

A STUDY OF THE DEPARTMENTAL SEGREGATION UNITS

Massachusetts Department of Correction

John O. Boone  
Commissioner

August, 1972

Researcher:

Robert P. Patrician  
Northeastern University  
Work Study Program

Carroll T. Miller  
Acting Social Science Research Specialist

Publication of this Document Approved by Alfred C. Holland, State Purchasing Agent

Number 6426 (30-100-10-72-CR)

Approved by Alfred C. Holland, State Purchasing Agent

## ABSTRACT

The Departmental Segregation Unit (DSU) at MCI-Walpole was opened in 1959. The purpose for which it was opened was to allow prison administrators a place to which to transfer those inmates who were detrimental to the programs of the institutions, thereby removing them from the general population of those institutions. In January, 1969 another DSU was opened, located at MCI-Bridgewater. The available space for segregation was thereby doubled.

During the first 17 months of the operation of this second unit, more men were transferred to a DSU than during the entire 9.5 years during which only the Walpole unit was in operation. The yearly number of transfers to DSU increased sevenfold. The purposes of this study are to determine what this increase reflects, to describe certain characteristics of men's confinement in DSU, to examine how DSU inmates differ from other inmates in the general prison populations, and to attempt to determine the effect of a period in DSU on the subsequent disciplinary problems of men.

Three samples were used in this study: The first was a random sample of men transferred to DSU for disciplinary reasons. The second was a random sample of protective custody transfers to DSU. The third is a general population sample. This was created by using information about men released during 1966 from Walpole, Norfolk, and Concord. These three groups of releasees were combined into one comparison sample by weighting each according to the relative numbers of men transferred to a DSU from each institution.

In attempting to determine what accounts for the striking rise in the number of transfers to DSU, the following were found to be true: (1) The increase in DSU transfers from Walpole paralleled an increase in the number of disciplinary reports at that institution. Along with a fivefold increase in the number of transfers from Walpole to DSU, the yearly rate of disciplinary reports at Walpole during 1968-70 was three times as great as during 1961-63. (2) The percentage of transfers that were protective custody cases also rose, from 8% of the transfers before January 1969 to 29% of the transfers after that date. (3) The average period of time spent in DSU decreased from eight months to five months. (4) It was not the case that men were sent to DSU with less serious disciplinary records, or that different types of men were sent to DSU, or that men were sent to DSU rather than to Bridgewater State Hospital for psychiatric observation. The upsurge in the number of transfers to DSU would then appear to have reflected changes in institutional conditions more than in transfer policies.

In comparing men transferred to DSU for disciplinary reasons to the general population sample, the most striking differences were predictably in the disciplinary records of the two groups. The men transferred to DSU for disciplinary reasons had many more good conduct days withheld, and many more disciplinary reports of every type. They also had longer sentences and were more likely to have been committed for an offense against the person, especially armed robbery. The DSU men were more likely to have prior arrests for person offenses, but less likely to have prior arrests for sex offenses, and less likely to have been committed for a sex offense.

A comparison of the protective custody group to the general population sample found the protective custody men to have more serious disciplinary records. The protective custody men also were younger at first arrest, had more arrests for

property offenses, had completed fewer years of school, had poorer job stability.

A comparison of men in DSU for disciplinary reasons and men there for protective custody found that the protective custody men had less serious disciplinary records. The protective custody men also had completed fewer years of school and had more prior arrests for property offenses and fewer for person offenses.

Good conduct days withheld per month was used as an indicator of the effect of time in DSU on discipline. It was found that 62% of the DSU group (excepting three men who had not yet been released from the unit by the time of data collection) had fewer GCD withheld per month after their time in DSU than before their transfer. Twenty-three per cent of the sample had more after than before. The remaining 15% had the same number withheld before as after; 88% of these had no GCD withheld before or after.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In mid-1959, the Departmental Segregation Unit (DSU) was established at M.C.I., Walpole. It was felt that the actions of some inmates in a correctional institution had detrimental effects on the programs and the safety of the institution, and that therefore the temporary removal of these inmates from the general population was warranted. A second Departmental Segregation Unit (DSU) was opened in 1969 at M.C.I., Bridgewater. This was necessitated at the time by a work stoppage at M.C.I., Norfolk. The total DSU capacity was thereby doubled. In the seventeen month period between January, 1969 when the second unit was opened, and May, 1970 when data collection for this study began, more men were transferred to DSU than in the entire nine and one-half years (1959-1969) when only the Walpole unit was in operation.

The initial purpose of the study was to provide statistical information as a background to considering whether to close the Bridgewater DSU. With the closing of this unit in February of 1972 and the ongoing review of policies and practices regarding segregation, the purpose of this study becomes one of providing a background description of certain aspects of the prior operations of the two DSU's. The specific purposes of the study are: (1) to determine what the above mentioned increase in transfers to segregation reflected, (2) to describe certain characteristics of a man's confinement in DSU, (3) to determine how men transferred to DSU differed from the general inmate population, and (4) to attempt to determine what effect a period spent in DSU has on the subsequent disciplinary problems of men. These four topics will be covered in separate sections of the report.

It is also important to emphasize what this report does not cover. It does not provide information about life in the DSU's or the quality of the physical plants. Such information is unavailable in the inmate folders at the central office, the single source of data for this report. The report does not effectively confront the central issue regarding DSU the effectiveness of the procedure of segregating individuals with serious disciplinary records as a means of coping with the custody problems of the institutions. Finally, the report does not refer to men transferred to DSU in the last two years, but only to men transferred between 1959 and May 1970. With these caveats clearly in mind let us proceed to cover the four topics listed above.

## II. THE SAMPLES

In examining these topics, the study employs three samples. First, a "general population" sample of men released in 1966. Second, a "DSU" sample of men transferred to the units for disciplinary reasons. Third, a protective custody ("PC") sample of men transferred to the unit at their own request.

The DSU and PC samples were constructed by random selection of men transferred to the units. The entire sample of 150 men (both PC and DSU) consists of 50 of the 224 transfers before January 1969; 50 of the 75 transfers to the Walpole DSU between January 1969 and May 1970; and 50 of the 151 transfers to the Bridgewater DSU during the latter time period. Thus, the sample includes proportionately twice as many of the men transferred to DSU between January 1969 and May 1970 (100 of 226) as between 1959 and 1968 (50 of 224).

This sample of 150 men transferred to DSU was then divided into two groups, those transferred to DSU at their own request and those transferred to DSU for disciplinary reasons. The result was a PC sample of 33 men and a DSU sample of 117 men.

A comparison group of 150 men was created statistically to represent the Walpole, Norfolk and Concord general populations. Use was made of already collected data about all men released to the streets during 1966 from the three institutions. These three general population samples were combined into one comparison sample by weighing each according to the relative numbers of men transferred to a DSU from each institution.

### III. WHAT DOES THE INCREASE IN DSU POPULATION AND TRANSFERS REFLECT?

With the opening of January, 1969 of a second DSU at MCI-Bridgewater, the space available for segregation was doubled. In the next seventeen months, the yearly rate of transfers to DSU increased sevenfold. In this section we will lay out some possible reasons for the increase in transfers to DSU (from 24 per year to 160 per year), then present data to support or reject each possibility.

Initially it was felt that the possible reasons for the increase in DSU capacity and transfers included the following:

1. Men may now be spending shorter periods of time in the segregation units.
2. Men with less serious disciplinary records may now be sent to DSU.
3. The institutions may now have more serious disciplinary problems with which to cope
4. Men formerly sent to Bridgewater State Hospital for psychiatric observation may now be sent to DSU instead. The implication here is that available space may be a factor in defining the nature of a man's problem—i.e. whether they are "disciplinary" or psychological.

5. More protective custody cases may now be sent to DSU.
6. The type of man transferred to DSU may have changed.

The results regarding each of these six possible reasons behind the increase in DSU capacity and transfers are as follows:

1. Shorter stays in DSU? The average period of time spent in DSU decreased from eight months to five.

2. Sent to DSU with less serious disciplinary records? It was not true that men transferred to DSU after January, 1969 had less serious disciplinary records. The average number of good conduct days withheld before transfer was virtually the same for men transferred before January 1969 (71 days) as for men transferred after that date (75 days). However, the later group of transfers had their good conduct days withheld over a shorter period of time. The men transferred before January 1969 averaged 71 good conduct days withheld over 32 months, while the transfers after that date averaged 75 good conduct days withheld over 23 months.

3. More Disciplinary Problems at Institution? Perhaps the most striking finding is that the increase in DSU transfers from Walpole parallels an increase in disciplinary problems at that institution. Along with a marked increase in transfers to segregation from Walpole, the yearly number of disciplinary reports, at Walpole, tripled from an average of 189 reports per year during 1961-63 to an average of 667 reports per year during 1968-70. Only slight increases in the yearly number of disciplinary reports occurred at Norfolk and at Concord.\*

4. Sent to DSU rather than to Bridgewater State Hospital? It did not seem to be the case that men formerly sent to the Bridgewater State Hospital for psychiatric observation were now sent to DSU because of its increased capacity. There was no drop in transfers to Bridgewater corresponding

---

\* The number of disciplinary reports per year at Norfolk averaged 326 during 1961-63 and 450 during 1968-70. The number of disciplinary reports per year at Concord averaged 602 during 1961-63 and 823 during 1968-70.

to the increase in transfers to DSU.

5. More Protective Custody Cases? The proportion of men in DSU who were protective custody cases increased from 8% before January, 1969 to 29% since that date. This constituted a twenty-seven fold increase in the yearly number of PC men transferred to the segregation units.

6. Different types of men sent to DSU? Men sent to DSU before and after the opening of the Bridgewater unit differed only slightly. The two groups significantly differed on only 5 of the 42 factors on which they were compared.

The arrest records of men transferred after January, 1969 were more serious. Slightly over 70% of those transferred before that date had seven or more prior arrests while 90% of those since that date had such records. Men in the more recent group were significantly more likely to have had three or more drunkenness arrests, four or more arrests for offenses against persons, and to have come from a family in which the parents had no criminal history. More importantly, the percentage of Blacks rose from 7% to 19%. Thus increased racial tensions may be associated with the increased DSU transfers; the change was from a situation where Blacks were underrepresented to one where they were proportionately represented.

In summary, the key changes behind the increased number of transfers to DSU appear to have increased disciplinary problems, reflected in an increased yearly number of disciplinary reports at Walpole and an increased number of protective custody cases. In addition, the average period of time spent in DSU has decreased. It is not the case that men are being sent to DSU rather than to Bridgewater State Hospital for psychiatric observation, or that different types of men are now being sent to DSU (exceptions: more Blacks, longer criminal records), or that men are being sent to DSU with less serious disciplinary records. The upsurge in transfers to DSU around early 1969 thus

appears to have been brought more by changes in institutional conditions than in transfer policies. The policies of correctional administrators, however, obviously do play a determining role in the number of transfers to DSU.

#### IV. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION-DSU SAMPLE

Several variables analyzed deal only with men who have been inmates in DSU. Protective custody men will be considered a separate group as previously mentioned.

Number of Times in DSU this Incarceration. 64% of the DSU sample were transferred only once during their present incarceration. 14% were transferred twice. 22% served three or more terms in the segregation unit.

Months in DSU. The average length of confinement in segregation for the DSU sample was seven months.

Months Served Prior to DSU Transfer. The average time served of the present incarceration prior to transfer was just over two years for the DSU sample. 21% of the sample had been in DSU previously during their present incarceration. The average period between that prior transfer and the transfer on which data was collected was slightly less than five months.

Months Between Parole Eligibility Date and DSU Transfer Date. Approximately 22% of the DSU sample had passed their parole eligibility date at the time of their transfer to DSU. These men averaged one year past their parole eligibility date. For those men still short of their parole eligibility date, the average period until that date was twenty-eight months.

Transferring Institution. Slightly less than half of the DSU sample were transferred to segregation from Walpole. Norfolk and Concord Transfers make up another 36% of the sample. Prior to January, 1969 no men

were transferred from a forestry camp. Since that date three men (3% of the sample) were transferred, all to the Walpole unit and all for escape. 9% of the sample were sent from Bridgewater State Hospital or from the other segregation unit. One man (1%) was transferred from a County House of Correction.

Extent of Disciplinary Records Prior to Transfer to DSU. Two measures were used of the seriousness of disciplinary records before transfer to DSU, the number of good conduct days and the number of disciplinary reports. 26% of the DSU sample had no good conduct days withheld before transfer to DSU; 14% had 3-30 days withheld; 20% had 33-90 days withheld; and 40% had more than 90 days withheld. As for the disciplinary reports before transfer to DSU, 12% had no reports; 39% had 1 to 5 reports; 17% had 6-10 reports; 16% had 11-19 reports; and 16% had 20 or more reports. Thus the typical DSU man had five disciplinary reports and fifty-four good conduct days withheld before transfer to segregation.

Type of Disciplinary Records Prior to Transfer to DSU. The 117 men in the DSU sample accumulated a total of 1108 reports prior to their transfers. Of these 1108 reports 42% were for disobedience, insolence or profanity. 17% were for threats or assaults, 14% for disturbances or malicious mischief, 9% for under the influence or drug contraband, 11% for other contraband or stealing, 6% for property damage, and 1% for dangerous weapons.

Table I describes the relative frequency of each type of disciplinary report in a different fashion. It presents the percentages of the men having no disciplinary reports, one to five reports, and six or more reports of each type.

TABLE I

PERCENTAGE OF DSU SAMPLE WITH DIFFERENT NUMBERS OF DISCIPLINARY REPORTS OF EACH TYPE

<u>Type of Report</u>	<u>% of DSU Sample with:</u>		
	<u>0 Reports</u>	<u>1-5 Reports</u>	<u>6 or More Reports</u>
Disobedience, Insolence, Profanity	26%	50%	24%
Threats, Assaults	47%	45%	8%
Disturbances, Malicious Mischief	49%	43%	8%
Under Infl, Drug Contraband	55%	43%	2%
Other Contraband, Stealing	55%	42%	3%
Property Damage	73%	24%	3%
Dangerous Weapons	96%	4%	0%

Psychiatric Evaluation. Information was collected from central office files on the psychiatric evaluations of men in this study. It was found that 90% of the DSU sample were characterized as having some "mental problems". 23% were described by some combination of the following terms: anti-social, little respect for authority, hostile, assaultive, aggressive, or destructive drives. 18% were characterized as immature, impulsive or manipulative. 14% were said to be paranoid, psychotic or schizophrenic. 10% were described as depressed, frustrated or angry (some suicidal). Anxiety was said to characterize 11% of the DSU sample. Other, less common, evaluations included sexual deviation, retardation, epilepsy, drug dependence, passive-aggressive and social isolation. These account for 13% of the total.

Reason for Transfer to Segregation. Five categories of reasons for transfer to DSU account for the majority of the DSU sample. These are: escapes (21%), riots and work stoppages (19%), gambling, theft, continuous disciplinary problems and other miscellaneous (18%), assaults (16%), and disturbances (12%). Other reasons include: contraband (8%), property damage (4%), and mental problems (1%).

Psychiatric Examinations while in DSU. More than 70% of the DSU sample received psychiatric exams while in segregation. 26% did not. One man (1%) refused to be examined. No data was found for this variable in 3% of the cas

Notable Events While in DSU. In attempting to determine what events of significance occurred during a man's stay in segregation, it was found that this information was lacking in the Central Office files. This was true in nearly 70% of the sample cases. This may, of course, mean that no events of importance occurred. In any event records of occurrences while in DSU could not be located for over two-thirds of the DSU men.

For those for whom information could be located, it was found that men were involved in disturbances, correspondence courses, court appearances, psychiatric or medical transfers, and that one man attempted escape from the unit. The main finding of importance to research is that the information was not available, making meaningful statements impossible.

#### V. DESCRIPTIVE INFORMATION-PC SAMPLE

Number of Times in DSU this Incarceration. 58% of the Protective Custody sample were transferred to segregation only once during their present incarceration. 33% were transferred twice. 9% served three or more terms.

Months in DSU. The average time spent in DSU by the PC sample was four months.

Months Served Before DSU. PC men had served an average of thirteen months of their present incarceration prior to transfer to segregation. 27% of the sample had been in DSU previously during their present incarceration. The average time between that prior transfer and the transfer on which data was collected was slightly less than five months.

Months Between Parole Eligibility Date and DSU Transfer Date. 27% of the PC sample had passed their parole eligibility date at the time of their transfer to DSU. For these men, the average period since the passing

of that date was over two years. For those men still short of their parole eligibility date, the average time until that date was just under two years.

Transferring Institution. More than 60% of the PC sample were transferred from Walpole. Another 18% were transferred from Norfolk or Concord. 9% were transferred either from Bridgewater State Hospital or from the other DSU. 3% were transfers from county Houses of Correction.

Extent of Disciplinary Records Prior to Transfer to DSU. 52% of the PC sample had no good conduct days withheld before transfer to DSU; 15% had 3-30 days withheld; 24% had 33-90 days withheld; and 9% had more than 90 days withheld.

As for disciplinary reports before transfer to DSU, 40% of the PC sample had no reports before transfer; 36% had 1-5 reports; 15% had 6-10 reports; and 9% had 11 or more reports.

Type of Disciplinary Records Prior to Transfer to DSU. The thirty-three men in the PC sample accumulated a total of 146 disciplinary reports before transfer to segregation. Of these 146 disciplinary reports, 34% were for disobedience, insolence or profanity. 17% were for threats or assaults, 22% for disturbances or malicious mischief, 7% for under the influence or drug contraband, 10% for other contraband or stealing, 8% for property damage, and 2% for dangerous weapons.

Table II presents the percentages of men in the PC sample having different numbers of disciplinary reports of each type.

TABLE II

PERCENTAGE OF PC SAMPLE WITH DIFFERENT NUMBERS OF DISCIPLINARY REPORTS OF EACH TYPE

<u>Type of Report</u>	<u>% of PC Sample with:</u>		
	<u>0 Reports</u>	<u>1-5 Reports</u>	<u>6 or More Reports</u>
Disobedience, Insolence, Profanity	49%	45%	6%
Threats, Assaults	68%	29%	3%
Disturbance, Malicious Mischief	55%	42%	3%
Under Infl., Drug Contraband	79%	21%	0%
Other Contraband, Stealing	70%	30%	0%
Property Damage	76%	24%	0%
Dangerous Weapons	94%	6%	0%

Psychiatric Evaluation. 90% of the PC sample were evaluated as having some mental problems. 21% of the sample were described as paranoid, psychotic or schizophrenic. An additional 21% were said to be angry, frustrated, depressed or suicidal. 15% were characterized as being immature, impulsive or manipulative. 12% were said to be suffering anxiety. 9% were described as anti-social, disrespectful of authority, hostile, aggressive, assaultive or destructive drives. Other evaluations included sexual deviation, retardation, epilepsy, drug dependence, passive-aggressive and socially isolated.

Psychiatric Examinations in DSU. 60% of the PC sample received psychiatric examinations while in DSU; 24% did not. One man refused to be examined. In 15% of the cases no information was available.

Notable Events in DSU. For 80% of the sample there was no information. For the remaining 20% the data points to no conclusive statements.

#### VI. COMPARISON OF DSU SAMPLE, PC SAMPLE AND GENERAL POPULATION SAMPLE

The question examined in this section will be how men placed in DSU for disciplinary reasons, and for protective custody, differed from the general population and from each other. For this purpose information was collected on 43 factors for the men in the DSU, PC and general population samples, and the three samples were then compared on each factor. We thus will have three comparisons-DSU to general population, PC to general population, and DSU to PC. The tables and accompanying text below present the differences between the three samples, and the Appendix contains specific figures to which the reader can refer.

The reader should keep in mind that the differences between the three samples presented below are those that were "statistically significant" (i.e. differences that we can be reasonably confident are real and not just a product of chance). It is also important to keep in mind that the statistically significant differences between the three samples are not all equally important. Thus Tables III, IV and V present the differences between the samples in the order of their importance, as well as present numbers ( $\phi^2$ )\* whose relative sizes indicate the relative importance of the various differences. Table III contains the differences between the DSU sample and the general population sample.

TABLE III

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE DSU SAMPLE AND GENERAL POPULATION  
SAMPLE IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE

<u>Relative Importance (<math>\phi^2</math>)</u>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>DSU Men more likely to be</u>
.29	Good Conduct Days Withheld	33 or more
.26	Total Disciplinary Reports	one or more
.24	Disciplinary Reports for Threats or Assaults	one or more
.24	Good Conduct Days Withheld	one or more
.20	Disc. Rpts. for Under Influence or Drug Contraband	one or more
.20	Present Offense	against a person
.20	Disc. Rpts. for Disobedience, Insolence or Profanity	one or more
.19	Disc. Rpts. for Disturbances or Malicious Mischief	one or more
.15	Present Offense	Armed Robbery
.13	Alcohol Use	no use
.12	Disc. Rpts. for Contraband or Stealing	one or more

\*  $\phi^2$  (phi-square) is equal to  $\chi^2/n$  and has a lower limit of 0 (no association) and an upper limit of 1 (perfect association)

<u>Relative Importance (<math>\phi^2</math>)</u>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>DSU Men more likely to be</u>
.09	Disc. Rpts. for Damage to State Property	one or more
.07	Emergency Addressee	other than a wife
.06	Prior Arrests for Person Offenses	one or more
.05	Present Offense	other than sex offense
.05	Minimum Sentence	six years or more
.05	Occupational Status	unskilled
.05	Overall Time Previously Incarcerated	21 months or more
.04	Marital Status	not married
.04	Institution Committed to	State Prison
.03	Prior Arrests for Sex Offenses	None
.03	Age at First Arrest	19 or less
.03	Total Prior Arrests	Five or more
.03	Committed for Parole Violation?	No
.02	Service Date-Type of Discharge	Other than honorable
.02	Drug Use	Some use
.02	Juvenile Incarcerations	Some
.02	Age at Incarceration	37 or less
.02	Service Data-Ever Served	No
.02	Race	White
.02	Longest Period on One Job	6 months or less
.01	Disc. Rpts. for Dangerous Weapons	Some
.01	Prior State or Federal Incarcerations	Some

Understandably, the most important differences between the DSU sample and the general population sample lie in their disciplinary records. The DSU men had more good conduct days withheld, more disciplinary reports, and more disciplinary reports of each type (previously listed). 60% of the DSU sample, and 9% of the general population sample had more than 33 good conduct days withheld. 88% of the DSU sample, and 38% of the general population sample, had received some disciplinary reports.

The DSU men were more likely to be committed for person offenses, especially armed robbery. Nearly 90% of the DSU sample were committed for offenses against persons, while this was true for only 41% of the general population group. 56% of the DSU men were committed for armed robbery, while only 19% of the comparison group were committed for this offense.

The DSU men were also more likely to have prior arrests for person offenses, but less likely to have prior arrests for sex offenses, and less likely to be committed for a sex offense. The DSU sample was more likely than the general population sample to have been first arrested at age nineteen or younger, been committed as juveniles, and been previously incarcerated in correctional institutions for 21 months or more. The DSU men were also more likely to be committed to the State Prison, to be incarcerated on a new commitment rather than on a parole violation, and to have a minimum sentence of six years or more.

As compared to the general population sample, fewer men in the DSU sample were married; fewer had alcohol problems; and fewer had served in the armed forces (fewer still had been discharged honorably). More of the DSU men were unskilled, had never worked at a job for more than six months, and age were 37 or less at incarceration.

Table IV presents the statistically significant differences between the PC sample and the general population sample.

TABLE IV

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PC SAMPLE AND GENERAL POPULATION  
SAMPLE IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE

<u>Relative</u> <u>Importance (<math>\phi^2</math>)</u>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>PC Men More Likely to be</u>
.13	Disciplinary Reports for Disturbances or Malicious Mischief	One or more
.10	Age at First Arrest	19 or less
.10	Total Disciplinary Reports	4 or more
.09	Education	7 years or less
.09	Prior Arrests for Property Offenses	9 or more
.08	Longest Period on One Job	6 months or less
.08	Total Number of Disc. Rpts.	2 or more
.08	Disc. Rpts. for Threats or Assaults	One or more
.07	Disc. Rpts. for Damage to State Property	One or more
.06	Good Conduct Days Withheld	45 or more
.04	Present Offense	Against a Person

<u>Relative Importance (<math>\phi^2</math>)</u>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>PC Men More Likely to be</u>
.04	Good Conduct Days Withheld	3 or more
.04	Disc. Rpts. for Disobedience, Insolence, Profanity	One or more
.04	Disc. Rpts. for Drug Contraband	One or more
.03	Juvenile Incarcerations	One or more
.03	Disc. Rpts. for Contraband	One or more
.03	Present Offense	Other than Property
.03	Occupational Status	Unskilled
.03	Prior Arrests	11 or more

The PC sample had more serious disciplinary records than did the general population sample. The PC men had more good conduct days withheld and received more disciplinary reports in total as well as more disciplinary reports of virtually every type. The most important difference between the samples was that the PC sample was more likely than the general population sample to have received some disciplinary reports for disturbances or malicious mischief.

The PC sample had poorer educational and job backgrounds than did the general population sample. PC men were more likely to have completed less than eight years of school, never worked on a job for more than six months, and held primarily unskilled jobs. The PC men were also more likely to have serious criminal histories as indicated by a younger age at first arrest, more prior arrests, more prior arrests for property offenses, more with a record of juvenile incarceration and more total time spent incarcerated. The PC sample was more likely to be committed for offenses against the person and less likely to be incarcerated as a parole violator.

Table V presents the differences between the PC sample and the DSU sample.

TABLE V

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PC SAMPLE AND DSU SAMPLE, IN ORDER OF IMPORTANCE

<u>Relative Importance (<math>\phi^2</math>)</u>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>PC Men More Likely to be</u>
.11	Education	7 years or less
.09	Total Disciplinary Reports	None
.07	Good Conduct Days Withheld	6 or Fewer

<u>Relative Importance (<math>\phi^2</math>)</u>	<u>Factor</u>	<u>PC Men More Likely to be</u>
.07	Disc. Rpts. for Disobedience, Insolence or Profanity	None
.06	Prior Arrests for Property Offenses	9 or More
.05	Prior Arrests for Property Offenses	5 or more
.04	Prior Arrests for Person Offenses	2 or more
.04	Total Disciplinary Reports	14 or fewer
.04	Prior Arrests for Person Offenses	One or more
.04	Longest Period on One Job	6 months or less
.04	Prior Arrests for Person Offenses	3 or more
.04	Present Offense	Other than Person
.04	Good Conduct Days Withheld	99 or fewer
.03	Total Disciplinary Reports	11 or fewer
.03	Disc. Rpts. for Threats/Assaults	One or None
.03	Disc. Rpts. for Contraband	One or None
.03	House of Correction Incarcerations	One or None
.03	Disc. Rpts. for Threats/ Assaults	None
.02	Psychiatric Evaluation	Other than Anti-Social

The disciplinary records of the PC men are markedly less serious than those of the DSU men. The PC sample is more likely to have fewer disciplinary reports and fewer good conduct days withheld. In other words, the PC men have less serious disciplinary records than DSU men and more serious disciplinary records than the general population sample.

The PC sample is more likely than the DSU sample to have completed less than eight years of school and to have never worked on a job more than six months. Comparisons of the criminal histories of the two samples reveal that the PC sample tends to have more prior property arrests, more House of Correction incarcerations, fewer arrests for drunkenness, and fewer arrests for person offenses. A smaller proportion of the PC sample were committed for offenses against the person. Examinations of psychiatric evaluations show that the PC men were less often characterized as anti-social or sociopathic, common descriptions of men in the DSU sample.

VII. EFFECT OF DSU ON MEN'S SUBSEQUENT DISCIPLINARY RECORDS

The purpose of this study has been to provide background information on the operations and processes of the DSU. In compiling this information, data has been found which appears to shed light on the question of the effect of DSU on a man's subsequent institutional adjustment. By comparing the monthly rate of good conduct days (GCD) withheld before and after a term in DSU, the DSU sample has been broken down into three sub-samples:

- (1) men with fewer GCD withheld per month after DSU than before  
(62% of the sample of 113 men\*)
- (2) men with more GCD withheld per month after DSU than before (23%)
- (3) men with the same number of GCD withheld per month after DSU as before (15%)

In other words, 62% of the DSU sample had GCD withheld at a slower rate after DSU than before, 23% had GCD withheld at a faster rate after DSU than before, and 15% had GCD withheld at the same rate.

We should be extremely cautious about reading this finding as that DSU "works". Although only 23% had more serious disciplinary problems after segregation than before, fully 36% of the sample were transferred to DSU more than once during the present incarceration (either before or after DSU). Furthermore, an evaluation of the efficacy of segregation involves more than just looking at the individuals placed in segregation. Finally, whether a man "improves" after DSU is a complex judgement and involves more than just the simplistic comparison mentioned above.

Another concern is whether there are differences between these three groups of men--those whose disciplinary problems after DSU are more serious, less serious, and equally serious. In comparing the third group--

---

\* Of the total sample of 117 men, 3 had not been released from DSU in time to collect this data, and 1 was an out-of-state man for whom data was inadequate.

those with the same monthly rate of GCD withheld both before and after their DSU term--to the rest of the DSU sample, the most important finding is that 15 of these 17 men had no GCD withheld before or after DSU. Furthermore, these 15 men received no disciplinary reports before transfer to DSU. Examination of reasons for the transfer of these 15 men to segregation shows: five men transferred for escape; four for assault or suspicion of assault; one each for the Norfolk work stoppage, contraband, drugs, unspecified disturbances, agitation; and one for whom a reason could not be found.

The major differences between the men with fewer GCD withheld per month after DSU and the men with more GCD withheld per month after DSU lie again in disciplinary records. First, the men with less serious disciplinary records after DSU tended to be the men with the most serious disciplinary records before DSU. It could be argued that men with extremely serious disciplinary records before DSU would find it difficult to have still more serious disciplinary records after DSU. Second, the men with more serious disciplinary records after DSU than before tended to be the men who received disciplinary reports while in DSU. Apparently disciplinary problems while in DSU predict continued problems. However, the most striking finding was that, in comparing the men with more serious and less serious disciplinary records after DSU, there was no significant differences between the two groups in any areas other than disciplinary records. This suggests that the "differential effects" of DSU on subsequent disciplinary adjustment is a function less of types of men than of types of disciplinary adjustment.

	DSU N%	Protective Custody N%	Base Expectancy N%
<b>I. BACKGROUND FACTORS</b>			
<u>AGE @ INCARCERATION</u>			
15-21	23 (19.7%)	4 (12.1%)	28 (18.7%)
22-27	47 (40.2%)	16 (48.5%)	55 (36.7%)
28-37	39 (33.3%)	11 (33.3%)	43 (28.7%)
38+	8 (6.0%)	2 (6.0%)	24 (16.0%)
<u>RACE</u>			
White	100 (85.5%)	33 (100.0%)	112 (74.7%)
Non-white	17 (14.5%)	0 (0.0%)	38 (25.2%)
<u>MARITAL STATUS</u>			
Single	71 (60.7%)	17 (51.5%)	74 (49.3%)
Married	13 (11.1%)	4 (12.1%)	42 (28.0%)
Other	33 (28.2%)	12 (36.9%)	34 (22.7%)
<u>SERVICE DATA</u>			
Never served	82 (70.1%)	22 (66.7%)	85 (56.7%)
Honorable discharge	9 (7.7%)	5 (15.2%)	34 (22.7%)
Dishon. discharge	3 (2.6%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (3.3%)
Other discharge	23 (19.7%)	6 (18.2%)	25 (16.7%)
No data	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (10.7%)
<u>RELATION OF EMERGENCY ADDRESSEE</u>			
Wife	12 (10.3%)	3 (9.0%)	33 (22.0%)
Father	17 (14.5%)	7 (21.2%)	19 (12.7%)
Mother	49 (41.9%)	12 (36.4%)	61 (40.7%)
Other	39 (33.3%)	11 (33.3%)	37 (24.7%)
<u>YEARS OF SCHOOL COMPLETED</u>			
8 or less	66 (56.4%)	15 (45.5%)	99 (66.0%)
9 or more	51 (43.6%)	18 (54.5%)	51 (34.0%)
<u>OCCUPATIONAL STATUS</u>			
Unskilled	98 (83.8%)	28 (84.8%)	96 (64.0%)
Other	19 (16.2%)	5 (15.2%)	54 (36.0%)
<u>LONGEST PERIOD ON ONE JOB</u>			
Less than 1 month	15 (12.8%)	8 (24.2%)	2 (1.3%)
1-6 months	41 (35.0%)	16 (48.5%)	51 (34.0%)
6 months or more	61 (52.2%)	9 (27.3%)	97 (64.7%)
<b>I. CRIMINAL HISTORY</b>			
<u>AGE @ 1ST ARREST</u>			
15 or younger	63 (53.8%)	21 (63.6%)	74 (49.3%)
16-19	41 (35.0%)	9 (27.3%)	39 (26.0%)
20-25	13 (11.1%)	3 (12.1%)	26 (17.3%)
26 or older	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	11 (7.3%)
<u>NO. OF PRIOR ARRESTS</u>			
0	4 (3.4%)	1 (3.0%)	5 (3.3%)
1-2	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.0%)	8 (5.3%)
3-4	5 (4.3%)	1 (3.0%)	16 (10.7%)
5-6	14 (12.0%)	6 (18.2%)	22 (14.7%)
7-8	17 (14.5%)	0 (0.0%)	21 (14.0%)
9-10	21 (17.9%)	4 (12.1%)	18 (12.0%)
11-12	13 (11.1%)	3 (9.0%)	13 (8.0%)
13-14	5 (4.7%)	11 (33.3%)	8 (5.3%)
15-16	11 (9.4%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (5.3%)
17 or more	28 (23.9%)	6 (18.2%)	31 (20.7%)

	DSU N%	PROTECTIVE CUSTODY N%	BASE EXPECTANCY N%
<u>PRIOR ARREST V. PERSONS</u>			
0	27 (23.1%)	15 (45.6%)	70 (46.7%)
1-3	68 (58.1%)	17 (51.5%)	68 (45.3%)
4 or more	22 (18.8%)	1 (3.0%)	12 (8.0%)
<u>PRIOR ARRESTS V. SEX</u>	107 (91.5%)	28 (84.8%)	118 (78.7%)
0	10 (8.5%)	5 (15.2%)	32 (21.3%)
1 or more			
<u>PRIOR ARRESTS V. PROPERTY</u>	10 (8.5%)	1 (3.0%)	23 (15.3%)
0	73 (62.4%)	13 (39.4%)	85 (56.7%)
1-6	34 (29.1%)	19 (57.6%)	42 (28.7%)
7 or more			
<u>PRIOR NARCOTIC ARRESTS</u>	105 (89.7%)	32 (97.0%)	138 (92.0%)
0	12 (10.3%)	1 (3.0%)	12 (8.0%)
1 or more			
<u>PRIOR DRUNKENESS ARRESTS</u>	49 (41.9%)	15 (45.6%)	75 (50.0%)
0	28 (23.9%)	12 (36.4%)	34 (22.7%)
1-2	40 (34.2%)	6 (18.2%)	41 (27.3%)
3 or more			
<u>PRIOR ST. OR FED. INCARCERATIONS</u>			
None	36 (30.8%)	12 (36.4%)	62 (41.3%)
1-3	70 (59.8%)	18 (54.5%)	75 (50.0%)
4 or more	11 (9.4%)	3 (9.0%)	13 (8.7%)
<u>HOUSE OF CORRECTION INCARCERATIONS</u>			
None	34 (29.1%)	6 (18.2%)	52 (34.7%)
Some	83 (70.9%)	27 (81.8%)	98 (65.3%)
<u>JUVENILE INCARCERATIONS</u>			
None	54 (46.2%)	12 (36.4%)	91 (60.7%)
<u>OVERALL TIME INCARCERATED</u>			
None	9 (7.7%)	3 (9.0%)	23 (15.3%)
1-20 mos.	13 (11.1%)	1 (3.0%)	35 (23.3%)
21-60	45 (38.5%)	15 (45.6%)	42 (28.0%)
61-100	22 (18.8%)	8 (24.2%)	29 (19.3%)
101 or more	28 (23.9%)	6 (18.2%)	21 (14.0%)
<u>PROBATION</u>			
Never on Adult or Juv.	17 (14.5%)	8 (24.2%)	35 (23.3%)
Juv. but no Adult	28 (23.9%)	6 (18.2%)	18 (12.0%)
Adult but no Juv.	37 (31.6%)	7 (21.2%)	58 (38.7%)
Both Adult & Juv.	35 (29.9%)	12 (36.4%)	38 (25.3%)
Not available	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)
<u>DATA ON PRESENT INCARCERATION</u>			
<u>INSTITUTION COMMITTED TO</u>			
Walpole	108 (92.3%)	28 (84.8%)	120 (80.0%)
Concord	3 (2.6%)	4 (12.1%)	23 (15.3%)
Charlestown	4 (3.4%)	1 (3.0%)	5 (3.3%)
House of Correction	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.3%)
Outside Mass.	2 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<u>TYPE OF OFFENSE</u>			
Total Person	100 (85.5%)	22 (66.7%)	62 (41.3%)
Murder 1	5 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Murder 2	10 (8.5%)	4 (12.1%)	4 (2.7%)
Manslaughter	5 (4.3%)	1 (3.0%)	6 (4.0%)
Armed Robbery	66 (56.4%)	13 (39.4%)	29 (19.3%)
Unarmed Robbery	1 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (4.0%)

	DSU N %	Custody N %	Expectancy N %
Aggravated Assault	8 (6.8%)	2 (6.0%)	9 (6.0%)
Other Assaults	4 (3.4%)	1 (3.0%)	6 (4.0%)
Abortion	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.7%)
Kidnapping	1 (0.9%)	1 (3.0%)	1 (0.7%)
Total Sex	2 (1.7%)	1 (3.0%)	22 (14.7%)
Total Property	11 (9.4%)	4 (12.1%)	49 (32.7%)
B & E	10 (8.5%)	4 (12.1%)	29 (19.3%)
Other property	1 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	20 (13.3%)
Total other	4 (3.4%)	6 (18.2%)	17 (11.3%)
Narcotics	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (2.7%)
Other	4 (3.4%)	6 (18.2%)	13 (8.7%)
<u>PAROLE VIOLATION</u>			
Parole violator	26 (22.2%)	7 (21.2%)	58 (38.7%)
Not a parole violator	82 (70.1%)	25 (75.8%)	81 (54.0%)
Pv + new com: some pv time served	10 (8.5%)	1 (3.0%)	9 (6.0%)
pv + new com: no pv time served	1 (0.9%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (1.3%)
<u>MINIMUM SENTENCE</u>			
2½ yrs.	5 (4.3%)	5 (15.2%)	26 (17.3%)
3	20 (17.1%)	4 (12.1%)	30 (20.0%)
4-5	16 (13.7%)	6 (18.2%)	30 (20.0%)
6-7	18 (15.4%)	4 (12.1%)	9 (6.0%)
8-9	9 (7.7%)	3 (9.0%)	8 (5.3%)
10-14	12 (10.3%)	4 (12.1%)	7 (4.7%)
15 or more	18 (7.7%)	1 (3.0%)	8 (5.3%)
Life	16 (13.7%)	3 (9.0%)	4 (2.7%)
5 yr. Indefinite	3 (2.6%)	1 (3.0%)	17 (11.3%)
5 yrs. + 1 day	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.0%)	3 (2.0%)
2 yr. Indefinite	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.0%)	1 (0.7%)
House of Correction	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (4.7%)
<u>NO. OF CODEFENDENTS</u>			
None	48 (41.0%)	18 (54.5%)	69 (46.0%)
1	36 (30.8%)	8 (24.2%)	44 (29.3%)
2 or more	33 (28.2%)	7 (21.2%)	37 (27.7%)
<u>INMATE VERSION OF PRESENT OFFENSE</u>			
Agrees	54 (46.2%)	21 (63.6%)	73 (48.7%)
Agrees w/qualification	13 (11.1%)	2 (6.0%)	13 (8.7%)
Disagrees	17 (14.5%)	2 (6.0%)	32 (21.3%)
Refuses to say/Can't remember	8 (6.8%)	1 (3.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Not available	25 (21.4%)	7 (21.2%)	32 (21.3%)
<u>TOTAL NO. OF DISC. REPORTS (DR)*</u>			
0	14 (12.0%)	13 (39.4%)	93 (62.0%)
1-5	46 (39.3%)	12 (36.4%)	47 (31.3%)
6-10	20 (17.1%)	5 (15.2%)	6 (4.0%)
11-19	18 (15.4%)	2 (6.0%)	3 (2.0%)
20 Or more	19 (16.2%)	1 (3.0%)	1 (0.7%)
<u>DR. FOR THREATS AND ASSAULTS*</u>			
0	55 (47.0%)	22 (66.7%)	137 (91.3%)
1-5	53 (45.3%)	10 (30.3%)	13 (8.7%)
6 or more	9 (7.7%)	1 (3.0%)	0 (0.0%)

	DSU N %	Protective Custody N %	Base Expectancy N %
<u>R. FOR DISTURBANCES, MALICIOUS MISCHIEF*</u>			
0	58 (49.6%)	18 (54.5%)	134 (89.3%)
1-5	50 (42.7%)	14 (42.4%)	15 (10.0%)
6 or more	9 (7.7%)	1 (3.0%)	1 (0.7%)
<u>R. FOR DAMAGE TO STATE PROPERTY*</u>			
0	86 (73.5%)	25 (75.8%)	142 (94.7%)
1-5	28 (23.9%)	8 (24.2%)	8 (5.3%)
6 or more	3 (2.6%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<u>R. FOR DISOBEDIENCE, INSOLENCE OR PROFANITY*</u>			
0	32 (27.7%)	16 (48.5%)	108 (72.0%)
1-10	71 (60.3%)	16 (48.5%)	42 (28.0%)
11 or more	14 (12.0%)	1 (3.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<u>R. FOR DANGEROUS WEAPONS*</u>			
0	112 (95.7%)	31 (93.9%)	149 (99.3%)
1 or more	5 (4.3%)	2 (6.1%)	1 (0.7%)
<u>R. FOR DRUGS, UNDER THE INFLUENCE*</u>			
0	64 (54.7%)	26 (78.8%)	140 (93.3%)
1-5	51 (43.6%)	7 (21.2%)	10 (6.7%)
6 or more	2 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<u>R. FOR CONTRABAND AND STEALING*</u>			
0	65 (55.6%)	23 (69.7%)	130 (86.7%)
1-5	48 (41.0%)	10 (30.3%)	20 (13.3%)
6 or more	4 (3.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
<u>D. OF GOOD CONDUCT DAYS WITHHELD **</u>			
0	30 (25.6%)	17 (51.5%)	112 (74.7%)
3-9	8 (6.8%)	2 (6.0%)	11 (7.3%)
12-30	9 (7.7%)	3 (9.0%)	13 (8.7%)
33-87	25 (21.4%)	8 (24.2%)	11 (7.3%)
90 or more	15 (38.5%)	3 (9.0%)	3 (2.0%)
*Prior to DSU transfer (For DSU and PC groups), For BES For entire incarceration			
<u>PAST PROBLEMS</u>			
<u>DRUGS</u>			
None	78 (66.7%)	22 (66.7%)	119 (79.3%)
Irregular Use	20 (17.1%)	7 (21.2%)	18 (12.0%)
Addictive Use	17 (14.5%)	4 (12.1%)	10 (6.7%)
No Data	2 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (2.0%)
<u>ALCOHOL</u>			
None	53 (45.3%)	14 (42.4%)	19 (12.7%)
Moderate Use	14 (12.0%)	4 (12.1%)	54 (40.7%)
Binges	7 (6.0%)	1 (3.0%)	20 (8.7%)
Heavy Use	21 (17.9%)	9 (27.3%)	45 (30.0%)
Alcoholic	20 (17.1%)	5 (15.2%)	10 (6.7%)
No Data	1 (0.9%)	1 (3.0%)	2 (1.3%)
<u>MENTAL HEALTH</u>			
No prior observations or commitments	74 (63.2%)	22 (66.7%)	101 (67.3%)
Past commitments	5 (4.3%)	2 (6.0%)	4 (2.7%)
Past observation	5 (4.3%)	1 (3.0%)	28 (18.7%)
More than 1 past obs/com	6 (5.1%)	2 (6.0%)	8 (5.3%)
Bridgewater in past	19 (16.2%)	6 (18.2%)	5 (3.3%)
No Data	8 (6.8%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (2.7%)

DSU  
N %

Protective  
Custody  
N %

Base  
Expectancy  
N %

V. FAMILY BACKGROUND

PARENTAL ALCOHOL OR MENTAL PROBLEMS

None	63 (53.8%)	20 (60.6%)	61 (40.7%)
Mother 1 or both	6 (5.1%)	2 (6.0%)	8 (5.3%)
Father 1 or both	27 (23.1%)	9 (27.3%)	37 (24.7%)
Both 1 or both	14 (12.0%)	1 (3.0%)	15 (10.0%)
Yes unspecified	4 (3.4%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
No Data	3 (2.6%)	3 (9.0%)	29 (19.3%)

BROKEN HOME BEFORE 16?

No	58 (49.6%)	19 (57.6%)	66 (44.0%)
Yes, unspecified	44 (37.6%)	11 (33.3%)	0 (0.0%)
Ward of State	2 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (4.7%)
Death of a Parent	8 (6.8%)	3 (9.0%)	24 (16.0%)
Desertion (or illegitimate)	3 (2.6%)	0 (0.0%)	17 (11.3%)
Divorce	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	18 (12.0%)
Separation	2 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	17 (11.3%)

PARENTAL CRIMINAL HISTORY

Neither	72 (61.5%)	22 (66.7%)	74 (49.3%)
Mother only	3 (2.6%)	1 (3.0%)	8 (5.3%)
Father only	21 (17.9%)	8 (24.2%)	44 (29.3%)
Both	7 (6.0%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (4.7%)
Yes, unspecified	11 (9.4%)	2 (6.0%)	0 (0.0%)
No Data	3 (2.6%)	0 (0.0%)	17 (11.3%)

SIBLING CRIMINAL HISTORY

No Data	4 (3.4%)	2 (6.0%)	22 (14.7%)
None	79 (67.5%)	19 (57.6%)	82 (54.0%)
1 sibling	13 (11.1%)	5 (15.2%)	26 (17.3%)
More than 1	11 (9.4%)	4 (12.1%)	20 (13.3%)
Yes, unspecified	10 (8.5%)	3 (9.0%)	0 (0.0%)

## AFTERWORD

(Note: The author of this study has insisted upon the inclusion of this section in the version of this report distributed to departmental staff. CTM)

The author of this study has had increasing skepticism about the value of the work, particularly as it relates to the reality of its subject matter. He feels that although the material presented here represents several important aspects of the Departmental Segregation Unit, whose importance, as background statistics cannot be denied, the most important issues involved in the continued existence of such a facility are not dealt with at all. The methodology of this study has provided no concrete understanding of the unit—neither its physical plants nor its process. In no way was the author able to compare the statistical facts presented here with the harsh reality of the experience of the prisoners who have done hard time in DSU.

Early in the 1960's an idea was presented suggesting the use of DSU for intensive treatment of violent prisoners.\* This treatment was to include segregation followed by gradual reintegration into the general population as it became clear that the individual was not a threat to others in the prison. The exploitation of the weaknesses of excessively violent men by others to strongarm those who have incurred the wrath of the prison "heavies" has often been noted. (It has also been noted that this system of prisoner rule is often used by those administrators most interested in the maintenance of security.) The author cannot concern himself with the right of violent men to express their aggression as some would have them do. He is more concerned that prisoners be free from intimidation and exploitation by anyone.

Somehow or other, however, this concept for the use of segregation was never implemented. Between the time of the espousal of this idea and the present, perhaps 800 men have done time in DSU, prison unrest has become an extremely significant phenomenon (and at present segregation policy is no small issue in this unrest), and the originators of this innovation rose

---

\* Fitzpatrick & Kruger, "Control of Violence in a Maximum Security Prison"

to positions of greatly increased power, and still the idea was without fruition.

Segregation remains the place where this department places prisoners it finds troublesome. These people are not always the same kind of people that were found in DSU back in the days when prisoners knew their place. They are not always interested in just wanton malicious destruction, interracial rioting or the blind flaunting of authority. The beginnings of a new consciousness are to be seen in prisoners, ex-prisoners and non-prisoners. This new consciousness will no longer allow the department to treat prisoners as animals or as non-persons.

Segregation, through, remains clear and simple punishment. This charge seems unassailable in light of the fact that for three years the Bridgewater DSU was a facility which "lacked facilities to meet basic standards of health and decent living", according to this Department's own press release announcing the closing of that unit. A basic purpose of this study originally was to provide statistics to facilitate the decision on whether or not to close that unit. If the department saw itself as treating people, as being humane, it wouldn't need statistics to shut down a pit the condition of which was well known to departmental decision-makers and best known to their charges who had done hard time there.

To be transferred to DSU one must commit a crime against the prison. DSU is a prison within the prison. Men are now sent there for being organizers (derogatory term=agitators). To transfer such men to segregation is to say that men who organize to demand to be treated as men are criminals for doing so. If a crime is involved here, it is the deprivation of men of their dignity, and the criminals need not be pointed out.

The author also feels a word must be said about the institution of disciplinary reports. Much of this study relies on these and other indicators of disciplinary records to establish the characteristics of individuals who did time in segregation. Standing alone, these statistics clearly show that these

men cause a great deal of trouble for the orderliness of the prison. It is assumed that the reason why men are transferred to segregation is because they are such problems. It is not clear at all, however, how much trouble the prison caused these men. There are no statistics in the above appendix which indicate how many men were provoked to finally strike back at what they recognized as their enemy. No variables are used to determine the kind treatment a man gets from his guards. Although a variable was used in this study called "Notable Events While in DSU", the information available in men's files was totally inadequate for making conclusive statements. Unless we are to assume that most men take correspondence courses, see the psychiatrist or go to court (on the charges for which they are already doing time in DSU before convicted after due process), then we must say that these records are incomplete. Even if there were a running record of the day to day happenings in the unit, it is too much to expect to find anyone implicated for anything wrong but the prisoner himself.

Shall the author assume that prisoners are basically different, that they are only capable of wanton violence? This is the only thing we can assume if guards are not assumed to be capable of the same, or more subtle kinds of violence. Can he assume that every time a disciplinary report is written that it is fair, a clearly necessary action for an obvious breach of just rules and regulations? Can he avoid thinking that if enough harassment occurs that it will not finally result in a man striking out at the one who harasses? This allowance is given to guards and police, evidently it cannot be given to people whose past actions have placed them in an environment universally agreed to be the worst possible for a man to live in.

It would be possible for the author to go on and on, ranting and raving his dissatisfactions. If the point can be made, however, it has been already. This unorthodox conclusion may need to be explained, though. The author is not sorry to have ever been involved with this study. It has shown him many things which he

will not forget. Therefore, this afterword is not in any way excusing him from the study. The study would not be a complete work, however, without this piece.