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Most correctional systems include pre-parole community placements. This study followed 114 inmates released to halfway house placement in one Michigan county over six years to determine the harm these inmates inflicted on the host community through new crime during halfway house placement and for three years following parole. Their criminal behavior was compared to statistical expectancies of criminal behavior for similar risk parolees. In a second analysis, the volume and seriousness of their criminal behavior was compared with non-comparable parolee controls. In both analyses, the extent and seriousness of crime by experimentals were comparable to that of controls. Criminal activity of experimentals was also compared before and after placement selection processes changed. The second time period group had lower felony rates, especially non-violent offenses during halfway house placement, despite being considered higher risk offenders on several dimensions. Selective incapacitation and reintegration theoretical models were applied to the findings.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Community corrections were hailed twenty years ago as "the most important breakthrough in this century for increasing the rate of prisoner rehabilitation" (Glaser, 1964, p. 415). Although subsequent developments raise serious questions about the accuracy of that prediction, there is no question that the community corrections movement has dominated the field of corrections since.

As with any new development, community corrections rests upon the successes and failures of preceding practices. Following an emphasis on revenge as a correctional model, the primary focus over the last few centuries has been upon confinement, institutionally embodied in jails and prisons. Punishment was the sentencing objective emphasized, indirectly contributing to goals of defining societal norms and leading to deterrence.

Reformers of the nineteenth century, while not rejecting previous goals, shifted the focus of correctional intervention from a backward look at offenders' actions to consideration of offenders' potential future behavior. Prisons remained to fulfill the objectives noted above, but these institutions were relabeled "reformatories," and a goal of rehabilitation took precedence over other correctional objectives. Rehabilitative programs were developed in penal institutions, but the primary expression of the rehabilitation model was the development of probation and parole services. Dealing with the
offender in the community has been accepted to the extent that in most jurisdictions 50% or more of the sentencing dispositions are for probation. Probation continues to be viewed as a viable means of implementing societal goals in the criminal intervention process, and rehabilitation remains a primary sentencing objective. About 75% of all offenders under correctional supervision are currently in the community (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1983, p. 74).

For many years there has been a growing perception that rehabilitation has not been occurring in the prison-parole therapeutic process. Critics point to specific problems within the correctional facilities and to problems inherent in the institutional process. Especially in the last fifteen to twenty years, prisons have become overcrowded and inadequate to the extent that in 1983 twenty-nine state correctional systems were operating under court orders to improve conditions and litigation was pending in seven other states (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1983, p. 80). These conditions have led to an atmosphere of despair and violence in prisons.

An even larger impediment to rehabilitation is the institutionalization process itself. Life in an institutional setting does not prepare offenders to return to legitimate society. The violence breeds a survivalist mentality and distrust not productive later in the workplace or in close relationships with other persons. Inmates are alienated from family and other sources of community support and legitimate patterns of behavior while constantly exposed to negative behavioral styles. Institutions by their nature are regimented.
Many of the day-to-day decisions are made for the offender. This does not prepare him/her to make the most basic decisions after release.

The community corrections movement, focusing on reintegration, began as an attempt to enhance rehabilitation, not as a replacement for it as some have suggested. Some authors have cited the competing objectives of custody and control versus rehabilitation (Doeren and Hageman, 1982, p. 6) and the fact that therapy cannot effectively be "directed against the prisoner" (Johnson in Sandhu, 1981, p. viii) as a justification for taking the rehabilitation process outside of the prison setting. However, all correctional intervention is coercive in nature, whatever the correctional setting. The difference in community corrections is the perceived source of crime and the means of combating it. The therapeutic model focuses upon the offender, making him/her responsible for individual behavior with correctional workers defining and implementing what they deem to be appropriate interventions. Community corrections recognizes that many of the sources of criminality are symptoms of the failures and disorganization of the community as well as individual offenders....The task of corrections therefore includes building or rebuilding solid ties between the offender and the community, integrating or reintegrating the offender into community life....This requires...efforts toward changing the individual...[and] mobilization and changes of the community and its institutions. (President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, 1967, p. 7)

This reintegrative model still emphasizes rehabilitation of the offender with the accompanying objective of the alteration of
community institutions which will prevent rather than deter future criminal acts by the offender and others. This model attempts to direct social group pressure on the offender toward conformity. Involvement rather than isolation of the offender is believed to enhance prosocial attitudes and behavior.

Just as the punishment/restraint model found its best expression in prisons and the treatment/rehabilitation model for less serious offenders is most clearly seen in probation, the new reintegration/rehabilitative model is most clearly associated with the use of halfway houses and other intensive treatment settings in the community for more serious or persistent offenders.

Keeping offenders in the community has become a primary objective, but other correctional goals of punishment and incapacitation have remained important considerations in the sentencing decision. Critics have questioned whether community corrections can be pursued without posing immediate dangers to society from the criminal participants who otherwise would have been incapacitated and wonder what effects less severe punishment may have on present offenders and the deterrence of future ones.

Despite these concerns, following the lead of the Federal government, many jurisdictions began experimenting with these programs in the 1960s. Community corrections includes both the diversion of offenders from prison to intensive community programs and selective release of offenders from institutional settings to placements in the community. Evaluations of such programs began, and by the 1970s questions were being raised about the rehabilitative results of such
programs. However, at the same time many prison systems were becoming seriously overcrowded. While not demonstrating consistent improvements in recidivism, results of such studies seemed to support the conclusion that offenders could be retained in or returned to the community without posing undue public danger. Community corrections have come to be viewed as cost-efficient safety valves for the overcrowded prison systems. Under these pressures, pre-release community programs have become integrated into the correctional systems of many states and in many instances have actually expanded.

The Problem

The present study is taking place in this pragmatic atmosphere. Many will concede that placing inmates in the community prior to parole does not result in lower recidivism. If, however, increased recidivism does not occur and community programs can operate at lower costs, or even comparable costs while eliminating the need to construct new prisons, community corrections can be justified as correctional policy. Questions, of course, will remain about offenders not receiving their "just desserts" and the possible negative effects on deterrence from such practices.

Pre-parole programs have existed in the State of Michigan for more than twenty years. These consist of Correction Centers and Resident Home Programs. Correction Centers are staffed 24 hours a day by Department of Corrections employees, while Resident Home Programs are contractual arrangements with community organizations or individuals to provide housing for inmates. Departmental employees
still maintain overall supervision and administer discipline, but
day-to-day oversight is provided by private parties in Resident Home
Programs.

Very little research beyond a descriptive nature has been done
in the State of Michigan (Community Corrections Resource Programs,
1974; Johnson, 1978; Murphy, 1983), and most of the studies done
elsewhere have concentrated on measuring program effects on the parti-
cipants. The viability of the Community Residential Programs (CRP)
operated by the Michigan Department of Corrections is essentially
a product of the selection process and subsequent programming which
is followed. Thus, an important question beyond whether halfway
house participation changes offenders is whether offenders can be
released on a selective basis into a community from prison without
posing an increased risk of harm to that community? Further, can the
community be "at risk" for a longer period of time (including both
the pre-parole and parole period, while traditionally only at risk
during the parole period) without experiencing additional damage
from the participant group?

At this time, for practical reasons, pre-release programs are a
part of most correctional systems in this country. As with many
other correctional programs, they may not be either "right" or
"wrong" but rather appropriate or inappropriate for given offenders
in given settings or in certain time frames. This study will assess
the experience of one county in Michigan over a nine year period.
The main focus will be a comparison of the "damage" or harm to the
community as measured by subsequent criminal behavior by a group of
participants in a Resident Home Program with damage done by a group of non-participants.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Relationship Between Institutional Treatment/ Length of Confinement and Recidivism

The greatest impetus in the development of community corrections was the perception that correctional institutions were not reforming offenders. Some of the earliest researchers to draw this conclusion were the Gluecks (1930), who stated that none of the methods used to treat offenders at that time led to any measurable difference in their subsequent criminal behavior. More recently, some authors have reviewed available literature on the relationship between various types of institutional treatment and post-release criminal behavior and have drawn similar conclusions (Bailey, 1966; Hood, 1971; Logan, 1972; Logan, 1977; Moos, 1975; Shireman, Mann, Larson and Young, 1972; Ward, 1973). Some specific studies did claim improved performance of experimentals, but these differences disappeared with structural changes or with time (Goldberg and Adams, 1964, cited in Martinson, 1974, p. 33; Shireman et al., 1972).

A major problem in these studies was addressed by several authors and is applicable to almost all research in the field of corrections. Logan (1972) pursued the point most thoroughly. In applying seven criteria of what he deemed to be minimal methodological requirements to one hundred studies of all kinds of correctional treatment programs, he found no studies which met all seven. He
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concluded in a later article that, "it seems to be extremely difficult to provide methodologically valid assessments of the effects of any given correctional program on recidivism" (1977, p. 425). Bailey drew similar conclusions, noting that "evidence supporting the efficacy of correctional treatment is slight, inconclusive, and of questionable validity" (1966, p. 157).

In light of the above findings, questions have been raised about whether rehabilitation can be better accomplished through less restrictive custody or through an earlier release of offenders from institutions. The effects such steps might have on certain sentencing objectives such as normative reinforcement and deterrence are difficult to assess and will not be directly addressed in this discussion.

Fox found that "older youths" who were rated as good future risks did better following release from a medium security prison than similar offenders placed in a maximum security prison (1950).

Large-scale releases of inmates have occurred throughout history without significant differences noted in the reconviction rates of those completing prison terms and those receiving early releases (Council of Europe, 1967, cited in Harlow, Weber and Wilkins, 1971, p. 27). In 1971 and 1972 the State of Massachusetts closed all of its juvenile institutions without reportedly experiencing any increased recidivism (Rutherford, 1974, cited in Greenberg, 1975, p. 21; Sandhu, 1981, p. 226). Berecickea, Jaman and Jones (1973) found no relationship between sentence length and parole outcome, and Babst, Moseley, Schmeidler, Neithercutt and Koval (1976) drew
similar conclusions in a follow-up study of drug users. Garrity (1956, cited in Martinson, 1974, p. 37) concluded that offenders with "prosocial" attitudes do well regardless of sentence length, "antisocial" offenders do better with shorter sentences and "manipulative" offenders show improved post-release behavior with longer sentences. In a study in Denmark, Bernsten and Christiansen found indications that offenders receiving sentences of three months or less did much better following release than comparable offenders who received sentences of eight months or more (1965, cited in Martinson, 1974, p. 37). The above differences disappeared, however, for recidivists. Results of other studies with recidivists are not consistent. Hammond and Chayen (1963, cited in Martinson, 1974, p. 37) found no improvement in recidivism for second offenders following a reduction in sentence. Martinson summarized two studies from Great Britain concluding that perhaps adult recidivists do better with longer sentences while shorter sentences are more effective with juvenile recidivists (1974, pp. 37, 38). In general, early release has resulted in as good, occasionally better, post-release adjustment (Crowther, 1969, cited in Harlow et al., 1971, p. 27; Martinson, 1974, pp. 36, 37; Robison and Smith, 1971). Lipton, Martinson and Wilks (1975, pp. 81-83) concluded that offenders serving shorter and longer sentences appear to do better following release than those serving intermediate prison terms, especially if they are first offenders.

Other than parole, which is an institutionalized mechanism for early release, the most widely used partial custody arrangement has
been work release, extant in this country since 1913. Although the concept is appealing intuitively, there was very little research to substantiate its value. Waldo, Chiricos and Dobrin (1973) summarized the findings of research to that time: work release participants had lower recommitment rates than non-participants. Two studies, Adams and Dellinger (1969, cited in Waldo et al., 1973, p. 349) and California Department of Corrections (1975, cited in Austin and Krisberg, 1982, pp. 387-388), asserted that participants did worse than non-participants. As in many correctional research projects, all of the studies were limited by not having a truly comparable control group. That problem was eliminated in a subsequent study by Waldo and Chiricos (1977) in the State of Florida in which they randomly assigned eligibles to work release or institutional settings. There were no significant differences found between the groups regardless of the measure used to assess recidivism. The authors speculated that increased contact with the public in partial custody settings might lead to more direct external or internal labeling of offenders, affecting self-concepts and subsequent behavior. That conclusion, of relevance to any partial custody program, was supported in an earlier study of Borstals in Great Britain. McClintock found, for some offenders, total custody was more effective and better received by the offender than partial custody (1961, cited in Lipton et al., 1975, p. 36). (Also see Hylton, 1982) Finally, both the study in Florida, noted above, and another study in the State of Oklahoma concluded that "employment experience has had little, if any, effect
in lengthening the amount of time a person is free before he is reincarcerated" (Oklahoma Crime Commission, 1978, p. 9).

Another type of early release mechanism is the split sentence (if announced at the time of sentencing) or "shock" release to probation or parole (if granted at some later date). The assumption is that a small amount of incarceration will impact upon the offender, making him/her more prepared to make changes in his/her life or more amenable to intervention. Findings demonstrate no ill effects on the community but question whether the program has diverted offenders from custody or has merely been used as a supplement to other correctional options. There is also a question whether the "shock" actually accomplishes a rehabilitative objective. (See Allen, Carlson and Parks, 1979, pp. 167-174; Vaughan, Scott, Bonde and Kramer, 1974; for an international perspective, see Friday and Peterson, 1973)

The Use of Halfway Houses in Correctional Settings

Juvenile

Juvenile systems pioneered in the use of halfway houses in the early 1950s. Initial evaluations were at Wiltwyck School (McCord and McCord, 1953) and Highfields (Freeman and Weeks, 1956; McCorkel, Elias and Bixby, 1958; Weeks, 1958). Other partial custody programs for juveniles were established, referred to as "milieu" therapy since there was a conscious effort to structure the environment of the treatment facility to enhance constructive social learning.
Martinson (1974, pp. 33-35) summarized many studies of these programs, concluding that in most cases no differences were found between participants and non-participants. In those cases showing slight benefit to experimentals, such differences disappeared within two to five years following the program participation. (Also see California Department of Youth Authority, 1967, cited in Martinson, 1974, p. 35--Marshall Program; Fixen, Phillips and Wolf, 1972, 1973--Achievement Place; Houlihan, 1971, cited in Sullivan, Seigel and Clear, 1974, p. 191--Faces Program; Jesness, 1965, cited in Martinson, 1974, p. 34--Fricot Ranch; Knight, 1970, cited in Moos, 1975, p. 176--Marshall Program; Laulicht, 1962, cited in Martinson, 1974, p. 34--Berkshire Farms; Levinson and Kitchenet, n.d., cited in Martinson, 1974, p. 35--National Training School for Boys; Phillips, Phillips, Fixen and Wolf, 1973--Achievement Place; Reed, 1967, cited in Lipton et al., 1975, p. 270--MacLaren Vocational Center; Seckel, 1967, cited in Moos, 1975, p. 176--Fremont Program.) Although unable to demonstrate reduced recidivism, some studies claimed that experimentals were involved in less serious subsequent offenses. Overall, these studies established that offenders in partial custody programs did no worse than institutionalized delinquents, and treatment cost less due to lower per diem costs or the fact that these programs were usually of shorter duration than the institutional ones.

The most extensive study of the use of halfway houses for juveniles was the California Treatment Project (CTP). After initial phases assessing whether delinquents could be treated in the
community, it generated into an attempt to match offender typologies to different treatment modalities and correctional worker characteristics. Improved recidivism of experimentals was claimed (36% better), but methodological concerns have been raised. Palmer concluded that a large number (89%) of eligible youths could be treated "at least as effectively [in the community] as has the traditional program" (1971, p. 91). Three other facts were clearly demonstrated. First, not all offenders could be successfully treated in the community settings; analysis, for instance, showed that "neurotic" delinquents did very well in halfway houses, while "power hungry" delinquents did not (Sandhu, 1981, pp. 228, 229). Second, in order to be effective with a wide array of offenders, community based corrections have to be part of a wider system of alternative placements, including institutions, to meet the needs of specific offenders or temporary needs of rule violators (Palmer, 1971). Burdman (1969, cited in Moos, 1975, p. 233) echoes this conclusion that 70% or more of all offenders can be treated in the community, although some might need some short-term, community based confinement. Third, staff selection and training (Palmer, 1971, p. 88) and other structural components play a large role in treatment success or failure. (Also see Moos, 1975; Sullivan et al., 1974.) (In addition to the above citations, for more information about CTP see Empey, 1973; Harlow et al., 1971; Palmer, 1974; Palmer and Herrera, 1972a, 1972b, cited in Miller, 1977; for critiques, see Beker and Heyman, 1972; Gibbons, 1970; Lemert, 1978; Lerman, 1975; Moos, 1973, cited in Moos, 1975, p. 241.)
The difficulty in interpreting results of treatment programs is shown in a study of a non-residential program for juvenile offenders, the Provo Experiment. The program was based upon Guided Group Interaction, a non-supportive, peer group focused approach. The results were impressive, showing those who successfully completed the program were significantly less likely to get into further trouble. Unfortunately, those who failed the program were more likely to recidivate than comparable individuals who had never gone to the program. The implication is that perhaps many programs have positive effects on some offenders, but the combined experience of many different types of offenders results in a showing of no net effects. (See Empey, 1966, cited in Killinger and Cromwell, 1974; Empey, 1973; Empey and Erickson, 1972; Martinson, 1974, p. 39; Sandhu, 1981, p. 200.)

**Adult**

In the field of adult corrections, halfway houses have been in use for more than one hundred years, primarily administered by private religious or philanthropic organizations. They provided post-release assistance to prisoners, usually in the form of housing. These facilities were not widespread and were not part of the formal criminal justice system. (For historical accounts, see Alper, 1974; Beha, 1975; Doeren and Hageman, 1982; Fox, 1972; Keller and Alper, 1970; Reckless, 1958; Sandu, 1981; Seiter, Carlson, Bowman, Grangfield and Beran, 1977.)

With the perceived success of juvenile programs, beginning in the 1950s programs were started with adult offenders, initially to
address the needs of specific offender groups, such as those with mental health or substance abuse problems. Private non-profit organizations still were the primary service providers to an amalgamation of offenders following or preceding incarceration. A broad base of referrals was necessary for financial survival.

The first involvement of a governmental agency in post-prison partial custody settings for adult offenders occurred when the Federal Bureau of Prisons opened three Pre-Release Guidance Centers in 1961 for youthful offenders in New York, Chicago and Los Angeles. Two years later they opened a similar program in Detroit, jointly operated with the Michigan Department of Corrections, offering placements for Federal and State inmates nearing parole. Following the lead of the Federal government and the endorsement of then Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy (1964), many other states began similar programs. Nearly 40 of the 50 states, the District of Columbia and the Federal government had pre-release systems of some type in 1980 according to Averill (1980). In 1978 estimates were that 4% (12,000) of inmates in this country were in halfway houses, with specific percentages varying widely from state to state (DeJong, 1980). (Also see Griggs and McCune, 1972; Killinger and Cromwell, 1974, p. 68, 135.) Over the last few years the State of Michigan has placed up to 15% of the total inmate population in Community Residential Programs (1981, 1982).
Many halfway houses for adults exist to meet specific offender needs. Studies of drug treatment programs show no difference in post-program criminal or drug use behavior. (It should be noted that some of these programs were in lieu of prison or after prison rather than pre-release as outlined here.) One study did claim improved performance for Southmore House participants who completed the program (Kaplan and Meyerwitz, 1970). (Also see California Department of Corrections, 1971, cited by Sullivan et al., 1974, p. 191—Parkway House; Geis, 1966, cited by Greenberg, 1975, p. 9—East Los Angeles Halfway House for Narcotic Addicts.) Improvement in the number of escapees and with recidivism was claimed in a non-controlled study of participants at Euclid House, a program stressing psychotherapy (Aldort and Jones, 1973). No significant differences were reported at Crittendon House, a placement for parolees (California Department of Corrections, 1972, cited by Beha, 1975, p. 468).

Two studies were reported of inmates in county jails being placed in halfway houses. Both showed no difference in recidivism, but one (Lamb and Goertzel, 1974—Ellsworth House) reported improved employment records for experimentals one year later (also see Kirby, 1972—Crofton House). Kirby concludes that "any short-term treatment program...is seldom enough to make any perceptible change in anyone's lifestyle" (1972, p. 54). (Also see Grygier, Nease and Anderson, 1970, p. 287.)
Several studies have been done of private organizations which contract for state and/or Federal inmate placement. Two of these studies are basically descriptive (Moczydlowski, 1980--Troy House; Moran, Kass and Munz, 1977--Magdala Foundation). A third facility, Brooke House, in Boston, Massachusetts, accepts a wide variety of offenders. The program claimed improved recidivism for participants (Beha, 1975, p. 467, cites the following studies of that program: Massachusetts Halfway Houses, 1972; Pleck, Simon and Riley, 1969; Runyan, 1970). Beha (1975) focusing on state parolees at that facility over a seven year period, found no net effect in reducing recidivism, although he acknowledged that the program might have helped some people. Finally, a study of a private program established to stress vocational placement in local industry was deemed a failure when participants, although highly successful in obtaining employment, showed a higher recidivism rate than non-participants (Vasoli and Fahey, 1970--Notre Dame Youth Center).

State and Federal evaluations of programs show little evidence of improved recidivism for program participants. Reiss and his associates found no significant difference in recidivism between 1962 and 1963 participants at the Federal Pre-Release Guidance Centers and non-participant controls (Correctional Research Associates, 1966, cited in Sullivan et al., 1974, p. 190). Another study did show significantly better experience for Federal prisoners when compared with base expectancy rates (Hall, Millazzo and Posner, 1966, cited in Lipton et al., 1975, pp. 269, 270), but the study
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has been criticized on methodological grounds since offenders upon whom the base expectancy tables were developed were not all similar to program participants. The study also raised the possibility, discussed earlier, that certain types of offenders do worse in these programs. The 1978 Community Treatment Field Study (Beck, Seiter and Lebowitz) did not show improved recidivism but did claim that participants had better work records after release to the community.

such as employment stability, into one measurement of "relative adjustment," Seiter and his associates found halfway house participants in Ohio did significantly better than non-participants. The participants committed fewer and less serious offenses, although not significantly different. When combined with other adjustment measures, however, the differences between the groups were significant. They concluded that halfway houses are more effective in integrating offenders into the community (Seiter, Petersilia and Allen, 1974).

The States of Minnesota and Georgia have administered similar programs, placing offenders in partial custody settings with the focus upon the offender making restitution to his/her victim(s). Program participants in Minnesota are granted early parole prior to transfer to the halfway house under a contractual agreement, but in Georgia some offenders are still on inmate status. Heinz, Galaway and Hudson (1976) report significantly less criminal behavior and better work records for participants. Another study found no differences but argued that program participants were higher risk offenders than the comparison group, implying success (Bonta, Boyle, Motiuk and Sonnichsen, 1983). (Also see Hudson and Chesney, 1977, and Warren and Harlan, 1981, both cited in Blackmore, 1981, pp. 18, 19.)

Several authors have attempted to summarize the research findings on the effectiveness of halfway houses in reducing subsequent criminal behavior. All have found the results "mixed and inconclusive" (Doeren and Hageman, 1982, p. 212), of questionable validity and difficult to generalize due to the variety of such programs.
within a single categorization. (Moos has attempted to develop a typology of community correctional programs to address this problem, 1975, pp. 245-251.) Community corrections have a good record of providing services to the residents, but there are few differences in recidivism from other community programs; if different, the results are occasionally worse (Sullivan et al., 1974, p. 189). (Also see Greenberg, 1975; Grygier et al., 1970, pp. 285-287; Hylton, 1982, pp. 347-349; Lipton et al., 1975, pp. 271, 277; Robison and Smith, 1971.) Seiter and his associates summarized that "the evidence is about equally divided between lower recidivism rates for halfway house residents or no difference in recidivism rates when compared to a control or comparison group" (1977, p. 26). Beha concluded that the "reports currently available on halfway houses generally fail to demonstrate the value of that experience in deterring subsequent criminal behavior" (1975, p. 473). A slightly more optimistic conclusion was drawn by Carlson and Seiter. They felt that halfway houses "are as effective as their institutional alternatives, and there is fairly conclusive evidence that halfway houses are more effective than the traditional prison/parole cycle" (1977, pp. 388, 389). Similar slight benefits to halfway house participants were noted by Martinson and Wilks (1976, cited in Doeren and Hageman, 1982, p. 214). (Also see Blackmore, 1981.) Another study focusing on parolees placed in halfway houses concluded that "the most conservative conclusion is that they are at least as effective as parole" (Latessa and Allen, 1982, p. 160),
while noting that parolees placed in halfway houses are those with the least stability and highest risk. Although clear demonstration of reduced recidivism is lacking, community placement "has the major advantage of reducing the time spent in institutions...with no measurable increase in harm to the community" (Lipton et al., 1975, p. 254).

Some researchers have attempted to isolate the personal characteristics associated with success or failure in halfway house settings. This has been difficult to do effectively since so many variables are being dealt with simultaneously. Each halfway house, even within the same system, has unique structural and personnel components. These differences are important since people vary their behavior in different social settings (Bergin, 1971, cited in Moos, 1975, p. 177; Goffman, 1959; Moos, 1969). Thus, measurements of in-house attitudes and behavior are important indicators of program completion or non-completion, but they are not good predictors of post-program success (Chase, 1973, cited in Moos, 1975, p. 193; Moos, 1975). It is speculated that perhaps this is due to the fact that offenders return to the same communities and social groups in which their criminal patterns developed (Grygier et al., 1970). It might also be related to the fact that program participants and staff tend to see their needs differently. Inmates see their aftercare needs in material terms, such as jobs, while staffs emphasize the need for inmates to change attitudes and specific behaviors (Grygier et al., 1970, p. 285). (Also see Duffee and Duffee, 1981.)
Beyond these personal perceptions or adaptations to environment, Sullivan et al., (1974) argue that structural program components, including clarification of organizational goals and congruence between formal and informal management practices impact strongly on program participants. Moos's attempt to develop a typology of program orientations and practices is in response to this problem (1975).

Returning to the initial attempt to list personal characteristics of successful participants, thus far there is "little empirical data to discriminate among the types of offenders who will or will not benefit from halfway house treatment" or from certain program structures (Goldfarb and Singer, 1973, p. 583). Several programs listed a high failure rate for residents with prior histories of serious substance abuse. Characteristics associated with stability in work history or residence prior to incarceration, age, lack of extensive institutionalization and prior record are all claimed to be related to in-program halfway house success. Several studies have also claimed a higher than expected rate of success with selected high risk offenders, possibly due to the deterrence a lengthy sentence provides hanging over their heads. By far the most consistent indicators of success or failure are selection factors (Beha, 1975; Grygier et al., 1970).

The failure of programs thus far to determine which offenders do well in each program limits their ability to demonstrate any consistent program results. By trying to accept all offenders, it
may be that currently programs show no overall success but are successful with certain offenders (Sullivan et al., 1974, p. 193).
(Also see Beck et al., 1978; Bonta et al., 1983; Community Corrections Resource Programs, 1974; Logan, 1977; Moczydlowski, 1980; Moran et al., 1977; Seiter and Carlson, 1976.)

Costs of Pre-Release Centers

Although disagreement remains about the rehabilitative benefits of halfway houses, proponents argue that such arrangements are less expensive to operate than institutions. The majority of such programs claim lower or comparable per diem costs. Gordon (1977) and Johnson (1978) place the cost of halfway houses at 60-65% of institutional costs in the states of Ohio and Michigan. Another study claimed an average of 63-85% of institutional costs, depending on the programming provided at the halfway house (Singer and Wright, 1976, cited in Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1983, p. 93). Lower costs were also cited in Pennsylvania (Informatics, 1972), New Jersey and New Hampshire (New Jersey Department of Corrections, 1979, and McDonald, 1979, both cited in Averill, 1980). (Also see Community Corrections Resource Programs, 1974; Mullen, Carlson, and Smith, 1980; Thalheimer, 1975a, 1975b.) Three states, Massachusetts, Minnesota and Oklahoma, documented higher per diem costs during a two year phase-in period (Averill, 1980; Minnesota Department of Corrections, 1976, cited in Averill, 1980; Oklahoma Crime Commission, 1978).

George and Camille Camp (1982, cited in Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1983, p. 93) reported that it cost between $5,121 and
$22,748 per year to incarcerate an individual in prison. The Federal system costs $13,000 annually per inmate (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1983, p. 93). In 1981 in the State of Michigan it cost $5,320 per inmate for halfway house placement and an average of $9,275 for institutional care (Michigan Department of Corrections, 1982, p. 75).

(Also see Carlson and Seiter, 1977; Empey and Lubeck, 1971; Glaser, 1964, p. 420; Latessa and Allen, 1982; Pettibone, 1973.)

Critics claim that due to the small number of participants in most programs (necessary to avoid institutional effects according to Grygier, et al., 1970) changes in resident population cause much larger cost fluctuations in halfway house operations than in the institutions. Thus, costs stay high because few programs operate at capacity consistently (Beha, 1975; Carlson and Seiter, 1977; Greenberg, 1975; Miller, 1977; Sullivan et al., 1974). With small populations services are more expensive per client to provide, and many services are needed in the community which are not required in institutional settings. Even if the program costs are higher in halfway houses, though, "most institutional...costs go toward basic needs and security, while halfway house costs are generally for basic needs and provision of services" (Seiter et al., 1977, p. 5).

Finally, recent attention to more indirect costs questions the savings claimed. These indirect costs include the fact that many costs are merely deferred from the institutional level to local service providers, as halfway house participants use resources in the host community (McSparron, 1980; Thalheimer, 1975a, 1975b).
These costs have seldom been included in the cost figures cited above. Austin and Krisberg argue that high rates of recidivism and escape by halfway house participants result in some offenders actually serving more time in custody than they would have originally, offsetting some of the savings claimed in initial estimates (1982, p. 387). (Also see McSparron, 1980.) On a broader scale, researchers question whether offenders could have been retained in the community in the first place at even less cost. They claim that halfway houses have been used as a supplement to existing institutions rather than the alternative which was originally envisioned (Adams, n.d., cited in Harlow et al., 1971, p. 35; Hylton, 1982; Sarri, 1981; Scull, 1977).

Short of radical reassessment of sentencing practices, critics concede that the use of halfway houses has some financial advantage beyond humanistic concerns. Generally, program participants hold jobs and contribute to the community through payment of taxes, support of family members and contributions from earnings toward the costs of operating the halfway house (Beha, 1975; Miller, 1977). All agree that the greatest savings are realized through reducing the need to construct new prison beds during times when prison populations are expanding (Austin and Krisberg, 1982; Miller, 1977; Palmer, 1971). In most instances, the costs of keeping an individual in prison exclude initial construction costs, while halfway house costs include the facility, which is usually leased. Prison construction costs have been estimated per bed to range from $34,000 to $110,000 (in 1982 dollars) (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1983,
Placement of inmates in less secure community settings can save significant amounts of money if fewer new prisons have to be built despite large increases in inmate populations, as has occurred during the last ten years. If halfway house use in the State of Michigan was eliminated, at this time three 500-bed prisons would have to be constructed at a cost to the taxpayers in excess of 100 million dollars, or the offenders would have to be placed in other minimum security settings offering no more structure than is now provided. (For further discussions of cost-effectiveness, see Hennessey, Gray, and Conover, 1977; Nelson, 1975.)

Summary

The research findings regarding the effectiveness of halfway house treatment of adult offenders are inconclusive and parallel the conclusions of researchers studying juvenile programs. Improved rates of recidivism for participants cannot be consistently documented. In cases where differences are found, these differences between experimentals and controls disappear within a couple of years following treatment. It is possible that programs benefit certain offenders and work to the detriment of others, registering little net change. It appears that offenders can be placed in the community without doing significantly worse, and there is some evidence that this can be accomplished at a lower cost. Placement of offenders in halfway houses clearly eliminates the need for new prison beds during times of expanding inmate populations, producing significant
savings. Greater attention needs to be focused upon which types of offenders do well in which settings or at what times of their incarceration experience, with attention to structural program components.
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH DESIGN

Research Problem

The majority of previous research has focused upon the rehabilitative effects of post-prison partial release programs. From this perspective, maintaining the similarity of experimentals and controls and comparing them over the same period of time were critical elements of the research process. Clearly, those controls are essential in determining the rehabilitative potential of any correctional program. However, neither condition exists in reality in correctional programs as practiced. Offenders going to pre-release programs are different from those not going on dimensions of whatever selection criteria are utilized. Further, the communities into which these program participants go are not "at risk" for comparable amounts of time, since experimentals are in the communities for both the halfway house placement and during their subsequent paroles.

In a recent study, Terry Murphy of the Michigan Department of Corrections attempted to measure the issue of "threat" (1983). While effectively addressing the first issue, the fact that experimentals and controls are not comparable, he ignored the second issue by comparing threat to the community through recidivism over a one year period following release by each group. He found that participants in community programs in Michigan had significantly less
known criminal behavior, which should be expected since the selection process, if valid, should isolate the "best risks" for release into the community. Murphy's analysis does not address the real public policy issue, however, of whether these "best risks" can be in the community for a longer period of time without any increased harm or threat to the host community. On a limited basis, this study will address that issue.

The Concept of "Harm" to the Community

It is difficult to operationalize the concept of "harm" or cost. As previously discussed, the existence of inmates in the community often represents a shifting of the costs of resources from the state prison system to local service providers, including local police agencies, detention facilities and courts for those involved in new criminal activity. These costs are often ignored in comparisons of halfway house cost-effectiveness. Some rough estimates can be made, but an on-going field study would be required to accurately assess such costs, especially for resources beyond the criminal justice system, such as additional demands by inmates for substance abuse, mental health, employment, welfare, and similar services.

Clearly, however, the most politically volatile cost is additional crime which participants commit while at risk. While not a total indicator of harm or cost, it is of major concern to the public and can be measured in an ex-post-facto analysis such as this one. For these reasons, new crime will be the measure of harm in this study.
It is evident that this study cannot actually measure total criminal activity since much behavior is never detected and/or officially recorded. The extent of this unknown criminal behavior cannot be determined. The National Crime Survey reports that victim surveys place the actual level of criminal activity at more than twice the officially recorded amounts (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1983, p. 25). The halfway house participants will be at risk longer and will have more opportunity, in terms of time, to engage in undetected crime. However, they are a group with lower crime potential (if the selection criteria are valid), and they are under comparably high levels of surveillance while in the halfway house setting. The bias that this unknown criminal activity will introduce into this study cannot be determined.

In measuring officially recorded criminal activity, this study will document harm in terms of both behavior and official court convictions so comparisons can be made with other studies which have been done. For instance, the Michigan Risk Study (Michigan Department of Corrections, 1978; Murphy, 1980), which will be discussed below, and the recent study completed by Terry Murphy (1983) were based upon demonstrable behavior, whether or not such behavior resulted in charges and/or convictions in court. This is seen as the most liberal estimate of harm to the community (Murphy, 1983, p. 9). It also takes into account the fact that often when a violator is returned to prison for technical rule violations, local authorities do not pursue a court conviction on new criminal activity.
unless the new offense is serious. Other studies have used conviction or reconfi
mence in state or local detention facilities for 30 days or longer as the chosen indica
tor of recidivism. By tabulating the data of this study in a variety of ways, compariso
ns can be made with the results of these other studies. Returns to prison for technical violations will be reported, but for purposes of this study, such action will not be considered harm to the community unless the return was in lieu of prosecution of criminal behavior.

Measurement of Differential Seriousness of Criminal Behavior

A mere total number of criminal behaviors does not adequately reflect the harm done to the community--50 shopliftings are not equivalent to 50 murders. To whatever extent the criminal code attempts to attach valuations of seriousness to maximum sentences for given crimes, they can be an effective measurement of seriousness. Thus, an average maximum for those crimes committed by participants can be compared with the average maximum for those crimes committed by non-participants as a gross estimate of seriousness.

The Sellin-Wolfgang Seriousness Index (1964) is an attempt to move beyond legal labels to a behaviorally-based measurement of each element of a criminal event. The scale measures bodily injury, extent of theft and/or property damage, and it includes aggravating factors such as the use of a weapon. Since it was first introduced it has undergone numerous replications. It has been recently updated in the National Survey of Crime Severity (Wolfgang, Figlio, Tracy,
and Singer, 1985), a component of the National Crime survey conducted in 1977. The basic format remains the same although weight values have been changed. The major alteration is the rating for seriousness of the dollar amount of theft or property loss which is considered a power function rather than an ordinal scale, as before. Criticisms of the approach remain, but the major problem for this study is the number of criminal behaviors which are omitted. All criminal events in which there is no actual loss, violence or threat of violence or illegal entry are not scored. In this study that will omit drug offenses, possession of weapons in settings in which they were not used, escapes and attempts to commit crimes which were interrupted prior to documentable harm.

Despite these limitations, seriousness scores for all scoreable criminal behavior for each group will be totalled. The total number of crimes which were not scored will be reported by category.

Controlling for Changes in Selection Criteria

A major program change occurred in August, 1978, when a new policy went into effect regarding eligibility and the selection process for entry into Community Residential Programs (CRP) in the state of Michigan. That new policy was based upon the results of a risk study of parolees which had been completed that year.

In the Michigan Risk Study (Michigan Department of Corrections, 1978) 360 variables from three time periods, prior to incarceration, during incarceration and following release to the community, were
controlled for 1,000 parolees released in 1971. The goal was to isolate those variables which best differentiated between levels of probability for subsequent involvement in new assaultive or property felony behavior during a three year period or as long as the parolee remained under supervision. Using a process of Automatic Interaction Detection, successive dichotomous partitioning on maximum variance in the dependent variable, a group of variables was selected which most clearly spread the sample into groups of increasing potential for involvement in new criminal activity. Using these results, the process was validated by blindly applying the criteria to a second 1,000 parolees released the same year. Further validation was done through a replication study of parolees (N=1,200) released during 1974 (Murphy, 1980).

Following the completion of the study, each inmate in the prison system was assigned Assaultive and Property Risk Factors. These Risk Factors are considered in programming, placement and release decisions. They control eligibility dates for entry into pre-release programs. Lower risk offenders are eligible for consideration further from their first consideration date for parole than higher risk offenders. The final step of the release decision remained a screening of applicant's files by Department employees.

Although it is expected that use of the risk factors should have improved the selection process, during the second half of the study an increasing proportion of the prison population was in CRP. Thus, although eligibility might have been more factually-based,
it is believed that prison overcrowding led screeners to make more liberal release decisions as CRP was increasingly used as a release safety valve for the overcrowded prison system. It is anticipated that a more marginal group was released during the second half of the study due to both the larger proportion of inmates in the status and from more liberal decision-making due to prison overcrowding.

A major interest of this study is to determine what, if any, differences these changes in the selection process made in terms of the subsequent harm to the community by program participants.

Control Group

A true control group does not exist for this study. In Michigan almost all inmates are eligible for community programs (sex offenders, first degree murderers, large-scale drug traffickers and career criminals are excluded, the last two categories being administrative labels which inmates can contest in hearings). Higher risk inmates, based upon the risk factors noted above, are eligible but have to be closer to their first parole eligibility dates for participation than lower risk offenders.

A statistical control group can be created using the results of the Michigan Risk Study (Michigan Department of Corrections, 1978; Murphy, 1980). Each risk category has a statistical expectancy of subsequent assaultive or property felony behavior. While these expectancies cannot be applied to any individual offender, group expectancies can be compared with each group's actual performance.
Since these expectancies are for similar risk offenders only during parole, if halfway house participants engage in no more criminal behavior during both halfway house participation and parole than would have been expected during parole, no additional harm to the community will have occurred through the use of halfway houses.

The Michigan Risk Study was based on each parolee's worst behavior while under supervision: no problem, technical violations, misdemeanor behavior, non-violent felony behavior or violent felony behavior. Since only the single worst behavior is reflected, real harm to the community is not assessed since individuals engaged in multiple criminal acts are scored the same as individuals only having a single criminal act. Thus, a small group of offenders engaged in multiple criminal acts might inflict a great deal of harm on the community without the group as a whole exceeding expectancies. A group in which each participant committed one violent felony would appear to be the same as a group in which each participant committed five violent felonies. Since the focus of this study is demonstrable harm to the community, using the risk factor statistical expectancies as the control group needs to be supplemented by another approach.

While the public may accept the concept of parole, it may not like the threat of parolees in the community and may opt to retain them in prison longer. On the other hand, parole is generally accepted as a cost-effective alternative to extended incarceration. In accepting parolees, communities accept the resulting risk of potential harm inflicted by parolees. Using this reasoning, it can be
argued that the public will support the halfway house program if halfway house participants inflict no more damage on the community during their halfway house placement and parole than parolees serving only their parole terms inflict. It is understood that the control group in this analysis is not comparable. It becomes a test of the adequacy of the selection and administration of the program, who they put out, for how long and under what circumstances did they allow them to stay out, rather than an attempt to understand what made it work or why. From a public policy standpoint, this is a legitimate question, did this program work, as practiced, in terms of harm to the community in the form of new crime?

Both approaches described above, using statistical expectancies and using parolees as the control group, will be pursued in this study. Actual performance will be measured by comparing program participants' worst behavior during halfway house placement and parole with the statistical expectancies for parolees of similar risk from the Michigan Risk Study. Second, for purposes of analyzing the program from a public acceptance standpoint, parolees not participating in the halfway house program will be the control group. If participants are demonstrably comparable (not expected), the non-participants can be used as a control group in the pure sense.

Population

The population will consist of all male offenders who were released from the Michigan prison system to placement in the Resident
Home Program or to parole supervision in Calhoun County on or after June 1, 1975, and who began parole supervision no later than September 30, 1981. This provides an equal time period, 38 months, before and after the change in the procedure for the selection of halfway house program participants. To enhance tracking and to minimize biases based upon variations in supervision and opportunities which might be present in other localities, the population will be further limited to offenders who were not supervised outside of Calhoun County for longer than 60 days during the tracking period unless they were in custody. Two five offenders will be eliminated who were released to Discharge Furlough, as will four individuals whose convictions were overturned at various stages of the supervision process.4

Serious overcrowding in the state prison system and the length of time included in this study will lead to some selection difficulties. Offenders returned to prison, especially for technical rule violations, were frequently re-released quickly, often back to the halfway house program. If the population is based upon admissions to supervision in Calhoun County, several individuals will appear in the population more than once. Since this study is an attempt to measure the program as it was actually practiced, inmates have been included in the population each time they were released from the prison system. The only remaining concern is that an offender not be monitored twice during the same tracking period (defined below). Otherwise, harm to the community would not be accurately measured, since one offense committed would be scored twice. For that reason
if an individual is selected, under the procedures outlined below, a second time with overlapping tracking periods, he will be placed in the group in which he appeared at the earliest calendar date, and an alternate will be chosen for the vacated position.

Tracking Period

The goal of this study is to measure harm to the community by halfway house participants, both during halfway house placement and parole. This is seen as a dynamic process in which the Department of Corrections' release and return decisions control the amount of time the community is at risk and have some control over the resulting harm to the community. In this context, a decision to return a rule violator to prison prior to the commission of a new crime is viewed as "positive" and not a failure of the program.

There are two sources of differential time at risk. First, many studies have been based upon the supervision period. This introduces a problem since paroles vary in length. Some control over this difference can be achieved by tracking offenders for a set length of time regardless of parole length.

Second, disciplinary returns and returns of offenders who have committed new crimes reduces the communities' time at risk. It is possible that non-participating parolees, presumably higher risk, will be returned more frequently, resulting in less time at risk. This must be taken into account in interpreting the findings by comparing groups based upon crime rates per month at risk. In a
gross measurement of community harm, however, differential time at risk is not the issue since the Department of Corrections chose to put certain offenders in the community or chose to leave certain offenders in the community, and this study is an attempt to measure the results of that decision making.

Halfway house participants will be tracked for harm to the community through new criminal behavior during that status. In addition, both participants and non-participants will be tracked for three years following their release on parole.

The goal is to follow each case for a set period of time, halfway house placement and three years. In the event a halfway house participant or non-participant is returned to custody, the case will continue to be tracked as planned, but the times in custody and at risk will be computed and used as controlling variables for data interpretation. Since a halfway house participant might be returned to prison prior to actually paroling, for those cases, the tracking period will begin at halfway house placement and continue for three years from the date they were scheduled to have been released on parole.

Sample Size and Selection

The above discussion has isolated two major groups, participants in pre-release programs and non-participants who go directly from the institution to parole. Each of these groups will be further divided
into subgroups based upon those who participated before and after the selection criteria changed for halfway house program participation.

A preliminary analysis of releases to each status during the time of the study places subgroup populations at $E_1 = 88$, $E_2 = 101$, $C_1 = 117$ and $C_2 = 86$. A proportional stratified random sample will be drawn of 60% of each subgroup population. Thus, the total sample in this study will consist of 236 participants, distributed as follows: $E_1 = 53$, $E_2 = 61$, $C_1 = 70$ and $C_2 = 52$.

An attempt was made to remove all ineligibles from the population, based upon the restrictions outlined in the previous section, "Population." To deal with the possibility that an individual's ineligibility is not discovered until data are being gathered and to deal with the replacements needed due to overlapping tracking periods, as discussed, an extra 20% optional sample will also be drawn in each subgroup at the same time the regular sample is drawn. These optionals will be used in the order drawn, as needed, in accordance with the research design.

Variables

A variety of controls will be coded relating to each offender's personal characteristics, criminal histories and present offense information. The dependent variable, harm to the community as measured by new officially recorded criminal behavior, will be determined in several ways.
First, during the time that the offender is under supervision, the supervising agent notes all known new criminal activity in file material. The records will be reviewed. Second, the Michigan State Police have agreed to provide computerized criminal records for each person in the sample. This is a good indicator of serious crime, but is less accurate in documenting less serious offenses since the system is dependent upon each arresting agency to input data. Compliance improves with crime severity. Third, the Battle Creek City Police Department and the Calhoun County Sheriff's Department have agreed to allow access to their records of contacts and arrests. The Sheriff's office will also allow access to records of detention of offenders brought to the County Jail by any police agency in Calhoun County. Fourth, the Calhoun County Prosecutor's Office has also allowed access to their records. This would include all requests for warrants from county police agencies for violation of criminal statutes. Ordinance violations would not be recorded in that office but would appear in District Court records. Fifth, court records in both the District and Circuit Courts are public records and can document convictions and supplement information from other sources.

This approach should provide an excellent measurement of all officially recorded criminal behavior committed by offenders in this county. During the time the offender is under supervision, there should be accurate information about his criminal activity outside of the county as well. After supervision has ended,
serious offenses should continue to be accurately located through the State Police records, but there will be some loss of accuracy on less serious, out-of-county offenses. Some information will be lost as well after supervision on out-of-state offenses. The effects of these limitations in the research design cannot be accurately assessed.

Hypotheses

Three major research questions are being addressed in this study. All center on the use of pre-parole halfway houses in Calhoun County over a six year period and the resulting level of harm to the community through subsequent criminal behavior. Can these "best risks" in the prison system, carefully selected and monitored, be in the community for a longer time than in the traditional prison/parole process without increased harm to the community?

Unit of Analysis: Group

Control Group: For Hypothesis 1A, the statistical expectancies for each risk group from the Michigan Risk Study.

For Hypotheses 1B to 1D and Hypothesis 2, Parolees released to Calhoun County between June 1, 1975, and September 30, 1981. (C = control group)

Experimental Group: Inmates released to the Calhoun County Resident Home Program on or after June 1, 1975, and who paroled or were scheduled to parole (if returned to prison) by September 30, 1981. (E = experimental group)
$C_1 / E_1$: Controls or Experimentals released prior to August 1, 1978.

$C_2 / E_2$: Controls or Experimentals released on or after August 1, 1978.

$E_X$: Criminal acts committed by Experimentals

$C_X$: Criminal acts committed by Controls

$E_F$: Felony criminal acts committed by Experimentals

$C_F$: Felony criminal acts committed by Controls

$E_Y$: Felony convictions for Experimentals

$C_Y$: Felony convictions for Controls

$E_S$: Seriousness of felony behavior by Experimentals

$C_S$: Seriousness of felony behavior by Controls

**Extent of Criminal Activity**

The criminal activity of experimentals, at risk longer, will be no more than the criminal activity of controls.

1A. The most serious violation (as defined in the Michigan Risk Study) for experimentals while under supervision will be no more than statistical expectancies for similar risk offenders from the Michigan Risk Study.

1B. The total number of officially recorded criminal acts committed by experimentals during the tracking period will be no more than the number of officially recorded criminal acts committed by controls during the tracking period.
IC. The total number of felony criminal acts committed by experimentals during the tracking period will be no more than the number of felony criminal acts committed by controls during the tracking period.

\[ E_{E} \leq E_{C} \]

ID. The total number of felony convictions for criminal acts committed by experimentals during the tracking period will be no more than the number of felony convictions for criminal acts committed by controls during the tracking period.

\[ E_{E'} \leq E_{C'} \]

Seriousness of Criminal Behavior

The seriousness of criminal activity of experimentals, at risk longer, will be no more than the seriousness of the criminal activity of controls.

2. The sum of seriousness scores, as measured by the Sellin-Wolfgang Seriousness Index and the National Survey of Crime Severity Index, for all scoreable felony criminal acts by experimentals will be no more than the sum of the seriousness scores for all felony criminal acts by controls during the tracking period using the same scales.
The Effects of Program Selection Changes on Criminal Behavior

The average amount and seriousness of criminal activity will be less by experimentals released before program eligibility changes took effect than the criminal activity by experimentals released after the changes took effect.

3A. The average number of criminal acts committed during the tracking period by experimentals released prior to August 1, 1978, will be less than the average number of criminal acts committed during the tracking period by experimentals released on or after that date.

$$\bar{E}_{1x} < \bar{E}_{2x}$$

3B. The average number of felony criminal acts committed during the tracking period by experimentals released prior to August 1, 1978, will be less than the average number of felony criminal acts committed during the tracking period by experimentals released on or after that date.

$$\bar{E}_{1f} < \bar{E}_{2f}$$

3C. The average seriousness as measured by the Sellin-Wolfgang Seriosness Index and the National Survey of Crime Severity Index of felony acts committed during the tracking period
by experimentals released prior to August 1, 1978, will be less than the average seriousness, as measured by those scales, of the felony criminal acts committed during the tracking period by experimentals released on or after that date.

\[
\frac{E_1}{S} < \frac{E_2}{S}
\]

**Theoretical Perspectives**

The interrelationship between criminological theory and correctional practices is usually tenuous. "Society must do something about crime. Theory, therefore, often becomes little more than subsequent rationalization of and justification for the practices established as a consequence of what at the time was deemed a practical necessity" (Vold and Bernard, 1970, p. 394).

Correctional practices rest on the not always consistent bases of neo-classical and modified positive criminological theories in their emphasis on both punishment and treatment. Neo-classical theory, assuming at least partial individual free will and society's right to control individual behavior for the good of the whole, legitimizes the state's right to punish. Punishment and the perceived deterrence which follows consistent punishment may form the central premise of all correctional intervention since "lessor penalties may be imposed...but the threat back of these is generally the alternative of prison" (Vold and Bernard, 1970, p. 398).
Treatment rests on the assumption that it is possible to scientifically identify personal characteristics and/or social factors which are associated with criminal behavior. The correctional worker can then attempt to change the offender or mobilize efforts to change the setting in which the criminal behavior developed. Since changing the social situation is typically viewed as beyond the control of the worker, the primary emphasis is upon changing the offender or his/her coping skills. A strict positivist position, however, reduces assumptions of free will and, thereby, reduces the culpability of the offender and the justification for the state to punish him/her. Punishment in a positivist framework becomes incapacitation, the state's right to protect itself from the offender while he/she is treated. Some writers merge the concepts of punishment and incapacitation by pointing out that democratic societies' appreciation of personal liberty makes mere incapacitation psychological punishment (Sutherland and Cressey, 1978, p. 530).

Early advocates of halfway house programs took a positivist position, many of the roots of criminality had social bases, resting outside of the individual. Halfway house practices were based upon the concept of reintegration, as outlined in the first chapter of this study. By reintegrating the offender into positive social life, social pressures could be mobilized and directed on the offender toward conformity with majority behavior. Halfway house programs have a good record of providing services to participants. Studies measuring overall social adjustment, including job maintenance and other
indications of stability and social integration have shown that halfway house participants generally have better adjustment on these dimensions than non-participants. Thus far, however, there has been no demonstrable proof that reintegration, as it has been measured, has had any significant effect on recidivism. It is entirely possible that integration or reintegration has not been realized since offenders have typically returned to the same social settings and groups in which their criminal behavior originally developed. Thus, jobs or participation in other community assistance programs may not have been able to offset social pressures toward negative behavior from other sources.

As halfway house programs moved from rehabilitative to pragmatic justifications, the practices became based upon the concept of selective incapacitation. The use of selective incapacitation occurs throughout the criminal justice process beginning at the initial police decision whether to arrest. Discretion at all levels is based upon the assumption that it is possible to identify those individuals who pose the greatest risk for future criminality. In sentencing, the length of the sentence imposed is a function of the seriousness of the offense (how much punishment is deserved) and the perceived future risk of the offender (how long should he/she be incapacitated). Positivist beliefs underlie the assumption that it is possible to accurately identify these greater risks.

The research question is whether selected inmates in the Michigan prison system can be released to community placement without
subjecting the recipient community to excess harm in the process.
Both the reintegration and selective incapacitation models will be
utilized to determine which model offers the best explanation for
interpreting the results of this study.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

The data were collected as outlined in the last chapter. Files on all of the subjects were available through the Department of Corrections' office in Calhoun County or were reviewed in other offices. The research design provided for the replacement of ineligibles who were discovered during the data accumulation process. It was necessary to use optionals which were randomly drawn in the following numbers: $E_1=6$ optionals, $E_2=9$ optionals, $C_1=10$ optionals and $C_2=15$ optionals. In all but two of the cases, optionals were needed either because the subject had been supervised outside of the county during the tracking period, or because the subject had been drawn in the sample at an earlier calendar date and tracking periods could not overlap, as outlined in the research design. Two cases were replaced since the persons died during the tracking period.

Information about each subject's subsequent criminal behavior was obtained from all of the sources planned. Police reports or Pre-sentence Investigation Reports were read on all known felony behavior to score the seriousness of each offense. One robbery which occurred out of the state and two old burglary police reports could not be obtained. In both instances, the offenders had been involved in a pattern of multiple similar offenses, five robberies in the one instance and ten burglaries in the other. For these three offenses, the
seriousness for the offenses for which reports could not be reviewed was scored as the average for the other similar offenses in the criminal pattern.

Background variables, information about program participation and subsequent criminal activity were tabulated on a data sheet (see Appendix A).

Personal Characteristics of Offenders

Eight dimensions of personal characteristics were addressed: race, marital status, education, employment prior to incarceration, substance abuse history, psychiatric history, length of residence in the county prior to incarceration and age at release.

The only variable on which the experimentals and controls were significantly different was the extent of formal education. Experimentals had a higher level of formal education, $\chi^2(3, N = 236) = 8.44, p < .05$. The second variable addressing education, the offender's functional level when he entered prison, was not significantly different for the groups.

There were some other relationships which were significant in moving from the earlier to the later time period. More blacks participated in the halfway house program during the second time period, 61% versus 36%. This intragroup shift in experimentals was significant, $\chi^2(2, n = 114) = 9.16, p < .02$.

Both groups reflected a time bias on the issue of marital status as well. There was a definite trend for the second time period
to include fewer married and more formerly married subjects, 
\[ \chi^2(6, N = 236) = 17.2, \ p < .01. \]

Overall, the experimentals had fewer blacks than the controls, 49% versus 57%. In the second time period, however, the experimental group contained 61% blacks while the controls in the second time period contained 54%. The majority of the participants were single, 64% of the controls and 68% of the experimentals. More than half lacked their high school education, and 68% were functioning at an eighth grade level or lower when they arrived at prison. About 75% of both groups were unskilled, and 67% of them had worked less than 40% of the time during the five years preceding their confinement. Nearly half had involvement with serious drugs, and about half had serious substance abuse problems continuing until their incarceration. Experimentals had slightly more serious substance abuse histories, but the extent of the abuse just prior to confinement was almost identical for both groups. Controls had a little more untreated mental health problems and more histories of inpatient psychiatric treatment. More than 80% of both groups had lived in the community for at least five years prior to incarceration. However, more than 20% of the Time 2 experimentals had not lived in the county prior to paroling to the community. Half of the sample were 24 years old or younger at release. Overall, the experimentals were a little younger, and those released in the first time period were younger in both experimental and control groups.
Prior Criminal History of Sample

Variables relating to the five dimensions of prior record were as follows: age at first conviction, juvenile record, adult offense pattern, previous adjustments to supervision and history of confinement.

Controls had significantly more extensive juvenile histories, $\chi^2(4, n = 234) = 9.96, p < .05$. Controls were likely to have had a formal revocation of probation or parole previously, $\chi^2(1, N = 236) = 5.34, p < .02$. Controls were more likely to have been on parole at the time they committed their current offense, while experimentals were more likely to have not been under supervision or on felony probation, $\chi^2(7, N = 236) = 15.78, p < .05$. Controls had served a larger percentage of their lives in custody since the age of 17 and had served more time in years during their adult lives prior to release, $\chi^2(5, N = 236) = 13.94, p < .02$, and $\chi^2(3, N = 236) = 38.63, p < .001$, respectively.

Half of the sample was under the age of 17 at their first conviction, with the control group a little younger. Each group had about 50% with no juvenile convictions, and about the same number in each group was never committed to any type of juvenile facility. More than 60% of the sample had been convicted of two or fewer misdemeanors, and 70% had one or fewer felony convictions. Controls had a slightly higher rate of felonies and were also more likely to have a pattern of violent personal crimes. There was also a trend
toward more assaultive and mixed pattern offenders coming to both experimental and control statuses during the second time period.

Almost half of the sample had never been under supervision or had typically been successful while under supervision. A slightly larger group of controls had multiple, primarily negative, supervisions. There were fewer offenders in the second time period who had formal revocations of parole or probation on their records.

More than 60% of the sample had served one or fewer jail terms with a slightly better record for experimentals. More than 70% had never served a prison term before, again, with a slightly better record for experimentals. Both experimentals and controls showed more time in custody during the second time period. This was also supported by the variable, time served immediately before release. Both groups showed about 10 months more served in Time 2 than in Time 1. Overall, experimentals averaged 21.4 months prior to release while controls averaged 33.94.

Incarcerated Offense

Four variables were related to the offense for which the offender was incarcerated immediately before release: age at commission of the offense, type of offense, and minimum and maximum sentences serving on the present offense.

The only variable which showed a significant difference between experimentals and controls was the type of offense being served. Controls were serving for more violent offenses and weapons offenses, \( \chi^2(5, N = 236) = 24.17, p < .001. \)
About one-third of the sample was 19 years old or younger when they committed the offense for which they went to prison. Other differences were slight although offenders in the second time period were a little older.

Both experimentals and controls were more often serving for violent offenses during the second time period, and the difference from Time 1 to Time 2 was significant, \( \chi^2(1, N = 236) = 10.95, p < .001 \).

The experimentals were serving shorter average sentences than controls, 41 versus 45 months, but were serving longer average maximum sentences, 113 versus 112 months.

Differences in Tracking Period, Risk Classification and Release Date

The length of the tracking period for each subgroup is listed in Table 1. As outlined in the research design, the experimentals were going to be tracked longer, and it was assumed that the community would be "at risk" for a longer time from experimentals. The table shows a six to eight month additional tracking time for experimentals, but the differential additional time "at risk" for the experimental group was four to six months. Both experimental and control Time 2 subjects were at risk an average of three months longer than Time 1 subjects.

The Risk Factor rating of each of the subgroups is listed in Table 2. The differences in the Property Risk distribution were not significant. The Assaultive Risk distribution showed controls
Table 1
Average Length of Time at Each Status During the Tracking Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Tracking Period</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Supervision CRP</th>
<th>Post-Supervision Custody</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E₁</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; 14.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E₂</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.5&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; 17.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0&lt;sub&gt;a&lt;/sub&gt; 14.5</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0            17.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All figures in the table are in months.

<sup>a</sup>Subsequent releases to CRP (Community Residential Programs), halfway house placement.

were higher risks, and these differences were significant,

χ²(4, N = 236) = 15.2, p < .01.

Within the first time period there was a significant difference between controls and experimentals in the year of release. The experimental group had a larger proportion released in 1978, while the
Table 2
Distribution of Risk Factors for the Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Category</th>
<th>Experimentals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaultive Risk Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Risk Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
controls had more released during 1976 and 1977, $\chi^2(3, n = 123) = 9.13, p < .03$.

**Additional Structural Differences Between Experimentals**

Time 2 experimentals were released significantly longer before their first parole consideration dates than Time 1 experimentals, 8.7 months versus 6.7 months, $\chi^2(24, n = 114) = 42.18, p < .02$, $\eta^2 = .165$.

Two other structural changes were taking place during this time period. First, an increasing proportion of the state prison population was being placed in halfway houses. During the time of this study it ranged from 3.6% to 14.7% (see Appendix B). Thus, all of the Time 2 experimentals were in the community when a much larger proportion of inmates were in similar programs, 11.5% average for Time 2 and 6.6% average for Time 1. Second, with the expanding halfway house program, the Department of Corrections provided additional staffing from earlier times. Appendix C shows the changing inmate/staff ratios in the county in which this study took place. This ratio ranged from 33.7 to 6.7 during the time period of this study. This expanding staffing was occurring consistently over time, thus producing much lower average ratios for Time 2 experimentals than for Time 1, 15.1 versus 22.8.
Overall Behavior of Sample

Terminations by type are listed in Table 3. Experimental had higher success rates in parole completion than controls, but that should be expected since they were presumably lower risk offenders. Time 2 samples, both experimental and controls, had higher success rates at all statuses than Time 1 offenders.

Some discretion exists in how corrections staff reacts to client behavior. Thus, termination type might not be an accurate reflection of actual offender behavior. For that reason, a variable was included to measure each offender's most serious behavior while in the halfway house program. While more offenders at Time 2 had no problems while in the halfway house program, there were also more persons considered serious management problems (average two or more major misconducts per month or technical rule violation return to prison), and there were more offenders with misdemeanor behavior. Many fewer in Time 2 escaped or committed other non-violent felonies, while assaultive felonies remained about the same, slightly elevated at Time 2. These differences between the E1 and E2 groups in the most serious behavior while in the halfway house program were significant, $\chi^2(5, n = 114) = 12.01, p < .04$.

 About half of the experimental in both groups were returned to custody for 30 days or longer during the tracking period. The Time 2 experimental had a slightly lower rate. The Time 2 controls, though, had the lowest recommitment rate, under 30%, although that could be a reflection of more conservative return decisions based on prison space.
Table 3
Terminations by Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Successful Completion</th>
<th>Technical Violation</th>
<th>Misdemeanor</th>
<th>Non-violent Felony</th>
<th>Violent Felony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimentals at CRP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( E_1 )</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( E_2 )</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12(^a)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>21(^a)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimentals on Parole</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( E_1 )</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( E_2 )</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls on Parole</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_1 )</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( C_2 )</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15(^b)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a,b\) Adjusted slightly to total 100%

Employment of the Sample During the Tracking Period

The level of unemployment during the time of this study is outlined in Appendix D. There was very little difference in the level
of employment maintained by experimentals between the two time periods. In both groups about half maintained what was defined as full-time employment (70% or more of the time employed). The Time 2 experimental had slightly better rates in this regard, 53% versus 51%. When halfway house participants reached parole, however, they did not maintain the level of employment they had while in the halfway houses, only about 30% maintained full-time employment. They did, however, maintain a higher level of employment than the parolees did. Of those controls considered employable, less than 20% maintained full-time employment. These differences in employment levels between experimentals and controls during parole status were significant, \( \chi^2(2, n = 203) = 9.35, p < .01 \).

Characteristics Associated with Successful Program Completion

Although the main focus of this presentation is on harm to the community through new criminal behavior, it is of interest to determine what personal characteristics or other factors were related to successful halfway house completion.

The only factor which was significantly related to program completion in both time periods was the inmate/staff ratio. As staffing increased, fewer program participants successfully completed the program, with \( \lambda_b = .727 \) for the \( E_1 \) group and \( \lambda_b = .714 \) for the \( E_2 \) group.

During Time 1, those with higher levels of formal education, \( \chi^2(8, n = 53) = 17.21, p < .03 \), with fewer misdemeanor convictions
prior to incarceration, $\lambda_b = .182$, fewer prior revocations of parole or probation, $\chi^2(2, n = 53) = 8.86, p < .02$, and lower prevailing unemployment rates, $\lambda_b = .682$, were all associated with successful halfway house completion.

During Time 2 psychiatric history was significantly related to program success, with those offenders with acknowledged psychiatric problems but no history of treatment and those with histories of inpatient treatment showing much lower levels of success at CRP, $\chi^2(6, n = 61) = 14.04, p < .03, \lambda_b = .095$. The number of juvenile convictions was also negatively related to program success, $\chi^2(14, n = 61) = 25.83, p < .03, \lambda_b = .095$. The number of months to first parole date at the time of release to halfway house status was also significant with offenders more often successful with short parole dates, $\lambda_b = .429$.

Descriptively, minorities had better records of successful completion at both time periods. Marital status was not clear, although singles had the best records during the second time period. Over both time periods, there was not much difference between various marital statuses. Alcoholics had the worst records of success during the first time period, while those who used alcohol and marijuana had the worst performance during the second time period. Those who lived in the county less than five years or more than 15 years did better in both time periods than those who had lived in the county 5 to 15 years prior to incarceration. Offenders who had their first conviction as older juveniles (15-16) performed the worst in both
time periods. There was not much difference in performance between offenders with no juvenile commitments and those who had been committed to private residential programs. Offenders with one prior felony conviction performed better than those in prison for their first offense. Offenders serving for violent offenses had a better record of program success than non-violent offenders. Assaultive Risk Factors were not indicative of successful completion, with Very Low Assaultive Risk offenders during Time 2 showing very poor completion rates. Individuals who had served less than 5% of their adult lives in custody did not do as well as those who had served slightly more, up to 20%. At Time 1 the worst completion records were by individuals who had previously escaped from secure facilities. During Time 2, non-secure facility escapees had the worst completion records. Finally, an interesting fact from both time periods was that those released in the spring did much better than those released at other times of the year, averaging about 30% higher successful completions than those released in the winter over both time periods. This might be related to employment opportunities or to weather-related impediments to work-seeking, which usually occurs on foot.

**Criminal Behavior of the Sample**

**During the Tracking Period**

The misdemeanor behavior of the sample is outlined in Table 4. Time 2 offenders had higher rates of misdemeanor behavior, with the largest variation evident in larceny and assaultive offenses. The
misdemeanor rates per 10 subjects at risk were 15.8 for Time 2 and 13.3 for Time 1. Experimentals in both time periods had a misdemeanor rate of 14.1 versus 14.8 for controls. From Time 1 to Time 2, the experimentals' rate of larcenies quadrupled and the rate of assaults doubled. A larger percentage of offenses resulted in convictions in Time 2 as well, but experimentals were still convicted of a smaller percentage of their offenses, 30.4%, than controls, 47.2%.

Felony behavior of the sample is shown in Table 5. As in the misdemeanor behavior, a larger percentage of the $E_2$ group remained
Table 5

Felony Behavior of Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>% of group with none</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Felonies</th>
<th>Convictions</th>
<th>Felony</th>
<th>Misdemeanor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_1$</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>12 9 35 7</td>
<td>6 1 5 1 3 12 6 2</td>
<td>27 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_2$</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>10 18 12 13 15 0 1 0 5 0 7 7</td>
<td>36 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_1$</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>2 16 32 12 7 1 5 2 8 11 12 4</td>
<td>45 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2$</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1 12 13 14 1 0 4 8 13 0 12 3</td>
<td>35 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CSC refers to criminal sexual conduct*
crime-free. Less than half of the felonies committed resulted in a conviction, and with the $E_1$ group, only about 30% resulted in a conviction. The $C_2$ group was more frequently involved in serious crimes of criminal sexual conduct and robbery. More burglaries, auto thefts and drug offenses were committed during the first time period, while larcenies and violent personal crimes increased in the second time period.

Since the majority of the public concern is with felony behavior, the remainder of this descriptive discussion will focus on the documented felonies.

The felony rates for each subgroup can be seen in Table 6. When differential time at risk is corrected for, Time 1 offenders clearly committed new felonies at a higher rate, while Time 2 experimental groups committed fewer felonies than the other groups.

The seriousness of the felony behavior is reflected, to some extent, in the maximum legal sentence allowed. Thus, the average maximum sentence of each group can be viewed as a rough indication of the seriousness of that group's criminal behavior. The average maximum sentence for the experimental group was 44.35 months, and the average maximum sentence for the control group was 75.75 months. The new criminal behavior of controls was in that regard more serious than the new criminal behavior of experimental groups.

As outlined in the research design, the seriousness of new crimes was calculated using the Sellin-Wolfgang Seriousness Index (1964). That was supplemented by using the National Survey of Crime Severity...
Table 6
Felony Rate for Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Felony Rate</th>
<th>Felony rate per month at risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E₁</td>
<td>18.68</td>
<td>0.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E₂</td>
<td>14.43</td>
<td>0.424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>0.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂</td>
<td>15.58</td>
<td>0.547</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Felony rate is number of felonies per 10 subjects at risk.

scale (1985) (see Appendix E). Both scales have the same format, and as discussed in the research design, both scales will not score a number of crimes which result in no tangible loss, harm or threat of harm. The crimes which each group committed which resulted in no score are listed in Table 7. The remaining crimes were scored using both scales. The results can be seen in Table 8. Experimentals' scores were typically lower than controls' scores. There was not much difference between the groups in the first time period, but the experimentalts were in the community longer and so showed a better rate per month at risk. Time 2 experimentalts inflicted much less harm on the community than controls as measured by the seriousness scores. The scores for the second scale paralleled the first but the scores were higher.
Table 7

Offenses Excluded from Seriousness Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Escape</th>
<th>Poss.</th>
<th>Poss.</th>
<th>Sale</th>
<th>Felony</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E₁</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E₂</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A further analysis of seriousness rates at each status during the tracking period showed the E₂ group with the lowest rates at all statuses. All of the other three groups had almost identical rates while on parole, but the controls committed crimes at much greater rates after supervision was terminated, with the C₂ group having the highest rates (see Table 9).

An attempt was made to determine what relationship substance abuse had with new criminal activity. Crimes were scored as substance abuse-related if the offense, itself, involved alcohol or drugs, or if there was clear information that substance abuse contributed to the commission of the offense. This was determined on the basis of reports of third parties or the offender's own description of his activities. There were some other instances in which
### Table 8
Seriousness of Felony Behavior on Two Scales by Sample Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Scored Crimes</th>
<th>Raw Score</th>
<th>Sellin-Wolfgang Seriousness Rate</th>
<th>National Survey of Crime Severity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E₁</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>57.92</td>
<td>97.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E₂</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>38.52</td>
<td>70.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>56.43</td>
<td>98.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>132.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Rate is computed as raw score per 10 subjects at risk.*
Table 9
Seriousness Rates at Each Supervision Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>CRP</th>
<th>Parole</th>
<th>Post-Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$E_1$</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_2$</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_1$</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_2$</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Figures in this table are based on Sellin-Wolfgang Seriousness Index scores for crimes committed at each status, per 10 subjects at risk, per months at risk.

$^a$Misleading to report since the group was at risk less than .02 month average. Seriousness score was 2 which would result in a seriousness rate of 19.23.

there was indirect evidence of substance abuse—if the offender committed the offense shortly after leaving the bar but denied that substance abuse had anything to do with his subsequent behavior. These offenses were scored as possibly substance abuse-related.

Each group in the sample contained about 40% of the new offenses which were clearly related to substance abuse and about another 10% which were possibly related. The only exception to this pattern was the $C_2$ group which contained many fewer new offenses related to substance abuse. Although that group had a felony rate comparable the other groups, only 21% of those offenses were substance abuse-related and an additional 7% were considered possibly related to substance abuse.
Approximately 40% of all new felonies were committed within the first six months after the offenders were released from custody. This was consistent for both time periods. The $E_1$ group had a rate slightly higher than that, with about 46% of their felonies occurring within the first six months of release. There was some support for the idea that parole supervision had a suppressing effect on the new crime rate, especially for the $C_2$ group. Their crime rate went up sharply as soon as supervision ended.

During the first time period, those experimentalists who successfully completed the halfway house program were more likely to complete parole. While that relationship was even stronger in the second time period, the relationship between successful completion and involvement in new crime was not that clear. In the first time period, successful completers were much less likely to be involved in new felony behavior, $\chi^2(14, n = 53) = 29.31, p < .01, \text{eta} = .331$. During the second time period, however, the strength of the relationship reduced to non-significance, $\chi^2(12, n = 61) = 19.44, p < .08, \text{eta} = .167$.

In the same vein, employment at CRP was not a good indicator of subsequent felony involvement during the whole tracking period. For the $E_1$ group, though, employment during parole was significantly related, eta = .432. No such relationship was evident in the $E_2$ group.
During the second time period, seven offenders were released to the Resident Home Program 30 days before their scheduled parole dates, with immediate eligibility for home furlough privileges. None of these individuals committed any felonies while still on inmate status, but their subsequent criminal behavior during the tracking period was much worse than either the experimentals or controls, with a felony rate four times higher than the rate for experimentals. They had no better employment records than parolee controls. Thus, any realization of reintegration goals is questionable. Due to the small number in the group, the results must be viewed with extreme caution. The information does raise some concerns about jeopardizing the credibility of the halfway house program, and there should be more study of the issue.

Testing the Hypotheses

This study outlined three major questions to be tested, comparing the extent of criminal activity by experimental halfway house participants with the extent of criminal activity by controls, comparing the seriousness of the criminal activity of experimentals with controls and comparing experimentals in two time periods, between which selection methods for choosing halfway house participants changed.
Extent of Criminal Activity

1A. The most serious violation (as defined in the Michigan Risk Study) for experimentals while under supervision in halfway house placement and parole will be no more than statistical expectancies from the Michigan Risk Study.

It will be recalled that each risk level for Assaultive and Property Risks in the Michigan Risk Study has an associated probability of subsequent assaultive or property felony behavior during the supervision period. Since the Replication Study (Murphy, 1980) was based upon parolees released in 1974, closer to the release dates of the offenders in this study, those probabilities will be used rather than the ones from the earlier study. Table 10 outlines the group sizes and associated probabilities for each subsample in this study.

Expectancies are that for similar risk parolees, 17.5 of them would have committed an assaultive felony as their worst behavior while under supervision. In this study, 18 experimentals committed an assaultive felony during halfway house placement and parole. This exceeds expectancies, so the hypothesis is not supported. Expectancies for similar risk parolees are that 29.9 of them would have committed a non-violent felony as their worst behavior while under supervision. In fact, 29 of the sample did so. Using a goodness of fit test, the differences were not significant, \( \chi^2(2, n = 114) = 2.57, p < .15 \), one-tailed.
Table 10

Expected versus Actual Performance of Experimentals based on Risk Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Group</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Expected no. of offenders</th>
<th>Actual no. of offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assaultive Risk Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Low</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>1.691</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>3.108</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>10.092</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>1.953</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.484</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Risk Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>7.482</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>11.920</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>10.540</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.942</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Probabilities are from Final Report (no. AP-0), Michigan Risk Prediction: A Replication Study (pp. 18, 20) by T. H. Murphy, 1980, unpublished report, Michigan Department of Corrections, Lansing.*
Although both of the risk expectancies were exceptionally close to the actual behavior of the sample, there were differences in the Property Risk distribution when that group was partitioned into Times 1 and 2. The results can be seen in Table 11. While assaultive behavior remained consistent with expectations, the \( E_1 \) group had more non-violent felonies than expected, and the \( E_2 \) group had much less non-violent felony behavior than expected. Using goodness of fit tests, the \( E_1 \) deviations from expectancies were not significant, but the differences for the \( E_2 \) group were significant, \( \chi^2(2, n = 61) = 7.903, p < .01, \text{ one-tailed} \).

Descriptively, low risk offenders committed a disproportionate share of new non-violent offenses, but the members of the higher risk groups committed much less than expected to keep the overall performance much lower than expectations.

1B. Experimentals will commit no more criminal acts than controls.

The experimentals committed 348 total crimes, 187 felonies and 161 misdemeanors. The controls committed 373 crimes, 193 felonies and 180 misdemeanors. This yields a crime rate per 10 subjects at risk of 30.53 for experimentals and 30.57 for controls. These differences were not significant, \( t(228.04) = .01, p < .50, \) one-tailed.

1C. The experimentals will commit no more felonies than the controls commit.
Table 11

Expected versus Actual Performance of Experimentals based on Risk Factors at Time 1 and Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Group</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Expected Offenders</th>
<th>Actual Offenders</th>
<th>Risk Group</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Expected Offenders</th>
<th>Actual Offenders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assaultive Risk Distribution: Time 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assaultive Risk Distribution: Time 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Low</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>1.068</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>V. Low</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>0.623</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>1.443</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>1.665</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>4.350</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>5.742</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. High</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>V. High</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.698</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Risk Distribution: Time 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Property Risk Distribution: Time 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>3.132</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>4.350</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>6.258</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>5.662</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>4.760</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>5.780</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.150</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Probabilities are from Final Report (no. AP-0), Michigan Risk Prediction: A Replication Study (pp. 18, 20) by T. H. Murphy, 1980, unpublished report, Michigan Department of Corrections, Lansing.*
The experimentals committed 187 felonies, while the controls committed 193 felonies. The felony rate per 10 subjects at risk for experimentals was 16.40 while the controls had a felony rate of 15.82. Thus, although the gross number of felonies was less, when corrected for the number of subjects at risk, the experimentals had a slightly higher violation rate. These differences were not significant, \( t(231.73) = -0.21, p < .42 \), one-tailed.

ID. The experimentals will be convicted of no more felonies than the controls.

The experimentals were convicted of 63 felonies during the tracking period, and the controls were convicted of 80 felonies. This yields a conviction rate per 10 subjects at risk of 5.53 for experimentals and 6.56 for controls. This difference was not significant, \( t(232.98) = 0.95, p < .17 \), one-tailed.

**Seriousness of Criminal Activity**

2. The seriousness of the criminal acts committed by the experimentals will be no more than the seriousness of the criminal acts committed by the controls.

Previously in the discussion it was noted that the Sellin-Wolfgang Seriousness Index does not score many crimes which result in no tangible harm or loss. Thus, many felonies are not considered in the figures which follow. Table 7 lists the crimes not scored.
The total seriousness score for experimentals was 542 and for controls was 733. This converts to a seriousness rate per 10 subjects at risk of 47.54 for experimentals and 60.08 for controls. This difference between the groups was not significant, \( t(227.86) = 1.16, p < .13, \) one-tailed.

The results using the second seriousness scale from the National Survey of Crime Severity, were comparable. Experimentals had a total score of 941.5 and a severity rate of 82.59. Controls had a total score of 1,376.3 and a severity rate of 112.81. These differences were not significant, \( t(203.6) = 1.41, p < .08, \) one-tailed.

The Effects of a Change in the Selection Process for Program Participants on Subsequent Crime

3A. The average number of criminal acts committed by the \( E_1 \) group will be less than the average number of criminal acts committed by the \( E_2 \) group.

The crime rate for 10 subjects at risk for the Time 1 experimentals was 30.94 and for the Time 2 experimentals was 30.16. This was opposite to the direction hypothesized, yet the difference was not significant, \( t(109.03) = 0.13, p < .46, \) one-tailed.

3B. The average number of felonies committed by group \( E_1 \) will be less than the average number of felonies committed by the \( E_2 \) group.

The \( E_1 \) group committed 99 felonies, while the \( E_2 \) group committed 88. This produces a felony rate of 18.68 and 14.43 for each.
Again, the results were opposite to what was hypothesized, yet were not significant, $t(104) = 1.03, p < .16$, one-tailed.

3C. The average seriousness of felonies committed by the $E_1$ group will be less than the average seriousness of felonies committed by the $E_2$ group.

The seriousness scores were also in the direction opposite to what was hypothesized. The average seriousness rate for the earlier experimental group was 56.92 and for the later group was 38.52. This difference was not significant, $t(93.49) = 1.37, p < .09$, one-tailed.

The second seriousness scale was computed and the rate for the $E_1$ group was 97.06 and for the $E_2$ group was 70.02. As above, this was not in the direction hypothesized, yet the differences were not significant, $t(93.49) = 1.15, p < .13$, one-tailed.

Summary of Findings on Hypotheses

Using the Michigan Risk Study expectancies as a statistical control group, the sample’s overall behavior was extremely close to expectancies. When the Property Risk distribution was broken down into Time 1 and Time 2, however, differences were found, with the Time 2 offenders performing significantly better during halfway house placement and parole than would have been expected from similar risk parolees during only parole.

The remaining hypotheses concerning the extent and seriousness of criminal behavior used parolees as the control group. In all
instances the experimentals committed fewer crimes and were convicted of fewer crimes than the controls. The differences were so small that the conclusion would have to be that there were no differences between experimentals and controls.

The experimentals also consistently had lower seriousness scores for their offenses than the controls had. However, many crimes were not scored on the seriousness indices used, some of which, such as escape and drug sales, are of great concern to the public. Experimentals disproportionately committed these non-scored offenses.

The changes in the selection criteria also occurred at a time when an increasing percentage of the prison population was being placed in halfway houses. It was expected that with the release of more marginal candidates the Time 2 experimentals would have worse records than Time 1 experimentals. That was not supported. Consistently, the experimentals from the second time period committed fewer crimes and less serious crimes (average seriousness per scored crime was 4.72 for $E_1$ and 3.41 for $E_2$). Although Time 2 experimentals performed better in each category, none of the differences was significant.

Some indirect support for the original hypothesis was found in another variable. When the year of release was crosstabulated with felony behavior, there was a positive relationship, $r = .217, p < .05$, implying that although the whole $E_2$ group had a better rate, within that group there was increasing felony behavior over time as had been suspected.
While these results cannot support the argument that halfway house participants commit less crime than controls, it is clear that they commit no more crime, in volume or seriousness, although the recipient community is at risk longer.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The question at the heart of this study is whether selected offenders can be released to pre-parole placements without subjecting the host community to excess harm in the process. Two theoretical models were presented which have formed the justification for halfway house use for post-prison populations. The reintegration model emphasizes programming to involve the offender in the ongoing positive social life of the community, while the selective incapacitation model emphasizes selection and structural programming aspects.

The data in this study did not establish any clear indication that selective incapacitation can be practiced consistently with less harm to the community than the community currently absorbs from parolees. Halfway house participants did not cause significantly more harm. In fact, for the specific sample selected, the gross amount of harm was less, both in volume and seriousness.

In a cursory analysis, it is clear that the majority of the support for fewer crimes by experimentals came from the halfway house participants during the second time period of the study. This lower rate of new crime was especially noticeable in the number of non-violent offenses by the E2 group. This reduction is in many ways contrary to what would have been expected. The crime rate during the second time period was nearly 12% higher than it was during the first
time period. The second group was at risk nearly four months longer. When corrected for this additional time at risk, it would be reasonable to expect a 13.4% higher crime rate. Instead the rate was 22.8% less.

Many of the differences in the samples would also support an argument for a higher crime rate in Time 2. The only variables showing significant differences between the two time periods were race and marital status. Time 2 experimentals included more minorities and unmarrieds, both characteristics which have been associated with increased crime in positivist perspectives. Other, non-significant, differences indicated that the $E_2$ group had more involvement with hard drugs and alcohol and a little more history of serious abuse continuing up to the time of arrest. There were also more who had lived in the county less than one year prior to incarceration. The $E_2$ members had committed more violent crimes, had more felony convictions and fewer were serving for their first offense. They had worse histories of supervision, had more jail and prison terms and had served more time in custody in their adult lives. Structurally, a larger percentage of the prison population was in halfway houses, implying more marginal candidates.

Despite these expectations, the second time period halfway house participants committed much less new crime. Non-violent crime rates by supervision status were computed to see if this reduction was consistent with all statuses, implying an aberantly low risk group, or whether the reduction occurred at any particular
status. As Table 12 shows, although this group did show somewhat reduced crime rates at all statuses, the clear majority of the difference between the two experimental groups occurred during their halfway house participation.

Table 12
Non-violent Felony Rates by Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>CRP</th>
<th>Parole or Subsequent Supervision</th>
<th>Post-Supervision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E₁</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E₂</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₁</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C₂</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. All rates are crimes per 10 subjects at risk per month at status.

In attempting to explain this reduced crime during halfway house placement, the most general conclusion would have to be that the selection methods and programming followed in the second time period isolated a group who remained more crime-free during the halfway house participation, although they did return to similar crime rates during subsequent statuses. Unfortunately, the ex-post-facto research design limited the amount of understanding of that process which can be determined. Many of the structural components could not be reconstructed from file material. It probably will not be
possible to adequately address some of these issues until an ongoing field study is completed in which data can be obtained on existing programming practices as they occur.

With the information that was available, it was clear that the prison population was increasingly becoming comprised of violent offenders rather than property offenders. Releases to both halfway house and parole statuses show a reduction from Time 1 to Time 2 in individuals serving for a non-violent offense from 67.4% to 48.7%. Although a larger proportion of these non-violent offenders were sent to the halfway houses, the composition of halfway house participants changed between the time periods. In the first time period, 81.1% of the participants were serving for a non-violent offense. In the second time period the number had reduced to 62.3%. This pattern was also evident in the reduction from 34% to 23% of the halfway house sample in the two time periods whose primary offense pattern in the past had been property offenses.

These changes were studied through crosstabulation analysis. Not only were fewer non-violent offenders in the second sample, but the relationship between the type of offense and new non-violent crime changed as well. During the first time period, offenders serving for non-violent offenses committed few of the new crimes. During the second time period, offenders serving for violent offenses had lower rates of new crime. This was even more pronounced when only considering new non-violent offenses. Thus, with a larger number of violent offenders in the second sample and those violent
offenders committing new crimes at a lower rate, the overall number of new non-violent crimes dropped dramatically during the second time period.

For the reader's interest, the number of violent offenses increased slightly in the second time period with the larger number of violent offenders in the group from 0.57 to 0.65 per 10 subjects at risk. When corrected for differential time at risk, however, the rate per month at risk was 0.11 for the $E_1$ group and 0.10 for the $E_2$ group. So, although the second time period sample contained more violent offenders, they committed new violent offenses at a lower rate per month than the sample from the first time period.

Besides the changing non-violent/violent composition of the samples, two other variables are of interest. Involvement in self-improvement programs was associated with reduced levels of crime. This relationship was stronger in the first time period than the second. However, during the first time period only 33% of the group were involved in such programming while 57.7% were involved during the second time period.

Finally, maintenance of full time employment was associated with lower new crime rates. There was not much difference in the employment of the halfway house participants in the two time periods, however. The second group included 52.5% who maintained full time employment while the first time period had 50.9%. On the other end of the continuum, 18% of the $E_2$ group were employed less than 40% of the time, while 18.9% of the $E_1$ group were in that category. Thus, the
differences cannot be explained on the basis of the number of participants employed.

The relationship of low levels of employment with new crime, though, was much different during the two time periods. For the $E_1$ group, those employed less than 40% of the time were involved in a high volume of new crime while the low level employed of the $E_2$ group had almost as good a record of non-involvement in new crime as those working full time.

The reasons for these changes in criminal behavior from Time 1 to Time 2 are not clear. It is known that during the second time period there were increasing levels of surveillance through reduced inmate/staff ratios. For these samples, however, that variable did not show a very strong relationship to new crime levels. It may be that intensity of supervision has differing effects on non-violent/violent offenders or employed/unemployed offenders, but this study could establish no such relationship. On the employment issue, it is known that unemployed offenders were provided with a $10 per week subsidy for bus money and other incidentals during part of the second time period. During the first time period offenders were subsidized for only the first five weeks. File material was not adequate to control for this issue to determine if any relationship existed.

The major effort in the above discussion has been to try to explain why the $E_2$ group was lower than expected in new crime. Another approach is to try to explain why the $E_1$ group was higher.
than expected. Policing levels remained very consistent in the coun-
ty between the two time periods, so they were not controlled for in
this study. There was a major interagency police undercover opera-
tion during the first time period into drug trafficking in the area.
The results are clearly reflected in Table 5, in which all new drug
offenses by both experimentals and controls occurred during the first
time period. Since both experimentals and controls were exposed to
this, no bias is introduced in comparing those two groups. In con-
sidering the two time periods, however, the two groups were affected
differentially. If those drug offenses, directly attributable to dif-
ferential policing, are ignored, the new felony rate for each 10 ex-
perimentals at risk in the two time periods reduces to 1.64 for Time 1
versus 1.44 for Time 2, rather than 1.87 versus 1.44, respectively.

An analysis of covariance was completed using a number of var-
iables which crosstabulation analysis showed were associated with new
crime. The same variables were used in analyses of each time period.
None of the factors or covariates used were significantly related to
new crime in this analysis. At Time 1, escape records, employment
while at CRP and the unemployment rate showed the strongest explana-
tion of variance in new non-violent crime during halfway house place-
ment. During Time 2, the type of offense being served, involvement
in self-improvement programs and the time in the county prior to in-
carceration showed the strongest prediction of new non-violent
crime. These results have to be viewed with extreme caution since
it cannot be demonstrated that the samples from the two time periods
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came from the same population, an assumption necessary for the test. Also strong interaction effects are suspected from the data, but the computer program used, SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) did not adequately address that. First, the program does not measure interaction effects between factors and covariates; and, second, measurement of interaction effects are suppressed if empty cells exist in the data distribution, which was true in this data. In this analysis, it is believed that interaction effects were not fully measured; and interaction effects, if present, distort the stated prediction by main factors.

Testing the Theoretical Models

Two theoretical models were previously discussed which have been used to support the use of halfway houses. The reintegration model focuses on attempts to integrate the offender into community life to bring social pressures to bear on him/her toward law-abiding behavior. The selective incapacitation model emphasizes selection and structural programming to identify those offenders who are believed to be better risks to place in reduced custody settings.

Variables were selected which would indicate support for each of the two theoretical models, reintegration and selective incapacitation. A major difficulty in this procedure was that the research design limited detailed information about both models which could have only been collected in an ongoing study. Analyses of variance (for the reintegration model) and covariance (for the selective
incapacitation model) were run over both time periods since the models, if valid, should account for variation at both time periods. Since both time periods are included in one sample, the problem of assuming similarity of sample populations is eliminated. It is possible, however, that if differences in the groups exist, these may act as intervening variables skewing the overall findings.

The variables chosen to reflect the reintegration model were time in the county prior to incarceration, involvement in self-improvement programs and employment while at CRP.

The variables chosen to represent the selective incapacitation model were the type of offense being served, employment at CRP, inmate/staff ratio and length of time at CRP.

Both of these models were run against total crime at CRP status. The reintegration model showed one significant factor, involvement in self-improvement programs, $F(1, 103) = 3.939, p = .05$. Employment at CRP showed a strong, but not significant, explanation for new crime at CRP status. Involvement in self-improvement and maintenance of full time employment, in interaction, were related to lower levels of new crime, at non-significant levels.

The selective incapacitation model revealed a significant interaction between the type of offense being served with employment at CRP in relation to new crime, $F(2, 106) = 3.344, p < .04$. Violent offenders who were employed full time committed the least new crimes, while non-violent offenders who were employed less than full time, especially those partially employed (40-69% of the time), committed
the most new crimes. Other factors were not significant. A covariate, inmate/staff ratio, showed low levels of support for the idea that increased staffing reduced new crime. It was speculated that there might be some interaction between that variable and some others, such as type of offense or employment status, with new crime. The computer program used does not measure interactions between factors and covariates, so that could not be determined in this analysis.

Overall neither model provided very much understanding of the crime at halfway house status. The reintegration model, as outlined, explained only 8% of the variance in the dependent variable, crime at CRP. The selective incapacitation model, as indicated in the variables chose, explained about 12%. This inadequacy of explanation might be attributable to an inadequacy of the theoretical models, limitations of the research design in terms of what variables could be scored or the variables chosen to be indicative of the given models.

Limitations of the Study

The research design imposes limitations on the application of the findings of this research to other settings. The nature of the research question, itself, led to problems with generalization. The strong desire to measure the program as it had been practiced and the resulting harm to the community led to the selection methods followed. The selection methods, however, are not consistent with requirements of independence and randomness, assumptions with almost
every statistical technique. The violations of these rules include the fact that individuals were not replaced as drawn, making it more likely that the remaining members would be selected and a correction factor was not used, the fact that persons appeared in the population of more than one sample group and the fact that some individuals selected were eliminated to avoid any tracking periods overlapping.

In generalizing beyond this study, the most serious limitation is that the population for this study was one county in Michigan, which is probably not typical of the entire state. The results provide some factual basis for assessing the amount of harm done to the community through new criminal behavior, but may not be indicative of similar programs elsewhere in the state.

The ex-post-facto research design also imposed limitations, primarily in being able to control for structural and programming elements which would have added much more understanding to the behavior of the sample. File material and other records did not contain enough information to control for these elements. An on-going research design would be needed to adequately address these issues.

This study was limited to a specific time period, although it was broad. With overcrowding in Michigan prisons during the last few years, the numbers and kinds of offenders sent to halfway houses have changed frequently. In this volatile situation the applicability of the findings to other time periods is questionable.

The lack of a true control group limits assessment of the impact of halfway house participation on specific offender groups.
This also clouds the issue of differential harm and the resulting policy implications.

The measurement of harm to the community must be broadened to include more than just new criminal behavior. The community absorbs more costs through placement of inmates in community settings than is reflected in recidivism. An ongoing field study would be needed to even begin to measure these costs, and such a study would be essential before the true costs and benefits of various correctional alternatives can be assessed.

It was previously mentioned that the use of community placements, reducing the length and certainty of punishment, might lessen deterrence resulting in an increase in criminal behavior in the future. This issue was beyond the scope of this study but remains an important consideration in drawing conclusions about the question of harm to the community.

Ethical concerns remain about the use of selective incapacitation, whether or not it can be proven to "work." Cohen in a recent article summarizes these concerns (1983). Can programs be justified that treat offenders differentially on the basis of possible future criminality, especially when recent studies have shown that one-half to two-thirds of the high risk offenders identified through most screening techniques are false positives? The Michigan Risk Study used as the screening device in this study assumes 55-65% false positives in the highest risk group. Until screening becomes more accurate, the equity of programs using the techniques will be questioned.
Finally, any program such as the one on which this study is based raises questions of whether what has been demonstrated supports the idea that offenders can be released earlier from prison or whether it shows that they could have been diverted from prison into intensive community supervision programs in the first place. That, of course, is part of the deterrence question discussed above.

Directions for Future Research

Clearly the halfway house program in Michigan and those in other parts of the country have developed on pragmatic and largely untested assumptions. It is reasonable to believe that they will continue to operate because they meet a need in the correctional system and have the support of persons with rehabilitative and deinstitutionalization goals. Unfortunately, there is very little hard evidence about such programs, and so the possibilities for further research are wide open.

Each specific element of the halfway house program could be studied to determine if it is necessary for the program to operate effectively and efficiently. Some specific information from this study deserves additional study. In this sample, groups of offenders typically considered high risk responded better to the halfway house program that those usually considered better risks. These groups included minorities, single offenders and those with higher assaultive risk ratings under the Michigan Risk Study.
Another issue that should be studied is the improved overall crime rate which was achieved by placing more violent offenders in the halfway house program. Undoubtedly, there was not a purposive plan to send more violent offenders, they just sent who was eligible. The change in selection criteria and/or programming followed did allow more violent offenders to participate with a drop in criminal behavior during halfway house placement. There was a slight increase in violent offenses, but for this sample that appeared to be more of a result of additional time at risk than a higher level of assaultive crime. If the basis for the difference in the behavior of the violent offenders in the two time periods can be determined, it will allow the continued use of halfway houses even though prison populations become increasingly composed of violent offenders and serious recidivists.

There was some indication that the time of release was related to program success. If supported, that would indicate that success could be enhanced by increased releases at certain times of the year.

Another area needing additional study is the relationship of employment and the prevailing unemployment rate and new criminal behavior. This relationship was not the same in this study for persons under halfway house supervision and later on parole. A slight inverse relationship between the unemployment rate and new crime was present during parole. During halfway house placement, however, the relationship was a positive one, as the unemployment rate went up, crime increased. It could be speculated that with
the emphasis placed on the location and maintenance of full-time employment during halfway house placement, offenders commit more crimes when unable to locate employment as jobs become more scarce. This pattern was especially true for non-violent offenders who were unable to maintain full-time employment. (The reader should be aware that in the halfway house program not only is employment required, but social privileges, including curfew limits and home visits are contingent upon the maintenance of full-time employment.) By such emphasis, new criminal behavior might be stimulated as a frustration reaction. It was clear that the emphasis on employment or tighter supervision did produce a much larger group (50% versus 30%) in the halfway house who maintained full-time employment compared with the same individuals later under parole supervision. A study of employment should also address the question of what differences the provision of small cash subsidies to unemployed participants makes.

The real need is to conduct an ongoing field study of several halfway house programs in which there is a serious attempt to control not only for variation in offender characteristics but program and staff characteristics as well. Moos (1975) has provided an initial approach to this concept. Until program characteristics can be controlled in these kinds of studies, there will be no way to really gain understanding of which offenders do well in which settings. This understanding is necessary not only to maximize benefits to offenders, but it may be critical if halfway houses are
going to be used in lieu of incarceration and maintain any public acceptance.

An ongoing field study would also be able to begin to address the question of costs and benefits of halfway houses as correctional alternatives, giving legitimate consideration to indirect costs and costs which the state penal system passes on to the community receiving the inmates.

A useful theoretical framework in which such an ongoing study could be pursued is the "routine activity approach" (Cohen and Felson, 1979). This theory makes no attempt to explain why specific offenders develop into criminals. Borrowing from human ecology theory, the authors suggest that crime, as practiced, is routine activity, at times enmeshed in the legitimate opportunity structure, which occurs when there is a "convergence in space and time of...motivated offenders...suitable targets, and...the absence of capable guardians against violation" (Cohen and Felson, 1979, p. 589). The social structure influences when these three necessary elements converge.

Guardianship in routine activity theory includes all of the formal and informal constraints (Reckless, 1973, pp. 55-57) and social forces in the community which discourage criminal behavior. Within this framework, in a micro-level analysis, changes in supervision or program elements could be studied to see what resulting changes occur in crime rates or patterns. This would be extremely helpful from a program planning standpoint to minimize harm to the
community while utilizing the halfway house program for rehabilitative or pragmatic reasons.

Conclusions

As can be seen from the above discussion, this study has scarcely scraped the surface of the need for solid research in the use of halfway houses in pre-parole settings. This study has changed the focus of the problem from an analysis of benefits to participants to a consideration of harm to the community, a more pragmatic approach. Perhaps that is the study's largest contribution.

As a type of pilot project, however, it demonstrates the potential for such studies, and makes clear the need for an ongoing data base in existing programs beyond the basic descriptive measures now recorded.

The sample in this study did commit fewer crimes and less serious crimes as was hypothesized. The differences were small and not significant. It was clear that they did not commit more crimes and more serious crimes than the host community now experiences from parolees.

Changes in the selection procedures, including use of the results of the Michigan Risk Study, did allow a more marginal risk group to be placed in the community while experiencing a reduction in the number of crimes halfway house participants committed. This improved performance was not expected but was consistent, though not significant, in all measurements made. Involvement in self-improvement
programs, changes in the violent/non-violent composition of the
group and reduced crime by offenders with low levels of employment
are associated with this reduced crime rate.

The fact that this study was limited to one county in Michigan
makes the results helpful in designing further research, but prob­
ably not predictive of state-wide program participant behavior.
It is a beginning focusing primary attention of correctional policy
on community needs rather than limiting attention to the needs of
the offenders or the correctional organization. It is hoped that
additional research will further this objective.
Footnotes

1 Insufficient numbers of female offenders participated in the halfway house program to complete any kind of analysis, so they were excluded.

2 That specific number of days was chosen since halfway house participants frequently were placed in nearby correction centers for disciplinary reasons (usually for 30 days) or due to lack of bed space locally. By excluding all offenders supervised outside the county without the time limit would severely reduce the population.

3 These are individuals released 30 days before discharge from sentence. Thus, they are not supervised at all after that brief period of time under the supervision of halfway house staff. While their adjustment would be interesting to track, there were insufficient numbers to merit inclusion in this study.

4 These terminations of supervision occurred abruptly and at different stages of supervision. This difference could not be adequately controlled. As with the Discharge Furloughs, it would be interesting to track their subsequent behavior after supervision terminated, but that remains beyond the scope of this study.

5 The difference in crime rate was 11.9% between the two time periods under study. This was a weighted average, based upon the number released to each group each year and the length of the tracking period. Uniform Crime Reports from 1975 through 1984 were used, and the crime rate used was the one cited for the Battle Creek standard metropolitan statistical area (which actually includes Barry county as well as Calhoun County). The difference in assaultive crime rates was 12.3% more in Time 2 than in Time 1 using the same procedures.

6 Variables included the type of offense, escape history, employment at CRP, involvement in self-improvement programs, inmate/staff ratio, time to first parole date, time in the county prior to incarceration and unemployment rate during CRP placement.
### Appendix A

#### DATA SHEET

**COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS: AN ASSESSMENT OF THE HARM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inmate Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Study Identification Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Control Groups: 1) CRP released prior to 8/1/78 2) CRP released on or after 8/1/78 3) Parole released prior to 8/1/78 4) Parole on or after 8/1/78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parole Furlough: 0) No 1) Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Length of Tracking Period (in months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Race: 1) Black 2) White 3) Other 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Marital Status: 1) Single, never married 2) Separated, Divorced or Widower 3) Married or Common Law 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Education: 1) 8th Grade or less 2) Some High School 3) High School 4) GED 5) Some college 6) Four year college degree or higher 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>AGR: 1) 2nd grade or lower 2) 3rd to 5th grade 3) 6th to 8th grade 4) 9th to 11th grade 5) 12th grade or higher 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Employment Type: 1) White collar/Professional 2) Skilled 3) Semi-skilled 4) Unskilled 5) No work history 6) Not Applicable (Housewife/Student) 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Employment Regularity during Five Years Preceding Confinement (exclude school/other confinements): 1) 70% or more of time available for employment 2) 40-69% 3) Less than 40% 4) Not applicable (Housewife/Student) 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Substance Abuse, Type: 0) None 1) Alcohol Only 2) Marijuana 3) Alcohol and Marijuana 4) Other Drug 5) Poly-drug 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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12 Substance Abuse, Extent: 0) None 1) Social Use Claimed—moderate and no history of abuse 2) Prior Abuse but no present use admitted or documented 3) Prior Abuse and present moderate/social use 4) Episodic serious abuse continuing 5) Continuing Abuse 9) Unknown

13 Substance Abuse Treatment: 0) No known need 1) Acknowledged need but no treatment beyond evaluation 2) Outpatient only 3) Short-term inpatient (30 days or less) 4) Long-term inpatient 9) Unknown

14 Psychiatric History 0) No known problem 1) Acknowledged need but no treatment beyond evaluation 2) Outpatient Only 3) Inpatient treatment 9) Unknown

15 Length of Residence in Calhoun County Prior to Present Incarceration (in years): 0) None 1) One Year or Less 2) 1+ - 4 years 3) 5 - 15 4) 15+ 9) Unknown

16 Age at First Conviction: 1) Under 15 2) 15-16 3) 17-19 4) 20-24 5) 25-35 6) 36 and above 7) Unknown

17 Number of Juvenile Convictions: (Actual Number 0,1,2,3...) 8) 8 or more 9) Unknown

18 Juvenile Commitments: 0) None 1) Local Facility 2) Private Facility 3) State DSS 9) Unknown

19 Prior Adult Misdemeanor Convictions: (Actual Number 0, 1,2,3...) 8) 8 or more 9) Unknown

20 Prior Adult Felony Convictions: (Actual Number 0,1,2,3...) 8) 8 or more 9) Unknown


22 Prior Probation/Parole Supervision: 0) None 1) Successful Completion 2) Unsuccessful Completion 3) Multiple Supervisions--50% + Successful Completions 4) Multiple Supervisions--less than 50% Successful Completions 9) Unknown

23 At least One Prior Probation/Parole Revocation: 0) No 1) Yes 9) Unknown

24 Number of Prior Jail Commitments: (Actual Number 0,1,2,3...) 8) 8 or more 9) Unknown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Prior Prison Commitments: (Actual Number 0,1,2,3...)</td>
<td>8) 8 or more 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Total Amount of Time Incarcerated Since Age 17 (at time of release to community):</td>
<td>1) 5% or less 2) 6-10% 3) 11-20% 4) 21-40% 5) 41-70% 6) 71%+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27-</td>
<td>Total amount of time incarcerated, as above in years since age 17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Age at Commission of Present Offense:</td>
<td>1) 19 or younger 2) 20-24 3) 25-35 4) 36 and older 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Length of Minimum Sentence (in months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Length of Maximum Sentence (in months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Prior Escape History:</td>
<td>0) None 1) Juvenile—Runaway or non-secure facility 2) Juvenile—secure 3) Adult abscond bond/supervision 4) Adult-nonsecure facility 5) Adult—secure 9) Unknown Score most serious escape, or, if multiple of equal seriousness, score most recent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Prior Community Placement:</td>
<td>0) None 1) Successful Completion 2) Unsuccessful 3) Multiple Placements—mixed results 4) Multiple Placements—positive 5) Multiple Placements—negative 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Length of Time in CRP (in months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Months Served at Time of Release to the Community (Actual Months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Months Remaining to First Parole Date:</td>
<td>0) Parolee 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Age at Release:</td>
<td>1) 19 or younger 2) 20-24 3) 25-35 4) 36 and older 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date of Release: 1) January thru March  2) April thru June  3) July thru September  4) October thru December  9) Unknown


Risk Factors, Assaultive: 1) Very Low  2) Low  3) Middle  4) High  5) Very High  9) Unknown

Risk Factors, Property: 1) Low  2) Middle  3) High

Most Serious Violation While on CRP Status: 0) Parolee  1) No Problem  2) Serious Management Problem (Average two or more Major Misconducts per month during placement)  3) Misdemeanor behavior  4) Escape  5) Other non-violent felony behavior  6) Violent felony behavior  9) Unknown

Successful Completion of CRP Supervision?:  0) Parolee  1) Yes  2) No  9) Unknown

If no, above, Unsatisfactory Termination Type:  0) Parolee or successful  1) Technical Violation Return  2) Technical Violation return in lieu of Misdemeanor  3) Technical Rule Violation Return in lieu of newFelony  4) Returned new misdemeanor  5) Returned Misdemeanor in lieu of new Felony  6) Escape  7) Other non-violent Felony  8) Violent Felony  9) Unknown

If Second CRP placement during tracking period, second placement showed  0) Parolee  1) Improved performance/termination  2) Worse performance/termination type  3) No change  4) Multiple placement--mixed results  5) Multiple placement--positive results  6) Multiple placement--negative results  9) Unknown


If Second Parole period during tracking period, second placement showed  1) Improved performance/termination  2) Worse termination/performance  3) No change  4) Still on parole at end of tracking period  5) Still on CRP at end of tracking period  9) Unknown

Total Months at Risk During Tracking Period: (Actual Months)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60-61</td>
<td><strong>Total Months Under Supervision During the Tracking Period</strong> (Actual Months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td><strong>Employment While in CRP:</strong> 0) Parolee  1) 70% or more 2) 40-69% 3) Less than 40% 4) Not applicable (Housewife/Student) 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td><strong>Employment While on Parole:</strong> 1) 70% or more 2) 40-69% 3) Less than 40% 4) Not applicable (Housewife/Student) 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td><strong>Involvement in Self-Improvement Programs?</strong> 1) Educational 2) Vocational 3) Substance Abuse 4) Psychological 5) Multiple Involvement 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-66</td>
<td><strong>Total Number of Months During Tracking Period in Custody:</strong> (Actual Months)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td><strong>Number of Misdemeanors During CRP:</strong> 0) None or Parolee 1,2,3... Actual Number 8) 8 or more 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td><strong>Number of Misdemeanor Convictions During CRP:</strong> 0) None or Parolee 1,2,3... Actual Number 8) 8 or more 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td><strong>Number of Misdemeanors During Parole:</strong> 0,1,2,3...Actual Number 8) 8 or more 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>**Number of Misdemeanor Convictions During Parole 0,1,2,3... Actual Number 8) 8 or more 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td><strong>Number of Misdemeanors After Supervision Terminated:</strong> 0,1,2,3... Actual Number 8) 8 or more 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td><strong>Number of Misdemeanor Convictions After Supervision Terminated:</strong> 0,1,2,3... Actual Number 8) 8 or more 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td><strong>Total Number of Misdemeanors During Tracking Period:</strong> 0,1,2,3... Actual Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td><strong>Total Number of Misdemeanor Convictions During Tracking Period:</strong> 0,1,2,3... Actual Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Number of Misdemeanors (Behavior) of Each Type, Below:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Property—Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Property—Destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Assaultive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Public Order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Misdemeanors by Type (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Alcohol/Drug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Weapons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>84-86</th>
<th>Percent of Total Prison Population in CRP at Date of CRP Entry (Actual Percentage) Parolee = 00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Michigan Risk Study Control: (Most serious behavior during 36 months after release or as long as under supervision): 1) No Illegal Behavior 2) Technical Violation 3) Misdemeanor 4) Non-violent Felony 5) Violent Felony 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Returned to Jail/Prison for 30 days or more during the supervision period? 0) No 1) Yes 9) Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89-90</td>
<td>Total Number of Felonies (Behavior) During Tracking Period: 0,1,2,3... Actual Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Escape/Abscond on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Larceny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Burglary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Forgery/False Pretenses/Checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Homicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Criminal Sexual Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Drug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Weapons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Property Destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Number of Felony Convictions, by Type, Below:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>No Conviction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Misdemeanor Conviction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>Escape/Abscond on Bond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Larceny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Burglary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Forgery/False Pretenses/Checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Homicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Auto Theft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Criminal Sexual Conduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Robbery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Felony Convictions by Type (continued)

115 _____ Drug
116 _____ Weapons
117 _____ Property Destruction

Total Seriousness of Offenses (Sellin-Wolfgang Scale) by Status:

184-187 _____ Total Seriousness Score at CRP
118-121 _____ Total Seriousness Score at Parole
188-191 _____ Total Seriousness Score for Offenses Committed After Supervision Terminated

Total Seriousness of Offenses (National Survey of Crime Severity) by Status

192-195 _____ Total Seriousness Score at CRP
122-125 _____ Total Seriousness Score at Parole
196-199 _____ Total Seriousness Score for Offenses Committed After Supervision Terminated

Number of Crimes Resulting in No Tangible Damage Which Are Not Included in Seriousness Scores Above, by Type:

126 _____ Escape/Abscond From Bond
127 _____ Weapons Possession
128 _____ Possession of Drugs
129 _____ Sale of Drugs
130 _____ Attempts to Commit Felonies—No Actual Damage

Total Minimum Sentences (in months) Imposed For New Crimes Committed at Each Status, Below:

131-133 _____ Sentences for Crimes at CRP
134-136 _____ Sentences for Crimes Committed While on Parole
137-139 _____ Sentences for Crimes Committed After Supervision Terminated
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Length of Time Out of Custody at Commission of New Offense---

Total Number of Crimes in Each Time Period (in months):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Total Crimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inmate Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Day to Six Months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven - Twelve Months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirteen - Eighteen Months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nineteen - Twenty-Four Months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twenty-Five - Thirty Months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirty-One - Thirty-Six Months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thirty-Six Months and Over</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Crimes of Each Type Committed at Each Status Listed Below:

Escape:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Total Crimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Initial CRP Release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Subsequent CRP Release or While Inmate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Non-violent Felonies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Total Crimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Initial CRP Release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP Graduate on Subsequent Parole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group, on Parole Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During Subsequent Period of Supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenses Committed After Supervision Terminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Violent Felonies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Total Crimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Initial CRP Release</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenses Committed by CRP Graduate on Parole</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group, Offenses on Parole Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenses Committed During Subsequent Periods of Supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offenses Committed After Supervision Terminated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment Status at Offense—Total Number of Offenses Committed at Each Employment Status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Total Crimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None—Offender Disabled, Housewife, Student, Inmate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% or More</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Substance Abuse Involvement in the Commission of the Offense—Total Number of Offenses in Each Category:

168 _____ Yes
169 _____ No
170 _____ Possibly
171 _____ Unknown

172-174 _____ Total Maximum Sentences Imposed for All Offenses
175-177 _____ Average Inmate/Staff Ratios in CRP during placement:
0) Parolee  Actual Ratio

Average Unemployment Rate During Placement:
178-180 _____ During CRP  0) Parolee
181-183 _____ During Parole
Appendix B

Percentage Of Total Prison Population In CRP
(By Quarter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1st Quarter</th>
<th>2nd Quarter</th>
<th>3rd Quarter</th>
<th>4th Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The data in this table are from the 1980 and 1981 Annual Statistical Reports of the Michigan Department of Corrections.
### Appendix C

**Inmate/Staff Ratio**

(By Quarter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1st Quarter</th>
<th>2nd Quarter</th>
<th>3rd Quarter</th>
<th>4th Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Unemployment Rate
(By Quarter)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1st Quarter</th>
<th>2nd Quarter</th>
<th>3rd Quarter</th>
<th>4th Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appendix E**

**National Survey of Crime Severity**

**Seriousness Scoring Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Scored</th>
<th>Scale Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I  Injury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Minor harm</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Treated and discharged</td>
<td>8.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Hospitalized</td>
<td>11.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Killed</td>
<td>35.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Forcible sex acts</td>
<td>25.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Intimidation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Verbal or physical</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Weapon</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Premises forcibly entered</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Motor vehicle stolen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Recovered</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Not recovered</td>
<td>8.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Property theft/damage</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ *\log_{10} Y = 0.26776656 \log_{10} X \]

where Y = crime severity weight  
X = total dollar value of theft or damage.

**Note.** Above scale adapted from Wolfgang, Figlio, Tracy and Singer, National Survey of Crime Severity (1985, p. 131).
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