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Preface

This project was funded jointly by the AIDS Trust of Australia* and the NSW Department of Corrective Services (DCS). Its aim was to ascertain the feasibility of conducting a comprehensive and accurate study on changes in peoples HIV risk behaviours brought about by them being sentenced to imprisonment or detention within the NSW correctional system.

Assistance in the development and monitoring of the study, was provided by representatives from the National Centre for HIV Social Research (NCHSR), the National Drug and Alcohol Research Centre (NDARC); and staff from the Research & Statistics Unit, and Prison AIDS Project (PAP) of the NSW Department of Corrective Services.

The study has enabled us to determine whether it is worthwhile applying for further funding to carry out a full scale research project looking at the effect of imprisonment on peoples HIV risk behaviours. The type of information obtained from a comprehensive study of this type would be of invaluable assistance in the development of the future direction of HIV and AIDS educational and preventative programs, policies and strategies within the NSW correctional system.

I would like to acknowledge the assistance of Jan Cregan, Sue Kippax and June Crawford from NCHSR; Kate Dolan from NDARC; Gino Vumbaca from the PAP; Margaret Bowery, Maria Kevin and Simon Eyland from the Research and Statistics Unit of the DCS; Karen Boyko, Diane Scott, Flo Snell, Arthur McClough and Col Bezzant the Program Managers from the Correctional Centres visited; as well as all inmates who were interviewed and other DCS staff who assisted with the study.

Stephen Taylor
Research Officer
Prison AIDS Project
December 1994

* - The AIDS Trust of Australia is the only national non-government charitable trust which provides financial support to organisations which provide education, care and research related to HIV and AIDS.
Executive Summary

The discovery of the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) and how it is transmitted has had major ramifications throughout the world. In particular it raises many challenges for Public Health, Social and Correctional System service providers.

In Australia the two main ways HIV is transmitted are through high risk, or unprotected, sexual activity and through the sharing of needles and syringes that have not been effectively cleaned by injecting drug users.

To address the challenges HIV presents to those in the correctional system environment the Prison AIDS Project (PAP) was established in 1987 by the NSW Department of Corrective Services, with joint recurrent funding provided by the NSW Department of Health. PAP's objectives are to provide accurate educational and preventative policies, programs and services, for both inmates and staff and to minimise the transmission of HIV and other blood borne communicable diseases (BBCD’s) in NSW correctional centres.

It was felt, therefore, that a project that looked at the changes in risk behaviours brought about by imprisonment would provide important information for the PAP in meeting its objectives.

As there was no certainty about whether it was possible to obtain accurate information on the level of risk behaviours that occurred in the NSW correctional system, and to what extent (if any) they were attributable to imprisonment, it was decided to conduct a pilot study.

The aim of the pilot study was to see if it was possible to obtain information on people's risk behaviours or practices before and after imprisonment or detention. As such its aim was to develop and test the methodological approach and instruments to be used to obtain the data required. This report is the result of that pilot study.

The pilot study was primarily designed to test the following things:

a) the level of participation that could be expected from inmates for a study of this type;

b) the type of information inmates would discuss about how their lives (and risk behaviours) had changed due to imprisonment, and the extent to which they would discuss or disclose different types of information required;

c) the interview schedules designed to collect the desired information;

d) any logistical and/or practical problems associated with running a study of this type in the correctional system environment;

e) the feasibility of conducting a full scale research project that looks at all correctional centres;

f) the basis for a timetable for a larger NSW study, in particular, providing a guideline for time and costing requirements.

As such the pilot study did not aim to present any information obtained from inmates on any changes in their lives and
risk behaviours brought about by imprisonment or detention. It was aiming to test the viability of a study of this type and whether it would be worth investing the relatively large amounts of time and resources required to conduct a full scale study.

The results obtained show that it would clearly be feasible to conduct a larger representative study that looks at the changes in people’s HIV risk behaviours due to imprisonment.

The basic project methodology and design proved to be a successful formula for obtaining the type and quality of information required. With the pilot achieving an excellent participation rate (or non-refusal) rate of ninety point seven percent.

Furthermore, all of those interviewed willingly provided answers to all the areas covered by the interview schedule, and this resulted in many frank disclosures and discussion of their experiences during the interviews.

The interview schedules used proved to be effective in obtaining the type of information sought from inmates for the study and would require only relatively minor refinements and alterations for any further study that may be conducted.

No major logistical problems were encountered in conducting the study, and full co-operation was obtained from practically all the staff and inmates involved.

Additionally, where operational requirements required the lock-down of some of the centres visited, the utmost co-

operation was received in trying to maintain the project timetable and requirements by all those involved.

Therefore, the methods used to conduct and run the pilot study proved to be highly successful in ensuring it was able to be carried out in the timeframe set.

Overall this pilot study looking at risk behaviour changes can be seen to be successful in meeting the aims and objectives set for it. The study has enabled us to ascertain that people sentenced to imprisonment or detention are willing to frankly discuss their risk behaviours both before and after their imprisonment. It has also enabled us to test the methodologies and strategies used to obtain this information, and provides an excellent basis for conducting any future research projects in this area within the correctional system environment.
Introduction

The identification of the need to develop a project which looked at obtaining information on changes in people's HIV risk behaviours brought about by imprisonment (or detention) arose from informal discussions held at the Prison AIDS Project in 1993 and early in 1994.

It was decided that a project of this type would provide valuable information for determining and prioritising the future direction of HIV and AIDS educational and preventative programs, policies and strategies within the correctional system environment. A project such as this would provide important information on whether changes in HIV risk behaviours were related to any particular factor (or factors) associated with imprisonment or detention. Factors such as inmates length of sentence and classification; the security rating of the centre, its location, culture and operational environment. Or whether any changes were brought about by imprisonment itself and so were not affected by the different environmental situations or factors someone could find themselves in once sentenced. It followed then that the results from the findings of any such study could also potentially have an effect on the operational framework and activities of centres within the correctional system.

A project of this type, however, to be of any relevance, would require considerable financial and material resources and would need to be conducted over a two to three year time frame in order to obtain sufficient data and information for it to be of worthwhile significance.

Apart from the resource requirements of such a project, another important factor to consider was whether it would be possible to obtain any accurate information on the changes in people's risk behaviours brought about by imprisonment or detention. Especially when we consider the general social, morally sensitive, taboo, and often (within the correctional system) illegal nature of many of the risk activities associated with HIV transmission and infection. Activities which include unprotected sexual intercourse, injecting drug use, body piercing and the use of tattoo guns. These factors meant that even if resources were committed to such a project, the end results may turn out to be of no significance as people may not want to discuss, disclose or may lie about any changes that occurred in their risk behaviours because of their sentence.

Thus, it was decided that, before committing the considerable time and resources that would be required to undertake such a project, that a pilot/feasibility study would need to be conducted in order to establish whether it was possible to obtain the core research data required and to test any methodologies developed to obtain this information.

A pilot study brief was then developed and joint funding was sought from the Department of Corrective Services through their annual Research Program, the Prison AIDS Project and the AIDS Trust of Australia. By August of 1994 these submissions for funding were all approved and the project was able to commence. Details of the project brief developed are outlined below.
At this stage it should be noted that due to time and budget constraints, and for logistical and methodological reasons (for example, the need to develop gender specific interview schedules) that the pilot study would only look at the changes in men's HIV risk activities. Additionally, as men have the highest levels of HIV infection in the Australian community and also constitute around ninety-five percent of the NSW inmate population it was decided they would be the main focus of the pilot study. This however is not to devalue the importance of obtaining information on any changes in women's HIV risk behaviours brought about by imprisonment or detention and it is essential that any future study should incorporate both men and women within its scope.
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Project Brief

**TIMEFRAME:** Project to be run over 5 months. Employing one full-time project research officer.

**OBJECTIVE:** To undertake a pilot, feasibility study to see if it is possible to obtain data on the changes in men's HIV risk behaviours/practices brought about by imprisonment or detention.

**AIM:** To fully develop and test the methodologies designed for the project including interview schedules, logistical constraints, and the type and quality of information that may be obtained from inmates.

**PRIMARY TARGET GROUPS:** (1) Men who have sex with men due to imprisonment (a group previously not specifically targeted by any community based education campaigns - non-gay identified). (2) Injecting drug users. (3) Men who have tattoos while imprisoned. (4) Men who have body piercing while imprisoned.

**ACTIVITIES:** The primary activity set for the pilot, apart from developing the methodology for the study, was conducting closed, confidential, one-on-one interviews, with around fifty inmates. They were to be randomly selected, from four correctional centres and one periodic detention centre (PDC) - 1 medium country and metropolitan, 1 minimum country, 1 maximum country, 1 metropolitan PDC.

**IDENTIFIED NEEDS AND GOALS:**

- **Need** - To be able to appropriately target future HIV/AIDS educational and preventative programs, policies and strategies, so they take into account the changes in HIV risk behaviours and practices of people who are imprisoned.

  - **Short Term Goal** - To be able to ascertain, one way or the other, whether it is possible to obtain information on the changes in people's HIV risk behaviours and practices brought about by imprisonment or detention.

  - **Long Term Goal** - To have sufficient information on the effects of imprisonment on HIV risk behaviours and practices of inmates to be able to effectively target them for future HIV/AIDS educational and preventative programs, policies and strategies.

**RELATIONSHIP TO GOVERNMENT OBJECTIVES:** Minimisation of the transmission of HIV and other blood borne communicable diseases in Australia, both within and outside of the correctional system environment.

**MEASURE OF SUCCESS:** Project will be deemed to be successful if it is able to establish the extent to which it is possible to obtain core research data on the changes in men's HIV risk behaviours/activities brought about by imprisonment.

**MONITORING:** Project monitored by:

- Gino Vumbaca, Manager, PAP;
- Margaret Bowery, Research Officer, Research & Statistics Unit, DCS;
- Jan Cregan, Associate Professor Sue Kippax and Associate Professor June Crawford from the National Centre for HIV Social Research (NCHSR);
- Kate Dolan, Research Officer, National Drug & Alcohol research Centre (NDARC).
Development

The project was developed and conducted over a twenty week time frame which resulted in the production of this report. A chronology of the activities associated with carrying out the study are outlined in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WEEK</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Planning, co-ordination and liaison, finalise budget, Literature searches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Literature review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Develop methodologies, logistical and practical processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Develop interview schedules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Further develop draft interview schedules, submission for approval for payments for interviewees. Draft letters to be sent to Governors and Program Managers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Attend meetings at NCHSR and NDARC to consider draft interview schedules. Conduct pilot interview with inmate from Long Bay Correctional Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Review and finalised interview schedules, Follow up meeting at NCHSR. Organise interviews for Malabar mid-week PDC - co-ordinate with staff and send out letters to potential interviewees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Administration - copy and number interview schedules etc. Conduct interviews at Malabar mid-week PDC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Organise interviews for Metropolitan Training Centre, co-ordinate with staff and write letters to interviewees, Governor and Program Manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Distribute letters to interviewees, Governors and Program Managers at Tamworth, Maitland and Berrima Correctional Centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Conduct interviews at Metropolitan Training Centre - Long Bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Conduct interviews at Metropolitan Training Centre at Long Bay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Conduct interviews at Tamworth and Maitland Correctional Centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Conduct interviews at Berrima Correctional Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Organise and start coding analysis for interview schedules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Finalise coding and develop data input formatting for SPSS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Commence data input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Finalise data input and print out results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Write up results and prepare project report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Finalise draft project report for review and approval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Methodology

Inmates were selected for interview by obtaining a list of all inmates held at each centre approximately ten days before the interviews were scheduled to take place. All names on the lists obtained were then sequentially numbered and corresponding numbers were placed in a container for random selection. As it was uncertain as to what the actual turn up or acceptance rate for interviews would be, about twice as many inmates were selected to be sent information letters about the interviews than were required to attend interviews. In these letters (see Annex 1), the study was explained to them and they were also told that they may not necessarily be required for an interview.

At the same time that inmates were notified of the study, both the Program Managers and Governors at each centre were also notified of the study and asked for their co-operation and assistance in its completion—see Annex 1.

The scheduling of interviews was organised and co-ordinated through the Program Managers in each centre. With approximately one and half to two hours allowed for each interview.

A breakdown of the centres visited, the number and proportion of inmates interviewed, and the difficulties experienced with interviewing is outlined in the schedule of interviews contained in Annex 2.

Inmates were interviewed, where possible, in order of their random selection for the information letters, until the maximum sample required for that centre had been obtained. Of the fifty six interviews scheduled in total there were; (i) two that had to be cancelled due to insufficient time for completion (due to a "lock down" at Maitland correctional centre); (ii) two to which inmates did not show up, and; (iii) a further three where the inmates selected did not want to participate. This resulted in an excellent non-refusal or participation rate for the study of ninety point seven percent. Much of this result can be attributed to having obtained approval for paying those attending interviews ten dollars for their participation. Given many inmates only receive a base allowance of around thirteen dollars per week, this payment for their attendance provided a considerable incentive for many to turn up for the interviews. It should be noted however that many said or commented that they would have participated regardless of whether they were being paid or not. There is however little doubt that the participation rate would not have been as high had the incentive payment not been made, as many also said it was one of the reasons for their attendance. Therefore the inclusion of an incentive payment can be seen as an essential part of the methodology adopted for this project and would need to be accounted for in any costings for future projects.

As previously mentioned the aim of the study was to see the type and quality of data, if any, that could be obtained from men on the changes in their risk behaviours brought about by being sentenced to imprisonment or detention. As such, careful consideration was given to the design of the interview schedules and how they were handled.
For security reasons, anything that is taken into or out of a correctional centre can be inspected, this of course includes materials and documents used by anyone who has contact with the inmates. This requirement provided the first hurdle in the design of the interview schedules, as it meant that inmates would be reluctant to provide details on any risk activities - especially any injecting drug use - they may have been undertaking if they felt it could be easily traced back to them. In order to overcome this problem, a number of strategies were incorporated into the interview methodology. Firstly, no names were recorded on the interview schedules. Secondly, demographic information (which can fairly easily identify an individual) was obtained at the end of the interview and recorded on a separate schedule. Thirdly, both the interview and demographic schedules were randomly assigned non-correlating numbers to ensure they could not be matched up without the list that recorded these assignments; and finally, the interview schedules were kept apart in separate envelopes until all interviews had been completed. It was only after all interviews had been completed that the two parts of the interview schedules were re-linked back together (using the assignment sheet) in order to input the data obtained into the SPSS statistical package for analysis. These procedures were explained to each inmate at the start of each interview in order to alleviate any concerns they may have had concerning any disclosures they made. It was also felt they were essential in order to maintain the strictest confidentiality required by a project of this nature.

The next hurdle to overcome was to try and develop appropriate interview schedules. For this part of the methodology it was decided that the way the project was presented would play a crucial role in its success. After much consideration, it was decided that the interviews should adopt a holistic approach that looked at the overall changes in peoples’ lives that had occurred because of their being sentenced to imprisonment or detention. Of course the primary focus would centre around risk behaviours and activities, but these would be addressed in an overall context. This approach enabled two objectives to be met. Firstly, it enabled a rapport and trust to be established between the inmates and the interviewer; and secondly, it enabled the project to be presented in such a way that it would not alienate those who were selected to attend. That is, it was obvious from the beginning that if it was presented as a study looking at "AIDS stuff", many inmates would not want to participate and/or see the project as having no relevance to them.

Therefore, these were the reasons why the interview schedule was developed and presented using an overall or holistic focus which looked at the changes in inmates lives brought about by imprisonment, rather than specifically just asking about HIV related risk activities. As such the interview schedules were structured to obtain information on changes experienced by inmates due to imprisonment, in the following areas and manner:
(a) physical health - fitness and weight; dental/oral hygiene & services; diet and food; living conditions; illness; headaches, stress and sleeping; testing for HIV, Hepatitis and sexually transmitted diseases;
(b) drug use in the six months before imprisonment - whether they used: cigarettes/tobacco, alcohol, marijuana, heroin, street or clinic methadone, speed/amphetamines, cocaaines/crack,
risk behaviour
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trips/acid/LSD, ecstasy, mushrooms or karva, steroids, sniffers, pain killers, barbiturates, benzodiazepine, other medications. The frequency of use, amount used and the details of any injecting practices they participated in;

drug use in the last six months of imprisonment, both in their current and any other correctional centres - with the same details as covered in (b) above;

background information on those who had a history of injecting drug use;

inmates' perceptions on the levels of injecting drug use within the correctional system;

details of tattoos and tattooing - including perceptions of the number of inmates tattooing within the correctional system;

details on body piercing - including inmates' perceptions on the number of inmates doing body piercing within the correctional system;

inmates' experiences regarding the availability of bleach;

changes in inmates' social circumstances with family, friends, partners and children;

sexual activities/history mainly focused on the six months prior to imprisonment;

sexual activities during the last six months in their current or any other correctional centres;

details on how imprisonment had changed their sexual activities and how they felt about these changes; their sexual orientation; and who they preferred to have sex with;

any other changes in their lives that had not been covered, including how they felt things could be made better for people imprisoned, in particular with regard to drug use and sexual activities; and,

demographic information.

It should be noted that in designing the interview schedules much consideration was given to data collected and the methods used in many major Australian and overseas studies that have looked (or are looking) at HIV risk activities and behaviours. These studies included Project Male Call (Kippax et al, 1994), Bi-sexually Active and Non-Gay Attached Research (Hood et al, 1994), Australian National AIDS and Injecting Drug Use Study (ANAIDUS, 1992). Where possible comparable instruments or questions were used in order to maintain some comparability of results.

Furthermore the interview schedules had built into them reliability measures in order to provide checks on the quality and reliability of the data obtained. The main reliability measures incorporated into the interview schedules are outlined below:

1. questions relating to actual drug use prior to and during imprisonment or detention for cross checking with questions asking about prior injecting drug use history;

2. types of sexual partners and activities (both inside and outside of the correctional system) for cross checking with questions relating to self reporting.
of sexual orientation, sexual preference and social circumstances;
3. demographic information was collected that could be cross checked with information available from the department's inmate offender records system;
4. a number of questions were incorporated that will also be asked in the current study "Sexual Practice in Male Prisons: Implications for HIV Prevention" that is being conducted by Jan Cregan from NCHSR in order to provide cross-study reliability and comparative measures.

Though a great deal of interesting information was gained from conducting the interviews, which could in itself provide an interesting and relevant report. It was not within the scope of this project to provide a full detailed analysis of the data obtained from the interviews. This project was undertaken to test the methodology developed for the study and to ascertain the type and quality of information that could be obtained from the inmates interviewed.

As such this report will not directly present the result of the interviews, instead it will concentrate on the number and type of responses obtained, and whether there were any problems experienced in obtaining this information. It is within this context that the data obtained will be presented.
Discussion of Response Rates

For ease of interpretation the results have been split up into the main focus areas that were addressed in the interviews.

PHYSICAL HEALTH

For the area of physical health six major prompts were used to record any changes in inmates lives due to imprisonment.

These prompts and the results obtained are outlined below. For all results the sample size was forty nine (n=49), except for prompts marked with an * as they were not applicable to inmates interviewed from the periodic detention centre. In these instances the sample size was forty four (n=44). All inmates provided answers to all of these questions.

Following each major prompt is the proportion of inmates who provided a response to the prompt. For some of the major prompts, additional areas were raised by inmates and these, along with the proportion mentioning them have also been included below.

1. Fitness - 81.6%
   Weight - 83.7%
2. Dental Services* - 83.6%
3. Diet - 93.9%
   Food - 95.9%
   *Buy-Ups** - 65.9%
   *Cooking Facilities* - 61.4%
4. Living Conditions (Cell) - 83.7%
   • Yard - 36.7%
   • Visits* - 27.3%
   • General - 36.7%
5. New Illnesses - 100.0%
   • Pre-existing conditions - 16.3%
6. Other: Headaches - 55.1%
   Stress - 91.8%
   Sleeping - 75.9%

These results indicate that those inmates interviewed were very willing to discuss how their physical health had changed because of being sentenced to imprisonment or detention. All prompts achieved high to very high response rates. There appeared to be no concerns presented by inmates over any areas that were covered and the results reflected a wide diversity of experiences.

In addition to the six major prompts outlined above this part of the interview schedule was used to obtain information on the level of testing for HIV, Hepatitis and sexually transmitted diseases (STD's).

The number of inmates who were able to provide answers to the testing questions are outlined in the table on the following page.

From these results we can see that it was only for the Hepatitis viruses and HIV that the majority of inmates could provide answers as to whether they had been tested and the details of such tests. (It should be noted that between 5 November 1990 and 23 December 1994 the DCS has had a mandatory testing policy for HIV. Furthermore, many of the inmates interviewed stated that they were also tested for the different Hepatitis viruses when their HIV tests were done). Many inmates had received blood tests from doctors (or at clinics) but did not know, or could not remember, the details of these tests, and so
HIV Risk Behaviour Pilot Study - NSW Correctional System

could not provide any information about these tests in the interview.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Test</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hepatitis A</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepatitis B</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepatitis C</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonorrhoea</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herpes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syphilis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Specific Urethritis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genital Warts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrush</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A = Number who reported being tested.
B = Number who could remember when last test undertaken.
C = Number who reported having had a positive result.
D = Number whose last test was conducted within the correctional system.

Interestingly, of those who said they'd been tested for Hepatitis C, six of them (17.6%) had received positive test results for Hepatitis C antibodies. As there are no statistics currently published on the prevalence of Hepatitis C antibody positive inmates within the NSW correctional system, it is hard to comment on the representativeness of this particular result. There is, however, much anecdotal evidence that suggests the number of Hepatitis C antibody positive inmates is relatively high and this is supported by the results obtained. More importantly, in terms of the aims of the pilot study, it demonstrates inmates' willingness to disclose their seropositive status within the interviews.

These questions on testing for HIV, Hepatitis and STD's were incorporated into the interviews in order to ascertain if they could provide a further indicator of the level of sexual activity of inmates by using STD transmission rates as surrogate markers. Given the generally relatively poor levels of reporting for this section of the interview, it would appear to be of little benefit to include this part of the interviews in any larger study that is undertaken. If the results for these items were needed, it would seem a better strategy to obtain this type of information by surveying the clinics operating at each correctional centre which are run by the Corrections Health Service. Or combining this strategy with blood sample (finger prick) or saliva testing of those interviewed.

DRUG USE IN THE SIX MONTHS PRIOR TO IMPRISONMENT/DETENTION.

This section of the interview was designed to collect information of inmates' drug use in the six month period prior to being sentenced to imprisonment or detention. Thus any results obtained, once compared to their current drug use, could be used to determine any changes in their drug use patterns brought about by imprisonment.

The term drug was given a very broad definition for the purposes of the study and included both socially sanctioned drugs (such as cigarettes, pain killers and alcohol) and those that are illegal (such as heroin and amphetamines). This enabled the collection of a great deal of information on inmates drug use prior to imprisonment. There was only one problem encountered in the interviewing for this section, where one inmate did not want to disclose the actual...
amount of heroin he had been using on a daily basis prior to imprisonment - he did however provide all other details including those relating to injecting and sharing practices. The number of inmates providing responses to each of the areas in the interview schedule are outlined in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>A*</th>
<th>B*</th>
<th>C*</th>
<th>D*</th>
<th>E*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cigarettes/Tobacco</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Methadone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic Methadone</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed/Ampphetamines</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips/ACID/LSD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecstasy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mushrooms/Kava</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steroids</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sniffers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzo's</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain Killers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbiturates</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Medications</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A* = Number who reported use in the six months prior to imprisonment.  
B* = Number who reported frequency of use.  
C* = Number who reported quantity used.  
D* = Number who reported injecting drug.  
E* = Number who reported injecting details.

From these results we can see that inmates were willing to disclose the different types of drugs and use patterns they had been pursuing prior to imprisonment. Fifteen of them (30.6%) disclosed they had injected one or more types of drugs at least once (i.e., being active injecting drug users) during the six months prior to their imprisonment. This frank disclosure of past drug use can probably be attributable to the fact that inmates were given prior warning that they would be asked about their drug use, if any, as part of the interview. Potentially, there was also a negative impact which this prior warning may have had. This was to give the inmates the opportunity to think about whether they would disclose any drug use at all. Given that it is impossible to account for this factor, (and that it would be more than likely that people who did not want to disclose past drug use practices would be even less likely to do so on the spot), we can conclude that the results show little evidence of people deliberately not disclosing their prior drug use patterns. If anything, it appears to have prepared them to answer the questions relating to their prior drug use activities. As such it can be seen as a useful tool in obtaining the information required. In a full study the table used in the interview would need some refinement in its layout and a further breakdown of some of the categories (such as pain killers) would be needed in order to record the information obtained more accurately. The relatively minor deficiencies found in the table used for the pilot interviews were compensated for by the fact that there was only one person interviewing enabling consistency to be maintained.
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DRUG USE DURING THE LAST SIX MONTHS OF IMPRISONMENT/DETENTION.

This section of the interview schedule was divided into two sections. The first looked at inmates' drug use in their current correctional centre during the preceding six months, and the second looked at their drug use in any other centre they may have been in during this same period. The format and layout was kept the same as that used for the questions relating to their drug use prior to imprisonment in order to ensure consistency and comparability of data.

The idea behind setting up the methodology in such a way was to enable comparison to be made not only between drug use activities that occurred both outside of and within the correctional system, but also to highlight any changes that may arise because of movements within the system. The first table below shows different drug use activities that were reported by inmates within their current correctional centre during the preceding six months and the second the drug use patterns of inmates who had also been in other correctional centres during the last six months.

From these tables we can see the type of changes in drug use patterns reported by those inmates interviewed. An obvious result worth mentioning were the changes in the levels of drug use reported for the readily available "legal" drugs. For these drugs, as would be expected, there was little or no change in numbers of inmates providing information on their usage which suggests some consistency in their reporting (please note however, this is not to say the level, or frequency, of their usage of these drugs did not change).

Furthermore there was still a fairly high level of drug use reported for the "illegal" drugs, such as marijuana, where eleven inmates (22.4%) reported their levels of usage in the last six months in their current correctional centre. In addition three inmates (6.1%) reported using and injecting heroin during the last six months in their current centre.
The consistency of the injecting drug use reported was checked by using one of the reliability measures built into the study. This measure asked inmates about their history of injecting drug use. When this check was used and the cross-tabulation done (checking the last time they reported using fits with the length of time they had spent in their current correctional centre), there was complete correlation between the two sets of results reported. This is an excellent result for both instruments used to collect this information in the interview schedule. However, it should be noted that because of the relatively small numbers of inmates interviewed, it is not possible to say there would be complete correlation of these measures in any larger study. They do however appear to provide a fairly effective reliability measure to check the consistency of reporting of injecting drug use by inmates. In addition, in the process of completing this exercise, it was found a couple of refinements could be made to the collection instruments to further improve their reliability - such as (i) not only asking when the last injecting drug practice took place but also what was injected, and (ii) recording with greater accuracy the timeframes/dates of relevance for these measures. Another area of potential concern was that no inmate reported having consumed any alcohol during the preceding six month period. It is hard to say whether this just reflected the reality within those correctional centres included in the pilot, or whether inmates did not equate "Goal Brew" with alcohol. In order to ascertain this issue more clearly it was suggested that the interview schedule should be modified to include "Goal Brew" as a separate category in the drug use schedules.

### HISTORY OF INJECTING DRUG USE.

In order to check the consistency of injecting drug use, inmates were asked questions about their history of injecting drug use. The number of inmates providing responses to these sections of the interviews are outlined below:

- having ever injected drugs - 49 (20 saying "Yes");
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PERCEPTIONS OF INJECTING DRUG USE WITHIN THE NSW CORRECTIONAL SYSTEM.

Information was obtained on the type of drug use undertaken by inmates both before and during imprisonment. In addition, the methodology was designed to see if inmates would (or could) provide estimates on injecting drug use practices within the NSW correctional system.Outlined below is a summary of the questions asked followed by the number of inmates who were willing to answer the question. The figures in brackets refer to the number of inmates who provided an estimate for the percentage of inmates involved in the activity.

- Percentage of inmates who injected drugs in prison when available - 49 (35);
- Percentage of inmates who injected drugs that used shared fits - 49 (20);
- Percentage of inmates who injected drugs, shared fits and cleaned their fits - 49 (21);
- Provided an explanation of why they thought inmates didn't clean their fits - 49 (21).

These results show that all those interviewed were willing to answer the questions asked in this section, however, not all of them felt they knew enough to provide actual estimates for each question. By looking at the information provided by those who could give us estimates, in a larger study, we would be able to compare a number of things. Firstly, inmates perceptions on the levels of injecting drug use; secondly, how their perceptions compared to the levels of injecting drug use actually reported and whether there was any consistency with the levels reported, and; finally how the estimates provided from

The results show a relatively high level of reporting of injecting drug use (at one time or another) by those inmates interviewed, and a willingness by these inmates to disclose the details of their injecting drug usage. Twenty inmates (40.8%) reported having had an injecting drug use history, but only eight of them had injected in the previous six months, and only three of these while in the correctional system.

...
such a study compared to similar data collected through education programs run by the Prison AIDS Project, and any other studies looking at these issues. As such this part of the interview schedule could potentially provide some interesting sociological data on perceived levels versus actual levels of injecting drug use within the correctional system.

CHANGES IN DRUG USE ACTIVITIES

The final section of the drug use part of the interview schedule was designed to see if inmates would provide some comments on how their drug use activities had changed because of imprisonment and how they felt about these changes. In addition they were asked if they felt they had a drug or alcohol problem, and what (if any) kind of help they had received for this problem upon imprisonment. The number of inmates who provided answers to these questions are outlined below:

- how prison had changed their drug use - 49;
- how they felt about the changes to their drug use brought about by imprisonment - 49;
- whether they felt they had a drug or alcohol problem before imprisonment - 46 (23 said "No");
- reported type of help, if any, received for drug or alcohol problem they had - 25.

These results clearly show inmates openly discussed the changes in their drug use activities and how they felt about them in the interviews. In order to provide further data for analysis of these issues, the demographic section contained questions asking inmates whether their crime was related to drugs or alcohol or involved them as contributing factors.

TATTOOING

This part of the interview schedule was used to find out about the inmates experiences and perceptions on tattooing. Inmates freely provided information on the number of tattoos they had, when they had their last tattoo, cleaning practices, along with the number they had received outside and inside the correctional system. They were then asked if they could provide estimates on the level of tattooing occurring inside correctional centres. The response rates obtained are outlined below.

- whether had any tattoos - 49;
- number of tattoos they had - 25;
- when had last tattoo - 25;
- when last had a tattoo with a gun used on someone else - 25;
- details of how tattoo gun cleaned (if at all) last time had a tattoo - 25;
- number of tattoos they had obtained outside of prison - 25;
- details of tattoo gun cleaning (if at all) for tattoos received outside of prison - 23;
- number of tattoos they had received in their current correctional centre - 25;
- details of tattoo gun cleaning (if applicable) for tattoos received in their current correctional centre - 2;
- number of tattoos they had received in other correctional centres - 25;
- details of tattoo gun cleaning (if applicable) for tattoos received in other correctional centres - 14.

The amounts in brackets after the following response rates refer to the number
of inmates who felt able to provide an estimate for the question asked of them.

- percentage of inmates who used tattoo guns while in prison - 49 (31);
- percentage of inmates who shared tattoo guns while in prison - 49 (25);
- percentage of inmates who had tattoos, shared guns and cleaned the tattoo guns - 49 (18);
- provide an explanation of why they thought inmates didn't clean tattoo guns - 49 (13).

These results show that all those interviewed were willing to answer the questions asked in this section, however, not all of them felt they knew enough to provide actual estimates for each question. Many commented that the amount of tattooing occurring in the correctional system had dramatically decreased since the change in the personal property rules introduced in September 1990 and again amended in 1993. The change resulted in the virtual elimination of audio tape players, which were the main source for providing the motors required for "home-made" tattoo guns.

BODY PIERCING

Like the tattooing section of the interview schedule, the section on body piercing was designed to see if inmates were willing to provide details on their experiences and perceptions both within and outside of the correctional system, but with the focus being on body piercing activities. The number of inmates who responded to each question are outlined below, again there were no problems experienced with getting inmates to talk about these activities. The only issues seemed to be that many had no experience of any sort with body piercing activities and so were unable to provide any information for parts of this section of the interview.

- Whether they had any parts of their body pierced - 49 (21 said "No");
- number of piercing they had - 28;
- last time they were pierced - 28;
- whether their piercing was done inside or outside of prison - 28 (only 3 in prison);
- where had their piercing done - 28;
- who did their piercing - 28;
- what was used for each piercing - 28;
- whether object used for each piercing had been cleaned - 28;
- what was done (if anything), to clean the object(s) used to do their piercing - 28.

The amounts in brackets after the following response rates refer to the number of inmates who felt able to provide an estimate for the question asked of them.

- percentage of inmates who had parts of their body pierced while inside prison - 49 (25);
- percentage of inmates having piercing done inside prison who cleaned the implement used to do the piercing - 49 (7).

These results show that relatively few of them (25 or 51%) were able to provide any estimate on the levels of body piercing being undertaken in the correctional system and inmates did not feel confident in providing estimates for the number of inmates who were cleaning the objects they used for piercing. Therefore the importance and relevance of a section covering body piercing practices would need to be carefully considered for any future study.
AVAILABILITY OF BLEACH

The questions in this part of the interview were used to discover inmates' knowledge of the DCS policy on the availability of bleach for inmates and what their experience had been with trying to obtain bleach. All inmates answered every question in this section. It was included to provide a measure of inmates' experiences with bleach and as such was a valuable tool for obtaining the type of information required. As such this section would provide invaluable information for the review, monitoring and modification of the DCS bleach policy.

- whether they knew if the DCS had a policy on the supply of bleach to inmates - 49 (33 said "No");
- whether they'd tried to get bleach for general cleaning 49 (30 said "No");
- ease they had in getting bleach for general cleaning - 19;
- whether they'd tried to get bleach for cleaning tattoo guns or fits - 49 (38 said "No");
- ease they had in getting bleach for cleaning tattoo guns or fits - 11
- whether they had ever been in trouble for having had bleach while in prison - 49 (49 said "No").

CHANGE IN SOCIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

This section on the change in inmates' social circumstances was primarily included to maintain and build on the trust and rapport already established in the interviews before the areas of sexual activities were covered. The questions were designed to obtain a more intimate and personal perspective on how inmates' lives had changed because of imprisonment or detention. For all questions the sample size was forty nine (n=49), except for those relating to visits as they were not applicable to inmates interviewed from the periodic detention centre in these instances the sample size was forty four (n=44).

- details of what their relationship was like with their partner and/or children before prison - 49;
- details of what their relationship was like with their parents, siblings and relatives before prison - 49;
- whether they received any visits - 49;
- details of their visits (if any) - 44;
- whether any of their visitors were their regular sex partner outside of prison - 44;
- what they discussed with their visitors - 44;
- how things had changed with their partner because of being sentenced - 49;
- how things had changed with their children because of their sentence - 49;
- how things had changed with their parents, relatives and siblings because of their sentence - 49;
- how things had changed with their friends because of their sentence - 49;
- how they felt about the overall change in their social circumstances because they had been sentenced to imprisonment - 49.

The results clearly show all those interviewed for the pilot study were willing to discuss the impact imprisonment or detention had on their social circumstances. Given in a larger study there would be more than one interviewer, minor layout and structuring review would be needed for this section of the interview schedule in order to
record the information obtained in the most consistent and accurate manner.

**SEXUAL ACTIVITIES IN THE SIX MONTHS PRIOR TO IMPRISONMENT/DETENTION.**

This section of the interview was designed to collect information of inmates sexual activities in the six month period prior to being sentenced to imprisonment or detention. Thus any results obtained, once compared to their current sexual activities, could be used to determine the impact imprisonment had made on their sexual activities.

The response rates for these parts of the interview are outlined below:

**Identified Sexual Partners prior to imprisonment or detention.**
- Who their sexual partners were in the six months before they came to prison 49 (1 "with men only", 1 "transsexual only", 1 "mostly with women and sometimes with men", 1 "with no-one" and the remaining 45 or 93.7% "with women only");
- number of regular female, male and transsexual sex partners they had in the six months before they came to prison - 49;
- number of casual female, male and transsexual sex partners they had in the six months before the came to prison - 49.

**Condom usage prior to imprisonment or detention.**
- Whether they had ever used condoms - 49 (17 said "No" and 18 "Only a few times");
- whether they would use condoms if asked to - 49 (6 said "No");
- if they used condoms with their regular sex partners - 48 (28 said "No");
- reason don't use condoms with their regular sex partner - 48 (16 said "because they're my partner" and 7 said "don't like using them");
- if they used condoms with their casual sex partners - 14 (4 said "No");
- reason they don't use condoms with their casual sex partners - 14.

**Differences in sexual practices with different categories of sexual partners prior to imprisonment or detention.**
- Details of anything they would do with their regular female sex partner that they would not do with their regular male sex partner - 1;
- Details of anything they would do with their regular female sex partners and not their casual female sex partners - 14;
- Details of anything they would do with their casual female sex partners and not their regular female sex partners - 14.

**Basis of sexual relationships with partners.**
- Whether outside of prison their relationships were supposed to be sexually monogamous - 49 (43 said "Yes");
- whether outside of prison their relationship was sexually monogamous - 49 (24 said "Yes");
- whether while they were in prison they thought their partner was sexually monogamous - 49 (22 said "Yes");
- whether while they were in prison they thought their partner worried about them having sex - 49 (6 said "Yes").
Knowledge of HIV and Hepatitis.

- If they knew how they could get HIV or Hepatitis B or C when having sex with people - 49 (6 said "No");
- they could describe how they thought they could get HIV or Hepatitis B or C when having sex with people - 43;
- if they knew how they could stop getting HIV or Hepatitis B or C when having sex with people - 49 (6 said "No");
- they could describe how they thought you could stop getting HIV or Hepatitis B or C when having sex with people - 43.

Identified sexual activities involving payment or force.

- If in the six months before prison they were ever paid or forced to have sex with anyone - 49, and if they could provide details of this - 2;
- If in the six months before prison they ever paid or forced anyone else to have sex with them - 49, and if they could provide details of this - 9.

The response rates obtained for these questions were generally high to very high, which reflected inmates willingness to frankly discuss their sexual activities in the interviews. Given the sensitive nature of many of the questions asked and the level and type of responses received it would appear that this part of the interview schedule was successful in obtaining information on inmates' sexual activities in the six months prior to imprisonment.

SEXUAL ACTIVITIES DURING THE LAST SIX MONTHS IN CORRECTIONAL CENTRES.

This part of the interview schedule was designed to see if inmates would discuss sexual activity within the correctional system during the preceding six months of their sentence. As unprotected sexual activity is the major means of transmission of HIV in Australia, it was important to examine the extent to which inmates would disclose their sexual activities within the correctional system. Furthermore given that sex between men is still generally regarded as socially unacceptable, the need to ascertain the extent to which men in prison would discuss the subject was of interest. Thus the interview schedule was divided into six sections:

1. the type and extent of sexual activity undertaken in inmates' current correctional centre in the previous six months - including whether any of it was forced or paid for;
2. the type and extent of sexual activity undertaken in other correctional centres inmates' may have been in during the previous six months - including whether any of it was forced or paid for;
3. whether they felt inmates should be allowed condoms inside correctional centres and whether they thought inmates would use condoms if they were available, and any reasons they gave for their answers;
4. their perceptions on the level of different types of sexual activities that took place within the correctional system, including the proportion of men involved in these activities;
5. whether they could provide any information on any sexual assaults that had occurred within their or any other correctional centres in the preceding six months, and finally;
6. how being sentenced to prison had changed their sexual activities and how they felt about these changes, what they considered their sexual orientation to be.
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and who they preferred to have sex with.

It should be noted at this stage the pilot sample was by no means meant to be a representative sample of the NSW correctional system. Indeed it contained five inmates from a periodic detention centre (who only attend the centre for two days a week), six inmates with C3 security classifications which made them eligible for day leave from their centres, and another six inmates who where held at the Berrima Correctional Centre where all but six of the sixty five inmates have single cell accommodation. In addition because most of the pilot sample was drawn from centres with minimum or medium security classifications, twenty one of those interviewed (47.9%) had a sentence length of less than two years.

In light of these characteristics of the sample, the response rates for the six areas covered in this section of the interview schedule are outlined below:

Sexual activities while in prison or detention.
• if they had sex or "gotten off" with anyone in their current correctional centre in the last six months - 49 (49 said "No");
• what they had done for sexual release in any other correctional centres they had been in the last six months - 12 (4 abstained and 8 masturbated);
• whether they had been paid or forced to have sex with anyone in any other correctional centres they had been in the last six months - 12 (12 said "No");

Attitudes towards the availability of condoms in the correctional system.
• Whether they thought inmates should be allowed to have condoms in prison - 49 (42 said "Yes"), and the reason for their answer - 49
• Whether they thought inmates would use condoms if they were available and in prison - 49 (38 said "Yes" & 10 "Didn't know"), and the reason for their answer - 47.

Any future study should also consider the inclusion of more attitudinal indicators that relate to the treatment of HIV or Hepatitis C antibody positive inmates - such as whether they should be segregated or not.

The results obtained from these types of questions would assist in the targeting of educational strategies and programs that address such issues (such as discrimination) that are provided by the Prison AIDS Project.

Inmates perceptions of sexual activities occurring in the correctional system.
The amounts in brackets after the following response rates refer to the number of inmates who felt able to provide an estimate for the question asked of them.
• Percentage of inmates who undertook no form of sexual release or activity - 49 (28);
• percentage of inmates who masturbated by themselves - 49 (38);
\* percentage of inmates who masturbated with others - 49 (18);
\* percentage of inmates who had oral sex - 49 (21);
\* percentage of inmates who had anal sex - 49 (20);
\* percentage of inmates who had other types of sex (eg D&B, S&M etc) - 49 (14);
\* percentage of inmates who had sex with other men only when they were in prison - 49 (21);
\* percentage of inmates who were men who had sex with men outside of prison as well - 49 (22).

Levels of sexual assaults in the correctional system.
\* Whether they'd heard of any sexual assaults that had occurred in their current correctional centre in the last six months - 49, and the details of these assaults - 12;
\* Whether they'd heard of any sexual assaults that had occurred in any other correctional centres in the last six months - 13, and the details of these assaults - 8;

Effect of imprisonment or detention on inmates' sexual activities.
\* How being sentenced to imprisonment or detention had changed their sexual activities - 49;
\* How they felt about the change in their sexual activities - 49

From these results we can again see that those inmates interviewed were willing to discuss all the areas they were questioned on in these parts of the interview, although it could be taken as an unrealistic result that none of them reported any sexual activities with other men during the last six months. Given the type of sample chosen for the pilot and the frankness to which inmates discussed and disclosed all areas of their sexual activities (including their sexual orientation) it should be seen as probably reflecting the reality of the situation for those inmates interviewed. Interestingly, one inmate did disclose that they had a regular transsexual sexual partner (their co-accused & sentenced) while in prison, and two inmates admitted to having had male sexual partners in prison, but none of these three situations had occurred in the preceding six months. In light of this finding due consideration would need to be given to the timeframe of reference that these types of questions relate to in any further study that was to take place. In addition, any future study should also incorporate into its structure some attitudinal indicators to determine how inmates feel about different types of sexual activities and orientations. This would supplement and compliment the other data collected and enable some comparisons of attitudes with behaviour patterns and perhaps help provide some explanation for any inconsistencies that may occur.

Identified Sexual Orientations.
\* How they would describe themselves sexually - 49 (3 "Bisexual", 1 "Gay" & 43 "Straight")
\* Who they preferred to have sex with - 49 (48 "Women" & 1 "Men")
The last three questions of the interview were open ended questions designed to give the inmates the opportunity to bring up any issues that had not been covered in the interview. As such it was their opportunity to provide additional information on how things could have potentially been made better; for them when they were sentenced to imprisonment or detention, or what types of things could be done to reduce any drug use or sexual activities taking place within the correctional system. As the results below show, most of those interviewed took the opportunity to provide some feedback on these issues in the interviews.

- Any other things they wanted to talk about how their lives had changed because of imprisonment and how this could be improved - 45;
- what could be done about drug use and imprisonment - 42;
- what could be done about sex and imprisonment - 44.

DEMographics

After having conducted the in-depth interview that they had just attended, the disclosure of personal background and demographic information presented no problem to those interviewed. Thus, full details for the demographic questions were supplied by all 49 inmates interviewed. This would enable a full demographic profile to be drawn up and used to assist in the analysis of the data obtained in the interviews. In particular, interesting information was reported in this section on inmates relating to how, or if, their sentence was related to drugs or alcohol.

It should be mentioned that the study was successful in recruiting inmates from a diverse range of ethnic and cultural backgrounds. These included six Aboriginal or Torres Straight Islanders, four inmates who did not use English as their main language outside of the correctional system (resulting in one interview being successfully conducted using an interpreter, who was a friend of the interviewee), five inmates from an Arabic/Lebanese background, nine from a European background and three from an Asian cultural background.

Furthermore, a sample of the demographic questions could be used as a reliability measure by cross checking the data provided by inmates with that contained on the inmate offender records system. This could be used to highlight those inmates who did not provide any consistent or factual data in their responses. As such this reliability measure could potentially be used to estimate (and allow for) the proportion, if any, of inmates who did not provide reliable information during the interviews. Due to the time limitations associated with this pilot study, full testing of this reliability instrument was unable to be conducted, but should be considered for incorporation in any future study.
Conclusion

The primary aim of this pilot study was to see if it was possible to obtain information on people's risk behaviours or practices before and after imprisonment or detention. As such, it set out to develop and test the methodological approach and instruments to be used to obtain the data required.

From the results presented in this report we can conclude that the pilot study was successful in ascertaining the following:

a) the level of participation that could be expected from inmates for a study of this type;

b) the type of information inmates would discuss about how their lives (and risk behaviours) had changed due to imprisonment, and the extent to which they would discuss or disclose different types of information required;

c) the suitability of the interview schedules designed to collect the desired information;

d) the logistical and/or practical problems that may be encountered in running a study of this type in the correctional system environment;

e) the feasibility of conducting a full scale research project that looks at all correctional centres;

f) the basis for a timetable for a larger study, in particular, providing a guideline for time and costing requirements.

The basic project methodology and design proved to be a successful formula for obtaining the type and quality of information required. With the pilot achieving an excellent participation rate (or non-refusal) rate of 90.7%.

Furthermore, all of those interviewed willingly provided answers to all the areas covered by the interview schedule, and this resulted in many frank disclosures and discussion of their experiences during the interviews.

The interview schedules used proved to be effective in obtaining the type of information sought from inmates for the study and would require only relatively minor refinements and alterations for any further study that may be conducted. No major logistical problems were encountered in conducting the study, and full cooperation was obtained from practically all the staff and inmates involved.

Therefore, the methods use to conduct and run the pilot study proved to be highly successful in ensuring it was able to be carried out in the timeframe set.

Overall this pilot study looking at risk behaviour changes has been successful in meeting the aims and objectives set for it. The study has enabled us to ascertain that people sentenced to imprisonment or detention are willing to frankly discuss their risk behaviours both before and after their imprisonment. It has also enabled us to test the methodologies and strategies used to obtain this information, and provides an
excellent basis for conducting any future research projects in this area within the correctional system environment.
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