

VICTIMIZATION OF INMATES WITH INTELLECTUAL
DISABILITY: A QUALITATIVE STUDY

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY

OF

SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

PACIFIC UNIVERSITY, FOREST GROVE, OREGON

BY

MARGARET E. LOBERG

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF

DOCTOR OF PSYCHOLOGY

APRIL 25, 2009

APPROVED: _____
Genevieve Arnaut, Psy.D., Ph.D.

Michelle Guyton, Ph.D.

PROFESSOR AND DEAN: _____
Michel Hersen, Ph.D., ABPP

Copyright 2009 by Margaret E. Loberg

ABSTRACT

Researchers have reported negative psychological effects on inmates who have been victimized and have recently begun to focus attention on unique inmate populations in order to facilitate psychological adjustment to incarceration. The purpose of the present study was to explore the experience of victimization for inmates who are intellectually delayed. A qualitative research project was conducted in which 20 male inmates were interviewed at Oregon State Correctional Institution. The results were organized into three categories: Contributors to Victimization, Inmate Response to Victimization, and Institutional Response to Victimization. Within the Contributors to Victimization category, themes of Internal Characteristics and External Variables emerged. Subthemes of Internal Characteristics included the following: Intellectual Disability, Mental Illness, Age, Physical Stature, Race, and Personal Attributes. Subthemes of External Variables included Environmental Norm, Crime Categorization, Length of Sentence, and Property Ownership. In the second category, Inmate Response to Victimization, themes of Behavioral Response and Emotional Response emerged. Subthemes of Behavioral Response included Verbal Confrontation, Peer Consultation, Positive Peer Affiliation, Reporting, Destruction of Property, Retaliation, Hypervigilance, Avoidance, and Minimization. Subthemes of Emotional Response included Anger, Fear, and Sadness/Depression. In the final category, Institutional Response to Victimization, two themes emerged: Positive Perceptions and Negative Perceptions. Inmate recommendations for Institutional Response are also presented.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research would not have been possible were it not for the honest and frank participation of the inmates at the Oregon Department of Corrections. The life experiences that they shared have remained in my thoughts long after my meetings with them. Thank you to Dr. Arnaut, who advised me of the request for this research and provided support and guidance throughout the process. Your professionalism, knowledge, sense of humor, and quiet demeanor are inspiring. Thanks also to the forensic research group for their support of my research.

To Kathryn Marshall and Brittany Keller, special thanks for the support that you provided both during this research and throughout our education. I'm excited to enter into this field with you both. Thanks to Corey Montoya for her assistance in coding my data. And thanks to Laena Huffaker, who patiently provided both preliminary editorial assistance and emotional support throughout the writing of this project.

Finally, thank you to my family for your support during my work on this project and throughout my education. Special thanks to my parents, who encouraged me to dream and achieve. Also to my Grandma Aggie who brimmed with hope and pride throughout my educational journey. Although my work often took time away from my family you supported me wholeheartedly. For this truly selfless act and for your genuine support I will be forever grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	3
Violence and Victimization	3
Victimization of Subgroups	7
Effects of Victimization on Inmates	10
Intellectually Delayed Inmates	12
Description of Terms	12
Intellectually Delayed Inmates	12
Purpose of the Current Study	16
METHOD	17
Definition of Intellectual Delay	19
Participants	20
Procedure	22
Data Analysis	25
RESULTS	28
Experience of Victimization by Intellectually Delayed Inmates	28
Inmate Recommendations for Staff Response to Victimization	61

DISCUSSION	72
Findings and Implications	72
Strengths and Limitations.....	86
Future Directions	89
Conclusion.....	90
REFERENCES.....	92
APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT	95
APPENDIX B: SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS	99

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1: Main Themes and Subthemes of Interviews.....	29
Table 2: Inmate Recommendations for Staff Response to Victimization.....	62

INTRODUCTION

Violence in prison is a prominent problem, reported by some researchers to be a way of life among inmates in prison settings (Morrison, 1991). In 2003, Stephan and Karberg reported that between July 1, 1999, and June 30, 2000, federal and state correctional facilities cited 34,355 inmate-on-inmate assaults (an average of 28 violations per 1,000 inmates) that resulted in 51 inmate deaths. These authors also reported that in the same period 17,952 inmate-on-staff assaults occurred (an average of 14.6 violations per 1,000 inmates), which resulted in 5 staff deaths. In addition, Stephan and Karberg reported that the number of major disturbances in correctional facilities, defined as those involving five or more inmates and resulting in serious injury or significant property damage, nearly doubled between 1995 (with a total of 317) and 2000 (a total of 606).

Inmates who have experienced victimization in prison have been shown to display higher rates of depression, anxiety, stress, anger, and hopelessness (Biggam & Power, 1999; Wooldredge, 1999). Researchers have stressed the importance of identification of unique needs of inmates as an important step toward developing strategies to facilitate psychological adjustment to incarceration (Wooldredge, 1999). In response to this need, researchers have begun to turn their attention toward specific subpopulations of inmates in order to better understand the experiences of victimization in these populations.

Researchers have noted that quantitative studies of inmates' experiences of victimization have tended to be limited in scope due to variations in defining victimization, and they have therefore encouraged future researchers to undertake

qualitative research in the area (Cooley, 1993; Hensley, Tewksbury, & Castle, 2003; Morrison, 1991). Although qualitative studies have been conducted to explore the experience of victimization for other subgroups, such as mentally ill and elderly prisoners (Kerbs & Jolley, 2007; Morrison, 1991), very little research exists to date on the experience of victimization for intellectually delayed inmates. Oregon Department of Corrections (ODOC) officials have been concerned that inmates with intellectual delay may be threatened or exploited by general population inmates who are housed at Oregon State Correctional Institution (OSCI) during incarceration or prior to their release (P. Bellatty, C. Tupou, personal communication, August 27, 2007). For this reason, ODOC liaisons requested that a qualitative study be carried out in order to explore the experience of inmates with intellectual delay who have been victimized while incarcerated. The purpose of the current study was to investigate in depth the experience of victimization for inmates with intellectual delay in order to assist in the development of recommendations for prevention of and response to such instances.

In the following review, research on the prevalence of violence and victimization in prison (among general population and subgroups) is presented. This is followed by a review of the effect of victimization on inmates. Finally, information pertinent to intellectual disability is presented in order to outline the need for research pertaining to this population.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Violence and Victimization

Official reports of rates of violence are believed to underrepresent the level and type of victimization that occurs inside prisons (Cooley, 1993). Underrepresentation is thought to result from underreporting on the part of inmates who adhere to peer-enforced norms of silence in order to avoid retaliation or being labeled as a snitch (Wolff, Blitz, Shi, Siegel, & Bachman, 2007). Compounding problems of underreporting is the problem of defining victimization. Very few inmates can be categorized purely as either victim or aggressor (Ireland & Ireland, 2000). In most cases, the designation of victim is made by assessing which individual sustained the most serious harm or injury (Edgar & O'Donnell, 1998). This designation is made because an actual or potential aggressor may become a victim, such as in cases of attempted cell theft gone awry. Additionally, in cases such as mutual assault the designation of victim is somewhat arbitrary.

Researchers have varied in their inclusionary criteria for defining victimization. For example, some researchers have used only broad categories such as physical assault (Wolff et al., 2007; Wooldredge, 1999), whereas others have measured subcategories for victimization, including incidents such as psychological victimization (threats, insults, exclusion, name calling), property crime against another inmate (cell theft, robbery), sexual crime against another inmate (threats, sexual targeting, and sexual assault), and a range of physical assault behaviors (Cooley, 1993; Edgar & O'Donnell, 1998; Kerbs & Jolley, 2007; Wooldredge, 1998). Still others have opted for a focus on only one area of victimization, such as that of sexual assault (Hensley, Koscheski, & Tewksbury, 2005; Hensley, Tewksbury, & Castle, 2003). Variations in inclusionary criteria for defining

victimization affect the rates of victimization reported in such studies. With their sources of variation in mind, let us consider representative studies in this area.

Wolff et al. (2007) assessed the prevalence of physical victimization in 14 prisons (13 adult male facilities and 1 adult female facility) in a mid-Atlantic state. Participants were 7,221 men and 546 women who were surveyed using a computer-administered questionnaire supplemented with instructions delivered via headphones. The researchers hoped that this design would enhance accuracy of reporting sensitive or stigmatizing information. Victimization was defined as physical assault, including having been hit, slapped, kicked, bitten, choked, beaten up, or threatened with a weapon.

The researchers reported that 20% of female inmates and 25% of male inmates endorsed having been physically assaulted by another inmate while serving their current sentence. This rate was comparable to rates of physical assault (25%) reported by Wooldredge (1998). Wolff et al. (2007) reported that men were more likely than women to report violence involving a weapon (141 per 1,000 inmates vs. 94 per 1,000 inmates, respectively). Rates of victimization varied by facility: higher rates of inmate-on-inmate violence were reported at small facilities than at large facilities, whereas higher rates of inmate-on-staff violence were reported at large facilities than at small facilities. This is consistent with Wooldredge's (1998) findings of higher victimization rates in populations that are transient (high turnover), high population densities (i.e., crowded environments), and younger populations.

With variation in facility size accounted for, prevalence rates ranged from 129 to 346 incidents per 1,000 inmates for inmate-on-inmate physical victimization and from 101 to 321 per 1,000 inmates for staff-on-inmate physical victimization (Wolff et al.,

2007). Prevalence rates for inmate-on-staff victimization were not reported. The researchers made note of several limitations in their study, including the absence of non-physical forms of victimization and the possibility of decreased accuracy due to self-report data and a potential motivation to make facility staff look bad.

In a survey of 1,566 inmates, Edgar and O'Donnell (1998) examined rates of six types of victimization, including assault, robbery, threat, insult, exclusion, and cell theft. Statistical results were only reported for two types of victimization (assault and insult). The researchers found that 19% of adult inmates reported having been assaulted at least once in the previous month. Further, 26% of adults reported verbal abuse in the form of insults at least once in the previous month. The researchers speculated that verbal abuse and physical assault both served as forms of sparring or competition and that verbal abuse increased chances of being physically assaulted.

Follow-up interviews by Edgar and O'Donnell (1998) were performed with aggressors ($n = 60$) and victims ($n = 31$) of assault in order to ascertain inmate perceptions of assault. Reportedly, inmates perceived themselves as being more vulnerable to assault if they were known to have been convicted of a sex offense. Further, inmates who perceived themselves as showing fear and who did not fight back when attacked were at higher risk of being attacked. Reportedly, public demonstrations of an inmate's weakness (e.g., public physical assault of an inmate who did not defend him- or herself) allowed other inmates to identify the victim as a suitable target for further victimization. The aggressor was more likely to aggress if there was little risk of suffering a negative consequence (such as physical retaliation from the victim).

Cooley (1993) surveyed 117 male inmates in five federal Canadian prisons regarding their experiences with victimization using two categories of victimization: personal (sexual assault, robbery, assault, threats) and property (cell theft, vandalism). Of the inmates surveyed, 47% reported at least one victimization incident, with 42% reporting at least one personal victimization and 20% reporting at least one property victimization. Of the inmates who reported victimization, the most frequently reported victimization was theft (39% of all incidents), followed by assault (28%) and threats (21%). The more severe incidents accounted for smaller percentages, including sexual assault (6%), robbery (4%), and extortion (2%). Cooley reported that victims tended to be younger, housed in higher security settings, and in the early stages of their sentences (as compared to non-victims). Cooley noted a discrepancy between his findings and the reported findings in official records: His findings were over three times higher than the official rate of victimization, and he speculated that official records likely underestimated the rates of victimization in prisons.

Hensley and his colleagues assessed rates of sexual assault and victimization in two separate studies. In the first study, 24 of 174 inmates (13.8%) interviewed reported being sexual targets (as defined by receiving sexual threats), and 2 inmates (1.1%) reported having been victims of sexual assault during their incarceration (Hensley et al., 2003). Hensley et al. speculated that face-to-face interviews may have resulted in underreporting of incidents due to the sensitive nature of the topic. In the second study, 26 of 142 inmates (18.3%) who responded to a survey reported being sexual targets, and 12 inmates (8.5%) reported having been victims of sexual assault during their incarceration (Hensley et al., 2005). The researchers noted that the 18% response rate to

the survey may have resulted in selection bias and they recommended interpreting the results with caution. They further recommended a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods in future to more accurately assess the rate of sexual assault in prisons.

Victimization of Subgroups

Recently, researchers have turned the investigation of victimization toward subpopulations in prisons. Notably, researchers have investigated the experience of victimization for mentally ill inmates (Blitz, Wolff, & Shi, 2008; Ireland & Rowley, 2007; Morrison, 1991; Wolff, Blitz, & Shi, 2007) and for older male inmates (Kerbs & Jolley, 2007). In a qualitative study, Morrison (1991) examined perceptions of 13 mentally ill inmates by other inmates and staff members at a forensic halfway house in the southwestern United States. The mentally ill inmates were identified by staff and inmates as having a higher risk of being victimized than inmates without mental illness because of poor social skills and dependency that was evidenced by affiliation with guards. Further, the cognitive and social deficits evidenced by mentally ill inmates reportedly inhibited either their ability or willingness to adhere to prison norms, which led other inmates to view the mentally ill inmates as untrustworthy. Finally, inmates reported that manipulation of mentally ill inmates was easy and that mentally ill inmates frequently were either used as scapegoats or exploited. Morrison's assertions were supported by Wooldredge (1999), who noted that inmates with atypical characteristics may have more difficulty adjusting to prison because such characteristics may inhibit the inmate's ability to integrate into the social system of the prison.

In another study specific to inmates with mental illness, Wolff, Blitz, and Shi (2007) surveyed inmates with and without mental disorders in order to ascertain rates of sexual victimization in 13 prisons in a mid-Atlantic state prison system. Participants were 6,964 male inmates and 564 female inmates aged 18 or older. Determination of the presence of mental disorder was based upon self-reported previous mental health treatment for the following mental disorders: schizophrenia, depression, posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), bipolar disorder, and anxiety disorders. The researchers reportedly found self-report to be consistent with clinical records maintained by the prison system. Concrete data were not provided to substantiate this claim. The researchers reported that rates of sexual victimization were higher for inmates with a mental disorder (15.1%) than those without (8.9%).

Blitz, Wolff, and Shi (2008) also examined rates of physical victimization for individuals with and without a mental disorder. The designation of mental disorder was based on self-reported mental health treatment for particular mental disorders (schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, depression, PTSD, or anxiety disorders). The researchers reported that rates of physical victimization were 1.6 times higher for male inmates with mental disorders than for male inmates without mental disorders. Rates of victimization were highest among males who reported prior treatment for schizophrenia or bipolar disorder (310 per 1000 inmates, as opposed to 205 per 1000 inmates for inmates not reporting mental health concerns). The researchers noted the compounding impact of race on victimization of inmates with mental disorders: Rates of victimization were 1.4 times higher among Hispanic and Black male inmates with mental disorders compared to their White counterparts with mental disorders.

In another study of mental illness and victimization, Ireland and Rowley (2007) studied the experience of bullying (as defined by direct or indirect aggression that occurs on a weekly basis) among adult male mentally ill patient-offenders in a forensic hospital. They found that 60.8% of the surveyed population reported at least one instance of being bullied in the previous week. Types of reported bullying were verbal (30.4%), psychological (25.6%), theft-related (22.4%), physical (14.4%), and sexual (4.8%). The researchers noted that verbal aggression is representative of a subtle type of aggression and that perpetrators can often evade detection. They reported that “even if detected, verbal aggression is more likely to have its seriousness minimized (by staff) in comparison to more overt forms of direct aggression such as physical, theft-related and sexual” (Ireland & Rowley, 2007, p.386). As such, they concluded that verbal victimization constituted the lowest cost (in regard to risk) to perpetrators while still causing a great deal of harm to victims.

Although not directly relevant to the population of interest in the current study, information about other vulnerable populations may inform the current research. In a qualitative and quantitative study, Kerbs and Jolley (2007) assessed the prevalence and experience of four types of victimization (psychological, property, physical, and sexual) among older male inmates in the North Carolina Department of Corrections. For the 65 male inmates who were interviewed, victimization rates were provided for each of the four categories: (a) *psychological victimization*: 85% were cut in front of while standing in line, 40% experienced verbal insults, 25% experienced threats in the form of fake punches, 19% experienced name calling (e.g., “snitch”), and 17% experienced verbal threats; (b) *property victimization*: 29.9% were cheated out of money, 27.7% experienced

cell theft, 9.2% experienced property damage, and 3.1% experienced other inmates taking their food away; (c) *physical victimization*: 10.8% reported being punched, kicked, pushed, or otherwise physically attacked, and 6.2% reported being robbed, 1.5% reported being mugged, 1.5% reported being attacked with a weapon; and (d) *sexual victimization*: 10.8% reported sexual harassment, 1.5% reported having been forced to have sex in order to repay a debt, and another 1.5% reported sexual assault. The researchers noted that 75% of older inmates would prefer to live in an age-segregated facility if it were available to them. The researchers expressed reluctance to advocate for the segregation of older inmates as a proposed solution for their victimization given the preliminary nature of this study. They instead encouraged further studies with greater methodological rigor and recommended that policy makers to work towards prevention of violence.

Effects of Victimization on Inmates

Victimization of inmates has been negatively correlated with their psychological well-being. Inmates who report victimization express elevated levels of fear and greater concern for personal safety than those who do not (McCorkle, 1993). Additionally, inmates who are victimized exhibit high levels of social and emotional loneliness and are often stigmatized by their peer group when they fail to respond to aggression with reciprocal aggression (Ireland & Qualter, 2007).

In a survey of 581 inmates from three Ohio correctional facilities, Wooldredge (1999) found that inmates who reported experiences of victimization also reported high rates of depression, anxiety, and stress as determined by level of agreement with statements designed to assess psychological well-being (e.g., “I often feel depressed. I have problems dealing with stress”; p. 241). Wooldredge speculated that the reason for

higher rates of negative affective states may have been the inmates' lack of perceived control over the environment. Specifically, inmates who had been victimized likely felt less secure because they were unsure of what to expect on a daily basis and were therefore left to fear the unknown. Similarly, in a study of juvenile offenders Ireland (2005) reported that juveniles who experienced aggression (bullying) demonstrated increased anxiety, depression, insomnia, social dysfunction, and overall poor psychological health. The researcher hypothesized that poor health could result from victimization within a closed setting in which victims were largely unable to avoid their aggressors.

Similar results were reported in a survey of Scottish Young Offenders Institutions (YOI) by Biggam and Power (1999). The researchers surveyed 100 inmates aged 16-25 who had displayed difficulties in adjusting to life in prison. Negative affective states were highest in inmates who expressed suicidal ideation, followed by victims of bullying. Victims of bullying displayed the highest levels of hopelessness, even more so than inmates who expressed suicidal ideation. Levels of hopelessness reported by victims of bullying were reportedly comparable to those found in studies examining severe depression and parasuicide. Additionally, victims of bullying were found to have the highest levels of anger and hostility. This latter finding is of particular interest, in that some researchers have suggested that inmates who believe they have been victimized may respond by bullying others (Ireland, 2001).

The aforementioned studies highlight the potential negative consequences that victimization experiences have on the psychological functioning of inmates. Researchers have stressed the importance of identifying the unique needs of inmates as an important

step toward developing strategies to facilitate psychological adjustment to incarceration (Wooldredge, 1999). In the following section, research specifically pertaining to intellectual delay and victimization is reviewed.

Intellectually Delayed Inmates

Description of Terms

Several terms are used in the literature to describe intellectual delay. Use of the term “developmental delay/disability” suggests that there was a delay in reaching childhood (developmental) milestones, whereas use of the term “intellectual delay/disability” is considered representative of those with impaired functioning resulting from either delay in reaching developmental milestones or impairment that occurred as a result of brain injury (e.g., head trauma, loss of functioning due to prolonged drug use) following a period of normal development (Holland, Clare, & Mukhopadhyay, 2002). Although these terms describe a similar construct, they are not interchangeable and terms used in the original research will be retained in this section.

Intellectually Delayed Inmates

As just shown, several researchers have responded to the call for identification of unique needs of inmates in order to develop strategies to facilitate psychological adjustment to incarceration. Yet although violence and victimization are prominent problems in prisons, and inmates who have experienced victimization display higher rates of maladjustment to prison (Biggam & Power, 1999; Wooldredge, 1999), relatively little research has been conducted on the experience of victimization for subgroups in the mainstream prison population.

Intellectually delayed individuals constitute 1% of the general population, and prevalence rates of intellectual disability have been documented at 6.15% in one prison (Chan, Hudson, & Sigafos, 2003); most estimates fall between 3% and 10% (Haney, 2006). Prevalence rates vary based on the criteria used to define intellectual delay and are higher when individuals with borderline intelligence are included (Barron, Hassiotis, & Banes, 2004). Rates also vary based on the screening procedures used for identification of developmental disability at various institutions.

In a recent study, Glaser and Deane (1999) examined the experiences of 109 inmates with intellectual disability in an Australian prison system. Of the sample, 42 inmates were selected for follow-up interviewing. Of the 42 inmates selected for follow-up, 35 had been diagnosed with mental retardation. The percentage of inmates convicted of a sex offense in the group was high (45%). This information was congruent with other researchers' speculations that low intellectual functioning corresponded with a higher risk of detection and increased rates of arson and sexual offenses (Lindsay, 2002).

Inmates were selected for interview because they had recently been admitted to a special prison unit (K6, a maximum-security facility) designed to house inmates with developmental disability and inmates who were identified by prison officials as being at risk. Reportedly, the impetus for relocation to K6 had been protective concerns. Developmentally disabled inmates who had been incarcerated with the general population (prior to the opening of K6) had experienced serious assaults that required medical and dental treatment and that, in some cases, involved burns and sexual abuse. Additionally, inmates with developmental disability were reportedly involved in more incidents than other inmates, although no data were provided to validate these claims. Prison staff

reported “deeply ambivalent feelings toward this difficult group of prisoners. New admissions were variously described as dull, smelly, and insignificant, a complete no-hoper, of no value to society whatsoever, and having all the attributes of a recidivist” (Glaser & Deane, 1999, p. 349). These assertions are concerning given that inmates who are alienated from staff are often perceived as being “attractive targets” (Wooldredge, 1998, p. 495) because of the low likelihood that they will report their victimization to staff.

Protective concerns were managed by placing developmentally delayed inmates in environments believed by prison officials to be safe as a result of higher security ratings. Of the 42 inmates interviewed for follow-up, 87% served their entire term in a maximum-security facility (K6) despite the high proportion (63%) who had security ratings that would have enabled transfer to medium- or minimum-security facilities. Although the unit provided protection for inmates with developmental disability, this protection came at a cost of being in a more restrictive environment. The researchers reported that the most ideal recommendation would be a small unit for individuals with intellectual disability in which individualized programs and services were offered to maximize potential for later community integration. They acknowledged that such a change would necessitate major shifts in the criminal justice system.

Although no direct link has been made to date between higher than average rates of victimization in prison and intellectual delay, studies of victimization in the general population have indicated that intellectually delayed individuals are at risk for victimization. It has been reported that individuals with intellectual disabilities in the general population are more likely to be maltreated (i.e., psychologically or physically

abused) than are individuals without intellectual disabilities and individuals with physical disabilities (Horner-Johnson & Drum, 2006). Individuals with mental retardation in the general population have been identified as being at great risk for personal (or violent) crimes as well as economic crimes (Petersilia, 2001). Further, individuals with intellectual disability are reportedly overrepresented in the criminal justice system (Haney, 2006). Researchers have reported that the probable cause for this overrepresentation is a high correlation among offenders with intellectual disability with psychosocial disadvantage: These offenders are more likely to be uneducated, unemployed, poor, have deficits in social and communication skills, and suffer from behavioral or psychiatric disorders (Glaser & Deane, 1999).

In addition to these concerns, inmates who are perceived as vulnerable are reported to be more prone to victimization (Edgar & O'Donnell, 1998; Kerbs & Jolley, 2007; Morrison, 1991). Intellectual delay has been reported to be linked to initial maladjustment in prison, as inmates are slower to adjust to routine and may have more difficulty in learning the norms of prison life (Finn, 1993). Historically, misperceptions that developmental delay was inherently linked with criminal behavior (Parker, 1972) have permeated cultural beliefs, and unexplained or unpredictable behavior resulting from developmental delay can be misconstrued as dangerousness (Haney, 2006). Jailers reportedly perceive intellectually disabled inmates as threatening their own physical safety (Snow & Hooper-Brair, 1990) and as being more difficult to manage (Glaser & Deane, 1999). Further, although outward signs of vulnerability may be interpreted as an invitation to exploitation and victimization, it has been noted by Haney (2006) that:

People who appear weak and in need of help may be scorned by other prisoners, marginalized, and taken advantage of. For this reason, prisoners with a mental

illness, developmental disability, or other vulnerability may be reluctant to admit that there are things that they do not understand or cannot do; they are reluctant to acknowledge their limitations or to seek assistance. (p. 257)

This reluctance to seek assistance is of interest, given the response styles of inmates who choose to respond to victimization independently rather than reporting. Inmates have been shown to respond to victimization by isolating themselves (77.7%), avoiding certain areas of prison (41.5%), and using violence or a threat of violence to deter aggression (69.6%); (McCorkle, 1992).

Purpose of the Current Study

The purpose of the current study was to investigate in depth the experience of victimization for inmates with intellectual delay. My goal was to contribute to the knowledge base regarding the experience of victimization for individuals with intellectual disability in order to aid development of recommendations for prevention and response to instances of victimization of intellectually delayed individuals. No hypotheses were developed a priori because no factors have yet been identified in the scientific literature; hence this research was exploratory. Inmates were also encouraged to make recommendations regarding effective prevention of or staff response to victimization of inmates at ODOC.

METHOD

Selection of Research Method

For several reasons, qualitative research was selected as the preferred method of obtaining information regarding victimization of intellectually delayed individuals. First, researchers have noted that quantitative studies of inmates' experiences of victimization have tended to be limited in scope and these authors have therefore encouraged future researchers to undertake qualitative research in the area (Cooley, 1993; Hensley, Tewksbury, & Castle, 2003; Morrison, 1991). A qualitative research approach is particularly useful for areas in which little is known about the phenomenon under investigation; moving to quantitative research too quickly can artificially constrain and limit understanding of the individuals' experiences.

The second reason for selecting a qualitative approach related to the target population of this study. Researchers have noted a tendency toward acquiescence in individuals who demonstrate low intellectual functioning; this tendency has reportedly led to invalid information and unfounded research conclusions, particularly in quantitative research (Sigelman, Budd, Spanhel, & Schoenrock, 1981). By noting whether individuals are responding in an inconsistent manner during the interviewing, an interviewer can ask interviewees to expand upon answers that have been provided in order to clarify conflicting response styles or information. An interviewer can also clarify any confusion the respondents may have about the nature of a question and can ask respondents to provide additional information when needed to clarify a response.

In further support of qualitative methodology, ODOC liaisons have noted that it is possible that individuals with low intellectual functioning may not recognize certain events as victimization (P. Bellatty and C. Tupou, personal communication, August 27, 2007). For instance, an inmate with low intellectual functioning may believe that another inmate is being friendly or is doing him or her a favor when in fact the other person is manipulating, exploiting, or victimizing the inmate. As such, it is possible that accurate information on victimization would not be obtained through file review or quantitative questionnaires. Further, researchers have noted that official records have consistently underrepresented true rates of victimization (Cooley, 1993). Underrepresentation is thought to result from underreporting on the part of inmates who adhere to peer-enforced norms of silence in order to avoid retaliation or labeling as a “snitch” (Wolff et al., 2007, p. 589).¹

The grounded theory method of qualitative research (Charmaz, 2008) was selected due to a fit of the method with the proposed goal of the study. Grounded theorists seek to understand multiple layers of personal experience, including the stated explanation of an individual’s actions, unstated assumptions about an individual’s actions, intentions for engaging in a particular action, the effect of an action on other individuals, and the ultimate consequences of the actions (Charmaz, 2006). In short, grounded theorists are interested in understanding “the meaning of persons’ experiences” (Rennie, 2006, p. 64).

¹ Validation of this concern was obtained in the current study when one inmate noted that he had previously completed a survey regarding victimization for ODOC but had not been forthcoming when completing the survey. The inmate explained that he is illiterate and stated that questions were read aloud to him in an area in which other inmates could hear the question and his response.

Given the goal of the study (to obtain understanding of the experience of victimization by inmates with intellectual delay), both qualitative methods and the grounded theory methodology were appropriate. Further description of grounded theory methodology is outlined in a later section (data analysis).

Definition of Intellectual Delay

For the purpose of this study, I utilized the terms “intellectual delay” and “intellectual disability” to represent the population of inmates who are designated as “developmentally delayed” or having a “developmental disability” by ODOC. Use of the term “developmental delay/disability” suggests that there was a delay in reaching childhood (developmental) milestones, whereas use of the term “intellectual delay/disability” is considered representative of those with impaired functioning resulting from either delay in reaching developmental milestones or impairment that occurred as a result of brain injury (e.g., head trauma, loss of functioning due to prolonged drug use) following a period of normal development (Holland, Clare, & Mukhopadhyay, 2002).

ODOC facilities have continued to use prior terminology (“developmental delay”) when assigning coding to inmates, regardless of whether the delay occurred during development or as the result of injury. Designation of developmental disability is determined by ODOC based on intelligence testing (a Full-Scale IQ estimate below 85) and an adaptive functioning interview completed at the time of intake. Inmates with low intellectual functioning are assigned a developmental disability (DD) code, which is then entered into the ODOC database. Inmates are advised of their coding and provided with ongoing case management.

The ODOC cut-off score DD coding (IQ of 85 or below) is consistent with scores used by researchers to identify individuals as intellectually delayed (Baron, Hassiotis, & Banes, 2004). Although ODOC staff still used the term developmental delay in their DD coding system at the time this study was conducted, because the term “intellectual delay” is more inclusive and because ODOC did not track the origins of low functioning, the terms intellectual disability and intellectual delay are used here in order to more accurately represent the construct.

Participants

In this study, the target population consisted of ODOC inmates who were identified by an ODOC liaison (specifically, a case manager) as having an intellectual disability and being potentially vulnerable to victimization by other inmates (i.e., being housed in a facility with non-intellectually disabled inmates who were scheduled to be released; although some participants may have experienced a prior instance of victimization, this was not an inclusion criteria). Participants had to be over 18 years of age and fluent English speakers.

Charmaz (2006) defined theoretical sampling as “sampling for theory construction, not for representativeness of a given population, to check and refine the analyst’s emerging categories” (p. 497) and described it as the preferred sampling method for grounded theory methods of qualitative research. In order to obtain theoretical sampling, a list of 27 inmates who met these criteria was provided by a prison liaison. At the time the participant list was provided, the participant pool resided in Oregon State Correctional Institution (OSCI) within the general population (GP). At the time of data collection the total population at ODOC was 14,946 inmates. Of this population 1,040

inmates (14.37%) were classified as intellectually disabled (J. Duncan, personal communication, July 13, 2009). The GP is comprised of inmates who are not in segregated housing (such as Disciplinary Segregation Unit [DSU], Special Management Unit [SMU], or Administrative Segregation Housing [ASH]), protective custody, or the infirmary. OSCI is a medium-security men's prison that is located in Salem, Oregon.

Of the possible pool, 1 inmate was unavailable due to an out-of-facility transfer, 1 inmate did not meet required criteria (i.e., he was Spanish-speaking), and 3 inmates refused to participate. Reasons provided for refusal to participate included reported distress about current victimization and a desire to speak to a case manager rather than the researcher ($n = 2$), a belief that "nothing will change," ($n = 1$), and a report by one inmate he had not experienced victimization and consequently did not believe that his participation would be useful. One inmate who was housed in DSU as the result of a disciplinary infraction did not provide a reason for refusal.

The final sample consisted of 20 male inmates who were coded as "DD" and housed in the GP at OSCI. Participants ranged in age from 19 to 84 ($M = 43.25$, $SD = 16.5$, $Mdn = 42.5$). Of the 20 participants, 16 (80%) identified as Caucasian/White, 2 (10%) identified as African American/Black, 1 (5%) identified as Hispanic, and 1 (5%) identified as other. Ethnicities for the larger population of DD inmates in ODOC are as follows: Caucasian 64%, African American 18%, Hispanic 13%, Other 5% (J. Duncan, personal communication, July 13, 2009). Therefore, the ethnicities represented in the sample were relatively consistent with the total population of ODOC inmates classified as DD, although there were more Caucasian inmates in the sample than in the ODOC population and fewer inmates of color. Level of educational attainment ranged from 0 to

12 years. Data for level of educational attainment is not available for comparison (J. Duncan, personal communication, July 13, 2009). Of the participants, 14 (70%) carried mental health diagnoses other than DD and the remaining 6 (30%) did not. Of those who carried a mental health diagnosis, 6 (43%) were diagnosed with psychotic disorders, 4 (29%) with mood disorders, 3 (21%) with cognitive disorders, and 1 (7%) with an adjustment disorder. In this regard the sample was somewhat inconsistent with the total population of DD inmates, for whom 43% carry mental health diagnoses. Information regarding specific diagnoses was not available (J. Duncan, personal communication, July 13, 2009).

Among inmates interviewed, the following criminal convictions were represented: sexual crimes (sodomy, rape, sexual assault, attempted rape), 40%; various theft charges (theft, burglary, robbery), 45%; assault, 20%; vehicular charges (driving with a suspended license), 5%; identity theft, 5%; and parole violation, 5%. These convictions were fairly consistent with the following statistics recorded for the population: sexual crimes, 26%; theft charges, 32%; assault, 15%; vehicular charges, 4%; and other charges, 5%. Other convictions represented among this population (but not in the population interviewed) were homicide (7%), kidnapping (4%), drugs (6%) and arson (1%; J. Duncan, personal communication, July 13, 2009). Length of sentence ranged from 13 to 120 months ($M = 49.25$, $SD = 45.94$). Length of time served at the time of interview ranged from 1 to 84 months ($M = 31.0$, $SD = 25.17$).

Procedure

The list of 27 inmates who met the criteria outlined above was provided by the mental health case manager for all inmates classified as developmentally delayed within

OSCI. Interviews were carried out at OSCI. Inmates were called out of their cells to meet with me. ODOC correctional officers are provided with a list of inmate appointments (or call-outs) each morning. The list designates inmate name and appointment location for all inmates residing in the facility. The call-out was listed to the educational department or counseling and treatment services department as determined by facility room availability. No reason was listed for the call-out in order to maintain confidentiality. Given the sensitive nature of questioning, efforts were taken to assure that the interview location was private and confidential. All interviews were performed in a secure, closed room in which the inmate and I were alone throughout the duration of the interview.

Upon each inmate's arrival at the interview room, I explained the purpose of the study and asked the inmate to participate. All inmates reviewed the informed consent form (Appendix A), which I read aloud. Inmates were advised that their participation was voluntary and that they could withdraw at any time. Both oral and written permission were obtained from each participant (see Appendix A). After reading the consent form aloud, I answered any questions the participant had about the consent form. After informed consent was obtained, data were collected through semi-structured interviews.

The length of interviews ranged from 10 to 67 min ($M = 26.2$, $SD = 14.9$, $Mdn = 24.5$). Participants were asked questions (see Appendix B) modeled after a semi-structured interview published by Kerbs and Jolley (2007). Permission to utilize the interview questions was granted by the primary researcher (personal communication, John Kerbs, September 4, 2007). The interview developed by Kerbs and Jolley (2007) was appropriate for a grounded theory approach due to the broad nature of questions (for example, "Since you've been in this prison system, have other inmates ever physically

attacked or assaulted you?") followed by probes designed to generate responses that could promote understanding of the individual's experiencing of the event.

A tenet of grounded theory is adaptation of the initial interview guide to "add areas to explore and to delete questions that have not been fruitful" (Charmaz, 2004, p. 503). With this in mind, several questions were refined on a case-by-case basis in order to assist in development of emerging codes and categories. However, it should be noted that complete adaptation of the initial interview was not possible due to Institutional Review Board policy that prohibits modification of materials that have been approved for a research project. Interview questions were aimed at gathering information about the inmates' experiences of various forms (psychological, property, physical, and sexual) of victimization. In general, broad questions were asked initially and more specific follow-up questions were posed as needed for clarification or elaboration. This was done in order to obtain clarification regarding participants' meanings, intentions, actions, and situations: a tenant of grounded theory (Charmaz, 2008).

The interview was audio-recorded and the tape recorder remained in my possession throughout the study. Data from the recorder were destroyed upon transcription of interviews. Each participant was assigned an identification number that was audio-recorded at the beginning of the interview. Identification numbers were assigned in the order in which participants were interviewed and served as the only identifying information on any paperwork generated during the course of the study.

Information from participants' records, including demographic information and reason for incarceration was obtained. Because the participants' record contained

protected medical and mental health information, the inmate was given the opportunity to request that his file not be reviewed by checking a box on the informed consent.

Data Analysis

Use of the grounded theory qualitative approach allows for creation of categories developed from the data, rather than from preconceived hypotheses (Charmaz, 2006; Charmaz, 2008; Rennie, 2006). As a first step in data analysis, the data (i.e., the interview texts) were analyzed using line-by-line coding (Charmaz, 2008). Each line of data was examined and defined by the actions of events that occurred in the text or that were represented by the text (Charmaz, 2008). Codes emerged as the data were evaluated and meanings were defined. Generally, codes are close to the literal meaning (and in some cases, the literal text) of the passage of text under study (Rennie, 2006). I recorded codes (in the margin of the paper on a computer template) and either collapsed codes into one another (if judged to be similar) or expanded them individually. This process is formally referred to as “constant comparative analysis” (Rennie, 2006, p. 64) or “constant comparative methods” (Charmaz, 2008, p. 92). Using constant comparison, new categories or relationships between codes were discovered throughout data analysis as similarities and differences were noted.

After development of codes was performed, categories were conceptualized. Codes are generally descriptive, whereas categories tend to be abstract (Rennie, 2006). In other words, categories provide a way by which to synthesize data (Charmaz, 2008). Only codes that occurred at least three times across the interviews were grouped into categories unless otherwise noted. Constant comparative analysis continued as categories were then conceptualized in order to develop higher-order categories. For the sake of

clarity in presentation of results, codes, categories, and higher-order categories are called subthemes, themes and categories. This usage of terms appears to be interchangeable in qualitative literature.

To illustrate: Physical stature was an element that several participants described as contributing to their victimization within the prison system, and it was subsequently identified as a code, or subtheme. Further analysis yielded additional subthemes (e.g., age, race, etc.) that were determined to be similar and were subsumed into a theme (internal characteristics). Another theme (external variables) formed from subthemes (e.g., length of sentence, property ownership) was deemed similar to internal characteristics and was subsumed into a category (contributors to victimization). As demonstrated, subthemes were descriptive (e.g., physical stature, age, race, length of sentence, property ownership) and were close to the literal meaning of the text. Themes (e.g., internal characteristics, external variables) were abstract and provided a way to synthesize the data. Categories (e.g., contributors to victimization) enhanced the synthesis of data. The end result was “a hierarchical structure of categories, with each level gathering together the categories in the level below it” (Rennie, 2006, p. 65).

Developers of grounded theory have taken into account the fact that the researchers' background and interests may influence both data collection and data analysis; however, it has been recommended that such interests be used as points for developing, rather than limiting, the emerging categories (Charmaz, 2006). In light of this, several measures were taken in an effort to promote objectivity. A coding partner aided in data analysis for several interviews as a cross-validation. Overall, our findings

were consistent. In addition, I kept a research diary in an effort to increase objectivity by noting developing codes and categories throughout the process of data collection.

I have used the method of thick description to present the results, whereby I provide numerous quotes to support the findings (codes, categories, and higher-order categories; deemed subthemes, themes, and categories). This method is recommended in order to “keep the human story in the forefront of the reader’s mind and to make the conceptual analysis more accessible to a wider audience” (Charmaz, 2008, p. 107). In addition to main findings I have listed participant’s recommendations for institutional response to victimization. The purpose of this section is to offer ideas about how staff might best respond to and prevent future victimization of inmates who are intellectually delayed.

RESULTS

The results below are organized into two sections. First, categories, themes, and subthemes obtained through line-by-line coding of the interview data are discussed. Next, inmate recommendations for ways that prison staff might respond to and prevent victimization, as requested by ODOC liaisons, are presented. Although the recommendations were analyzed, they were not representative of the inmates' actual experience of victimization and are subsequently presented in a separate section.

Experience of Victimization by Intellectually Delayed Inmates

Three categories with themes and subthemes were deemed representative of inmates' overall experience of victimization within the prison system: Contributors to Victimization, Personal (i.e., inmate) Response to Victimization, and Institutional (i.e., staff) Response to Victimization (Table 1). Meaning units were grouped into subthemes, and subthemes were then organized into themes. Categories were created to represent themes.

Quotes were selected to best illustrate subthemes. The number of quotes selected varied greatly and was largely dependent on the degree of endorsement of subthemes by participants. For example, the experiences of anger and avoidance were nearly unanimous among participants and are subsequently addressed at length. The experiences of destruction of property and depression were less widely represented but merited representative subthemes. In general, endorsement of subthemes by 4 participants was set as a standard. There were very few exceptions to this; however, in one case (destruction

Table 1

Categories, Themes, and Subthemes of Interviews

Categories	Themes/Subthemes
Contributors to Victimization	<p>Internal Characteristics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intellectual Disability • Mental Illness • Age • Physical Stature • Race • Personal Attributes <p>External Variables</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Norm • Crime Categorization • Length of Sentence • Property Ownership
Inmate Response to Victimization	<p>Behavioral</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verbal Confrontation • Peer Consultation • Positive Peer Affiliation • Reporting • Destruction of Property • Retaliation • Hypervigilance • Avoidance <p>Emotional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anger • Fear • Sadness/Depression
Institutional Response to Victimization	<p>Positive Perceptions</p> <p>Negative Perceptions</p>

of property subtheme) endorsement of items by 2 participants was deemed adequate for representation due to the unusual nature of the response.

Contributors to Victimization

The themes that emerged in the Contributors to Victimization category were Internal and External Variables. Upon initial analysis of line-by-line coding, themes of “risk factors” and “protective factors” were considered as potential mediating factors for victimization. However, as data analysis progressed it became apparent that inmates demonstrated contradictory beliefs regarding variables that may have been considered to be risk and protective factors. For example, some inmates endorsed peer relationships as a protective factor, whereas others reported that peer relationships may serve as a risk factor (especially when one’s peers were sexual offenders). In response to this, I thought it best to avoid placing my label or descriptor (e.g., risk vs. protective factors) on the inmates’ perceptions of factors that may contribute to victimization. Rather, codes were grouped by describing them as internal variables (innate characteristics) and external variables (environmental characteristics).

Theme 1: Internal Characteristics

Six subthemes were identified within the theme of Internal Characteristics: Intellectual Disability, Mental Illness, Age, Physical Stature, Race, and Personal Attributes.

Intellectual Disability. Several participants expressed a belief that their intellectual functioning was a contributing factor to having been victimized. For example, Participant 2 endorsed a belief that he had been harassed because of his intellectual functioning: “Cause of my learning disability. Called me a mental case, stuff like that.”

Participant 7 endorsed frequent name calling: “Retard. Yeah, that’s what they think.”

Participant 10 claimed that he had been verbally insulted by officers: “I got a few guards that tell me to shut up and stop acting like a retard.” Participant 13 expressed a belief that his experience of victimization was directly related to his intellectual functioning. He stated that he had been harassed “because I’m easy prey. Yep. Yep. They think that I’m not smart enough to know better.”

Participant 16 described a belief that he had been victimized because of factors related to his intellectual disability:

Like it’s kinda like um, what we call it is a, um, torpedo. They get paid for attacking you. Like they get paid like I don’t know how much. Like they go, uh, go up here, hit this guy, or hit this one, or anything else. And I think the reason why they do this is because I wouldn’t kinda fight back, or like they think I’m like some kinda weakling. Which I’m not.

When asked to describe what might contribute to a belief that he was weak,

Participant 16 stated: “Cause I’m slow and everything.”

Mental Illness. Inmates expressed a belief that mental illness was a contributing factor to victimization. Participant 10 reported direct experience with verbal harassment: “Hey lunatic, hey you walk like a fag.” Participant 4 expressed a belief that mental illness placed inmates at risk for victimization:

’Cause they’ve put all the people together, and they can’t do it. It doesn’t work like that. People that have mental problems? They can’t put them together. Because they ignore. They’re weak, and they’ll do anything you tell them to. And it, it can’t work like that. If they put everybody; all the gang members, all the assault people together, what they gonna do?

Participant 13 described a history of mental illness that he believed to be contributing to his experience of victimization:

I got a lotta problems but I don’t know what’s causing the mental disorder. I don’t know why I can’t remember things. When I’m here tomorrow, I can’t, I won’t be

able to tell you what we said. And um, it's, it's a kinda rotten way living life like that. You know?

He went on to say that this condition had an effect on his experience with victimization:

'Cause people always um, prey on the, the easy victim. I think. And then, in, in the world. I mean, animals, if you're an animal, animals eat animals, they prey on the victim. I mean the slower victim.

Participant 13 described his cellmates' attempts to highlight his mental illness with other inmates:

My cellie was walking down the hallway today and uh, the guy that's across the hall from us, he uh, he made the gesture, you know, that I, I was, I was crazy. He made that gesture to this guy. And uh. He knew it 'cause they'd been talking back and forth through the hallway through the door. You know, about me. He's always point at me and stuff and talking about me and uh, um, he's not, he's not very considerate around, around people.

Age. Several inmates expressed a belief that youth served as a contributing factor to victimization, whereas advanced age served as a protective factor. Participant 11 cited his advanced age as a deterrent for victimization: "Everybody, I'm kind of a, that, grandpa. So they treat me real good. Well, they call me pop, grandpa, Mr. [name removed]." Participant 5 also cited his advanced age as being cause for his lack of personal experience with victimization: "I been, I been around for a long time, so I know the youngsters and uh, they don't bother me at all 'cuz I'm an old timer." Participant 1 cited his advanced age and having elderly cellmates as contributing factors in his limited experience with victimization:

I've 'cause, I've probably, I got good cellies. My last cellie, he was 70 years old and he was a Christian, so he was really good. And then they just moved me over to another guy. He's older, you know, so I've had, and he's a good cellie. So I've had good cellies. So I think that's a big deal.

He also added:

It does, that makes all, if you got a young cellie, it's always with the younger kids that are doing the trading and uh, you know bringing in the tobacco and stuff like that. That's what I found out, just the younger crowd.

He went on to conclude the reasons for his lack of experience with victimization:

“Um, just hanging out with the right people. I just hang out with the older guys that are my age and I've never had that problem.”

Participant 9 expressed a similar sentiment, stating:

And plus I think, I think when you're older you don't have to go, you don't go through as much with problems like that. It's mainly with the youngsters. The young people that are here. Those are the ones that do you know, the name calling and all that. I think, you know, when you get a little older they still have the, they still have the little respect thing for elders. So.

Participant 16 expressed a belief that young inmates are at higher risk for victimization: “The younger these kids come in here the more subject they are to violence.” He then elaborated:

State hospital, you know, that's where I did most of my time. I got um, 18 years in there. There's not any politics. Here they got politics. Rules and rules. Staff have rules, the inmates have rules. Like there's a lot of um, no good people here. They prey on children. And you can spot 'em. When a new kid comes in you can spot 'em.

He later commented:

They want to be nice to the kid and all this, and they have ulterior motives. They're the kind of people that are scum bags in my eyes. The ones you wanna talk to are the little ones, the young ones that just come in. 'Cause they're the ones having shit happen to them.

Participant 4 recounted experience with victimization related to his age:

Um. I really don't know. I think I was a target because I was a youngster, a kid. By the older guys. They call 'em chicken hawks. They hawk on young kids. You used to see it around here all the time, all the older guys and all the young kids. Full example right there.

Physical Stature. Several inmates expressed a belief that physical stature was related to the experience of victimization. Participant 19 expressed a belief that he was extorted in part because of his stature:

Because. One it's because I'm short. Because I'm short in stature. I'm a small person. I'm overweight. They don't think I can fight because I haven't fought when I first started getting extorted.

Participant 3 reported:

I've been state raised since I was 14, so I been in and out of prison all my life and in the jails, group homes, foster homes, so I'll do my time. I didn't have very many fights, but, I did, I mean I had 'em, but as big as I am a lot of people don't want to mess with me anyways. So they get intimidated because of my size.

He went on to say that he believed his stature to be the reason he has been able to avoid sexual victimization: "Cause nobody wants a 6-foot-4 guy. Everybody wants a, uh, 5-foot-6, 5-foot-7 pretty boy, uh, you know, new FNG. Fucking New Guy."

Participant 10 expressed similar sentiment when asked whether he had been sexually victimized: "Naw. Someone didn't ask me a question like that or anything but I was like, no, I can't, I mean, I'm kinda like tall. Ain't no plans with a man." Participant 7 expressed fears of inmates due in part to physical size: "But if they keep hassling, something's gonna happen. Probably to me! You know? These guys are big!"

Race. Several inmates identified race as being related to victimization. Participant 10 referenced his experience with victimization and race: "A lot of 'em if they say somethin' like that they do nothin' but use the "N" word. That's not a good thing to do." He went on to say: "This is my first time here and I don't want to come back here. I came here the first time, had over two people attack me, be very, very racist." Participant 6 stated:

Certain gangs in prison that will find a vulnerable person and just uh, take everything he has. And that's usually mainly, uh, mainly I do that to sex offenders, but uh, it goes also with um, uh, um, different races or um, just different people that have their different types of weaknesses.

Participant 20 expressed a belief that race contributed to his experience of victimization:

Well for one, it has, all has to do with territory in here. South Siders with the South Siders. Blacks with the Blacks. Gangs with the gangs, and so forth and so forth, etcetera, etcetera.

Participant 4 reported an experience of sexual assault that he believed was racially motivated:

He was a shock collar for the Skins, you know who the Skins are right? Alright, well the Skins, Black power guys, he just decides that he was, I was a piece of shit, and that's what he would do to me, and that's what happened exactly.

Personal Attributes. Several inmates expressed a belief that their experiences of victimization were the result of personality differences or conflicts. Participant 7 provided this as a probable cause for his experience of victimization: "He, he just didn't like me." He elaborated: "A lot of guys in the unit, on the bottom tier, don't care too much for me. And they always try to find somebody to pick on me."

Participant 13 attempted to describe the intent of an inmate who assaulted him: "And uh, um, I don't even know why he did it. I have no idea. No. I still don't know why he hit me. I guess that he just didn't like me, that's all there is to it." Participant 4 reported that extortion frequently occurred because of personality conflict:

You can get shoes off the yard. They sell 'em. But they'll take a pair of shoes and say, well, 80 bucks. Even though they cost 30. They'll say 80 bucks and then turn around and make you pay it but never get it. And that's how it, that's how the prison works here. They just do, if they don't like you, they don't give it to you.

He went on to describe personal experience:

Well, the dude that didn't like me and the dude that was half Irish-pride guy that didn't like me, didn't like me so he extorted me, and he told me you're gonna pay this. And I lose \$2,200 by the time he got out of prison.

Theme 2: External Variables

Four subthemes were identified within the theme of external variables:

Environmental Norm, Crime Categorization, Property Ownership, and Length of Sentence.

Environmental Norm. Several inmates expressed beliefs that victimization is a way of life inside prison. Participant 22 described victimization as a way to pass the time in prison: "The more you're in your cell, the more they learn about you and the more they want to um, it takes away their time. To bother people. To get 'em all frustrated. It takes away their boredom. And that's all it is, it's escape. 'Cause they're bored."

Participant 3 cited victimization as an inevitable part of prison life: "It's gonna happen regardless. It's gonna happen regardless, no matter what you try to do about it, it gonna happen." Participant 15 described his beliefs in the inevitability of victimization after being assaulted shortly after his admission to prison:

Like, great, prison's gonna be great. Yep. And that was when I had like 5 years left, and I said well, it's gonna, it's gonna be pretty bad. It's gonna be pretty bad when prison, you know what I mean, like this.

Participant 12 endorsed violence as a normative experience in prison: "Like there's trouble happening all the time around here. And um, like I don't know if another inmate has told you this, but this is a warrior school." Participant 19 expressed a belief that victimization is a normative state that one must learn to manage in prison: "How's a person supposed to feel safe in prison? You can't! You gotta man up and you gotta, you gotta say ok I'm gonna take it." Participant 10 expressed a similar sentiment:

I can't stop 'em. You can't stop nobody! No, you can't stop it! The police can't even stop it. If somebody's gonna get you they can get you. People that come inside here, that walkin' down in that hallway, everybody says, "Well we're right here in a second," and everything. If people wanna get like, a visitor or somebody inside here, anybody could be gone. Anyone could be touched. Shoot, the president could be touched. I'm not sayin' I'm uh, the president could be touched. Any senator could be touched. Anything could happen to anybody inside this room. People could be touched if somebody wants them to be touched. It could happen. No, there's nothing that nobody could do, I mean, I don't care what they do, how they change everything, if somebody get mad enough they can let someone have it.

Despite acknowledging victimization as a prison norm, several inmates expressed a belief that OSCI was a safer place than other state institutions in which they had been incarcerated. Participant 17 reported: "This place is a release center, not a problem shark." Participant 10 described his experience:

Well, this penitentiary, it ain't like that really. Don't nobody, you gotta be in a gang or something like that. Not here. OSP, like somewhere...Snake River or OSP, a big one? You got to worry about that. But here it's, it's like a little kiddie, kiddie, kiddie place. You know, they just play games. Don't nobody try to rape you or, you know, they don't do that here. It ain't like, it ain't like, it ain't like it.

He went on to say:

Ain't nobody gonna come up and ya know, make you take your shoes off or nothin' like that. You know, it ain't like that. Not here. You might go to another place, to OSP or somethin', somewhere else like that, and they, you got to watch them, you know what I'm sayin' 'cause they, they, they hard core. But they ain't really hard core here, it's like little, little easy.

Participant 6 expressed similar beliefs:

But see the different institutions are different. Snake River is intense. I mean you'd be going down the hallway and somebody is, is either goin' to seg or coming out of seg, and you gotta turn around to the wall, like you're in a corner, like a little kid? 'Til it's gone.

He went on to describe his experience at OSCI in light of past experience:

Yeah, this place is not too bad. I'm a little surprised how easy-going this place really is. I mean, there's so many things people could do here that would just, none of these guys would even think of. But doesn't happen, you know. It's not

like California Corporate prison, Folsom, San Quentin. This is Disneyland. It's been so easy for me.

Crime Categorization. Many of the inmates noted that individuals convicted of sexual offenses are frequently targeted for victimization. Participant 19 explained: "And and, according to these, there's there's, a prison was just prison politics. If a person was in for rape, sodomy, all those other things, you're gonna be degraded." Participant 1 described his perceptions regarding sexual offenders and victimization:

And it's usually they only go after, in prison they only go after what I've seen and heard, is that the rapists. The rape-o's and that's what everybody always talks about, that's the only ones I've ever seen. I seen a guy get hit in the hall because he thought he was a tough rape-o, you know, and that's, you know, everybody, it's funny how the guys know exactly their crimes before they even come here. They'll see 'em and they'll know exactly what he's done. And then everybody will know not to sit with him, stay away from him, and that's the best thing to do.

He went on to say:

It was just um, just from other people talking. 'Cause they'll tell you, they'll come right up to you and tell you they'll say, they'll tell you what he's done. And they'll say, "Well, stay away from him," and you know to stay away from them 'cause or else you're gonna get in trouble.

Participant 16 expressed hostility toward those convicted of sexual offenses:

There's no TLC and stuff and, somebody who gets freaky with a child is a pervert, a slob, and ignorant piece of dirt. A worm and a worm swims in and...garbage. You know, they're maggots. That's what I was gonna say to a guy and I went around him, but that's what they are, maggots. I was molested. That's why I don't like 'em. Yeah. If they're pointed out to me that they're a child molester, and say I been talking to them and I didn't know they were a child molester? I'll walk up to them and tell 'em, "Hey dude, don't ever speak my name out of your mouth. Don't recognize me or nothing." 'Cause that's, that's a bad thing. And there's a lot of 'em in here.

Several inmates had personal experiences with victimization that they attributed to the offenses for which they had been convicted. In several cases, inmates were asked to show others their paperwork, which is prison documentation listing the charges for

which an inmate has been convicted. Participant 3 acknowledged that he was convicted of a sexual offense and experienced subsequent verbal harassment: “They call me baby raper, and child molester. Every day. One guy started today and spread it around to other guys.” He went on to say: “And they want me to show my paperwork to ’em. I won’t show ’em nothin’. They want to see what my charge is.” Participant 19 acknowledged having been extorted as a result of his offense: “It, the extortion kinda happened when I first got to Snake River. Because I had somebody pull me up in the, in the, in the day room. They had me bring my paperwork down and everything, and seen what it was.”

Participant 3 reported a belief that he had been victimized “because they didn’t like rapists.” Participant 7 reported having been given a small meal portion in a serving line: “Morning, I was goin’ to eat breakfast, he, he give me a little scoop, called rape-o portions, you know? You should get a big, man-sized portion.” Participant 12 believed that he was targeted because he had been charged of a sexual offense: “Cause you know in prison it’s harder for sex offender. Like you know, people hate us. For some no reason.” He went on to elaborate:

’Cause I kept on hearing the other guys talk about it and point at me and go, “That’s a rape-o, that’s a child molester.” You wouldn’t even, they go [mumbles, as if to mimic whispering in a crowd]. I got good hearing.

He then added:

Well basically I think it’s these crimes. ’Cause I hear people talking about it a lot and there’s a lot of stories goin’ on, and like uh, it kinda bring, bring a lot of dramas towards me. It’s a lot like, um, every time one of my friends hangs out with me, they, “Why you hanging with that child molester? You must be goin’ in too.”

Participant 20 reported that he had been extorted after disclosing his crime:

And after that a South Sider came in and said what I was in for it, and I went, alright cool. Yeah I’m in for this, this, and this, everything, stealing, da-da-da-da-

da. He's like, "No dude, what you really in for?" I'm like, "Well I'm in for attempted rape." He's like, "Dude you need to get the hell out, you're paying rent."

Length of Sentence. Several inmates expressed a belief that the length of sentencing was a contributing factor in the experience of victimization. Participant 19 expressed a belief that his sentence length was a contributing force in the verbal harassment that he endured: "Because he knows I'm a short-timer. Even though I got 5 months he called me a short-timer. He goes, 'You're a short time loser.'" Participant 1 expressed a similar belief regarding the cause of his verbal harassment:

Just 'cause he's been in prison, uh, uh, 6 years and I've only done like, uh, 10 months. So he thought that you know, he'd already say I've been down longer, you know, you know. He, uh, he was that type of guy. Just a bully, you could tell.

Participant 4 described his experience being sexually assaulted by an inmate who was sentenced to life in prison:

Yeah. This dude had some serious issues, that's all I got to say. He held me down, this one held me down 'cause I wasn't gonna let, I was gonna beat him up. He just held me down. I couldn't get up. There's no way to fight that dude, that dude was so big. He wasn't big, he was old and knew what he was doin'. He's a lifer and he woulda killed somebody if he had to.

Participant 18 also described an experience of being sexually assaulted by an inmate with a long prison sentence: "He tried to do the things, sexual things to me. And he told me if I said any, told anybody, he'd kill me." He went on to say that: "I don't know what the guy's problem was. Well they should make it where people who have been in prison for a long time, not cell anybody up with that person. Just to protect that other person to move in there."

Property Ownership. Having possessions was identified by several inmates as a cause for victimization. Participant 4 stated: "If you got money on your books, then, then,

and you're weak, and you don't do what they tell you to do, they take it. Every bit of it. They force you. They do it, and they'll take it all, every time." He elaborated with personal experience:

First year I didn't have money, I didn't want money in prison because I knew what was goin' on. But uh, yeah that, they take money, anything, and anything you got. See um, any property, you know, uh, if you had a, if you moved in with a gang member and they, he thought you were weak you'd take anything. Food. Hygiene. He would, he would leave me with nothing.

Participant 7 described being hassled because he had desirable possessions:

[They bothered me] so they could get me out of the darn cell and steal the radio. Yes. They wanted to get me outta there, get me to my dinner, and they doubled back and come back and, get it out.

Other inmates reported that they believed their lack of victimization was the result of not having possessions. Participant 8 acknowledged that he had been able to avoid losing his money or property because of poverty: "Well, I don't have much of either."

Participant 10 expressed similar sentiments in a more elaborate fashion:

I ain't gonna, how you gonna worry about your money and everything if you don't get none. They don't give you none inside here. I work \$28, for \$28 a month. Pushing. A. Broom. And like a mop and everything. They don't give you no money. I told you, you got to work at like, uh, there is no money in here. They do us bad. Don't nobody have it to lose in here, some of 'em their damn girlfriends, they send 'em money on their books and everything, or their parents.

Inmate Response to Victimization

Two themes emerged within the category of Inmate Response to Victimization: Behavioral and Emotional. Inmate's response to victimization was described primarily by the actions that they took (behavioral response), and interview questions were designed to elicit their feelings (emotional response) as they related to victimization. There is a degree of fluidity between behavioral and emotional responses as a result of the relationship between behaviors and emotions. Emotional responses frequently led to

actions (behavioral response). Despite this overlap, both factors (emotions and behaviors) seemed to warrant their own themes, as some inmates may experience an emotional response without a behavioral response or vice versa.

Theme 1: Behavioral Responses

Ten subthemes were identified within the theme of behavioral response to victimization: Verbal Confrontation, Peer Consultation, Positive Peer Affiliation, Reporting, Destruction of Property, Retaliation, Hypervigilance, Avoidance, Fantasies of Violence, and Minimization.

Verbal Confrontation. Inmates described attempts to verbally confront or mediate various forms of victimization. In some cases, their attempts served to deter further victimization whereas in other cases it served to exacerbate further victimization. Inmates used a variety of techniques to confront others verbally including mediating, asserting themselves, arguing/confronting, and joking.

Participant 11 described successful verbal mediation: “I just talk to them about it. And straighten it out. I’m pretty good at that.” He went on to say: “You can also avoid trouble if you know what to do... Yep. You just, people that cause trouble, you just talk ’em out of it.” Participant 6 described his technique in verbally deterring victimization:

Every time I even get into a little fight or something, a little argument, I try to reason with the person before it happens and um, um, give him choices so he understands okay, this is what’s going to happen, okay?

Participant 2 asserted himself when he was asked to move a gang member into his single cell: “I said no, I don’t want no hassle. I’m in control of my cell. And they got all angry and they said if I don’t get him moved in with his partner I’m going to get taken out of the yard.” After being threatened, he continued to assert himself: “I told ’em, I told

'em to screw off, I'm not doin', I don't want no gang banger in here. Forget it."

Participant 15 described making verbal requests of perpetrators: "I told him to leave me alone, like a few times. And the other Pisces [Latino gang], I told him to leave me the hell alone already, but he didn't listen."

Participant 7 described verbally confronting an officer when he felt as though he had been wronged:

I come back and I tell him, "What the hell's your trip...?" You know? "Cell in, [name removed], cell in!" He pulls his mace out. Little did he know I noticed it was sprayed towards him, if he squirted it. I told him, "I'll break your arm, dude. You got me between a rock and a hard spot."

Participant 12 described verbally confronting someone who attempted to steal from him:

I said, "That's a material thing, that can be replaced. A life can't. So I walked away. And then he started walking off and said, "Aw, leave him alone. Leave him alone... Yeah, then he left me alone 'cause someone...if you really, really get into them, like into their face and underneath their skin? They will bow down."

Participant 19 described a verbal confrontation which nearly escalated to violence:

It kind of went back and forth, we're both degrading each other, we're both calling each other punk this punk that, rat this rat that. You know, "Yeah at least fucking, you know, touch kids," you know....He was yelling making commotions getting the guard's attention, just like, "Come on punk, hit me, hit me!" You know, I'm like, you know, I'm just looking at him like, "Man, you're a retard."

Several inmates described using humor to diffuse sexual advances. Participant 11 described his response to a sexual advance: "They say, uh, 'Can I sleep with you tonight?' And I say, 'You try getting' in my bed, see what happens!'...I just kid around, you know?" Participant 10 described his response to sexual advances:

I was tryin' make sure everybody heard what he said and everything. I said, "You want me?" I said, "You think I look good or something?" And everybody's sittin' around like ha-ha-ha. I just turned it into a joke. And he did not bother me ever again. 'Cause like, you wanna sit back and talk to me, playin' like that, I make sure everybody knows. It's a party now!

Peer Consultation. Inmates described a pattern of consulting with their peers in order to determine course of action following instances of victimization. In some cases these consultations were brief, as in the case of Participant 7: "I talked to a Christian friend and he says, 'Hey, I'll talk to him.'" Participant 1 spoke in greater depth about a peer consultation:

Uh, yeah once this older guy celled up and he tried to rub oil on me, and uh, so uh, and then he uh, I said, "I don't like gay people," so he hit my bunk. He got mad. So when he's out in the yard I told my friends and they said, "Tell the guard." So we told the guard and then I, they moved me out of the cell and that was that.

He later noted that his friend's advice was important in his decision:

Because when I talked to my friends out there they decided, they said, "Man you gotta report that." I mean, they just said, "You need to get away from that." They said, "That's not right." I said, "Yeah, I don't want to cause any trouble." They said, "Yeah, just get away from him." And so they sorta helped me out.

Participant 6 described his friends as being inhibitory to reciprocal violence:

And I was lookin' for something, "Man, I'm gonna, I'm gonna uh, knock that guy 'cause he got me like that." I wanted to finish it. But all my friends say, "It's not worth it, it's not worth it." I could've, I could've done it. Sometimes I'm angry, turn, but I never did. I just let it go.

Participant 12 described consulting with a friend about his fears of extortion:

Like um, like, a lot of guys in, one guy is trying to extort me out with shoes. This is the only pair of shoes I got. Like, um, like I bought these shoes with my mom's money. They over \$70! And, um, I told one of my friends about it and he go outside with me on the yard, but actually near the horseshoe pit. It's kinda like wide open range. So nothing would happen.

Positive Peer Affiliation. Several inmates described their attempts to develop peer relationships that would serve as a deterrent to victimization. Participant 1 advised: “If I had any advice for anybody I’d say it’s good to make friends in here, you know, that you could talk to, that they’re not going to go and you know, blurt it to other people.”

Several inmates attributed their lack of experience with victimization to their affiliation with persons of faith. Participant 11 stated: “Well, they seem to all get along pretty good. Uh, I see Christians in there, so we all get along pretty good. My deal was when I come in here I started giving people Bibles. Get ’em, and get ’em to go to church.” Participant 18 reported a similar sentiment: “No one calls me names. No. I just hang around with people that are going down to chapel with. Yeah, hang around the Christian people.”

Reporting. Inmates described reporting victimization to various prison staff (e.g., mental health case managers, teachers, and correctional officers). In general, they described their response to reporting as positive or negative. Their beliefs regarding staff response are subsequently analyzed separately in a later section (see *Institution Response to Victimization*). However, it bears mention that a common behavioral response to victimization was reporting.

Most inmates did not elaborate on their filing of a report. Participant 12 stated: “I wrote a kyte to Captain [name removed] about it.” Participant 15 reported an instance of cell theft: “I asked him nicely, then I talked to Mr. [name removed], the officer that works there. I asked him, “Hey can you talk to the dude and tell him to give my stuff back?”” Participant 13 cited reporting as a last resort: “Like normally I wouldn’t, a couple years ago I wouldn’t have said anything at all. But as my problem’s getting worse I guess

somebody's gotta know about this." Participant 19 described his decision to report: "You know that saying fight or flight? I chose to just flight...I chose flight." Another inmate described his decision to become a Confidential Informer (CI) after frequent physical assaults:

And I just got tired, so I like, I started...You know what a CI is, you ever heard of a CI? Confidential Informer? Well, I was a gang member at that time still, at that time. And I was a CI at the same time. Basically, give information to officers so they know what was going on. Yeah, I don't like talkin' about it.

Destruction of Property. In order to deter future victimization, several inmates reported destroying their property. Participant 7 described his response to others' attempts to steal his radio: "I said, 'You want it?' (inmate makes whooshing sound), 'It's gone now, it's busted all in pieces.'" He later denied that he actually broke the radio: "No, I just, I faked like I did. I still have it. So he wouldn't threaten me anymore." Participant 7 also described his response to inmates who threatened to steal his coffee: "I got a couple coffees. Guy says, 'I want a whole bag, blab-a-blab.' It made me so mad I flushed one whole bag, eight dollars worth, in the toilet." Participant 12 provided a detailed description of his response to an inmate who wanted his property:

Like one guy came up and grabbed the CD player and I go, "That's mine." And he said, "It ain't no longer yours, it's mine." And I go, "Well, I paid for it," and he goes, "Well, I don't care you paid for it. It's mine now." And I go, "What you tryin' to do, extort me out of my CD player? That's all I got!" And he goes, "What you gonna do, rat on me if I take it?" And I go, "Well if you don't give it back something else is gonna happen." And he says, "What?" Well, hand it here and I'll show you....So he handed it back and I went SMASH! And I go, "Well, I ain't got it, and neither did you."...But instead of having him take it away from me I'd rather break it in front of him than for him to have it. So.

Although not destroying his property, Participant 3 displayed a similar mindset when he attempted to hide his property from a cell mate who he feared would steal them: "And at times he would take an envelope and don't even ask me about it. And I turn

around and I took the envelopes and...put 'em underneath my mattress where he won't touch them."

Retaliation. For some inmates, retaliation took the form of reciprocal physical violence. Participant 4 described:

First came to prison I didn't fight. At all. None. Now I do. Not any more, right now, but I used to do it. Three years ago, the last, from 2004, or 2004 to 2007 I was fightin'...My point about it is you fight back, they'll leave you alone. I should've done it in the first place. I run around this institution every day, they all say hi to me. The same people who used to beat me up.

Participant 7 described assaulting an inmate who had harassed him:

I work in the kitchen...I took my apron off. I said, "Aw, there's just one of you now, huh?" And the guard turned a blind eye, you know, he could see a wrapped up cord what should go around your waist...I said, "You wanna play games?" I said, "I'll play a game," I said, "You're goin' to heaven." He goes (choking sound). He never messed with me no more.

Participant 16 described his response to a request to join a gang:

I'm not going to go there. Well, you have to fight. If you don't stand up then you will be subject to everything. So it's a matter of how big you are or whatever you take on. Take on the biggest guy. Even if you get beat down you'll be recognized. Then you ain't got to deal with nothing no more...So, at that point right there, I took one somewhere and got the issue straightened out. I didn't lose. It was quick, but I didn't lose...Even if I would've, I would have been recognized. In other words, they never would've come up to me again. Which they don't no more anyway.

For one inmate, retaliation took the form of revenge. Participant 3 took action when his roommate stole his address book and began writing to women in it:

He turns around and he wrote some of the girls that I write to. By the address that he took out of my folder. And the only way that I could get back at him...he can't read their writing. And he ain't that good on reading or spelling and he has me read the letters. And when I read the letters I ask him can I copy the address, and when I copy the addresses that he let me copy from the letter, I write 'em and I tell 'em exactly what type of person he is and they quit writing to him...and continue to write to me. That's how I got even with him for stealing from me.

Hypervigilance. Inmates expressed an increased sense of vigilance in response to their experiences of victimization. Participant 2 described his fears of being assaulted:

“Taken out. Jump on me and shit. I can’t, I can’t trust them. I look behind my back.”

Participant 14 also endorsed being vigilant of his surroundings:

But I know who, but I know, I can tell who, who, who don’t, who, who, who won’t get into a fight. All the time, I can tell all day, look, so I’m trying to stay away from them.

Participant 1 described difficulties resting in his cell:

I’d always have to worry about what if I could even rest without him saying something, you know? He’d start talking and he says, “I’m talkin’ to you, yeah I want you to listen.” I’m like, “I’m just trying to rest,” ’cause I know that if I, whatever I say he could just blow up.

Participant 12 described being vigilant while waiting for his medications:

’Cause even when I go to med line I look around. Like um, like yesterday, the other day the line was so long I was standing there at the end, waiting and waiting, and I go, “Forget it.” And I went back. And I’m back on the unit and I said, “Forget it, I ain’t waiting back here.”

Participant 13 described his vigilance as inhibitory to his emotional well-being:

And um, I think me worrying about people here gets in the way of any um, any um, any um, I think people here get, they take away my attention. To where I can’t concentrate on getting better here.

Participant 10 demonstrated enhanced vigilance during the interview:

There’s nothing that nobody could do, I mean, I don’t care what they do, how they change everything, if somebody get mad enough they can let someone have it. If, just if, if you get mad at me right now and you want to take me out right now, you have something right now that I’m very, very much scared of. Right now. And that’s a pen. You could hurt me with that pen. You could poke my eyes out with that pen. Or you get that, or you stick me that, you know you got a weapon and just don’t know you got a weapon.

Avoidance. Participants expressed avoidance of a number of things including other inmates, situations, or places. Participants expressed a desire to avoid inmates they

believed to be involved with various kinds of victimization. Participant 5 described avoidance of individuals involved with extortion: "I don't be around the type of people that be doin' that. I stay away from 'em. I stay to myself." He later described avoiding individuals he believed to be involved in sexual assaults: "I don't hang around people that is gay." Participant 17 described his efforts to stay away from inmates who are assaultive: "I just don't get involved with their everyday life. I don't get close enough for them to do anything." Several inmates described avoidance of individuals who had victimized them. Participant 1 described avoiding his perpetrator as best he could:

If somebody's gonna be like that there's nothing you could do. I mean, I'd just lay on my bunk, I mean, I knew the way he was. So I tried to totally avoid him. And I'd be sleeping almost all day just to avoid him. But he would wake me up just, you know, just to get my reaction.

Participant 12 also described his attempts to avoid a perpetrator of assault:

And, um, well after the hit I just turned around and went back to the unit. Back to my cell. I said, "I ain't goin' to chow." So I go back on in and make me a soup, a ramen noodle soup. Like I did that for a few days. 'Cause I didn't want to end up it happening again.

He elaborated on his difficulty sustaining avoidance:

Basically, just like I talked to my mom on the phone and everything, and she said, "Is there anything you can do?" And I go, well for like now, I can't really do anything 'cause I ain't got nothing in my cell to eat at all. And canteen is like about five days away I think. Five, six. Six days away and like, um, she asked, "Can you go to chow? And I said, "I go once and a while, hang out with my friends, try to eat as fast as I can." I even have my friends go up to the juice area and get me one of the juice.

He provided an additional account of avoiding a perpetrator of sexual assault:

Yeah, tried to go outside if I could, which was even more dangerous, or go to church a lot. Go to the day room a lot. Then once when night time came around, boom. Soon as the lights go off he come down and pull down my pants.

Participant 13 described actively avoiding his cellmate, who had verbally harassed him:

I stay, uh, if my cellie goes out in the yard I stay in. If he stays in I go out. If he goes down to watch TV I don't. If he does, then I do. I try to stay away from him or any, all people. I just don't wanna be around people because, uh, once they figured you're an easy prey then you're, then you're, they just make fun of you.

Several participants described a tactic of global avoidance in order to avoid problems. For example, Participant 2 noted: "I just go to my classes and work and that's it. I just stay away from the whole crowd." Participant 8 described associating only with inmates on his unit: "Uh, just the ones that I, uh, are in my area. Those are the only ones I associate with." Participant 5 acknowledged: "No, I don't have no close friends. I have some associates, and that's all. Associates. I don't have no close friends." He then elaborated:

Associates are people that I just having daily conversation with. Like in school, when I go to school, and stuff like that. You talk to. You know basically, they ain't, they ain't really my friends. They just a personality to speak to or talk to while I'm here doin' homework or doin' work. Stuff like that. But I don't have no friends, you don't have friends in here, you know, I have family. Blood. Cousins. I talk to them, I hang out with them a little bit, so, I don't even hang around them that much. You know, they hang with the gangs, and uh, they have to catch me, talk to me, 'cuz I don't be, I don't, I don't have time for that. For those people. You know what I'm sayin', I'm tryin' to get out of here. Tryin' to get back out of here to the real world. I don't have no time to be playin' lolly-gaggin' and stuff. Can't get a chance on getting' in trouble, you know, I'm already in here, and it ain't no fun, goin' to the hole, you know what I'm sayin'? The locked up in your room and all that? I'm too old to be doin' that. I'm too old for this period. Bein' in here. So I'm just tryin' to get out of here. Get out of here. That's how I'm tryin' to do. Get out. Yeah. Nobody's gonna get you in trouble when you're doin' your own thing.

Participant 9 described avoiding situations in which he observed victimization of other inmates: "If I see a problem I'll just veer off from it, or I'll turn around and walk the other way." He later added:

I mean, like, if I see another inmate hassling another inmate. I'm just gonna turn around and walk away, so I don't get involved, or they don't really get eye contact and think, "Oh, he was gonna help." Pretty soon that's, that's when trouble starts for me. So I just either veer off or walk around or I turn around and walk the other way.

Several participants endorsed avoidance of the "yard," the outdoor recreational area. Participant 3 described: "I don't associate with too many people. That's the way I am, I don't associate with the people. I just keep to myself. I don't go to yard that much. I stay mostly in my cell." Participant 6 described avoidance of the yard:

I come out and I eat my three meals a day. Um, and I'm in honor housing. So we have a card room, we have two soda machines, and six phones. And all these tables, and everybody plays cards from regular cards to DD to gambling, everything. Um. It's easy. Stay out. Don't go to yard. I mean, there's no reason for anybody to go to the yard. Unless, you know, they wanna do it, get some air. And there's certain areas of the yard you just stay away from. Yeah. And they, the big, everybody that plays handball, there's uh, uh, uh, one, two, three, four, five – five areas, and there's one six. And nobody uses six because that's where people go in and they do their battle. And it's like "I'll see you at handball six," well whatever, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang! Mm-hm. They fight and that's what the big thing is. Go to handball six 'cause the tower can't see you in there.

Participant 12 described his rationale for bringing friends to yard:

And um, I told one of my friends about it and he go outside with me, on the yard, but actually near the horseshoe pit, it's kinda like wide open range. So nothing would happen. 'Cause it seem like it's always happening in closed places. They don't do anything outside.

He acknowledged the reason for this avoidance:

My one friend asked, "Why don't you go out, I got your back." And I go, "It ain't just that, you never know what's gonna happen." Like somebody could walk up with a shank and boom, and it would be over. My life would be over. Yeah, I try to avoid the yard, try to avoid the chow as much as I can.

Participant 16 advised avoidance of particular areas:

Sit up in the front rows, man, don't come back to the back tables. The front tables. In the chow hall. There's people... people that are scared sit in the aisle where they're watched all the time and the cameras are on 'em.

Minimization. In many cases, participants reported that ignoring victimization had been their first response to victimization. Many seemed to hope that if they ignored victimization it would eventually cease. Most inmates did not elaborate upon this response. Participant 2 simply stated: “I just ignored it.” Participant 4 reported the following in regard to verbal harassment: “I don’t really listen to that. When I hear it I just ignore it.” Participant 3 noted: “I just don’t pay no attention to what they say.” Participant 17 reported: “Basically ignore ’em.” He described his hope in doing this: “So I figured sooner or later he’d get caught.”

Many inmates minimized their experience of victimization. Participant 2 recalled being verbally harassed: “I didn’t think it was cruel, I didn’t think it was cruel, so I don’t know.” Similarly, Participant 4 minimized his experience of verbal harassment: “No, ’cause all my life it’s been like that, so I didn’t really care.” One inmate minimized his experience of victimization by excusing the actions of the perpetrator. Participant 11 stated: “The person is, um, kinda scatter-brained guy, you know...I just let it go.” Participant 1 minimized his experience of victimization when he reported that the perpetrator was likely compelled to victimize others because of mental illness: “He had some sort of problems with his, uh, anger. I think they call it PTS or DDS or whatever they call it.” He then went on to say: “He’d say I got DDS or whatever. And then he’d sit there and say he was sorry.”

Theme 2: Emotional Responses

Three subthemes were identified within the theme of Emotional Response to victimization: Anger, Fear, and Sadness/Depression. Boundaries between these subthemes were somewhat fluid as participants expressed a variety of emotions in

response to a single event. For example, Participant 12 recalled his feelings after a sexual advance: “Scared. Angry. Frustrated. Depressed. Like he was gonna try to rape me or something.” Notably, the limited number of subthemes that emerged may be the result of difficulty on the part of intellectually delayed inmates in articulating their emotional states.

Anger. Many inmates stated their feelings at having experienced victimization in somewhat simplistic terms. Participant 1 simply stated: “Makes me mad. I tell them that they don’t know a darn thing about me.” Participant 13 reported: “When they make fun of me, um, my head burns real hot. I get real mad.” Similarly, Participant 19 expressed the following: “I was getting so hot, I was getting so frustrated, I-I couldn’t even breathe. My head was swollen, my head hurt. I was like, I was shaking.” Participant 13 described his emotions following an experience with extortion: “I didn’t go to dinner ’cause I was so mad.”

Participant 15 described his emotional response to verbal harassment: “It’s starting to, what’s it called, make me mad. And I didn’t want to you know, fight or anything, or go to the hole.” He went on to describe his fear of losing his temper: “It made me mad, so I almost lost my temper, and I was holding my temper and I was like whatever I ain’t gonna do this.”

Many inmates endorsed the consideration of violence following victimization. Participant 3 described his response to cell theft: “It made me mad, and I wanted to whip his butt. But I knew if I did I’d go to the hole.” Participant 19 reported his response to being victimized as follows: “I felt like grabbing him through the bars and banging his head against the wall.” Participant 20 described his angry reaction to an officer who he

felt had wronged him: “I wanted to just blunt out just cuss him out...I felt like hitting him but I didn’t. ’Cause you know, that would’ve been a straight hole shot.” Participant 12 endorsed consideration of retaliation following an assault:

Like if I found out, that guy would be in trouble. But I don’t want any more drama ’cause, ’cause I’m, I’ve learned from, from experience from other inmates, like if you do round one then there comes another, and another, and another...all the sudden you get the whole, the whole gang out, after one person.

Fear. Participant 3 expressed concern following verbal harassment: “Uneasy. ’Cause going out in the hall I was afraid he’d try to beat me up.” Participant 19 described his initial reaction to threats of physical violence: “Made me feel kinda scared at first ’cause it was like I didn’t know what was gonna happen.” Participant 4 expressed fear after becoming a Confidential Informer (an individual who gives information to officers):

I don’t feel safe anymore. I don’t feel safe here, there, anywhere. Six feet under I wouldn’t feel safe. Eight feet under I wouldn’t feel safe. Place is not safe I don’t care where you’re at, this is my opinion.

Participant 12 acknowledged other’s perception of his fear:

Like a lot of people think I’m scared and everything and no, well, I am scared, but I don’t want to get in trouble ’cause I’m about two and half months away from making Level 3.

Sadness/Depression. Inmates described feelings of sadness following their experience of victimization. Participant 5 expressed this in a parsimonious manner: “Sometimes makes me feel, uh...depressed. Yeah, depressed.” Participant 12 described becoming tearful following an altercation on the yard: “He saw, tears kinda in my eyes.” Participant 19 described a strong emotional reaction to frequent victimization:

I’ve been in the hole twice for suicide watch ’cause I’ve got it to where I’ve got so stressed out. I’m so just, I don’t want to fight ’cause I got so much I can lose and it’s just like that’s the only easy way I know how to get out of it.

Institutional Response to Victimization

Two themes emerged in the Institutional Response to victimization category: Positive Perceptions and Negative Perceptions of institutional response to victimization.

Theme 1: Positive Perceptions

Participants indicated that the response of prison staff was helpful in some instances. Participant 19 described the response of staff to reported extortion:

Boy, she got on that real quick. She e-mailed [teacher name removed], she e-mailed, uh, Captain [name removed], she...and um, she uh, she talked to uh, she told me, she goes, "Okay, this is what I want you to do, this is the plan I have for you. If that happens, let me know. Give me a list of what you ordered and give us a list of what they ordered and then we'll go and do a surprise search. And if we find that extra items we'll stop them."

He went on to describe the follow-up response:

So they were all, ok, so they made a decision right then and there. No jobs. No nothing. And you, you can't do anything. You can't squeeze anything out of a turnip. That's what their expression was. We made all a decision that this was what was gonna happen. And if any of these guys came up and said, "You gotta pay us this, this, this, this," just tell 'em, "Hey, doctor's orders said you can't work," or whatever. Come up with some excuse that you can't work. And I've done that. I've told these guys out here that come around me, "Hey man, I've been literally barred from working!"

Participant 20 described a prompt response to his report of attempted extortion:

I looked at my CO [correctional officer] and I'm like, "Hey, check it out. My cellie wants me paying rent and all like this, you know. Da-da-da-da-da." He's like, "Alright, let's see what we can do." So they move him over to the other side. So then I get another cellie.

Participant 4 also described a prompt response to reported extortion:

And I told the cop, I told the cop, I said, "Well all my shit's gone and I need to go get it." So they, the cop took me to my cell, took the other inmate to the other side of the unit, and I took all my stuff.

Participant 7 described immediate staff response to a request for transfer:

No, it's he's a Black guy, and he's the same age as me. A Black officer, he said,

“What’re you doin’ over there in seg, in loss of privileges?” I said, “I don’t know. When I came back in this time officer, they put me here.” He said, “Well I’ll move you to Unit 13.” And I said, “No, I don’t want to go to Unit 13.” I said, “I wanna go to Unit 2 if it’s possible.” He moved me right over the next day.

Several participants expressed a belief that concerned staff that care for the welfare of inmates exist within the prison system. In some cases, they described the role or position of those who were identified as caring or concerned. Participant 4 acknowledged the presence of helpful staff:

Well, there’s cops in this institution that, that, that I know of that well, if I had a problem like that, and there’s STD managers I know real well here, that I know for years, that will help me with it. They would help me probably get the dude out of the institution if I had to.

He went on to identify mental health care staff as being particularly helpful:

Yeah, if I woulda told CTS counselor, like him in there, he could take care of it within seconds. He would, he would, he would make sure that dude would be in the hole and, and, and gone within, within, within seconds. That’s how, understand, other cops, people really their thing. Some of them can. There’s certain cops that will do it, and there’s certain cops that don’t like you.

Participant 12 expressed a belief that staff persons work to protect inmates:

See um, what basically these officers here say that they’re tryin’ to protect me the best they can. Well they’re tryin’ to, but it’s hard. It’s, it’s um hard because they gotta deal not with just one inmate but thousands inmates around. Like there’s trouble happening all the time around here.

He further elaborated on the difficulty of maintaining watch over many inmates:

Well they say it’s kinda outta their um, hands. But the only thing they say is we can keep an eye on you and everything. And sometimes let’s say a fight happens out in the hallway, which sometimes it will, you never know. They gotta go respond to that. So there it goes. Down there. Wide open. Weak.

Participant 9 expressed a belief that staff do what they can to protect inmates:

I mean, they do the best they can, and they separate you know, who they think that, who wouldn’t be good with who. You know. Cell, when they cell you up together. You know. They are doin’ that. But other than that, they really, I don’t

think they can stop it from happening.

Theme 2: Negative Perceptions

Many inmates expressed negative perceptions regarding the institutional response to their report of victimization. Several inmates reported that staff had been unresponsive to instances of victimization. For example, Participant 10 expressed a belief that officers were inattentive:

They're standing right next to the guards and everything. It's almost like the guards are lettin' 'em do it. I'm like, "Dude, you guys hearin' these people talk about they're gonna kill me, and let me have it," and they don't say nothin', they just kinda look at everybody. And they mingle with the people that's doin' it. Almost like they're payin' 'em. I guess they must hate me.

Participant 12 described staff inattention to his report of extortion:

That's what kinda pissed me off. When they didn't check up on me and everything. Like go over. That's one thing about I'm hearing at Snake River, they just check up on you over there and see how you don'. Over here, nothing. Nothing at all. Like um, like they won't call you out here or, or go, oh is he makin' up this story or was it true, or what's goin' on?

He went on to describe staff response to a separate report of sexual assault:

Well, I reported it and the cop didn't believe me. He said, "Oh your cellie ain't that way." Back then they didn't care. They didn't care what happened. Back then they didn't have PREA. Prison Rape Elimination Act. They should've.

Participant 4 expressed a belief that staff do not care about inmate victimization:

I don't know, I'm not trying to talk too bad about cops, but cops that usually when they somebody gets beat up over and over again they don't deal with it any more. They don't care what happens to ya. You get up it's your fault. But that's how it works.

Participant 19 expressed a similar belief that staff do not care:

Whatever you tell these cops, they just, they take it as oh well he put himself in that situation. And that's how I feel about it is these cops think I put myself in a position to where I'm trying to be bullied or I'm trying to be degraded to somebody else. I don't like it. They want us to give them respect but they don't give us respect. You know? And I mean, it, it, it hurts.

He then expressed a belief that some staff do not care about extortion:

It's usually down there at the canteen that you know, they, they, they put it in the bags but when they're coming back it's usually switch, switch, switch, switch, switch. You know when they come right in the door it's like switch, switch, switch, switch. Real quick, you know. Or it's like, you got an officer that don't really care, "Oh yeah, this guy asked me for a couple soups." And then, you know. What that don't really mean is that guys is extorting me! I gotta give him my soups!

Participant 12 also expressed a belief that staff do not care to respond: "Yeah, they done seen stuff like that all the time. What they gonna do about it? Nothing. Doesn't nobody wanna do no paperwork on nobody." He went on to describe a lack of response following his report of extortion:

It took about two weeks until I got a kyte back, which was double the kyte. I had to write two kytes, you know? And, and so I got the kyte back and he says, "Are your concerns still valid?" And I go, well, ask my cellie he meant about it, go through the, what I have, he said, um, "He means are they still in effect." So. I report it. I wrote kyte and everything.

Participant 16 declined to offer recommendations for staff response: "If they haven't figured it out by now I'm not going to help them. They know what goes on more than anybody."

Several inmates reported that staff response had been unhelpful in the past. Some inmates described a response that did not resolve the problem, whereas other inmates described a response of inaction. For example, Participant 3 stated: "Well, I told the officer. Quite a few officers about it, and they don't do nothin' about it." Participant 4 claimed that he was discouraged to take action after reporting an assault in the prison intake center (Coffee Creek Correctional Facility): "But they knew about it 'cause they heard it and stuff, but they said don't worry about it, you're gonna, you, you're be gone real soon."

Participant 3 described having been victimized and indicated that his report led to an investigation that was never completed:

I had a brand new pair of headphones, and in the unit one of the guys, he didn't like me that much, and every time he walked past me, he tells me why don't I take a shower, I stink. And I turned around and I told him, why don't he take a shower? And he walks up in my face and he pulls my headphones off my head and he walks down the hallway and he pulled the chord on the floor and stepped on the chord and ripped the chord in half. He did it right in front of the inmates, the two inmates that was at the table. He did it in front of the officer. And I reported it to the officer, and he called, he had him go to the lieutenant's office and talk to him. And he said he didn't do it. And then he called me to the lieutenant's office and I told him my half and the woman sergeant, she said that it's under investigation. And everything else. And by right, if an inmate destroys any property of yours, he's 'posed to pay for it. And even the officer in the unit was trying his darndest to find out if they were gonna make him pay for it. And they never did anything about it. It was all under investigation.

Participant 4 described a mishandled investigation following his report of rape:

And the last one I took showers and everything and they didn't say anything to me until the last minute. So. That was pretty well, pretty well, their fault on that part. The cops. The sergeants. Everyone said, no, they didn't tell me, "Don't take a shower." They just told me, "Wait." So I waited and then the officer said, "Go take a shower," so I took a shower, and then not more than 5 minutes later they took me to DSU and put me in a dry cell for it so they could do investigation. Didn't last more than a couple hours and I went back to my cell. State police said, "We can't really do anything 'cause you already took a shower." And I explained 'em this is what happened and I report and this and that and he said, "Ok, go back to the cell." It was over in 5 minutes.

He later expressed dissatisfaction with the response:

Like they didn't care. Like they didn't care. Like they didn't know the PREA case is going on here. Most these cops don't care. They just here for their money and that's all they care about. That's all. Yep. All they are about is their money. They don't care about what goes on with people.

Several participants described dissatisfaction with staff response that involved the return of a perpetrator of victimization to the unit or origin. Participant 3 described the following response of staff to observing an inmate who spilled scalding water on him:

And the officer called for back-up. And when back-up came the officer told him what he did, and he denied it. And they took me over to medical to see if I got burned from that 190. The only thing that save me gettin' burned is my shirt. And they put him in the hole. I don't know how many days he got in the hole for doin' but he end up telling the officer that he did do it. And every time he'd get out of the hole for something they'd put him right back in the same unit.

Participant 18 expressed dissatisfaction at the return of a perpetrator of sexual assault to the unit of origin:

They went and got him. They went and got him, and I didn't say anything at first. They found out that him and I weren't getting along and then they sent him back to the unit and then they talked to me. And then I told 'em what he was trying to do. Then they went and got him and took him to the hole. Then they took me there because I refused to cell back in with him 'cause of what he did. Or what he tried to do. And uh, I still don't forget about it.

Participant 11 described a belief that staff overreact to reports of victimization:

Well, well, the trouble with getting in with the staff, they go the wrong routes. They get carried away there. Yep. And then, kick you out into somewhere else. And mostly, most of the things they just need a good guard to talk to and tell 'em not to do anything anymore. We got some good guards and some bad guards.

He further explained that the victim is often displaced following a report: "Yeah, they'll move 'em somewhere else. Yeah, we had uh; let's see, in the last 6 months we've had three, four guys move to the hole."

Some inmates endorsed anticipatory expectations that staff response would be unhelpful were they to report. For instance, several inmates expressed fear that reporting would lead to placement in protective custody, or PC (PC is located within the same physical area as segregation or "the hole" at OSCI). Participant 2 stated: "I'm not gonna PC up, I'm not gonna PC up in the hole. That's just bein' punished, I ain't done nothin'. You know what I'm sayin'?" Participant 10 expressed a similar concern:

Oh no, they'll, they'll PC, they'll put someone in the PC, they'll throw them inside the, um, inside the hole where there's not T.V., and sheriff do them handcuffs you know. Yeah, they do stuff, type of thing like that to people. Like

everybody, you want some help; they put you in a situation like that. I don't wanna go through stuff like that.

Inmate Recommendations for Institutional Response

In this section I present participants' recommendations for institutional (staff) response to the victimization of intellectually delayed inmates. A list of recommendations is presented in Table 2. Because recommendations were requested by ODOC liaisons and are not representative of inmate's experience of victimization (the goal of the study), recommendations were not grouped into themes; recommendations made by even one inmate are presented. In some cases recommendations were provided in direct response to a query designed to elicit this information ("What could staff do so that this does not happen in the future?"), whereas in other cases this information was inferred based on responses to the standard interview questions.

Manage Reports of Victimization with Discretion

Inmates reported positive experiences with correctional officers who managed their reports of victimization with discretion. For example, Participant 1 stated:

The officer was really cool about it, he was out there and he pulled me out to the side and he made it so nobody seen us really talking. And then he just came by and he looked at me and said, "Ok, it's been taken care of."

Conversely, some inmates cited a fear that officers would overreact as cause for not reporting. Participant 9 stated: "Well, if it's in your name goes in there, and then, 'Well, this inmate gave your name,' and then you have more problems from their friends 'cause then you turn into a snitch."

Table 2

Recommendations for Institutional Response

- Manage reports of victimization with discretion
 - Do not dismiss reports of victimization
 - Investigate singular aggressive acts
 - Investigate suspicious behavior or circumstances
 - Separate victim and perpetrator
 - Segregate sexual offenders
 - Segregate inmates with long terms
 - Transfer inmates who are repeatedly victimized
 - Discuss course of action with inmate prior to acting
 - Create a separate prison for inmates with mental health needs
 - Create a separate prison for young inmates
 - Utilize protective custody with discretion
 - Enforce rules
 - Enhance security
 - In hallways
 - On “yard” (outdoor recreational area)
 - In “chow” (cafeteria)
 - Enhance staff vigilance
 - Increase yard time
-

Do Not Dismiss Reports of Victimization

Participants described feelings of frustration at not having their reports taken seriously. They described a pattern of engaging in other behaviors prior to reporting, and reporting as a later course of action. For example, Participant 18 acknowledged his desire to avoid reporting: “I didn’t want to go rat on the person. I’d rather bring heat on me.” He later reported that it was a threat of death that compelled him to report. Given the extent to which many inmates went to independently manage victimization experiences, it was frustrating for them to not have their reports taken seriously. Participant 3 reported: “Well, I told the officer. Quite a few officers about it, and they don’t do nothin’ about it.” Participant 12 described his mental health case manager’s response to his report of victimization, after which he had to reiterate his concerns: “So I got a kyte back and he says, ‘Are your concerns still valid?’ ...so...I report it.”

Participant 19 described his frustration at not having his report taken seriously:

So I mean, it’s, I wish that they would, I wish that the cops would realize that when somebody comes forward it’s because they’re being extorted. They’re not lying. You know?

Investigate Singular Aggressive Acts

Inmates expressed a desire that staff would attend to aggressive acts that may seem insignificant, because these acts were likely not representative of the victimization that was actually occurring. For example, one inmate indicated that because staff work in shifts they may not understand the extent of victimization occurring because their opportunity to see victimization over time is reduced (e.g., they only see singular events that occur during their 8-hr shift; also, not all acts of victimization are detected) Participant 9 described this phenomenon:

'Cause [correctional officers are] not, they're not like, close knit with the inmate, I mean, you know what I mean? Like in programs like when staff are right there with them all the time and they work with them, the officers aren't like that, so they can't really, you know, so. One day one officer can catch you doin' somethin', and then not see something happen for a month or two.

Due to victimization that may go unnoticed, it was recommended that correctional officers respond more diligently to singular acts of aggression. Participant 1 cited an incident in which a correctional officer observed aggression but did not respond:

They could of did something when they seen him walk by, you know, when he hit my bunk. The staff should've did something then. They should've realized, they should've pulled us out and said, "Hey," and said something, instead of just taking his word, the guy who's doing it...He told them that uh, we just had a misunderstanding...He goes, "It's all good, we just had a misunderstanding." And he was the one the one that's freaking out...Any time you see something like that you should just automatically should separate them. 'Cause that means one's bein' more aggressive than the other.

Investigate Suspicious Behavior or Circumstances

Several participants noted that they attempted to hide their experiences of victimization for fear of peer retaliation should they report. However, they acknowledged that they engaged in a variety of suspicious behaviors during this time that might have been recognized by attentive staff. For example, inmates must request packages of pain medication from their correctional officer. Participant 12 described his experience of taking pain medications and lying to staff members following an assault:

I was in the kitchen working...(I) was hit in my back. My lower back. And it hurt. For like days. I tried to take Aspirin, Tylenol, Ibuprofen, I even tried hot showers. Nothing will work...And I went to my boss and said, "Uh, I'm not feeling good right now..." Making up a lie and everything. Like I didn't say what happened or anything 'cause I didn't want any more drama to start.

He also described lying to an officer to escape an assailant on the yard:

And once when the guys, guys left, and called one of the officers up, right? Say, "Um, I need to go over there." And he says "Why?" And I go, um, "I'm not feelin' real good." That's a lie right there...So he goes, "Well like I have no good,

good reason sending you in.” And I go, “Come on, why don’t you cell me in for like horseplaying.” So he wrote that up and celled me in. That’s the only way that you could get in...like um, like that’s the, he needed a reason to single me in.

Participant 13 described his response to assault when he was at the intake center:

Yeah, the one, I think it was the CTS guy asked me. Why [my eyes] were black and blue. And I told him, I said um, “They were like that when I came in.” Lied to him...I have a hard time telling on somebody for doing something. I don’t like to. I don’t like to tell on people.

Participant 19 described creating a lie to hide extortion:

Or it’s like you got an officer that don’t really care, “Oh yeah, this guy asked me for a couple soups.” And then, you know. What that really don’t real mean is that guy is extorting me! I gotta give him my soups.

Separate Victim and Perpetrator

A number of participants expressed dissatisfaction with the return of an inmate who perpetrated an act of victimization to the unit of origin. Participant 3 reported: “And every time he’d get out of the hole for something they’d put him right back in the same unit.” Participant 18 described his refusal to cell in with his perpetrator: “Then they took me (to the hole) because I refused to cell back in with him ’cause of what he did.”

Participant 1 recommended the following based on his experience of victimization perpetrated by a cellmate:

Any time you see something like that you should just automatically should just separate them. ’Cause that means one’s bein’ more aggressive than the other. And if, you know, the other guy ain’t gonna say nothing. ’Cause he’s afraid of what that guy’s gonna do. You can’t say nothing right then because you know, he’s gonna freak...if you said something like that then you’re back in the cell again, it could be bad news.

Participant 4 described being assaulted a second time when a perpetrator was returned to the unit of origin:

Well, my cellie told me to come to yard so I went to the yard, I got beat up there because I refused to fight. No more than 80 hours later I went to Unit 3, and the

same gang member, his other brother, and the same brother decides he was gonna come in my cell and assault me. It's not, I don't know, it was bad. No lies, it was bad. I was sleepin'. I was sleepin'.

He went on to provide a recommendation: "The only thing I can think of, the only thing I can think of is same thing I told you earlier. Separate everybody. Then that won't be happening."

Segregate Sexual Offenders

Participants recommended that staff pay closer attention to the prior sexual assault records of inmates in the institution. Participant 4 described having been raped while incarcerated and offered the following recommendation:

If you think that something's gonna happen like that, go on like that, don't move the dude in the cell...He had a reputation before. Before I even moved in...he pulled this kid up and did it before. Put this dude on muscle relaxants and then did whatever he did. So he had a reputation...if they got a reputation of assaultive sexual activity, I mean any kind of sexual activity, anybody, then they should separate them. They should just not cell them with people that have that kinda, or have that kinda record.

Segregate Inmates with Long Terms

Participant 18 described having been victimized by an inmate with a life sentence who he believed had nothing to lose. He recommended the following: "Well, they should make it where people who have been in prison for a long time, not cell anybody up with that person."

Transfer Inmates Who Are Repeatedly Victimized

Several participants recommended that permanent separation of perpetrator and victim (via transfer to a different institution) would be the best response for inmates who are frequently victimized. Participant 11 simply stated: "Ain't a whole lot they can do about it. If it gets too bad well they can ship you somewhere else." Participant 4

recommended: “Well, if they’re, if something happens the first time and they know about it, let ’em out of the institution...to another institution.”

Discuss Course of Action with Victim Prior to Acting

Although several inmates expressed a desire to be transferred elsewhere following experiences of victimization, another participant recommended that staff first consult with the inmate in order to determine the preferred course of action. Participant 18 noted: “If I told them they could’ve done something, but I ain’t gonna tell. I’ll just deal with my own problems. Better that way.” Participant 11 described a belief that staff overreact to reports of victimization:

Well, well, the trouble with getting in with the staff, they go the wrong routes. They get carried away there. Yep. And then, kick you out into somewhere else. And mostly, most of the things they just need a good guard to talk to and tell ’em not to do anything anymore. We got some good guards and some bad guards.

He further explained that the victim is often displaced following a report: “Yeah, they’ll move ’em somewhere else. Yeah, we had uh; let’s see, in the last 6 months we’ve had three, four guys move to the hole.”

Create a Separate Institution for Inmates with Mental Health Needs

One recommendation for deterring victimization was to create a separate prison for inmates with mental health needs (Counseling and Treatment Services [CTS] inmates). Participant 4 explained his rationale:

Well, I can tell you right now, they need to make a prison that’s for CTS people only...because, let me tell you somethin’, this is my opinion. People that are in for murder, robbery, anything that’s assault, anything that, that’s property crimes, anything like that, anything like killing, shouldn’t be in this here prison. Anybody that’s been in for child molesting or anything like that, rape charges, they shouldn’t be near the people that are over here. Why I say that it’s because how, where all the fights and all the stabbings, all the, all the problems, that’s why there’s problems in prison, there are problems in prison. ’Cause they’ve put all the people together, and they can’t do it. It doesn’t work like that. People that have

mental problems? They can't put them together. Because they ignore. They're weak, and they'll do anything you tell them to. And it, it can't work like that...they just need to put all the CTS people in one prison and leave it like that. That's just my opinion.

Participant 7 acknowledged that there was a unit at OSCI designed for CTS inmates; however, he expressed a belief that some inmates on the unit do not necessarily have mental health concerns: "It's a dorm for people that say, 'Oh, I'm CTS.' And the ones that aren't on CTS, they should move to a different dorm! That's all I'm sayin'! They really should!" Participant 13 recommended a separate prison for CTS inmates:

Uh, maybe, uh, put them in a different environment...for all the people that were uh, like um, all the people that were on uh, CTS, had a actual building for them. Something different.

He described his rationale based on previous experience:

I was in a mental hospital in Pendleton. And it was okay there because there's not people in there that uh, that don't have problems like you have. So therefore they don't make fun of ya.

Create a Separate Prison for Young Inmates

Participant 16 had a recommendation regarding age segregation:

Yeah, you could advise the youngsters to, uh, you shouldn't send 'em here so early. Or not, not here. Send 'em somewhere where there's real people and not a house full of child molesters. Don't bring children to child molesters. You know, like feeding 'em. You're only feeding them.

Utilize Protective Custody with Discretion

Several inmates cited the desire to avoid protective custody (PC) as cause for not reporting, and indicated that their experience of protective custody was punitive. This seemed to be the result of the designated protective custody area also doubling as the segregation area ("the hole") where inmates are sent for punishment. For example, Participant 2 stated: "I'm not gonna PC up, I'm not gonna PC up in the hole. That's just

bein' punished, I ain't done nothin'...And if I'm gonna sit in the hole for my last 60 days, I'm not gonna do it [report]. There's no way. I ain't done nothin'!" Similarly, Participant 10 evidenced a desire to avoid protective custody:

Oh no, they'll, they'll PC, they'll put someone in the PC, they'll throw them inside the, um, inside the hole where there's no TV, and sheriff do them handcuffs you know...Like everybody, you want some help, they put you in a situation like that. I don't wanna go through stuff like that. I just, so I kinda like, keep my mouth shut and let these things happen.

Enforce Rules

Participants expressed dissatisfaction with the lack of enforcement of rules, which they seemed to equate to condoning violent behavior. For example, Participant 10 described his beliefs regarding a guard's inaction following verbal threats: "They're standing right next to the guards and everything. It's almost like the guards are lettin' 'em do it."

Participant 3 noted that he was the victim of property damage and was never reimbursed for damages done by another inmate. He recommended: "If an inmate destroys another inmate's headphones, they should make the inmate pay for it...and they never did anything about it. It was all under investigation."

Enhance Security

Inmates recommended a general enhancement of security be enhanced in order to ensure safety. Some inmates did not elaborate; for example, Participant 6 stated simply: "What I would have to say is better security." Several participants acknowledged the presence of "blind spots" in the prison; places where correctional officers cannot observe activity via either direct observation or camera surveillance. Participant 12 reported a fear of walking down the hallway: "Like anything could happen. Like even though there's

cameras around, but not all the cameras can catch everything.” Notably, inmates who take psychotropic medications must stand in the hallway for med line, and Participant 12 endorsed missing his medication due to fear of victimization while in the med line.

Participant 6 recommended avoidance of the yard: “Stay out...don’t go to yard...and there’s certain areas of the yard you just stay away from.” Participant 20 recommended better staffing on the yard:

Well, if they actually paid attention more. You know, if they had more guards out there on yard, you know. They’re already hiring new guys, so why don’t they just put ’em out there on yard? Yeah, like, there’s only like four guards out there on yard. That ain’t gonna cut it. If you want to see what’s going down on the yard, have like 10, 15 guards out there on the yard. And that way they could watch everybody making little deals here, people this, people that, you know.

Participant 16 recommended enhanced security for vulnerable individuals in the cafeteria: “In chow hall...there’s people that are scared sit in the aisle where they’re watched all the time and the cameras are on ’em. That’s where the officer should sit.”

Participant 12 additionally endorsed avoidance of both the yard and the cafeteria: “Yeah, I try to avoid the yard, try to avoid the chow as much as I can.” Participant 7 acknowledged issues of turf within the cafeteria that caused him concern when a fellow inmate refused to adhere to norms:

I told him, “Go to the other line.” It’s just a thing here in prison. The Blacks and the Mexicans go on one side and the Whites and retards and skinheads go on the other side, you know? I told him, “What are you doin’ tryin’ to get me killed here?” You know?

Greater Staff Vigilance

Participant 17 advised enhanced vigilance on the part of correctional officers: “Keep a better eye out on the inmates...uh, kinda watching out for loud mouths.”

Participant 19 expressed a belief that victimization was perpetuated by staff inaction. He recommended greater vigilance in regard to extortion:

The staff can get off their lazy butt and look at their receipts and say, “Ok, you got this, this, this, and this. Ok.” They can keep an eye on, on, on certain people. They can uh, they can go around, they can come in my house and say, “Ok, Mr. [name removed], what did you order? They write down, “Ok, this is what he got.” But if they come in my house, say if they do a surprise sweep in my house, “Well, Mr. [name removed], where’s all this stuff at?” Come on you guys, you already know.

Increase Yard Time

A final recommendation was to increase recreational time (“yard time”) for inmates. Despite the identification by inmates in this study of the yard as a high-risk area for victimization, one participant advised more yard time to help deter victimization:

’Cause um, see over at Snake River...a guy can go to yard maybe once, once, once a day here. Over there? Three times. Three times. Don’t have to worry about somebody coming out and hitting you. It don’t happen over there on the one side. Like um, like you might see like a fight or hear of a fight once in a great, great, great, great while. But it hardly ever happens.

DISCUSSION

In the present study, my goal was to investigate in depth the experience of victimization for inmates with intellectual delay. Additionally, I elicited recommendations from inmates with intellectual delay regarding how prison staff might best respond to or prevent victimization. A qualitative study was selected in order to obtain understanding of and generate hypotheses regarding inmates' experiences of victimization. The focus of this discussion is a comparison of the findings (categories, themes, and subthemes) with relevant research literature. I also evaluate strengths and limitations of this study, and propose future directions for research in this area.

Findings and Implications

Experience of Victimization by Intellectually Delayed Inmates

Three categories served to organize the experience of victimization by intellectually delayed inmates: Contributors to Victimization, Inmate Response to Victimization, and Institutional Response to Victimization. In creating these categories and themes I have attempted to synthesize and organize meaning units (quotes) in a manner that allows for holistic communication of inmates' experiences of victimization.

Contributors to Victimization

Within the category of Contributors to Victimization, themes of Internal Variables and External Variables emerged. The emergence of these categories is relevant given literature pertaining to perceived control over one's environment. Specifically, researchers have noted that inmates' perceived lack of control over their environment

may contribute to negative affective states (Wooldredge, 1999). Given this, one might hypothesize that inmates who identify internal characteristics (factors that are innate and cannot be changed) as contributory to victimization may experience higher degrees of negative affective states than inmates who identify external variables (factors that are environmentally assigned) as contributory to victimization.

Inmates identified a number of internal characteristics that they believed had contributed to their experiences of victimization. The following emerged as subthemes: Intellectual Disability, Mental Illness, Age, Physical Stature, Race, and Personal Attributes. Considering intellectual disability first, researchers have provided data demonstrating higher rates of victimization for individuals with intellectual disability in the general population (Horner-Johnson & Drum, 2006). Although some have speculated that incarcerated individuals who are intellectually delayed are involved in more victimization incidents than other inmates, no data were collected by prior researchers to substantiate these claims (Glaser & Deane, 1999). Inmates in the present study identified others' knowledge of their intellectual disability as a contributor to their experience of victimization. Specifically, they expressed a belief that others' knowledge of their intellectual disability led to the perception that they were mentally "slow" or "weak" and therefore an easy target.

These perceptions held by the inmates are likely accurate, given that authors of current literature have asserted that "people who appear weak and in need of help may be scorned by other prisoners, marginalized, and taken advantage of" (Haney, 2006, p. 257). Further, inmates who are perceived as vulnerable by their peers are reported to be more prone to victimization (Edgar & O'Donnell, 1998; Kerbs & Jolley, 2007; Morrison,

1991). Consequently, understanding subjective beliefs regarding weakness is likely to be important, given that inmates within the prison system typically create their own set of norms within the environment (e.g., regarding what factors constitute weakness and vulnerability).

Mental illness has been identified as a correlate to victimization. Inmates who have been diagnosed with a mental disorder have reported higher rates of both physical victimization (Blitz et al., 2008) and sexual victimization (Wolff et al., 2007) than inmates in the general population. In one study, rates were highest among males who reported prior treatment for schizophrenia or bipolar disorder (Blitz et al., 2008). This information is relevant given the demographics of the participants in the present study. Of inmates interviewed, 14 (70%) carried mental health diagnoses. This number was larger than the overall percentage of intellectually delayed inmates at ODOC who carry mental health diagnoses (43%, J. Duncan, personal communication, July 13, 2009). Of those who carried a mental health diagnosis, a high proportion (43%) were diagnosed with psychotic disorders (e.g., schizophrenia). Inmates in the present study expressed a belief that their mental illness led others to perceive them as easy targets. This belief is congruent with Morrison's (1991) findings in a study of perceptions of mentally ill inmates: Inmates in the general population reported a belief that manipulation of mentally ill inmates was easy and they consequently used mentally ill inmates as scapegoats.

One inmate in the current study noted that his cellmate attempted to highlight his mental illness in front of other inmates. Researchers have asserted that public demonstration of an inmate's weakness is believed to act as a means to identify the victim as a suitable target for future aggressors (Edgar & O'Donnell, 1998). Verbal

victimization (e.g., public taunting as described by the aforementioned inmate) is an efficient method of victimization for aggressors because it carries little risk of detection and great risk of harm for the victim (Ireland & Rowley, 2007). As such, public taunting likely serves as a way for aggressors of violence to identify inmates with mental illness as future victims without risking reprimand.

Age has also been identified in the literature as being correlated with victimization experiences. Several researchers have reported that younger age is associated with higher rates of victimization (Cooley, 1993). Advanced age has been identified by one researcher as contributory to victimization; however, that study was qualitative and the researchers did not compare rates of victimization for youthful versus elderly inmates (Kerbs & Jolley, 2007). The present study provides support for the assertion that younger age is a risk factor for victimization. Among inmates who participated in the current study, advanced age was cited as a protective factor against victimization, whereas youth was cited as a risk factor. Inmates expressed a strong belief that young chronological age was directly contributory to victimization experiences, particularly those of a sexual nature. Despite inmates' subjective label of "age" (a term used in this study to retain expressions used by inmates), some inmates appeared to describe perceived maturity rather than chronological age. For example, several inmates who were of advanced age reported that they were too old to be "playing games." As such, the results of the present study indicate that both young chronological age and perceived immaturity may be contributory to victimization.

Although not found in the reviewed literature, the subtheme of physical stature emerged as being contributory to victimization. Inmates in the present study expressed a

belief that large stature (tall, muscular body) served as a protective factor against victimization, whereas a small stature (short, heavysset body) served as a risk factor. Higher rates of victimization have also been associated with race (Black and Hispanic populations; Blitz et al., 2008). Results of the present study support this finding: Several inmates identified their race or race of the perpetrator as having been a contributing factor in their victimization. Specifically, inmates believed that they had been targeted by members of another ethnic group (e.g., White inmates endorsing victimization by Black inmates or vice versa).

Personal attributes (a general term used to describe personal characteristics which inmates indicated in a somewhat nondescript manner) were also identified by inmates in the present study as having contributed to their experience of victimization. Several inmates expressed a belief that their experiences of victimization were solely the consequence of others not liking them. Although researchers have not identified personal attributes or personality conflict as being contributory to victimization, researchers have noted that inmates with intellectual delay typically have deficits in social and communication skills (Glaser & Deane, 1999). One might postulate that such difficulties could easily contribute to interpersonal difficulties. Alternatively, it is possible that inmates' belief that personal attributes are to blame for their experiences with victimization may represent simplistic or concrete problem-solving abilities of the target sample.

Within the theme of External Variables, the following subthemes emerged: Environmental Norm, Crime Categorization, Length of Sentence, and Property Ownership. With regard to external variables, many inmates in the current study

expressed a belief that violence inside prison is an environmentally normative experience. This belief has been echoed by one researcher who described violence as a way of life among inmates (Morrison, 1991). Further, violence inside prison is believed to occur in part due to the nature of prison facilities, in which victims are largely unable to avoid their aggressors (Wooldredge, 1999). Inmates in the present study expressed a belief that close proximity to others lends itself to victimization. This is consistent with prior researchers' findings that victimization rates increase with population density (Wooldredge, 1998). This finding is further supported by inmates' assertions in the current study that OSCI is safer than larger facilities in which they had previously been incarcerated (Snake River Correctional Institution [SRCI] and Oregon State Penitentiary [OSP]).

Inmates strongly endorsed crime category as being another contributing factor to victimization. Specifically, inmates identified conviction for a sexual offense as placing one at high risk for victimization. This result is congruent with another study of inmate perceptions performed by Edgar and O'Donnell (1998) in which inmates perceived themselves as being more vulnerable to assault if they were known to have been convicted of a sex offense. Notably, the percentage of inmates convicted of a sex offense in the present study was high (40%). This rate is comparable to other studies of inmates with intellectual delay (45%; Glaser & Deane, 1999) and adds support to researcher speculations that low intellectual functioning likely corresponds with a higher risk of detection and increased rates of sexual offenses (Lindsay, 2002).

Length of prison sentence has previously been associated with victimization: Researchers have reported that victims tend to be in early stages of their sentence

(Cooley, 1993). This finding was supported in the present study: Inmates expressed a belief that having a short sentence placed one at risk for victimization. Additionally, inmates described experiences of victimization in which the perpetrator was serving a long sentence. This factor is likely compounded by intellectual disability: Researchers have reported that inmates with intellectual delay often struggle to adjust in prison because they are slower to adapt to the routine and norms of prison life (Finn, 1993). Given this, it is possible that short sentences for inmates with intellectual delay do not allow for adequate time in which to learn and adjust to prison norms. This is problematic given that researchers have reported that inmates who display inhibited ability or willingness to adhere to prison norms are viewed as untrustworthy by their peers (Morrison, 1991).

Property ownership was identified by several inmates as a contributing factor in experiences of victimization. Although property ownership was not identified as a contributing factor to victimization in any of the reviewed literature, it is reasonable to expect that risk of property crimes would be increased by ownership of desirable property. Desirable property was reported to take many forms: money, stereo equipment, and canteen items (in particular, envelopes).

Inmate Response to Victimization

Inmates' responses to victimization were widely discussed in the present study. Inmates identified both behavioral and emotional ways of responding to the experience of victimization. Very little research has been done to explore the subjective experience of inmate victimization, and this portion of the discussion will in large part be based on inmate response rather than on available research due to the lack of research in this area.

The first theme of inmate response to victimization (behavioral response) was diverse and included 10 subthemes: Verbal Confrontation, Peer Consultation, Positive Peer Affiliation, Reporting, Destruction of Property, Retaliation, Hypervigilance, Avoidance, and Minimization.

Many inmates in the present study identified verbal confrontation as a first line of defense in response to victimization. Verbal confrontation was often a reciprocal means by which to counter verbal harassment. Verbal abuse has been identified as a factor that increases one's chances of being physically assaulted in prison (Edgar & O'Donnell, 1998). In the present study, some inmates' attempts at verbal confrontation seemed to represent an effort to obtain the greatest benefit (e.g., de-escalation of conflict) with the least risk (e.g., physical harm, being identified as a target for future victimization). However, in some cases inmates' attempts to verbally resolve conflict were unsuccessful and led to frustration or anger for both parties. Given that inmates who are intellectually delayed often exhibit deficits in communication skills (Glaser & Deane, 1999), it is possible that efforts at verbal confrontation are unsuccessful due to skill deficit.

Peer consultation and positive peer affiliation were identified as behavioral responses to victimization. No research was available to substantiate these subthemes; however, the present study offers strong support for these approaches as common responses to victimization for inmates with intellectual disability. Inmates' efforts to involve peers appeared to be motivated by two things: a belief in safety in numbers and a desire to avoid involvement of prison staff.

Reporting victimization has been identified as a common behavioral response to victimization among inmates with mental illness as a result of dependency on guards for

protection (Morrison, 1991). However, it has been generally accepted that inmates in the general population often avoid reporting instances of victimization in order to adhere to a peer-enforced norm of silence and avoid being labeled a snitch (Wolff et al., 2007). In the present study, inmates rarely acknowledged fear of reporting; rather, they cited reporting as a final response to escalating or seemingly endless victimization. In short, inmates cited reporting as a last resort and a way by which to avoid (subjective) imminent physical harm.

Destruction of personal property in response to victimization (property crimes) has not been supported in the literature. However, several inmates endorsed having destroyed their own property to avoid theft. This effort appeared to have been motivated by a desire to avoid being identified as an easy target: Inmates reported that they would rather break their property than allow another inmate to take it from them. It is noteworthy that this line of action was taken rather than reporting, and it provides support for the aforementioned avoidance of reporting except in cases in which physical harm is feared.

Physical violence or threats of physical violence were identified as a response to victimization by 69.6% of inmates surveyed in one study (McCorkle, 1992). The results of the present study suggest that these actions are a common behavioral response for inmates who are intellectually delayed, as well. Inmates in the present study cited participation in reciprocal violence to deter future victimization. This finding is consistent with researchers' assertions that aggressors are much more likely to aggress if there is little risk of suffering negative consequences, such as physical retaliation (Edgar & O'Donnell, 1998). The present results supported these claims: Inmates expressed a belief

that fighting others would deter victimization even if they were to lose the fight. Several inmates in the present study expressed regret for not having resorted to reciprocal violence earlier in their incarceration because they found it to be effective in ending their experience of victimization.

Hypervigilance has been indirectly referenced as a response to victimization. Inmates who have reported victimization have expressed greater concern for personal safety than do those who have not made such reports (McCorkle, 1993), and Wooldredge (1999) noted that inmates who had been victimized likely felt less secure because they were unsure of what to expect on a daily basis and therefore feared the unknown. Given this, one might expect inmates who have experienced victimization to be more vigilant of their surroundings. Such was the case in the present study: Inmates described difficulties resting as well as hyperawareness of their surroundings. The degree of hypervigilance reported would be exhausting to retain on a daily basis and was identified by one inmate as being inhibitory to his emotional well-being. It is likely that mental energy expended in service of self preservation via hyperawareness of one's surroundings may detract from mental energy expended toward other goals (e.g., attaining mental health, fostering interpersonal relationships, etc.).

Avoidance through isolating oneself and avoiding certain areas of prison has been identified by one researcher as a common behavioral response to victimization (McCorkle, 1992). The present study provided strong support for these findings. Inmates described avoidance of both actual and potential perpetrators, global avoidance of all inmates, and avoidance of certain areas within OSCI (the "yard," or recreational area and "chow," or cafeteria). These responses suggest two different belief styles. Inmates who

cited avoidance of certain individuals or certain areas within OSCI appeared to exhibit a belief that high-risk individuals or areas could be identified and that risk could be reduced by avoidance. A second response style of more global avoidance and isolation indicated a belief that violence is unpredictable and that disengagement from the prison environment is the only means by which to decrease risk of victimization.

Minimization (and/or lack of recognition) of victimization experiences by inmates with intellectual delay was suspected by liaisons who requested this research (P. Bellatty, C. Tupou, personal communication, August 27, 2007). This speculation was supported. Some inmates cited experiences of victimization but claimed that they were not bothered by the experiences, whereas others ignored victimization or justified the actions of others (e.g., by citing mental illness on the part of the perpetrator as a factor that excused victimization). Given that individuals with intellectual delay are more likely to experience victimization in the community than individuals without intellectual delay (Horner-Johnson & Drum, 2006), it is possible that individuals with intellectual delay are socialized throughout life to expect victimization experiences and subsequently are less likely to react to what they view as a normative experience.

The second theme of Inmate Response to Victimization (emotional response) yielded three subthemes: Anger, Fear, and Sadness/Depression. Negative affective states including anger and depression are reportedly higher among inmates who experience victimization in prison than among those who do not (Biggam & Power, 1999; Wooldredge, 1999). Victims of bullying have been found to have high levels of anger and hostility (Biggam & Power, 1999). Fear is reportedly elevated in inmates who have been victimized compared to those who have not (McCorkle, 1993). The current study

supported the findings of high levels of negative affective states among inmates who have experienced victimization. Researchers have cited lack of perceived control over the environment (Wooldredge, 1999) and inability to avoid aggressors within a closed setting (Ireland, 2005) as possible causes for negative affective states.

Institutional Response to Victimization

Inmates' perceptions regarding Institutional Response to Victimization emerged as the final category in the present study. In general, inmates expressed dichotomous states of either Positive or Negative Perceptions regarding the response of staff. As such, these two perceptions emerged as themes. Literature regarding inmate perceptions of staff response to victimization is extremely limited, and this portion of the discussion will in large part be based on inmate response.

A number of inmates expressed positive perceptions regarding the response of staff to their experiences and/or reports of victimization. Many inmates provided examples of staff response that had been helpful and prompt. These experiences in turn led inmates to believe that staff cared about the well-being of inmates. In many cases, inmates identified certain staff persons (e.g., CTS case managers, teachers) as being safe to report incidents to, based on previous experience. Other inmates expressed a neutral/positive belief that although staff do the best they can, keeping watch over the vast number of inmates incarcerated at OSCI is a difficult undertaking that cannot be accomplished by the current number of staff.

Some inmates expressed negative perceptions regarding the response of staff to their experiences and/or reports of victimization. Several inmates reported that staff had been unresponsive to either observed or reported victimization. Some inmates described

unhelpful or mishandled responses in which they experienced little or no resolution. As a result of negative experiences, these inmates expressed beliefs that staff do not care about the well-being of inmates.

Recommendations for Response to and Prevention of Victimization

The following recommendations provided by inmates in this study centered on separation of victim and perpetrator: Separate victim and perpetrator, segregate sexual offenders, segregate inmates with long terms, transfer inmates who are repeatedly victimized, create a separate prison for inmates with mental health needs, and create a separate prison for young inmates. These suggestions are congruent with subthemes that emerged under the category of contributors to victimization in the present study (including crime categorization, length of sentence, mental illness, and age).

Inmates recommended that reports of victimization not be dismissed and that reports be handled by staff with discretion. Given the reluctance of many of the inmates to report, dismissal of or inattention to reports was experienced as quite distressing. Researchers have acknowledged that verbal aggression, if detected, is likely to have its seriousness minimized (Ireland & Rowley, 2007). However, verbal aggression can be damaging to victims given that it is often used to identify inmates as suitable targets for future victimization.

Inmates additionally expressed a desire that singular aggressive acts and suspicious behavior or circumstances be investigated. Correctional officers change shifts every eight hours and are responsible for overseeing the actions of many inmates. Inmates indicated that small incidents that are observed by staff may be representative of a larger problem and should be attended to. For example, one inmate described a situation

in which an officer observed the inmate's cellmate hitting his bunk. The inmate reported that his cellmate had been making sexual advances toward him and had become upset when the officer was passing by during a routine tier check; however, the officer did not know the background of the seemingly small act of aggression and subsequently did not separate the inmates. Several inmates expressed sentiments to the effect that inaction in such situations equated to condoning of violent or aggressive behaviors. Researchers have acknowledged that verbal abuse is commonly undetected (Ireland & Rowley, 2007); however, verbal abuse reportedly increases chances of being physically assaulted (Edgar & O'Donnell, 1998). This highlights the importance of recognizing and attending to even seemingly insignificant incidence of victimization.

One inmate expressed a desire that course of action (following the reporting of victimization) be discussed with inmates prior to initiating the action. This suggestion appeared to be in an effort to prevent (perceived) "over-reaction" on the part of staff. On the other hand, several inmates expressed a desire for officers to enforce rules more stringently and to be more vigilant. These recommendations are relevant both at a common sense level and in light of recent research. Aggressors are less likely to continue victimizing others if they suffer negative consequences (Edgar & O'Donnell, 1998). As such, vigilance in noticing and reprimanding aggressive behaviors would serve as a deterrent.

Inmates recommended enhanced security (e.g., more officers) in hallways, the "yard" (i.e., outdoor recreational area), and in "chow" (i.e., cafeteria). The belief seemed to stem from a previously noted concern that limited staff are unable to attend to the numerous inmates whom they oversee. Although instituting this recommendation may

decrease opportunity for victimization, it is unlikely (given inmate beliefs regarding contributors to victimization and the inevitability of victimization) that better staffing would eliminate opportunity for victimization.

Inmates recommended that protective custody (PC) be used with discretion. Researchers have noted that, in the past, protection of intellectually delayed inmates has come at the cost of placement in a more restrictive environment (Wooldredge, 1998). This assertion was supported in the present study. Inmates expressed a strong desire to avoid being placed in PC because of the restrictions of the environment (e.g., no T.V.) as well as a belief that placement in PC equated to punishment. Inmates could benefit from less restrictive measures by which to ensure the safety of inmates with intellectual disability who experience victimization.

One inmate expressed a belief that increased yard time would decrease instances of victimization. This recommendation is contradictory to statements of inmates who identified the yard as a high-risk area in which a number of “blind spots” (areas in which the inmate is not visible to correctional officers) exist.

In sum, inmate recommendations for institutional response to and prevention of victimization would involve a number of parties: policy makers (who would be responsible for coming to decisions regarding increased staffing), administrative officials (in creating segregate units for high-risk perpetrators or victims), and correctional officers (in enhancing vigilance and strictly enforcing rules).

Strengths and Limitations of the Current Study

The qualitative nature of the current study presents several strengths and weaknesses. With regard to strengths, the design allowed for in-depth investigation of

inmates' experiences of victimization and was conducted without a priori hypotheses. This in turn led to results that emerged based on respondents' subjective experiences rather than preconceived notions. The result was the emergence of new findings that have not yet been identified in other research literature and that can be expanded upon in future research.

A second strength in regard to the qualitative research design is specific to the target population (inmates with intellectual delay). Researchers conducting quantitative research have noted a tendency toward acquiescence in this population (Sigelman et al., 1981). The fluid nature of a qualitative design allowed for elaboration and follow-up questioning that lent themselves to more accurate results. This was demonstrated by several participants in the current study, who initially responded "No" when asked whether they had experienced instances of victimization but who went on to elaborate with examples and statements such as, "But it didn't bother me." Forced choice responses in such instances would have likely been inaccurate.

With regard to limitations resulting from the qualitative design, qualitative research is based on subjective response. Several researchers have identified factors that may lead to inaccuracy of self-report. Researchers have noted a tendency on the part of inmates to underreport experiences of victimization to prison officials, due to the personal nature of such instances (Hensley et al., 2003) or a belief that it is not the business of prison officials (Cooley, 1993). It is possible that the participants were not forthcoming regarding their experiences due to motivations such as impression management. Conversely, it has also been reported that inmates may overreport to researchers because they view the research as an opportunity to anonymously make

prison officials look bad (Wolff et al., 2007). As such, it is possible that participants in this study may have responded inaccurately in order to portray prison staff in a negative light.

Another potential limitation is the possibility of the researchers' background and interests influencing both data collection and data analysis (Charmaz, 2006). In order to promote objectivity, a coding partner aided in data analysis for four interviews as a cross-validation measure. My coding partner performed line-by-line analysis of four interviews and created categories, themes, and subthemes based on her analysis. Overall, our findings were consistent. In a second measure to promote objectivity, I kept a research journal and noted developing themes throughout the process of data collection.

One strength of this study was its large sample size and sample selection method. Twenty inmates were interviewed. Inmates had been identified by the DD case manager as being at high risk for victimization. Theoretical sampling (sampling for theory construction rather than for representativeness of a given population; Charmaz, 2008) allowed for rich results provided by inmates who had experience with the factor (victimization) being investigated.

A limitation related to the sample may be generalizability of the results. The study was carried out at OSCI, a medium-security facility in the ODOC. Although the results are likely representative of OSCI inmate's experiences, results may not transfer to inmates in other correctional facilities. Further, only male inmates were interviewed and results may not transfer to female inmates with intellectual delay.

The diverse sample of participants is both a potential strength and weakness of the study. Participants ranged in age from 19 to 84, were varied in race (Caucasian, African

American, Hispanic, Pacific Islander), and were incarcerated for a variety of criminal charges (predominantly sexual offenses, 40%, and theft charges, 40%). Additionally, a wide range of level of educational attainment was demonstrated (0-12 years). Both sentence length (13 to 120 months) and time served (1 to 84 months) were diverse. Finally, many of the inmates surveyed held mental health diagnoses (70%).

Age (Cooley, 1993; Wooldredge, 1998), race (Blitz et al., 2008), conviction of a sexual offense (Edgar & O'Donnell, 1998), time served on sentence (Cooley, 1993), and diagnoses of mental illness (Morrison, 1991; Blitz et al., 2008; Wolff et al., 2007) have all been identified as factors correlated with high risk and/or instance of victimization in prison. It is important to recognize that intellectual delay does not stand alone as a risk factor for victimization, given that many inmates may exhibit several risk factors. This may be viewed as a relative weakness of the current study (e.g., intellectual delay was not an isolated variable, nor could it have been). However, humans are complex and multifaceted, and understanding the complex interactions of multiple risk factors for victimization of intellectually delayed inmates is an important step in determining response and prevention techniques.

Future Directions

The qualitative nature of this study was intended to offer hypotheses for future research and to generate ideas for preventive action as well as staff response to victimization. As such, quantitative research could be helpful in validation of the findings of the present study. Careful investigation of quantitative research design for studies involving inmates with intellectual disability is recommended in order to avoid making

unfounded conclusions based on inaccurate data, given reported tendencies among intellectually delayed individuals toward acquiescence (Sigelman et al., 1981).

In this study, I explored the experience of victimization for inmates with intellectual delay in an all-male prison. Further qualitative research to investigate the experience in female counterparts may yield new and different themes. More broadly, in the study I investigated the experience of victimization for inmates with intellectual delay within ODOC; however, many confounding variables (age, race, mental illness, time served, conviction of sex offense) were identified. Further research of high-risk subpopulations within ODOC is recommended in order to better identify the parameters of risk factors and the manner in which they may interact (e.g., compounding one another). Future researchers may consider performing regression analyses of identified risk factors as they relate to number of instances of victimization.

Implementation of pilot programming designed to educate inmates with intellectual delay regarding subtle forms of victimization is recommended. In addition, psychoeducational programming centered on conflict resolution may be helpful, given that many inmates cited verbal communication as a strategy for deterring victimization (and given that many intellectually delayed inmates evidence deficits in social and communication skills that could aid them in responding to victimization).

Conclusion

In the present study, I highlighted various aspects of the experience of victimization of inmates with intellectual disability in an effort to contribute to the knowledge base and aid in development of recommendations for prevention and response to victimization. Inmates' descriptions of victimization experiences fell into three

categories: Contributors to Victimization, Inmate Response to Victimization, and Institutional Response to Victimization. Although inmates identified intellectual disability as a risk factor for victimization, this was only one of many proposed risk factors. Others included variables that were highly represented in the target sample, such as mental illness (70%) and conviction of a sexual offense (40%). Future research is recommended in order to identify the parameters of risk factors and the manner in which they may interact (e.g., compounding one another). In regard to inmate response to victimization, it is probable that deficits in communication and social skills resulting from intellectual disability had a negative impact on the manner in which inmate's in the present study responded to victimization. Psychoeducational programming centered on conflict resolution may be helpful in this regard. Finally, in regard to institutional response to victimization, inmates expressed dichotomous (negative/positive) feelings toward prison staff and in regard to staff response. These perceptions appeared to be based on previous experiences with victimization and assumptions regarding probable future actions of staff. Inmates provided recommendations for future staff response to and prevention of victimization. Primary recommendations included better staffing, separation of victim and perpetrator, immediate response to even subtle forms of victimization, and less restrictive options for protection of inmates who are being victimized. Integration of these recommendations into current policy would likely involve a number of parties including the following: policy makers (responsible for decisions regarding staffing), administrative officials (responsible for decisions regarding segregate units for high-risk perpetrators or victims), and correctional officers (responsible for enforcement of rules).

REFERENCES

- Barron, P., Hassiotis, A., & Banes, J. (2004). Offenders with intellectual disability: A prospective comparative study. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 48*, 69-76.
- Biggam, F., & Power, K. (1999). A comparison of the problem-solving abilities and psychological distress of suicidal, bullied, and protected prisoners. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 26*, 196-216.
- Blitz, C. L., Wolff, N., & Shi, J. (2008). Physical victimization in prison: the role of mental illness. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 31*, 385-393.
- Chan, J., Hudson, C., & Sigafoos, J. (2003). A preliminary study of offenders with intellectual disability and psychiatric disorder. *Mental Health Aspects of Developmental Disabilities, 6*, 147-152.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). Grounded theory. In S. N. Hesse-Biber & P. Leavy (Eds.), *Approaches to qualitative research: A reader on theory and practice* (pp. 496-520). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Charmaz, K. (2008). Grounded theory. In J. Smith (Ed.), *Qualitative psychology: A practical guide to research methods, second edition* (pp. 81-110). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cooley, D. (1993). Criminal victimization in male federal prisons. *Canadian Journal of Criminology, 479-495*.
- Edgar, K., & O'Donnell, I. (1998). Assault in prison: The 'victim's' contribution. *The British Journal of Criminology, 38*, 635-651.
- Finn, M. A. (1993). Disciplinary "careers" of mentally retarded inmates. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 19*, 57-73.
- Glaser, W., & Deane, K. (1999). Normalization in an abnormal world: A study of prisoners with an intellectual disability. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 43*, 338-356.
- Haney, C. (2006). "Special needs" prisoners in extremis. In C. Haney, *Reforming punishment: Psychological limits to the pains of imprisonment* (pp. 241-267). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Hensley, C., Koscheski, M., & Tewksbury, R. (2005). Examining the characteristics of male sexual assault targets in a southern maximum-security prison. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*, 667-679.
- Hensley, C., Tewksbury, R., & Castle, T. (2003). Characteristics of prison sexual assault targets in male Oklahoma correctional facilities. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*, 595-606.
- Holland, T., Clare, C. H., & Mukhopadhyay, T. (2002). Prevalence of 'criminal offending' by men and women with intellectual disability and characteristics of 'offenders': Implications for research and service development. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 46*, 6-20.
- Horner-Johnson, W., & Drum, C. E. (2006). Prevalence of maltreatment of people with intellectual disabilities: A review of recently published research. *Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities, 12*, 57-69.
- Ireland, C. A., & Ireland, J. L. (2000). Descriptive analysis of the nature and extent of bullying behavior in a maximum-security prison. *Aggressive Behavior, 26*, 213-223.
- Ireland, J. L. (2001). Distinguishing the perpetrators and victims of bullying behaviour in a prison environment: A study of male and female adult prisoners. *Legal and Criminological Psychology, 6*, 229-246.
- Ireland, J. L. (2005). Psychological health and bullying behavior among adolescent prisoners: a study of young and juvenile offenders. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 36*, 236-243.
- Ireland, J. L., & Qualter, P. (2007). Bullying and social and emotional loneliness in a sample of adult male prisoners. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 31*, 19-29.
- Ireland, J. L., & Rowley, J. (2007). Second offenders presenting with enduring mental illness: A study exploring behaviors indicative of bullying. *Aggressive Behavior, 33*, 377-388.
- Kerbs, J., & Jolley, J. (2007). Inmate-on-inmate victimization among older male prisoners. *Crime & Delinquency, 53*, 187-217.
- Lindsay, W. (2002). Integration of recent reviews on offenders with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities, 15*, 111-119.
- McCorkle, R. C. (1992). Personal precautions to violence in prison. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 19*, 160-173.

- McCorkle, R. C. (1993). Living on the edge: Fear in a maximum-security prison. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 20*, 73-91.
- Morrison, E. (1991). Victimization in prison: Implications for the mentally ill inmate and for health professionals. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing, 5*, 17-24.
- Parker, N. (1972). Segregation: The case for. *Australian Journal of Mental Retardation, 2*, 16-18.
- Petersilia, J. R. (2001). Crime victims with developmental disabilities: A review essay. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 28*, 655-694.
- Rennie, D. L. (2006). The grounded theory method: Applications of a variant of its procedure of constant comparative analysis to psychotherapy research. In C. Fischer (Ed.), *Qualitative research methods for psychologists: Introduction through empirical studies* (pp. 59-71). Burlington, MA: Academic Press.
- Sigelman, C., Budd, E., Spanhel, C., & Schoenrock, C. (1981). When in doubt, say yes: Acquiescence in interviews with mentally retarded persons. *Mental Retardation, 19*, 53-58.
- Snow, W., & Hooper-Briar, K. (1990). The convergence of the mentally disordered and the jail population. *Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation, 15*, 147-162.
- Stephan, J., & Karberg, J. (2003). *Census of state and federal correctional facilities 2000* (No. NCJ198272). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Wilson, C., Seaman, L., & Nettelbeck, T. (1996). Vulnerability to criminal exploitation: influence of interpersonal competence differences among people with mental retardation. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research, 40*, 8-16.
- Wolff, N., Blitz, C. L., & Shi, J. (2007). Rates of sexual victimization in prison for inmates with and without mental disorders. *Psychiatric Services, 58*, 1087-1094.
- Wolff, N., Blitz, C. L., Shi, J., Siegel, J., & Bachman, R. (2007). Physical violence inside prisons: Rates of victimization. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 34*, 588-599.
- Wooldredge, J. D. (1998). Inmate lifestyles and opportunities for victimization. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 35*, 480-502.
- Wooldredge, J. D. (1999). Inmate experiences and psychological well-being. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 26*, 235-250.

APPENDIX A

PACIFIC UNIVERSITY INFORMED CONSENT TO ACT AS A RESEARCH PARTICIPANT

The Experience of Victimization by Inmates with Intellectual Disability: A Qualitative Study

Investigator Contact Information

Principal Investigator:

Meg Loberg, M.S.

Doctoral Student, Pacific University, School of Professional Psychology
503-352-7322

Faculty Advisor:

Genevieve Arnaut, Psy.D., Ph.D.

Pacific University, School of Professional Psychology
503-352-2900

Faculty Advisor:

Michelle Guyton, Ph.D.

Pacific University, School of Professional Psychology
503-352-7317

1. Introduction and Background Information

You are invited to be in a research study. You are being asked because you are an inmate at this prison. Also, because of your score on tests you took when you came to prison, you have a developmental disability code in your file. Please read this form with care. Ask any questions you have before you sign the form.

This study is being carried out by Meg Loberg, Genevieve Arnaut, and Michelle Guyton. The goal of this study is to learn more about inmates like you who may be hurt or bullied by other inmates. Prison staff hope that information you provide will help them find ways to prevent or respond if an inmate is hurt or bullied.

2. Study Location and Dates

The study will start in January 2008. The study will end in August 2008. The study will take place in the prison that you are in.

3. Procedures

If you do the study, we will ask you to talk to the researcher for 1 to 2 hours. We will ask you to talk about times you may have been hurt or bullied since you came to prison. The researcher may look at your file to find out your age and how long you will be in prison. Health information will not be used in this study. If you do not want the researcher to look in your file, you can tell the researcher that.

4. Participants and Exclusion

To talk to the researcher, you have to be at least 18 years old. You have to speak English, and you need to have a developmental disability code in your file. If you are not at least 18 years old, you will not be asked to talk to the researcher. If you do not speak English, you will not be asked to talk to the researcher. If you do not have a developmental disability code in your file, you will not be asked to talk to the researcher.

5. Risks and Benefits

Some bad things might happen if you talk to the researcher. You could feel uncomfortable because of some of the questions. If you are uncomfortable with a question, you do not have to answer it. You can stop answering questions at any time without getting in trouble. Also, if other inmates hear you are talking about them, they could bully or hurt you if they think you are trying to get them in trouble. To prevent that, the researcher will remind you not to use names when you are talking about times you have been hurt or bullied. The researcher will not talk to other inmates about why you were called out of your cell. The call-out from your cell will be listed to the education or counseling department. The other inmates and officers will not know the reason that you are going to these departments. It may be a good idea not to tell other inmates the reason that you are called out.

There are no benefits for being a part of this study.

6. Alternatives Advantageous to Participants

N/A.

7. Participant Payment

You will not get any money if you agree to talk with the researcher.

8. Promise of Privacy

The things that you say to the researcher will be kept private. The things you say will be recorded. The recording will be kept by the researcher in a locked place. The recording will be erased after it has been typed into the researchers' computer. Your name will not be used with your information. You will be given a made-up number when you are interviewed. Only the researcher will know both your name and the number. Information that could let others know who you are will not be used in the write-up. Your whole interview will not be used in the final paper. No one but the researcher and faculty advisors will be able to see your whole interview.

This form will be kept separately from your interview. If this study is presented or published, information that would make it possible to know who you are will not be included. All information from this study will be kept in a locked place for at least 7 years after the study is done.

The researcher has to follow reporting rules at the prison. The researcher has to talk to your case manager if you talk about a few things:

- a plan to hurt yourself or someone else
- hurting children
- hurting disabled or older adults
- staff who have hurt inmates
- an escape plan
- other people harming you sexually

9. Voluntary Nature of the Study

Your decision to talk to the researcher will not help or hurt your relationship with Pacific University. Your decision will not help or hurt your position at prison. If you decide to talk to the researcher, you do not have to answer any question if you do not want to. You can ask to stop at any time. You will not get in trouble if you want to stop. If you ask to stop, the researcher will keep the information you gave unless you ask for the information to not be used. When the study ends, all the information you gave will be kept by the researcher. The information will be stored in a locked place in case it is needed for future use. The information will be kept for 7 years after the study has ended. After that, the information will be destroyed.

Compensation and Medical Care

If you decide to talk to the researcher, this does not mean that you will be a patient at Pacific University. If you are harmed in any way during the study, Pacific University will not be responsible for providing therapy or treatment. You will not get any money if you decide to talk to the researcher.

10. Contacts and Questions

The researcher will be happy to answer any questions you have about the study. If you think of questions after you are done talking to the researcher, please ask your case manager. Your case manager can contact the researcher to get the answer to your questions. If you need more answers after talking to your case manager, please call Pacific University's Institutional Review Board at (503) 352-2215. Your questions will be kept private.

12. Statement of Consent

I have read this form. I understand this form. My questions have been answered. I am at least 18 years old, and I speak English. I agree to talk to the researcher. I have been given a copy of this form to keep.

Participant's Signature

Date

It will let the researcher to look in my file.

Yes

No

Participant's Signature

Date

Participant contact information:

Street address:

Telephone:

Email:

This information is needed in case there are any concerns with the study and you need to be contacted. This information is also needed to give you the results of the study if you want them.

Would you like to have a summary of the results after the study is finished?

Yes

No

Investigator's Signature

Date

APPENDIX B

Semi-Structured Interview Questions

Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed. The purpose of our meeting is to talk about how and why people are harmed inside the prison, with the hope that we can prevent other people from being harmed.

I. PSYCHOLOGICAL VICTIMIZATION

First, let's talk about mental hassles in prison. What I mean by a mental hassle is anything one inmate does to you to create mental stress in your life. Some inmates call such hassles "head games." These hassles could occur when inmates bother you, harass you, insult you, or talk to you in ways that threaten you, frighten you, or intimidate you. You could also feel hassled if another inmate called you names that lead other inmates to think you're an easy target. I'm interested in hearing about your views on this problem in prison.

Main Question:

1. Have other inmates ever mentally hassled you while in this prison system? Remember, I do not want or need you to give me names, just the story about what happened.

Follow-up Questions:

If "yes," interviewer then asks: Can you tell me about this and give some recent examples without mentioning names? In short, I would like for you to describe what happened without telling me who hassled you. I don't want any names here--only details about what happened to you and how you felt about it.

Probes:

- When did this happen?
- Where did this happen?
- What took place? (Event, situation)
- What action did you take after the event?
 - Did you report the event?
 - Why or why not?
- How did you feel (after it happened)?
- What was the response of prison officials to the event?
- Why do you think that you were hassled?
- What could staff do so that this does not happen in the future?
- What could you do so that this does not happen in the future?

If "no," interviewer then asks: How have you been able to avoid such hassles?

Probes:

- Anything else?

II. PROPERTY VICTIMIZATION

Ok. Now let's talk about a different kind of problem in prison-- property crimes. The following questions are about other inmates who want your money and/or property. You can talk about anything you feel is important about this topic. You may want to talk about bribes, robbery, theft, scams, and/or being "burned" when you pay for something you never receive. As you answer the questions, please feel free to discuss anything about this problem that you feel is important. I'm interested in hearing about your ideas on this problem in prison. Ok, let's begin with the first question.

Main question:

1. Since you've been in this prison system, have any of these property crimes ever happened to you? Remember, I do not want or need you to give me names, just the story about what happened.

Follow-up questions:

If "yes," interviewer then asks: Can you tell me about this and give some recent examples without mentioning names? In short, I would like for you to describe what happened without telling me who did this to you. I don't want any names here--only details about what happened to you and how you felt about it.

Probes:

- When did this happen?
- Where did this happen?
- What took place? (Event, situation)
- What action did you take after the event?
 - Did you report the event?
 - Why or why not?
- How did you feel (after it happened)?
- What was the response of prison officials to the event?
- Why do you think that you were hassled?
- What could staff do so that this does not happen in the future?
- What could you do so that this does not happen in the future?

If "no," interviewer then asks: How have you been able to avoid losing your money and/or property in prison?

Probes:

- Anything else?

III. PHYSICAL VICIMIZATION

Now let's talk about physical attacks and assaults in prison. Such attacks and assaults can include any type of physical attack or violence, except sexual attacks which we'll talk about later. Examples of such attacks and assaults include being punched, kicked, stabbed, spit on, and/or any other form of physical violence which you feel reflects an attack of one inmate by another inmate. Once again, I'm interested in hearing about your views on this problem in prison. Ok, let's begin with the first question.

Main question:

1. Since you've been in this prison system, have other inmates ever physically attacked and/or assaulted you? Remember, I do not want or need you to give me names, just the story about what happened.

Follow-up questions:

If "yes," interviewer then asks: Can you tell me about this and give some recent examples without mentioning names? In short, I would like for you to describe what happened without telling me who did this to you. I don't want any names here--only details about what happened to you and how you felt about it.

Probes:

- When did this happen?
- Where did this happen?
- What took place? (Event, situation)
- What action did you take after the event?
 - Did you report the event?
 - Why or why not?
- How did you feel (after it happened?)
- What was the response of prison officials to the event?
- Why do you think that you were hassled?
- What could staff do so that this does not happen in the future?
- What could you do so that this does not happen in the future?

If "no," interviewer then asks: How have you been able to avoid such attacks or assaults in prison?

Probes:

- Anything else?

IV. SEXUAL VICTIMIZATION

Finally, let's talk about sexual attacks and assaults in prison. The following questions are related to sexual attacks and assaults which can mean everything from being grabbed and

fondled to being raped by another inmate or being forced to perform sexual acts under the threat of violence. Once again, I'm interested in hearing about your views on this problem in prison. Ok, let's begin with the first question.

1. Since you've been in this prison system, have other inmates ever sexually attacked and/or assaulted you? Remember, I do not want or need you to give me names, just the story about what happened.

Follow-up questions:

If "yes," interviewer then asks: Can you tell me about this and give some recent examples without mentioning names? In short, I would like for you to describe what happened without telling me who did this to you. I don't want any names here--only details about what happened to you and how you felt about it.

Probes:

- When did this happen?
- Where did this happen?
- What took place? (Event, situation)
- What action did you take after the event?
 - Did you report the event?
 - Why or why not?
- How did you feel (after it happened)?
- What was the response of prison officials to the event?
- Why do you think that you were hassled?
- What could staff do so that this does not happen in the future?
- What could you do so that this does not happen in the future?

If "no," interviewer asks: How have you been able to avoid sexual attacks and assaults?

Probes:

- Anything else?

