of a coeducational correctional facility. Unpublished masters' thesis, Boston University, 1975.
- Arditi, R. R., Goldberg, F., Hartle, M. M., Peters, J. H. & Phelps, W. R. The sexual segregation of American prisons. Yale Law Journal, 1973, 82, 1229-1273.
- Arditi, R. R., Goldberg, F., Hartle, M. M., Peters, J. H. & Phelps, W. R. The sexual segregation of American prisons. Mental Health Digest, 1973, 5, 18-26.
- Baunach, P. J. & Murton, T. O. Women in prison: an awakening minority. Crime and Corrections, 1973, 1, 4-12.
- Benedict, P. E., Brewer, C., Matthews, J., Polhemus, J., Schwartz, S., Suss, L. C., Teicholz, R., Thomas, D., Tuemmler, J., Tweedy, A. & Wilkins, C. The effects of a coeducational facility: a continued analysis. Unpublished masters' thesis, Boston University, 1976.
- Bernard, H. R. Report of results: staff and resident communication study, Fort Worth FCI. Unpublished paper, October 15, 1975.
- Boelter, D. & Nadroski, A. NARA Rector Program. Paper presented at the Second Annual Conference, Western Division, American Society of Criminology, San Francisco, February, 1975.
- Burkhart, K. W. Women in prison. Garden City: Doubleday, 1973.
- Cape, W. Prison sex: absence of choice. Federal Probation, March, 1968, 32, 23-27.
- Campbell, C. F. Co-corrections -- FCI Fort Worth after three years. Unpublished paper, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, no date.
- Catalino, A. Boys and girls in a coeducational training school are different, aren't they? Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, 1971, 14 (2), 1-12.
- Cavior, H. E. A survey of student reaction to a coed Federal youth institution: the Robert F. Kennedy Youth Center. Unpublished paper, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, October, 1972.

Cavior, H. E. Evaluation of co-corrections in the Federal Bureau of Prisons: a research proposal. Unpublished research proposal, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, no date.

Cavior, H. E. & Cohen, S. H. The development of a scale to assess resident and staff attitudes towards co-corrections. Unpublished paper, January, 1977.

Coed cons. Ebony, 1973, 29 (1), 193.

Co-corrections phased out at Kennedy Youth Center. Highlights. Federal Bureau of Prisons, February 17, 1975.

Coed corrections in Fort Worth. Target Newsletter. National League of Cities. U. S. Conference of Mayors, 1975.

Co-ed prison delights warden. Wisconsin State Journal, April 13, 1973, Section 2, 3.

Coeducational prison is a test in rehabilitation. New York Times. July 8, 1972, M 27.

Connecticut is going coed. New York Times. May 27, 1973.

Consad Research Corporation. Bureau of Prisons female and co-correctional addict client outcome evaluation. Pittsburgh: Consad Research Corporation, 1975.

Crawford, J. K. Two losers don't make a winner. The Grapevine, American Association of Wardens and Superintendents, November - December, 1975, 8 (2), 1-3.

DeFord, M. A. Stone walls. Philadelphia: Chilton, 1962.

D. C. Department of Corrections. Lorton improvement program. Proposal, March, 1975.

Dix, D. L. Prisons and prison discipline in the United States. New Jersey: Patterson Smith, 1845.

Eaton, T. Opening up legitimate opportunities. Paper delivered to South Western Sociological Association, March, 1975.

Evans, D. Prisons and conjugal visiting in Mexico. Annual proceedings from the Southern Conference of Corrections, 1975, 49-69.

Federal Correctional Institution, Fort Worth, Texas. A statement on the program. Unpublished paper, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, March, 1975.

- Flynn, E. E. The special problems of the female offender. We hold these truths: report of the National Conference on Corrections. Richmond: Division of Justice and Crime Prevention, 1972.
- Flynn, E. E. Fort Worth and Framingham: Report for the Harvard Center for Criminal Justice. Unpublished manuscript, no date.
- Gagnon, J. H. & Simon, W. The social meaning of prison homosexuality. Federal Probation. 1968, 32 (1), 23-29.
- Gibson, E. Women's prison: laboratories for penal reform. Wisconsin Law Review, 1973, 1.
- Glick, R. M. & Neto, V. V. National study of women's correctional programs. Sacramento: California Youth Authority, 1975.
- Gray, F. C. Prison discipline in America. London: J. Murray, 1847.
- Haft, M. Legal challenges to unequal treatment of women offenders. The Women Offender Report, 1975, 1 (3), 1-2.
- Haft, M. G. Women in prisons. In M. Hermann & M. G. Haft (Eds.), Prisoner's rights sourcebook: theory, litigation, practice. New York: Clark Boardman, 1973.
- Haley, J. Missouri mixes sexes in prison. Kansas City Times, December 16, 1976, 109 (86), 1A-2C.
- Heffernan, E. Making it in prison: the square, the cool and the life. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1972.
- Heffernan, E. Research design for Fort Worth FCI study. Unpublished research proposal, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, March, 1973.
- Heffernan, E. Interim report on research: Fort Worth FCI. Unpublished paper, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, April, 1974.
- Heffernan, E. Co-corrections: some questions to be asked. Proceedings of the tenth annual interagency workshop of the Institute of Contemporary Corrections and the Behavioral Sciences. Huntsville, Texas: Sam Houston State University, June, 1975.
- Heffernan, E. & Krippel, E. Final report on research: Fort Worth FCI. Unpublished report, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, March, 1975.
- Henry, J. Women in prison. New York: Doubleday, 1952.
- Hickey, J. E. & Scharf, P. (Eds.). The first community research and training center: a general statement. Unpublished paper, Connecticut State Institution for Women, Niantic, no date.

Holmquist, K. Family program initiated. Fort Worth Star-Telegram, August 5, 1973, G 1.

Hopper, C. B. Sex in prison. Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1969.

Inmate co-ed programs at Fulton and Bedford Hills. Correctional Services News, New York Department of Correctional Services, 1976, 1 (11), 5-8.

Jackson, D. Resident socialization and interpersonal relationships in the Fort Worth Correctional Institution. Unpublished research proposal, March, 1973.

Jones, C. Prisons go co-ed but mostly out of economic necessity. Christian Science Monitor. February 14, 1975.

Karacki, L. Going coed: a case study of the establishment of a coed program at a previously all male institution. Paper delivered to Oregon Correctional Association, October, 1973.

Karacki, L. Kennedy Youth Center student response to a coed questionnaire. Unpublished paper, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, October, 1972.

Karacki, L. et al. Application of the Correctional Institution Environment Scale to evaluation of the Federal Prison Service's Functional Unit Management. Unpublished paper, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, December, 1974.

Karacki, L. & Kitchener, H. Update, Correctional Institution Environment Scale, Fort Worth. Unpublished paper, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, January, 1975.

Karacki, L., Minor, J. A., Cavior, H. E.; & Kennedy, B. Going coed: a case study of the establishment of a coed program at a previously all male institution. Unpublished paper, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, October, 1972.

Kassebaum, G., Ward, D. & Wilner, D. Prison treatment and parole survival: an empirical assessment. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1971.

Keve, P.W. Prison life and human worth. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1974.

Killworth, P. & Bernard, H. R. Catij: a new sociometric and its application to a prison living unit. Human Organization, 1974, 33, 335-350.

Leckerkerker, E. Reformatories for women in the United States. 1931.

- Loving, N. & Olson, L. (Eds.). Proceedings: National Conference on Women and Crime. Washington: National League of Cities, U. S. Conference of Mayors, February, 1976.
- Mabli, J. Fort Worth research summary: "success rates." Unpublished paper, U.S. Bureau of Prisons, November, 1976.
- Mabli, J., Patrick, J., & Sanfilippo, M. A review of research at the Federal Correctional Institution at Fort Worth. Unpublished paper, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, November, 1975.
- McKelvey, B. M. American prisons: a study in American social history prior to 1915. Montclair, N. J.: Patterson Smith, 1968.
- Minor, J. A. The coed program at the Kennedy Youth Center. Unpublished paper, April, 1972.
- Monahan, F. Women in crime. New York: Washburn, 1941.
- Morris, N. The future of imprisonment. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1974.
- Murton, T. Shared decision-making as a treatment technique in prison management. Minneapolis: Murton Foundation for Criminal Justice, March, 1975.
- Nelson, C. A study of homosexuality among women inmates at two state prisons. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1974.
- Nagel, W. G. The new red barn: a critical look at the modern American prison. New York: Walker, 1973.
- Patrick, J. Doing time: an ethnography of a co-correctional institution. Unpublished report, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, May, 1976.
- Partick, J. & McCurdy, M. Women's unit ethnographic study: Fort Worth FCI. Unpublished report, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, 1975.
- Prisons: boys and girls together. Newsweek, July 23, 1973, 82 (4), 23-24.
- Proceedings of a conference on special needs of female residents in a correctional setting, Robert F. Kennedy Youth Center, Morgantown, September, 1974.
- Rans, L. & Gabel-Strickland, K. Evaluation of co-correctional institutions for adults. Unpublished paper, October, 1976.
- Ross, W. F. The women's unit. Federal Correctional Institution, Lexington, Kentucky. Unpublished paper, no date.

- Ruback, B. The sexually integrated prison -- a legal and policy evaluation. American Journal of Criminal Law, 1975, 3, 310-330.
- Scharf, P. & Hickey, J. The prison and the inmate's conception of legal justice: an experiment in democratic education. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 1976, 3 (2), 107-122.
- Scharf, P., Kohlberg, L. & Hickey, J. Ideology and correctional intervention: the creation of a just prison community. In J. Monahan (Ed.), Community health and the criminal justice system. Permagon Press, 1976.
- Schweber-Koren, C. Integration and education: a study of the education of adult women in the Federal prisons, 1975-1976. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1977.
- Sindwani, K. L. Pre-release attitudes. Fort Worth FCI. Unpublished report, Fort Worth, 1974.
- Sommer, R. The end of imprisonment. New York: Oxford, 1976.
- Spitz, J. An overview of manpower programs for incarcerated women. Unpublished master's thesis: Northeastern University College of Criminal Justice, no date.
- Stowers, C. A coed prison without bars. Parade, February 11, 1973, 8-9.
- Trotter, R. J. Stout walls and bars do not a prison make. Science News, August 12, 1972, 102, 122-124.
- U. S. Senate. Committee on Judiciary, Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries. Priorities for correctional reform and S. 662. Hearings, May 13-20, 1971. Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971.
- Vanier Center for Women. An evaluation of co-correctional recreational programs. Unpublished report, December, 1975.
- Ward, D. A. & Kassebaum, G. G. Women's prison: sex and social structure. Chicago: Aldine, 1965.
- Williams, J. E. Changing prisons. London: Peter Owen, 1975.

END